

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 2023

SESSION OF 2023

207TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 28

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 12 m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER (JOANNA E. McCLINTON) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. DARISHA K. PARKER, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Good morning.

Blessed be the Lord because He has heard the voice of my heart. The Lord is my strength and my impeccable shield. My heart trusts with unwavering confidence. In Him, I am helped, therefore my heart greatly rejoices. And with my song, I shall say, thank You, as I am asking today on this Tuesday, as we have many firsts but we will not have lasts, we have to make sure we check on each other, be kind – be kind – be loving and cheerful, because our health as one makes sure that we can do what needs to be done when we took our oath of office to serve as State Representatives. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Wednesday, June 14, 2023, will be postponed until printed.

JOURNALS APPROVED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the following regular session Journals will be approved:

Wednesday, March 1, 2023;
Thursday, March 2, 2023; and
Monday, March 6, 2023.

The SPEAKER. Members, if you can take your seats. We have some very important guests on the floor of the House. The House will come to order.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Seated this afternoon to the left of the Speaker, we have our colleague, Representative Malagari's father. His dad, Rick Malagari, is here visiting with us today. We hope you had a great Father's Day.

Also to the left of the Speaker's rostrum, our colleague, Representative McNeill, has her summer intern here today in the Capitol. Nicole Hill just graduated from Moravian University and will be attending Lehigh University to pursue her master's degree in political science. Please stand, Nicole. Welcome.

Our colleague, Representative Bradford, also has seated to the left of the Speaker's rostrum, Willow Whelan. She is shadowing him today and she is a senior at Elisabeth Irwin High School. Welcome, Willow. We are glad to have you.

Our colleague, Representative Delozier, has Hannah Reed, a student across the river who is shadowing her today. Hannah, please stand. Welcome.

In the back of the House, members, we have some very important guests. We have the students of the Pennsylvania chapter of the Jack and Jill of America, Inc. – Gavel Club from Montgomery County. I am pleased to bring these guests to the floor. The Jack and Jill of America is a membership organization of mothers with children ages 2 to 19 years old. They are dedicated to nurturing future African-American leaders by strengthening these children through leadership development, volunteer service, and civic duty. Let us please welcome Jack and Jill. We are so glad to have you.

Also in the rear of the House, we have some distinguished gentlemen. Our colleague, Representative Williams, and our colleague, Representative Bellmon, bring to the floor of the House the distinguished gentlemen of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc. The Alphas have historically been advocates for social justice, education, human and community service since 1906. It is getting cold in here. Welcome, Alphas.

In the gallery, we have some very important guests. Our colleague, Representative Cook, has Ella Menear here with her parents, Christine and Richard Menear. Ella is a Mapletown High School senior. She recently won the State title in the 200-yard individual championship. She got 2 minutes and 2.13 seconds. And she also won the silver medal in the 100-yard backstroke with a time of 53 seconds. Congratulations, Ella. Please stand with your parents. We are so glad to have you.

Also in the gallery, our colleague, Representative Briggs, brings the Scott family. Jeff and his sons, Jason and Dylan, are visiting the Capitol today. Scott family, please stand. Welcome.

Also in the gallery, our colleague, Representative Rabb, has his legislative interns here. Griffen Lloyd, Jasmine Gailliard, and Kayla Bass, please stand. Welcome, students.

Representative Steele has, seated in the gallery, guests who have traveled all the way from Australia to visit with us today. Guests, please stand. Welcome. We are so glad to have you.

Our colleague, Representative Sappey, brings Gabby Clark, who is a legislative intern in her district office and a student at George Washington University studying political science. Gabby, please stand. Welcome.

Our colleague, Representative Brown, has in the gallery constituents from her district. Rachel and Barb Callahan are here. Please stand, constituents. We are so glad to have you today.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Are there requests for leaves of absence?

The Chair recognizes the majority whip, who indicates there are none.

The Chair recognizes the minority whip, who indicates there are none.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. The Chair is about to take the master roll call. Members, 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
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
Deloso	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. Two hundred and three members having voted on the master roll call, a quorum is present.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 154 By Representatives NEILSON, GALLAGHER, SOLOMON, BELLMON, KINSEY, SAMUELSON, SCHMITT, WARREN, KENYATTA, MERSKI, McNEILL, BRENNAN, HADDOCK, MARCELL, GIRAL, HOWARD, KRUEGER, MALAGARI, SANCHEZ, D. WILLIAMS, PROBST, HOHENSTEIN, HANBIDGE, HILL-EVANS, BRIGGS, DELLOSO and CIRESI

A Concurrent Resolution extending in whole the disaster emergency declared on June 12, 2023, in response to the collapse of the northbound bridge and severe compromise of the southbound bridge on Interstate 95 in the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 16, 2023.

No. 160 By Representatives MEHAFFIE, FLEMING, GUENST, HILL-EVANS, KHAN, KINSEY, MALAGARI, MERSKI, O'MARA, PICKETT, SANCHEZ, VITALI, WATRO, BOROWSKI and GREEN

A Resolution designating June 30, 2023, as "Hershey's Chocolate World Day" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, June 16, 2023.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1408 By Representatives SCHWEYER, ISAACSON, FIEDLER, SCHLOSSBERG, MADDEN, T. DAVIS, WAXMAN, KRAJEWSKI, KINSEY, STEELE, NEILSON, KHAN, HANBIDGE, HILL-EVANS, CIRESI, BOROWSKI, PARKER, KAZEEM, PROBST, CURRY, McNEILL, KIM, PISCIOTTANO, SANCHEZ, DONAHUE, ROZZI, BOYD, D. WILLIAMS, WEBSTER, GUZMAN and TAKAC

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in grounds and buildings, further providing for limitation on new applications for Department of Education approval of public school building projects; and, in

construction and renovation of buildings by school entities, further providing for definitions, for school construction and renovation approval process, for high-performance building standards, for maintenance program, for building condition assessments, for project reimbursement and for applicability.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 16, 2023.

No. 1421 By Representatives SANCHEZ, GERGELY, MARKOSEK, STURLA, GUENST, MADDEN, HANBIDGE, DELLOSO, HILL-EVANS, VENKAT, HOWARD, FLEMING, KAZEEM, MALAGARI, HOHENSTEIN, WARREN, CERRATO, CEPEDA-FREYTIZ and McNEILL

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in licensing of drivers, further providing for issuance and content of driver's license, providing for contributions for autism spectrum disorder awareness and establishing the Autism Spectrum Disorder Awareness Account.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 15, 2023.

No. 1423 By Representatives KAZEEM, MADDEN, LAWRENCE, WAXMAN, HILL-EVANS, BOROWSKI, SANCHEZ, CERRATO, SMITH-WADE-EL, FIEDLER, SAPPEY and GREEN

An Act amending the act of July 10, 1987 (P.L.246, No.47), known as the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act, in receivership in municipalities, further providing for powers, duties and prohibited actions.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 15, 2023.

No. 1424 By Representatives KAZEEM, MADDEN, LAWRENCE, HANBIDGE, WAXMAN, HILL-EVANS, BOROWSKI, SANCHEZ, CERRATO, KINSEY, FIEDLER, KRAJEWSKI, SAPPEY, O'MARA and GREEN

An Act amending the act of July 10, 1987 (P.L.246, No.47), known as the Municipalities Financial Recovery Act, in receivership in municipalities, further providing for powers, duties and prohibited actions.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 15, 2023.

No. 1425 By Representatives PARKER, MADDEN, KINSEY, KAZEEM, SANCHEZ, PROBST, SCHLOSSBERG, HILL-EVANS, MAYES, O'MARA and GREEN

An Act providing for a universal maternal home visiting program; and conferring powers and imposing duties on the Office of Child Development and Early Learning.

Referred to Committee on HUMAN SERVICES, June 20, 2023.

No. 1426 By Representatives GALLOWAY, EMRICK, GUENST, SANCHEZ, MADDEN, HILL-EVANS, PARKER, CIRESI, PISCIOTTANO and D. WILLIAMS

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in Local Government Capital Project Loan Fund, further providing for definitions, for assistance to municipalities and for powers and duties of department.

Referred to Committee on COMMERCE, June 15, 2023.

No. 1427 By Representative KIM

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, for minimum wages and for preemption.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, June 20, 2023.

No. 1428 By Representative O'NEAL

An Act amending the act of July 10, 1990 (P.L.404, No.98), known as the Real Estate Appraisers Certification Act, further providing for title of act, for definitions, for State Board of Certified Real Estate Appraisers, for powers and duties of board and for application and qualifications; providing for application and qualifications of home inspectors and home inspectors-in-training and for conduct of home inspection; further providing for reciprocity, for certification renewal, licensure renewal and records, for disciplinary and corrective measures, for reinstatement of certificate or license, for reporting of multiple certification, for surrender of suspended or revoked certificate or license, for penalties and for injunctive relief; providing for remedies for home inspection services consumers, for home inspection contracts and for home inspection reports; and making a repeal.

Referred to Committee on PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE, June 20, 2023.

No. 1429 By Representatives ABNEY, ROZZI, KHAN, A. BROWN, MADDEN, T. DAVIS, HILL-EVANS, SCHLOSSBERG, SANCHEZ, McANDREW, MERSKI, PISCIOTTANO, KINSEY, PROBST, BELLMON, INNAMORATO, MAYES, BENHAM, SMITH-WADE-EL, STEELE, KRAJEWSKI, DELLOSO, KINKEAD, SALISBURY, BOROWSKI, O'MARA, WAXMAN, CEPEDA-FREYTIZ, GALLAGHER, CURRY, PICKETT 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 neighborhood assistance tax credit, further providing for tax credit and for grant of tax credit.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 20, 2023.

No. 1431 By Representatives KINKEAD, GUENST, ROZZI, ISAACSON, PISCIOTTANO, MADDEN, GERGELY, McNEILL, MALAGARI, SANCHEZ, DELLOSO, HILL-EVANS, HOHENSTEIN, KINSEY, PARKER, GALLOWAY, GREEN and NEILSON

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Commonwealth services, providing for work-related hazardous duty.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, June 20, 2023.

No. 1432 By Representatives OWLETT, WHITE, R. MACKENZIE, MERCURI, PICKETT, ROAE, HAMM, STAMBAUGH, ECKER, T. JONES, M. MACKENZIE, GROVE, ZIMMERMAN, KEEFER, ROWE, LEADBETER, LAWRENCE, GREINER, KUTZ, BERNSTINE and STAATS

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, establishing the Lifeline Scholarship Program and the Lifeline Scholarship Fund.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 20, 2023.

No. 1433 By Representative JAMES

An Act designating a bridge, identified as Bridge Key 33758, carrying Pennsylvania Route 427 over Sugar Creek in Sugarcreek Borough, Venango County, as the Staff Sergeant Richard James Mulholland Memorial Bridge.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 20, 2023.

No. 1434 By Representatives ISAACSON, MADDEN, HILL-EVANS, McNEILL, STURLA, SMITH-WADE-EL, DELLOSO, PARKER, SANCHEZ, KINSEY, MERSKI, KRAJEWSKI and GREEN

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for the Dual Credit Innovation and Equity Grant Program.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 20, 2023.

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

HB 1338, PN 1614 (Amended) By Rep. NEILSON

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in miscellaneous provisions relating to operation of vehicles, further providing for the offense of off-road vehicles in urban municipalities.

TRANSPORTATION.

HB 1394, PN 1556 By Rep. CONKLIN

An Act amending the act of October 27, 1955 (P.L.744, No.222), known as the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, further providing for definitions.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

SB 152, PN 124 By Rep. PASHINSKI

An Act repealing the act of September 1, 1965 (P.L.420, No.215), known as The Frozen Dessert Law.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

SB 277, PN 241 By Rep. PASHINSKI

An Act amending the act of June 30, 1987 (P.L.163, No.16), known as the Rural Pennsylvania Revitalization Act, in Center for Rural Pennsylvania, further providing for board of directors; and making a repeal.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES

HR 132, PN 1403 By Rep. PASHINSKI

A Resolution designating the week of June 19 through 25, 2023, as "Pollinator Week" in Pennsylvania.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

HR 148, PN 1546 By Rep. PASHINSKI

A Resolution designating September 18, 2023, as "State Grange Day" in Pennsylvania and celebrating the Pennsylvania State Grange on its 150th anniversary.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

HR 149, PN 1547 By Rep. CONKLIN

A Resolution recognizing June 19, 2023, as "Korean-American Citizenship Day" in Pennsylvania to celebrate the first naturalization of a Korean-American citizen in 1890.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HR 151, PN 1561 By Rep. PASHINSKI

A Resolution designating the month of June 2023 as "Dairy Month" in Pennsylvania.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

HR 152, PN 1587 By Rep. CONKLIN

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.

STATE GOVERNMENT.

HR 154, PN 1604 By Rep. NEILSON

A Concurrent Resolution extending in whole the disaster emergency declared on June 12, 2023, in response to the collapse of the northbound bridge and severe compromise of the southbound bridge on Interstate 95 in the City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia County.

TRANSPORTATION.

HR 160, PN 1603 By Rep. PASHINSKI

A Resolution designating June 30, 2023, as "Hershey's Chocolate World Day" in Pennsylvania.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS.

BILL REPORTED AND REREFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON LIQUOR CONTROL

HB 955, PN 976

By Rep. NEILSON

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 breweries; and, in distilleries, wineries, bonded warehouses, bailees for hire and transporters for hire, further providing for limited distilleries and distilleries.

Reported from Committee on TRANSPORTATION with request that it be rereferred to Committee on LIQUOR CONTROL.

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

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

SB 226, PN 195

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.

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

RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. SCHLOSSBERG. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

There will be a Rules Committee meeting immediately upon the break.

House Democrats will caucus at 1:15. We will be prepared to return to the floor at 1:45.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Rules Committee will meet immediately upon the break.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Republicans will also caucus at 1:15; that is 1:15 for Republican caucus.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Mullins for a committee announcement.

Mr. MULLINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Appropriations Committee will meet in the majority caucus room immediately following the Rules Committee meeting. Appropriations Committee to meet in the majority caucus room after Rules. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. In the gallery, our colleague, Representative Sanchez, has his summer interns here today. They are Carolyn Arnold and Madeline Bartol. Please stand, legislative interns. Welcome to the floor of the House.

RECESS

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

RECESS EXTENDED

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

AFTER RECESS

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

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats. We have a few more special guests.

Seated to the left of the Speaker's rostrum, our colleague, Representative Mihalek, has her eldest daughter here today, Petra Stuck. Please stand, Petra. We are so glad to have you.

Representative Warner is here with two of his children today. He has Ben and Paloma, and their longtime family friend, Ava Lion. Please stand. Welcome to the floor of the House.

Also seated to the left of the Speaker's rostrum is the First Lady in I believe the 154th Legislative District. The wife of Representative Napoleon Nelson, Shareese Nelson, is here. Please stand. They just sent their oldest child on a class trip, and she is with us for a few days.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. NELSON

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

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

Just wanted to give a shout-out to my wife back in Westmoreland County. Today is Sweet Sue's birthday. So happy birthday, honey. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman. Happy birthday to Mrs. Nelson.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEES**HB 580, PN 1456** By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the Fresh Food Financing Initiative; establishing the Fresh Food Financing Initiative Restricted Account; and imposing duties on the Department of Agriculture.

RULES.

HB 767, PN 1457 By Rep. BRADFORD

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, establishing the Pennsylvania Socially Diverse Farmers Commission and providing for its powers and duties.

RULES.

HB 1170, PN 1235 By Rep. HARRIS

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.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1246, PN 1415 By Rep. HARRIS

An Act providing for crematory regulation.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1249, PN 1348 By Rep. HARRIS

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.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1295, PN 1597 By Rep. HARRIS

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

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1500, PN 1615 (Amended)

By Rep. HARRIS

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, for minimum wages and for exemptions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

CALENDAR**RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. KHAN called up **HR 77, PN 946**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of June 2023 as "Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
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	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	Guent	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.

* * *

Ms. KAZEEM called up **HR 117, PN 1286**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of June 2023 as "Gun Violence Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of the resolution, will vote—
The Chair recognizes Representative Cutler, the minority leader, on HR 117.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, very briefly, I would like to address the underlying issue of the resolution that is being brought here before us.

Madam Speaker, violence – all violence – is wrong. Violence with guns, which is what this particular amendment or, excuse me, resolution seeks to address, we have seen all across the Commonwealth, whether it is in our urban cities like Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Reading, Lancaster, or York; or in the rural communities, as recently experienced this past weekend with our State Police in Juniata County.

The fact remains that many people who commit violent acts with weapons, it is not their first encounter with law enforcement. We have established I think some good changes here recently in terms of second chances and the ability to reintegrate individuals with lower-level crimes into our society and provide for rehabilitation opportunities, but in some cases, we have essentially created a revolving door with those that are truly violent offenders. And it is a very scary and tough truth that violent offenders do in fact exist, and I personally believe that they should be punished; particularly, felons, who are prohibited from possessing firearms, should be punished. That is an area, Madam Speaker, that I wish that we could find some greater bipartisan agreement on because too often we see the repeat offenders spilling out into society across our headlines with very tragic and long-lasting consequences.

For those reasons, Madam Speaker, I wish this resolution had simply went broader and discussed violence in general, because I think that many times, individuals utilize a variety of weapons, and to pick and choose one particular one I think sets a very dangerous precedent when in fact what we should be discussing is the cultural acceptance of the devaluing of another human's

life, the cultural acceptance of violence in today's discourse, and the fact that many of us – and we have talked about it here on the House floor – the sad reality that we have come to recognize it as a part of life. That, Madam Speaker, is very troubling. By resolving our issues in a civil way, as our Founders envisioned it, I think that we can strive to a better society with better results, while at the same time highlighting the issue of animosity and violence towards other individuals.

So those, Madam Speaker, are my concerns. All violence is wrong. I think that we should highlight all the impacts that violence has on our lives, not just one.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the maker of the resolution, Representative Kazeem.

Ms. KAZEEM. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate the minority leader speaking to this particular issue, but I just wanted to address the House and let them know that myself, I worked on the battleground helping around gun violence. And as a trauma-informed worker, and also a gun violence interrupter who has been on the ground raising awareness of the impact and trauma that gun violence has had and the impact that it has faced among so many families across our State, part of my job was providing solutions, that the minority leader does speak about, in which 50 percent of it was educating families why gun violence is not the response. I have spent time knocking on doors of law enforcements and/or even their family doors who were impacted on the line of duty while providing as well those solutions. I provided resources to those family members.

I also want to thank and appreciate the police departments, especially in my county in Delaware County, who have opened their doors to be educated on the trauma and the impact that gun violence has had and continues to have across Delaware County, across our State, or even in communities like my own in Chester City. I have also spoken to those same law enforcements on how they, too, can also be impacted with trauma just from responding to so many traumatic situations, such as domestic violence calls. I have witnessed how that itself can also take one person their own life.

I have knocked on the doors of families who have lost their babies as young, little as 4. Too many, too many of our babies, our children, are affected by this public health crisis no matter where they live across this Commonwealth. This is now requiring us to set aside and set recurring times and reflect on those we have lost, and also connect with those who are working on the ground to keep our communities safe.

Now, I am sure we can all agree that violence across the board should be recognized and which, in these cases, some months have been, such as October, which is dedicated to domestic abuse awareness, or even April, which is also Sexual Assault Awareness Month. But this dedication, the time and the effort of many families across this Commonwealth who come out from all over our State to this very ground that we are standing on to actually raise this awareness every June, some of us have seen them outside in front of the Capitol every June every year bringing up this particular topic. And that itself, on behalf of the families, I am asking all of my colleagues for a "yes" vote on HR 117.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—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	White
Davis	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Khan	Pielli	Young
Deasy	Kim	Pisciottano	
Delloso	Kinkead	Probst	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinsey	Rabb	Speaker
Evans			

NAYS—100

Adams	Fritz	Labs	Rapp
Armanini	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Banta	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roe
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	Williams, C.
Flood	Kuzma	Rader	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

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

**MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR
STATE TROOPER JACQUES ROUGEAU, JR.**

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order. The Sergeants at Arms will clear the aisles and close the doors of the House. Members, please take your seats. This afternoon we are going to honor a fallen hero.

This past weekend, tragedy struck our Commonwealth. On Saturday morning a man – whose name need not be mentioned in this body – drove a pickup truck to the State Police barracks in Mifflintown, got out of his car, and shot from a long rifle into marked police cars. After fleeing the scene, a manhunt ensued, and a State trooper, Jacques Rougeau, Jr., was ambushed and killed. Another State trooper, James Wagner, was critically injured in a shoot-out and is in need of our prayers. These brave men and countless others, our State troopers, they did what they do every single day. They put themselves between the end of their lives and all of the citizens in the public that they are sworn to protect and serve.

On behalf of a grateful Pennsylvania House of Representatives, we honor Trooper Rougeau for making the ultimate sacrifice, and we pray for his family. Additionally, we continuously pray for Trooper Wagner and pray that he recovers from his injuries.

Members and guests, please rise in a moment of silence to honor the sacrifice of our brave law enforcement officer.

(Whereupon, the members of the House and all visitors stood in a moment of silence in solemn respect to the memory of State Trooper Jacques Rougeau, Jr.)

The SPEAKER. Members and guests, please be seated. The Sergeants at Arms will open the doors of the House.

The House will be at ease.

The House will come to order.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Seated to the left of the Speaker's rostrum is a guest of our colleague, Representative Pashinski. His legislative intern, Hannah Ferenchick, is here. She is a Kutztown social work major. Hannah, please stand. Welcome to the floor of the House. We are so glad to have you.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 767, PN 1457**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, establishing the Pennsylvania Socially Diverse Farmers Commission and providing for its powers and duties.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1300, PN 1446**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of November 24, 2015 (P.L.232, No.64), known as the Pennsylvania Long-term Care Council Act, further providing for Pennsylvania Long-term Care Council.

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 580, PN 1456**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 3 (Agriculture) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the Fresh Food Financing Initiative; establishing the Fresh Food Financing Initiative Restricted Account; and imposing duties on the Department of Agriculture.

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

Miss **STEHR** offered the following amendment No. **A01055**:

Amend Bill, page 7, lines 27 and 28, by striking out all of line 27 and "12108" in line 28 and inserting 12107

Amend Bill, page 11, line 9, by striking out "12108" and inserting 12107

Amend Bill, page 13, lines 20 through 22, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 13, line 23, by striking out "12108" and inserting 12107

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

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

Miss **STEHR**. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Amendment 1055 would remove the provisions that give the Department of Agriculture the authority to promulgate rules and regulations to administrate and enforce the program. Grant programs typically do not require regulations and the language in the bill is sufficient for the grant program to be self-executing, especially in light of the requirements of the department to publish grant standards and requirements for the Pennsylvania Bulletin.

Madam Speaker, while I do not expect that the department would find the need to exercise regulatory authority for this program, removing the provision would simply ensure the unnecessary proliferation of regulations, and I urge an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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—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
Causer	James	Mentzer	Smith
Cook	Jones, M.	Mercuri	Staats
Cooper	Jones, T.	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cutler	Jozwiak	Mihalek	Stehr
D'Orsie	Kail	Miller, B.	Stender
Davanzo	Kaufner	Moul	Struzzi
DeLozier	Kauffman	Mustello	Tomlinson
Diamond	Keefe	Nelson, E.	Topper
Dunbar	Kephart	O'Neal	Twardzik
Ecker	Kerwin	Oberlander	Warner
Emrick	Klunk	Ortity	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	Sappety
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?

Ms. **BROWN** offered the following amendment No. **A01056**:

Amend Bill, page 11, line 8, by striking out "10%" and inserting 2.5%

Amend Bill, page 11, line 11, by striking out "COSTS FOR PERSONNEL MAY" and inserting

For the purpose of ensuring that the maximum amount of funding is available for grant recipient projects, costs for personnel may not

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

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

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

Amendment 1056 would reduce the amount of grant funding from 10 percent to 2.5 that the Department of Agriculture could use for cost in administering the program, and eliminate the ability to use any funding for personnel costs. Madam Speaker, if this program is funded at the amount of \$2 million in the Governor's proposed budget, \$200,000 seems like an inflated amount to use to pay personnel to execute the program. I believe we instead should maximize the amount of money for the grants intended to improve the access to fresh food in underserved communities, and \$50,000 is more than a reasonable amount for costs associated with operating the program.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I ask for an affirmative vote.

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—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	Kaufar	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?
Bill was agreed to.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 967, PN 1565**, entitled:

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

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 Pisciotano.

Mr. PISCIOTTANO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This legislation requires hotels to provide safety devices to employees working in guest rooms and throughout the hotel. It is important for the House to consider, during this vote, that women make up the majority of the hospitality workforce in our Commonwealth.

The hotel and hospitality industry experiences some of the highest rates of workplace sexual assault and harassment. According to data from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, workers in the hospitality industry experience the highest rates of sexual harassment at work. Nearly 15 percent of all EEOC sexual harassment reports come from the hospitality industry. This is due to the isolated nature of hotel housekeeping work, uneven power dynamics between hotel workers and guests, and fear of retaliation when taking action against a problematic guest.

An industry survey of women working in the industry found that 58 percent of hotel workers had been sexually harassed by a guest. The same survey found that 49 percent of housekeepers reported having had guests answer the door naked, expose themselves, or flash the worker. This, unfortunately, is just seen as part of their job, Madam Speaker. Among those who were sexually harassed by a guest, 56 percent of workers said they did not feel safe returning to work, and 96 percent of housekeepers surveyed said they would feel safer if they were equipped with a panic button.

HB 967 before us today would require hotel employers to provide a safety device, like a panic button, to all employees who are required to be in a guest room alone. Under HB 967, after a device is activated, the employer would be required to reassign the impacted worker to another area, notify other employees of alleged incidents, and provide a second person to accompany a worker when servicing the guest's room.

Madam Speaker, everyone deserves to work in an environment that is safe and free from harassment, so I would ask the House to please join me in making that one step closer to reality in Pennsylvania by voting "yes" on HB 967.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative D'Orsie.

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

First off, I want to thank my colleagues for adopting an amendment the other week that made this bill better, in my opinion. It exempted smaller hotels from the mandate. However, I am still in opposition to this bill, and the chief reason I stand today in opposition is because it is seemingly a knee-jerk reaction to a nonexistent problem.

When pressed in committee about what the impetus for this bill was, we were told that a study revealed that hotel security was a major problem for its employees. When we pressed further, we found that the study was actually a survey conducted by an advocacy group in Chicago 8 years ago. This is hardly grounds for a mandate that forces an already pressed hotel and hospitality industry to install a costly security system that, frankly, could be handled with a cell phone.

And speaking of this, I am well aware that in this day and age, a mobile app exists for pretty much anything under the sun. So I searched my app store for a panic button app that does more or less what this mandate sets out to accomplish, and I found,

actually, several options: the Rave Panic Button; Noonlight; A1 Panic Button; Red Panic Button; and SABRE Personal Safety, which is a high-rated app that sends immediate SMS (short message service) text alerts to those in one's circle.

So it seems to me like innovation through a mobile app would actually take care of this perceived problem and not a government mandate. So I would urge a "no" vote on HB 967.

Thanks, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The legislation that is before us today relating to the hospitality industry I think addresses and brings up a very serious issue and concern about sexual harassment in the workplace that should be addressed. And we want to make sure that when we actually have a problem like this, we have the appropriate data, we understand the situations, and we can really attack it so that we can address the issue head-on.

I think it is also important to note that we have a very strong hospitality industry here in Pennsylvania that provides hundreds of thousands of jobs to employees, and most of the time is exceedingly safe for those workers and those employees all across this Commonwealth. They have great-paying jobs. They do terrific business for Pennsylvania, bringing in tourists from all over the Commonwealth and around the country, and they do so in a safe and responsible fashion. And when there are problems, those issues can be raised to either a union, if those employees have collectively bargained and are a part of that union. They can also raise those issues directly to their employer if they are not in a union or if the issues persist beyond what a union is able to achieve in its collective-bargaining agreement.

There are some challenges, though, with this legislation that we brought up in committee that were not sufficiently addressed, unfortunately. They were not able to be addressed here on the floor, either, and I think this legislation needs some more work.

So a couple particular issues in the bill. There is a definition of "hotel employer" that is so broadly written that the definition talks about anybody who has any control over those employees in their day-to-day work schedules. That goes beyond just a hotel employer; it could include union leaders or union representatives who do engage in collective-bargaining agreements and have a say over those employers' wages, their hours of working, their safety, and conditions that they work in.

We also talked further about this issue in committee, where the collective-bargaining agreements in this legislation are allowed to supersede what is in law. And so even when a CBA provides for less protection, that would be the uniform standard, not this legislation. And they refused to address that; they refused to clean it up in committee. I think the legislation was rushed through the process. They missed that, in my opinion, and we were not able to go back and fix that important piece of this legislation.

I also think there are other penalties that go beyond the scope of what this legislation should consider. And I think that if we actually had a discussion, if we had a hearing on this legislation, if we discussed with the hospitality industry all of the protective and preventative measures that are already being put in place, we could figure out a way to continue to protect those that maybe are not receiving the protections that they should be afforded. But we continuously operate in a land where we use false data and false information. And so when we pushed in committee about why

this was needed, they cited a study dealing with Chicago – and I know the prime sponsor will probably want to address that, but he was the one that said that was the reason and justification for this legislation. People can go back and look at that committee. That was what he cited. If he found new data to support his argument today, that is additional. He did not have that when he brought up this legislation because he did not bring it up in committee. So I appreciate – you can always find data to support your argument. We all know that. So that is what the maker is going to do, but what was brought up in committee was this Chicago study – totally unrelated to Pennsylvania, totally unrelated to what is going on in our wonderful hospitality industry here in our Commonwealth.

Additionally, when we pressed in committee about why there was a carveout for 100 hotel rooms or less, they recognized an instance where people were being human trafficked, a horrible situation. It turns out we looked at that article, we found out that that hotel has less than 100 rooms and it would not even be covered by this legislation. So yet again, they brought up data and anecdotes and information that are not relevant.

But what happens time and time again is that we are passing legislation in a rushed fashion without hearings, without sufficient data, and without sufficient information to make the best policy that we can to impact employers and everybody's health and safety across this Commonwealth. So what I would suggest is, I suggest that we go back to the drawing board on this legislation and actually come up with a solution to address the problem. But unfortunately, I do not think that is going to happen. What I think is going to happen is we are going to hear some pushback, we are going to hear some more statistics, we are going to hear some more information that was not brought up that was not the basis for this legislation, that is new – maybe supports their argument, maybe not – but ultimately, at the end of the day, because we have bad policy and bad legislation, this will never be signed into law. It will never be signed into law. People can pat themselves on the back, they can clap at the end when they pass legislation through the House of Representatives, but if it does not get through the Senate, it does not get the Governor's signature, it is all just an exercise in messaging; it is all just an exercise in futility, and I really think we need to stop this. I think we need to take up legislation that has bipartisan support, has bipartisan buy-in, has stakeholder input, stakeholder support, and that is the way to find lasting impact and lasting change that helps everybody across the Commonwealth and will actually make people's lives better.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Fink.

Mrs. FINK. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

HB 967 is simply a mandate on our business. If Pennsylvania is ever going to become an economic leader in this country again, we need to stop placing these burdensome requirements on our businesses.

Ultimately, it is going to make our government here in Pennsylvania just a little bit bigger, and it is just going to pass the costs on to those hotel owners. Any costs that these hotels are going to be imposed upon, these new regulations, they are simply going to be passed on to the consumers and it is just going to end up costing us more money. So I urge a "no" vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the Representative.

The Chair recognizes, for the second time, the maker of the bill, Representative Pisciotano.

Mr. PISCIOTTANO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

We hear the same arguments today on the floor that we heard in committee. We worked with the Republican members of this committee. We amended this bill last week to raise the threshold, and now we want to talk about all these bad things that are going to happen because of this bill. Well, I can tell you one thing, one bad thing that will not happen if we pass this legislation: fewer women will be raped. If you want to be on the other side of that issue, that is fine, but let us be honest about what is happening here.

In committee we heard from the minority party that this was not a problem in Pennsylvania and that we cannot use data from anywhere else in the State because we do not have specific data about Pennsylvania. Right here, Madam Speaker, I have a news article from October 2022. Let me read it to you, Madam Speaker. "A man who was staying at a Snyder County hotel asked a woman in housekeeping to enter his room to take the trash out, then allegedly raped her...." The housekeeper knocked on the door to ask if the guest was extending his stay. The guest asked if she wanted to come into his room to drink alcohol. The housekeeper said no because she was only 18 years old. The guest then asked her to take out his trash, and when she entered his room to do so, he shut the door behind her and locked the door, and then he raped her – an 18-year-old; 18 years old.

This woman's life is never going to be the same – never. And this low-cost, commonsense bill potentially could have saved her from that traumatizing experience. If she would have had a panic button – any kind of panic button. We are not prescriptive in the bill. We let the hotels choose what works best for them. If she had some device to alert somebody, then her life would be different, Madam Speaker. She would not have to live the rest of her life knowing that she was raped as an 18-year-old.

Now, if you guys want to say that is government overreach, then you would have been making the same arguments about fire extinguishers and codes in buildings that burned down and women died in them. So let us not be crazy here that this is unreasonable.

We have worked with the industry. The PRLA (Pennsylvania Restaurant & Lodging Association) was heavily involved in drafting this legislation and is neutral on the bill. If you want to talk about this legislation, that it is going to make our hospitality industry unattractive, let me read you some of the other jurisdictions in this country that have this in place already. The city of New York – I am pretty sure there is a robust hospitality industry in the city of New York. Glendale, California; Long Beach, California; Los Angeles, California; Oakland, California; Sacramento, California; Santa Monica, California; West Hollywood, California; Miami Beach, Florida; Chicago, Illinois; Seattle, Washington; the State of Illinois; the State of New Jersey; and the State of Washington. They all still have hotels. In fact, many of those locations are premier tourist destinations.

So I find it completely disingenuous that anyone in this room would say that this is going to hurt the hospitality industry. This only helps our hospitality workers, who are predominately women and women of color and immigrants. How could anyone be against protecting those kinds of people?

This bill may not become law, as the minority chairman of the committee mentioned, but that is to our own fault. If this commonsense bill that we worked on with industry cannot become the law, then the General Assembly should look in the mirror here and say, what are we doing here if we cannot protect women workers in these hostile situations?

Madam Speaker, I would ask for "yes" vote on HB 967.

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—108

Abney	Fiedler	Kosierowski	Rabb
Bellmon	Fleming	Krajewski	Rozzi
Benham	Frankel	Krueger	Salisbury
Benninghoff	Freeman	Kulik	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Friel	Madden	Sanchez
Borowski	Gallagher	Madsen	Sappety
Boyd	Galloway	Malagari	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	Jones, M.	Otten	Webster
Davis	Kazeem	Parker	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Young
Deasy	Khan	Pielli	
Delloso	Kim	Pisciottano	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinkead	Probst	Speaker
Evans	Kinsey		

NAYS—95

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

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.

VOTE CORRECTION

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

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

To correct the record, please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may proceed.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you.

On Wednesday, June 14, 2023, I was recorded as a "no" vote on HB 1304. I wish to be recorded as a "yes."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's remarks will be spread across the record.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1160, PN 1295**, entitled:

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.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—202

Abney	Fleming	Krupa	Rapp
Adams	Flick	Kulik	Rigby
Armanini	Flood	Kutz	Roae
Banta	Frankel	Kuzma	Rossi
Barton	Freeman	Labs	Rowe
Bellmon	Friel	Lawrence	Rozzi
Benham	Fritz	Leadbeter	Ryncavage
Benninghoff	Gallagher	Mackenzie, M.	Salisbury
Bernstine	Galloway	Mackenzie, R.	Samuelson
Bizzarro	Gaydos	Madden	Sanchez
Bonner	Gergely	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
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	Kaufer	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

NAYS-1

Gillen

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.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third 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 third consideration?
Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

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	Sappery
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	Kaufer	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			

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 present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1207, PN 1277**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—147

Abney	Fleming	Kulik	Rozzi
Adams	Frankel	Kuzma	Ryncavage
Barton	Freeman	Labs	Salisbury
Bellmon	Friel	Madden	Samuelson
Benham	Fritz	Madsen	Sanchez
Benninghoff	Gallagher	Major	Sappey
Bizzarro	Galloway	Malagari	Scheuren
Bonner	Gaydos	Marcell	Schlegel
Borowski	Gergely	Markosek	Schlossberg
Boyd	Gillen	Marshall	Schmitt
Boyle	Giral	Matzie	Schweyer
Bradford	Green	Mayer	Scott
Brennan	Guenst	McAndrew	Shusterman
Briggs	Guzman	McNeill	Siegel
Brown, A.	Haddock	Mehaffie	Smith-Wade-El
Brown, M.	Hanbidge	Mercuri	Solomon
Bullock	Harkins	Merski	Steele
Burgos	Harris	Mihalek	Struzzi
Burns	Heffley	Miller, D.	Sturla
C Freytiz	Hogan	Mullins	Takac
Causar	Hohenstein	Munroe	Tomlinson
Cephas	Howard	Mustello	Topper
Cerrato	Innamorato	Neilson	Twardzik
Ciresi	Irvin	Nelson, N.	Venkat
Conklin	Isaacson	O'Mara	Vitali
Cook	James	O'Neal	Warren
Curry	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Watro
Daley	Kaufer	Otten	Waxman
Davis	Kazeem	Owlett	Webster
Dawkins	Kenyatta	Parker	Wentling
Deasy	Khan	Pashinski	White
Delloso	Kim	Pielli	Williams, C.
Diamond	Kinhead	Pisciottano	Williams, D.

Donahue	Kinsey	Probst	Young
Dunbar	Kosierowski	Rabb	
Emrick	Krajewski	Rader	McClinton,
Evans	Krueger	Rigby	Speaker
Fiedler			

NAYS—56

Armanini	Flood	Krupa	Pickett
Banta	Gleim	Kutz	Rapp
Bernstine	Gregory	Lawrence	Roae
Borowicz	Greiner	Leadbeter	Rossi
Cabell	Grove	Mackenzie, M.	Rowe
Cooper	Hamm	Mackenzie, R.	Schemel
Cutler	Jones, M.	Mako	Scialabba
D'Orsie	Jones, T.	Maloney	Smith
Davanzo	Kail	Mentzer	Staats
Delozier	Kauffman	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Ecker	Keefer	Miller, B.	Stehr
Fee	Kephart	Moul	Stender
Fink	Kerwin	Nelson, E.	Warner
Flick	Klunk	Oberlander	Zimmerman

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.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to submit my comments that I was going to make on HB 1207 for the record.

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

The remarks will be put on the record.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

House Bill 1207 grants municipalities of any population size the ability to establish a land bank on a voluntary basis.

Land banks are effective tools for communities to combat blight and foster redevelopment, turning vacant lots and blighted and abandoned homes into affordable housing and community spaces.

Current law only allows municipalities of 10,000 population or more to create land banks on their own, depriving smaller municipalities access to this critically important revitalization tool. My legislation removes the minimum 10,000 population requirement to establish a land bank, thereby affording to all communities the opportunity to use them. Most other States, such as Georgia, New York, Texas, and Virginia, do not have population size restraints associated with land bank development. And we as a legislature have already established the precedent of removing such arbitrary population requirements when we granted all municipalities the ability to establish redevelopment authorities in the 2019-2020 session.

In many respects, it is our Commonwealth's smaller communities that are most in need of the land bank tool. Many of our smaller communities have seen a loss of population over the years, resulting in a hollowing

out of their stability and vitality. Oftentimes their Main Street business districts have atrophied as local businesses have closed. Vacant, blighted, and dilapidated housing can become prevalent in the wake of such hollowing out of small towns, spreading like a cancer that undermines the cohesiveness of a community, pulls down the property values of adjacent properties, and robs a community of the ability to regenerate. Land banks can be a transformative tool to address blight, repair and revitalize deteriorated buildings, and set a community on the path to a more successful future.

House Bill 1207 was unanimously reported from the Housing and Community Development Committee and is strongly supported by the Boroughs Association, the Pennsylvania Municipal League, the Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania, and the administration.

I urge a "yes" vote on HB 1207.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

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

An Act providing for crematory regulation.

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlewoman, Representative Major, rise?

Ms. MAJOR. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Ms. MAJOR. Madam Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry and request a ruling concerning any potential conflict I may have under House rule 65, and by extension, Article III, section 13, of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

HB 1246 concerns, among other things, crematory regulation. In my case, I am a licensed funeral director employed at a funeral home with an on-site crematory. Under the House rule, do I need to recuse myself from this vote? I am happy to abide by the ruling of the Speaker on this question.

The SPEAKER. It is the Chair's opinion that the Representative is a member of a class and there is no conflict of interest.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentlelady, Representative Tomlinson, rise?

Miss TOMLINSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlelady may state her parliamentary inquiry.

Miss TOMLINSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry and request a ruling concerning any

potential conflict I might have under House rule 65, and by extension, Article III, section 13, of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

HB 1246 concerns, among other things, crematory regulation. In my case, I am a third-generation funeral director, and my family owns a funeral home, although we do not have a crematory on-site. Under House rule, do I need to recuse myself from this vote? I am happy to abide by the ruling of the Speaker on this question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

It is the Chair's opinion that the Representative is a member of a class and there is no conflict of interest.

Miss TOMLINSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

On the bill, please?

The SPEAKER. We are not to that point yet—

Miss TOMLINSON. Okay.

The SPEAKER. —but you may stay there if you would like.

Miss TOMLINSON. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

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 Malagari.

Mr. MALAGARI. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, today I stand before you to address a matter that affects an industry that is vital to our communities, an industry comprised of mostly small businesses, family-owned businesses in every county across the Commonwealth.

Currently there are 256 crematoriums operating in the Commonwealth, between animal and human. They are necessities in our communities, providing a vital service during times of grief and loss. And one such crematory in my district, Anders Detweiler Funeral Home & Crematory in Souderton, contacted my office a few years ago with a pressing concern regarding current temperature regulations. And although cremation services have witnessed a remarkable increase in demand in recent years — a trend set to continue — outdated regulations are capping the potential of Pennsylvania crematoriums.

Moreover, when the current temperature regulations were introduced for crematoriums, the demand for cremation services accounted for only 17.1 percent of funeral services; however, cremation services now account for about 60 percent of funeral services. So further, experts predict that by 2035, these services will account for almost 80 percent of the market.

So the current recommended temperature, for anyone who may not know, the range for modern crematoriums to operate efficiently and successfully is set between 1400 degrees Fahrenheit and 1800 degrees Fahrenheit. However, any crematorium put into operation after April 17 of 1989 is required to utilize the temperature of 1800 degrees Fahrenheit. The

requirement to consistently operate at a higher temperature places an undue burden on the equipment, leading to increased fuel consumption, greater emissions into the atmosphere, and increased financial burdens on these small businesses. So by slightly lowering the temperature requirement, we can alleviate the burdens faced by these small businesses without compromising the integrity of the cremation process.

So we are not seeking to weaken or neglect any necessary safety measures or environmental standards. Rather, we aim to strike that balance that supports the viability of these family-owned businesses, these crematoriums, while maintaining the highest standards of operation. And by revising the temperature guidelines and setting a more reasonable minimum operating temperature, we can support the sustainability of these small businesses.

So I thank you for your support, and I urge you to vote "yes" on HB 1246. I would also like to especially thank the members and staff of the Professional Licensure and Appropriations Committees who have worked diligently on this bill. A few degrees will make all the difference toward addressing the challenges faced by Pennsylvania crematoriums.

So thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Tomlinson.

Miss TOMLINSON. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Again, as a third-generation licensed funeral director, I rise in full support of this legislation. This bill would allow for crematories to operate at a minimum temperature of 1600 degrees, which both the funeral and cremation industry are in full support.

I would ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the Representative.

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	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	Guent	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	Kinlead	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 present the same to the Senate for concurrence.

* * *

The House proceeded to third 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 third consideration?

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

Mr. GROVE. On the bill, Madam Speaker.

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

It is the Chair's understanding that the late-filed amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
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 Munroe.

Mr. MUNROE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

To put it simply, HB 1249 is a tax credit that would be offered as an incentive for new police officers, new teachers, and new nurses.

We know that worker shortages are affecting all aspects of society, but police, teachers, and nurses are the backbone of a well-functioning society. They are the three positions that have also been most adversely affected by the COVID pandemic.

No one can question the emotional toll that had been thrust upon nurses in 2020 and 2021. We remember the days of people standing outside their homes applauding nurses' valiant, valiant efforts to save lives, and now they need our help.

Anyone who is a parent can remember what it was like during the shutdown with children and teachers trying to transition to online learning. The ripple effects to this very day are still impacting the teacher profession. Now they need our help.

And during the pandemic, police officers never gave up their role as first responders. These men and women still had to respond to domestics, burglaries, robberies, etc., while the pandemic was still in full force, putting their health and their safety at risk, as well as that of their families. And now they need our help. But now, for a wide variety of reasons, people are not seeking careers in these professions, and in some instances, they are leaving the profession.

So as many of you know, I was a police officer and a police corporal. Many, many years ago, I was an applicant. I was one of hundreds and hundreds of applicants vying for two, maybe three positions. Now police departments might get 30 or 40 applicants with multiple police departments competing against each other for a shrinking pool of applicants.

Speaking with police chiefs in my district and from my former police department, they have shared the same sentiment. Even though this may not solve the problem of a depleted pool, they do view this as being helpful. They want the best applicants that they can possibly acquire, and this tax incentive will be an added tool on their toolbelt to help get that done.

Madam Speaker, HB 1249 gives our police chiefs, superintendents, and our hospitals an important weapon that will allow them to attract more better qualified applicants to replenish their ranks. These last several years these professions stood up for us, and now I ask you, every single one of you, to stand up for them and let us support police, teachers, and nurses.

And I ask for an affirmative vote for HB 1249. 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 quick interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will not.

Mr. GROVE. Would the majority leader stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will not.

Mr. GROVE. Would the majority chairman of the Finance Committee stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines.

Mr. GROVE. Would the majority chairman of the Appropriations Committee stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines.

On the bill, you may proceed.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you.

Would the majority chairman of the Education Committee stand for interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Representative Grove, these questions are becoming dilatory. You said you wanted to speak on the bill. You may proceed on the bill.

The gentleman also declined.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you.

It is a very simple question – actually a few questions – on the technical aspects of the bill. Page 2, line 28, says "Letters of eligibility." I was just questioning what they are. I am not familiar with them. Page 3, lines 8 through 10, adds sheriffs and deputy sheriffs – or actually, just deputy sheriffs – to the bill. Just curious the policy decision to not add Fish and Boat Commission officers and wildlife conservation officers to that? In the list of nurses on page 3, lines 13 through 18, there is a State license. License of dietary nurses was not included in that. Just curious as to why that was. And then there is an addition of registered nurse aide. Line 3, page 18, "Registered nurse aide." They are not a State license, why were they added? Page 3, line 17, "Certified registered nurse anesthetists." They are considered registered nurses. Is that duplicative in nature? So very technical questions on the bill, Madam Speaker. Unfortunately, we are not going to get answers to any of these questions.

I do not know if this bill allows an individual to double-dip as a registered nurse, a registered nurse anesthetist. Obviously, if you are an L.P.N. (licensed practical nurse), you are not eligible for this because you are not included in the underlying provision. Those were the questions I wanted to ask, but unfortunately, I guess we will not have answers to those questions anytime soon.

I can say the bill before us, HB 1249, is not the Governor's proposal from his budget. The Governor included registered nurses, L.P.N.s, C.R.N.s (certified registered nurses), L.D.N.s (licensed dietician nutritionists), prescriptive authority, clinical nurse specialists; did not include specialization for the anesthetist and then registered nurse aide.

Further, the Governor's budget proposal did not include sheriffs – that was added – and then had this kind of conglomerate of teachers in-State and out-of-State, which does not reach the level of these certifications under page 2. Why I brought up letters of eligibility is, I am not sure if an individual can get a letter of eligibility as proof but yet never work in the field. I do not know if that occurs. I do not know what that is. I do not know what status they have within the education; whether they can be hired, cannot be hired – I do not know. So I do not know the impact of this bill.

What I do know is, the Governor's proposal, his \$24.6 million, they stand by that as early as today. This moves away from that. It has expanded beyond what the Governor has proposed, which means if we wanted to cover firefighters, we do not have that

opportunity. If we wanted to cover other law enforcement entities, we do not have that ability. If we wanted to cover the military, if we wanted to cover veterans, we do not have any of those abilities to do that because all those amendments were tabled. We are left with an underlying bill with terminology I do not understand and licensing, specifically for nurses that are not covered, which means you have unequal treatment of licensees under this bill, which is very unfair.

Due to all these reasons, I would ask my colleagues for a "no" vote. Obviously, this bill is not ready for the prime time. It is not well thought out and does not cover the areas it needs to. I would ask my colleagues again for a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I had not planned on speaking on this bill until I heard the prime sponsor's opening statements.

Madam Speaker, if you want to have people apply to be nurses and trained to become nurses, then we need hospital systems that do not go down the silly road of requiring a vaccine that does not work. We do not need hospital systems that require a 13-page application—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BRADFORD. Parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. DIAMOND. —for someone to obtain a—

Mr. BRADFORD. Point of order?

Mr. DIAMOND. —religious exemption for that vaccine.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRADFORD. I believe the gentleman is far, far afield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's point of order is well taken.

The gentleman directs the gentleman from Lebanon County to stick to the parameters of HB 1249.

You may proceed on final passage.

Mr. DIAMOND. Madam Speaker, the parameters of HB 1249 is to help replenish the nurse supply, replenish the teacher supply, and replenish the police officer supply, which was depleted by COVID policy supported by the majority party here—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BRADFORD. Madam Speaker?

Mr. DIAMOND. —and I need to go over that and remind the majority party that every single one of them—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

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

Mr. BRADFORD. Again, the gentleman is far, far afield. And while I appreciate his anti-vaxxer rhetoric, I do not think he has accomplished much today.

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker? Point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. There is a current point of order in process. I believe the minority leader is aware of that. If I could just facilitate up here. Is that all right?

On Representative Bradford's point of order, his point of order is well-taken.

Representative Diamond, this is your last warning on final passage of HB 1249. You have to talk about this bill, not your own opinions on topics that are not related to this bill. You will be given one last time to be recognized to talk about the parameters of this bill.

POINT OF ORDER

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

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The majority leader, at the end of his comments, I believe added some unnecessary inflammatory remarks. I do not believe it is appropriate to question the motives of an individual, particularly when he is discussing the issues of staff retention. I would simply appreciate some encouragement to not throw out unnecessary barbs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's point of order is well-taken. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Representative Diamond, this is your last chance to speak on the bill, HB 1249, not issues that are not related to this bill.

Mr. DIAMOND. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my last chance to speak on the provisions of this bill, which is tax credits for new nurses, teachers, and police officers.

Madam Speaker, tax credits means someone will not be paying a tax or we can credit it against their tax, which unfortunately means that other people will have to provide the tax dollars to replace that.

In the prime sponsor's opening speech, he mentioned consequences of a previous event in Pennsylvania that caused some of these employment losses. I do not believe, Madam Speaker, that the rest of the taxpayers of Pennsylvania who really, during that time, only wanted to go about their own business and live their lives should be responsible, with their tax dollars, for helping these industries replenish their personnel that were pushed out because their personnel would not adhere to extremely questionable policies by a Democratic administration and the Democratic majority of this House.

Madam Speaker, this bill goes far in trying to put Band-Aids on what you all did in the past, and I ask for a "no" vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Before recognizing the floor leaders, are there any other members that wish to speak on final passage of HB 1249?

The Chair recognizes, for the second time, the maker of the bill, Representative Munroe. And then the Chair will acknowledge the floor leaders.

Mr. MUNROE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

You know, being a freshman State Rep and a former police officer and police corporal and a Fraternal Order of Police member, for years now I have seen people claim to be pro-law enforcement – back the blue, post things up on Facebook, see an officer wearing full uniform standing next to them having that posted up on social media saying that they back the police. Here you have a Fraternal Order of Police member who has talked to his own police chiefs, and they are asking, and I am asking, for you to support them.

I had heard, both in committee and today, you know what? I support the police, but it is too expensive. I support the police, but process, etc., etc. You know what Grandma always used to

teach you about the word "but" is you ignore everything that precedes it.

It is really simple, Madam Speaker. Support police, support law enforcement, support teachers, support nurses. I again implore you to give a "yes" vote on HB 1249. Thank you.

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

The Chair recognizes the minority leader, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the good gentleman, the Republican Appropriations chair, attempted to get some questions answered. While I find it interesting that there is ample time to provide speeches, when it comes time to answer questions, nobody is available.

So what we have here is an unfocused proposal from the other side of the aisle that offers an incomplete solution, and we are going to dive into that a little bit because I think it is important. The good gentleman talks about teachers. And those of us who have children in the education system – I had three – and I, for one, want to commend our teachers for working with their limited resources and dealing with what was imposed on them, particularly in an area where I live, which is rural and has extremely limited access to broadband. That presented some unique challenges that I recognize that not everybody here in the room might be familiar with. On top of that, my wife is a nurse, so I am intimately familiar with the long hours and the multiple shifts that she worked. But that does not mean that this bill is the best way to fix a problem.

And I will concede, providing a tax credit to new teachers, new police, and new nurses may sound good in a press release and may make people feel warm and fuzzy when they go to sleep at night, but it does not actually help the current workers that we have, and that, Madam Speaker, is a fundamental flaw. It does nothing to reward and retain those who have already given their lives, or the best years of their lives, to this variety of professions. Since this proposal is modeled after one of the first discussed by the Governor during his budget address, I think it is important to point out that the State's largest teachers union said that this proposal misses the mark. Let us repeat that. They said it misses the mark.

When it comes to educators, House Republicans stand at the ready to support policies that create a child-first, family-focused educational experience that reimagines life in a classroom and opens up opportunity, allowing teachers to actually teach instead of erecting bureaucratic barriers and increasing testing standards – because that will be what increases teacher morale and once again attracts people to the education profession.

When it comes to the police, Madam Speaker, it is no wonder that after years of blaming the police for societal ills and calls to defund them that they have a morale and a recruiting problem. And people are leaving the profession and declining to enter the profession of policing. Our caucus is ready to support our police and our prosecutors with resources that they need to keep our communities safe and secure. This proposal does not do that. It is a false welcome mat to the professions, but does nothing to support our police currently on the frontlines and does nothing to help new recruits once they are in and are already protecting us.

And while we can all agree that the folks covered under this legislation are vital to the operation of our community – that part the prime sponsor is correct about – but they were not the only frontline workers who have experienced shortages over the last few years, they just happened to be perhaps the most numerous.

Truck drivers kept our goods and economy moving during the hardest times facing our country in the midst of a global pandemic.

The good gentleman from Bucks County had an amendment that was out of order that dealt with EMTs (emergency medical technicians) and firefighters, who continue to face funding and personnel shortages. It does nothing to mention the allied health professions, such as those who might work in the lab, in X-ray, ultrasound, CAT scan, cardiovascular – the list goes on and on. Noble professions that have been overlooked for too long by many who come here to lobby for bills to make changes. The licensed dieticians that the good chairman pointed out were included in the Governor's original plan, but we do not know why they are not included in this one.

And most importantly, Madam Speaker, there were a variety of amendments offered by the Republican Caucus that would have targeted more individuals to be included in this bill, but they were tabled; they were dismissed – including those precincts in Philadelphia that have some of the highest crime rates.

So yes, we care about the police, Madam Speaker; that is why we sought additional help. Once our friends on the other side of the aisle are actually ready to talk about ways in which this Commonwealth can help people get a budget done, they will find the Republicans ready and willing to have that conversation. Unfortunately, at this point on this proposal, I have to agree with the PSEA (Pennsylvania State Education Association) and recognize that HB 1249 misses the mark and is incomplete.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the majority leader, Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I will be brief.

I believe this issue has been belabored and somewhat distracted by the real issue. We have acute shortages right now in our workforce. Those workforces are driven by many things, and in no area are those shortages more painful and potentially more dangerous than the area of policing, nursing, and the teachers that provide for our children.

This proposal, the Governor's proposal – wildly popular – provides a \$2500-a-year tax credit for the next 3 years to recruit and retain these vital workers. This proposal does that. A vote "yes" is pro-nurse, pro-teacher, and pro-cop. A vote against it is against our teachers, against our nurses, and against our police. Vote "yes."

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—137

Abney	Frankel	Labs	Rabb
Bellmon	Freeman	Mackenzie, M.	Rigby
Benham	Friel	Mackenzie, R.	Rozzi
Bizzarro	Gallagher	Madden	Salisbury
Borowski	Galloway	Madsen	Samuelson
Boyd	Gaydos	Major	Sanchez
Boyle	Gergely	Mako	Sappey

Bradford	Gillen	Malagari	Scheuren
Brennan	Giral	Marcell	Schlossberg
Briggs	Green	Markosek	Schweyer
Brown, A.	Guenst	Marshall	Scott
Brown, M.	Guzman	Matzie	Shusterman
Bullock	Haddock	Mayes	Siegel
Burgos	Hanbridge	McAndrew	Smith-Wade-El
Burns	Harkins	McNeill	Solomon
C Freytiz	Harris	Mehaffie	Steele
Cephas	Hogan	Mercuri	Struzzi
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Merski	Sturla
Ciresi	Howard	Metzgar	Takac
Conklin	Innamorato	Mihalek	Tomlinson
Cooper	Isaacson	Miller, D.	Topper
Curry	Jozwiak	Mullins	Venkat
Daley	Kail	Munroe	Vitali
Davanzo	Kazeem	Neilson	Warner
Davis	Kenyatta	Nelson, E.	Warren
Dawkins	Kerwin	Nelson, N.	Waxman
Deasy	Khan	O'Mara	Webster
Deloso	Kim	O'Neal	White
Delozier	Kinthead	Ortitay	Williams, C.
Donahue	Kinsey	Otten	Williams, D.
Emrick	Kosierowski	Parker	Young
Evans	Krajewski	Pashinski	
Fiedler	Krueger	Pielli	McClinton,
Fleming	Kulik	Pisciottano	Speaker
Flood	Kuzma	Probst	

NAYS—66

Adams	Fink	Klunk	Rossi
Armanini	Flick	Krupa	Rowe
Banta	Fritz	Kutz	Ryncavage
Barton	Gleim	Lawrence	Schemel
Benninghoff	Gregory	Leadbeter	Schlegel
Bernstine	Greiner	Maloney	Schmitt
Bonner	Grove	Mentzer	Scialabba
Borowicz	Hamm	Miller, B.	Smith
Cabell	Heffley	Moul	Staats
Causar	Irvin	Mustello	Stambaugh
Cook	James	Oberlander	Stehr
Cutler	Jones, M.	Owlett	Stender
D'Orsie	Jones, T.	Pickett	Twardzik
Diamond	Kaufner	Rader	Watro
Dunbar	Kauffman	Rapp	Wentling
Ecker	Keefer	Roae	Zimmerman
Fee	Kephart		

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.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1283, PN 1399**, entitled:

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

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

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

Ms. DALEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

HB 1283, this legislation, is very straightforward. It simply gives municipalities the option to install pedestrian plazas and parking-protected bicycle lanes if they so choose. It accomplishes this by clarifying that vehicles can park within 12 inches of these facilities if they are present.

Under current law, vehicles must park within 12 inches of a curb, so this small technical detail prevents our municipalities from deploying parking-protected bike lanes, which are installed between a curb and on-street parking.

Protected bicycle lanes significantly improve safety for bicyclists by using the line of parked cars to shield them from passing vehicle traffic. Many bicyclists have been killed over the last few years, and they would still be here if we allowed municipalities to install these parking-protected bike lanes. There are two bicyclists I would like to highlight today.

On November 28, 2017, Emily Fredricks was riding her bike to work in Philadelphia when she was struck and killed by a sanitation truck. She was 24 years old, and she was a pastry chef.

On October 23, 2015, Susan Hicks was riding her bike home from work in Pittsburgh's Oakland neighborhood when she was struck and killed by a vehicle. She was 34 years old and a professor at the University of Pittsburgh.

Sadly, Emily and Susan are not the only bicyclists to have lost their lives in recent years. In 2021 there were 766 crashes involving bicyclists, with 754 injuries and 24 fatalities; 75 percent of these fatalities took place on State roads.

Last session this bill was unanimously passed by the House. This session this bill was unanimously approved by the House Transportation Committee. So I ask members to support this bill once again to give our municipalities the tools they need to create safe riding environments for our bicyclists. Thank you.

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

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Maloney.

Mr. MALONEY. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

What an outstanding bill. I fully support it.

Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Innamorato.

Ms. INNAMORATO. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I want to thank the prime sponsor of the bill this session, as well as the gentleman from Berks who championed this bill in sessions past. I also want to thank my colleague from Philadelphia who worked with me to amend the law so that we could name it in honor of Emily and Susan. And I am grateful for this body – I am grateful that this body is honoring sound policy by wrapping it in the stories of those individuals whose lives were lost when they were commuting to and from work via bicycle.

And I just want to take a moment to highlight a little bit more about Susan Hicks and the person she was in the community. On October 23, 2015, Susan Hicks, a professor at the University of Pittsburgh, was riding her bike home from work exactly the way Pennsylvania required her to: as if she was driving a car. Back then, Forbes Avenue, the main thoroughfare through Oakland, was not friendly for cyclists. Susan pulled her bike behind an SUV (sport utility vehicle) and waited for the left turn signal at a red light, then a speeding car slammed into the car behind her, causing a chain reaction that ultimately resulted in her death.

I remember that night vividly. I did not know Susan, but I know many of her friends and neighbors. Back in 2015, I commuted a lot more by bicycle, and that night I started to get texts and phone calls from friends and family members asking me if I was okay. And I was confused. I did not know what they were talking about. But what I soon realized was that the local news had just shared that there was a young woman with brown hair who was killed while riding her bike. And unlike my texts that all got returned, the texts that Susan got would forever go unanswered.

She was 34 years old. Susan is remembered as a scholar, passionate and brilliant. She loved Shakespeare, Russian films, and of course, riding her bike. She was a resident of my district, and her loss is still felt today in our community. And since Susan's tragic death, thanks to work of advocates, local leaders, and the universities, Forbes Avenue looks a lot different today. In 2017 a redesigning process began, with pedestrian and cyclist safety at the center. But there is one tool in local officials' toolbox that they would have liked to have, and that is parking-protected bike lanes. And there is good reason for that. A comprehensive study released in June 2019 found that roads with parking-protected bike lanes make both cycling and driving safer, and after analyzing crash data over a 13-year period, they found that there was a 44-percent reduction in deaths and 50 percent fewer serious injuries than the average city.

Parking-protected bike lanes, they make cities and streets safer for everyone, whether you are using an assisted mobility device, walking your children to school, catching the bus for your first day of class, or driving your car to work – all without losing parking in our business corridors or residential neighborhoods. When our streets are safer for cyclists, everyone wins. And like the maker of the bill said, this passed unanimously last session, and I am asking us to do that again for Susan and Emily's families and for cyclists across this Commonwealth.

But before I close, I just want to read something that Susan's brother and sister-in-law sent to me. "The bill proposed today in the PA legislature is one Susan Hicks would be pleased to support. The fact that it is based on protecting cyclists rather than punishing drivers is something she would advocate. Susan was a cycling enthusiast as a way to connect with her community and be part of her environment. As a trained Anthropologist, she used the trips to and from work to observe her surroundings: the people and events that make a city distinct. This bill will go a long way to protect our sisters and brothers, sons and daughters, parents and grandparents who cycle through our towns and cities."

Let us get this done this session. Let us honor Emily and Susan and send this bill to the Governor's desk. 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—198

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

NAYS—5

Kepphart	Metzgar	Mihalek	Warner
Leadbeter			

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.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1295, PN 1597**, 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 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 Mullins.

Mr. MULLINS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Every time we go for a haircut, buy or sell a house with the help of a real estate agent, have our taxes done by a C.P.A. (certified public accountant), or go for a checkup or a lifesaving surgery, we place our trust, our finances, our well-being – and sometimes, our lives – in the hands of professionally licensed individuals.

This engagement is a trust, a trust placed upon these individuals by us as consumers and patients, based on trust given by the Commonwealth in the form of a license. It is easy to forget just how often we engage with these exceptional and talented individuals. A trip to the vet with our dog; picking up a prescription from our community pharmacist; that mani-pedi before a friend's wedding; the satisfying snap, crackle, pop in the chiropractor's office; your child's speech therapy session; or chemotherapy for a loved one – we depend on these professionals for so much.

However, in the unfortunate circumstance of a reported violation of that license, that trust, there is a process, a due process, for disciplinary hearings under the State's various licensing boards and commissions. My bill, HB 1295, will improve the process for these hearings by putting safeguards in place to avoid delays and encouraging the physical appearance of the licensee, or respondent, for the hearing. Additionally, the bill allows for those who were adversely affected by the actions that led to the hearing an appropriate opportunity to be heard via a written impact statement. This proposal would ensure that such hearings and their outcomes have the benefit of full information and participation.

I very much appreciate the work of both chairmen of the Professional Licensure Committee and their committee staffs leading up to a unanimous committee vote. In closing, this bill will protect consumers in Pennsylvania and promote some of the most essential and noble callings and professionals in our lives. I appreciate your support.

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—177

Abney	Fee	Krueger	Rabb
Adams	Fiedler	Kulik	Rader
Armanini	Fleming	Kutz	Rigby
Banta	Flick	Kuzma	Rozzi
Barton	Flood	Labs	Ryncavage
Bellmon	Frankel	Mackenzie, M.	Salisbury
Benham	Freeman	Mackenzie, R.	Samuelson
Benninghoff	Friel	Madden	Sanchez
Bizzarro	Fritz	Madsen	Sappey
Bonner	Gallagher	Major	Scheuren
Borowski	Galloway	Mako	Schlegel
Boyd	Gaydos	Malagari	Schlossberg
Boyle	Gergely	Marcell	Schmitt
Bradford	Gillen	Markosek	Schweyer
Brennan	Giral	Marshall	Scialabba
Briggs	Green	Matzie	Scott
Brown, A.	Greiner	Mayes	Shusterman
Brown, M.	Grove	McAndrew	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McNeill	Smith
Burgos	Guzman	Mehaffie	Smith-Wade-El
Burns	Haddock	Mentzer	Solomon
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Mercuri	Staats
Cabell	Harkins	Merski	Steele
Causar	Harris	Metzgar	Stender
Cephas	Heffley	Mihalek	Struzzi
Cerrato	Hogan	Miller, B.	Sturla
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Miller, D.	Takac
Conklin	Howard	Mullins	Tomlinson
Cook	Innamorato	Munroe	Topper
Cooper	Irvin	Mustello	Twardzik
Curry	Isaacson	Neilson	Venkat
Cutler	James	Nelson, E.	Vitali
Daley	Jozwiak	Nelson, N.	Warren
Davanzo	Kail	O'Mara	Watro
Davis	Kaufer	O'Neal	Waxman
Dawkins	Kazeem	Oberlander	Webster
Deasy	Kenyatta	Ortitay	Wentling
Delloso	Kerwin	Otten	White
Delozier	Khan	Owlett	Williams, C.
Diamond	Kim	Parker	Williams, D.
Donahue	Kinhead	Pashinski	Young
Dunbar	Kinsey	Pickett	
Ecker	Klunk	Pielli	McClinton,
Emrick	Kosierowski	Pisciottano	Speaker
Evans	Krajewski	Probst	

NAYS—26

Bernstine	Jones, M.	Leadbeter	Rowe
Borowicz	Jones, T.	Maloney	Schemel
D'Orsie	Kauffman	Moul	Stambaugh
Fink	Keefer	Rapp	Stehr
Gleim	Kephart	Roae	Warner
Gregory	Krupa	Rossi	Zimmerman
Hamm	Lawrence		

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 1500, PN 1615**, 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, for minimum wages and for exemptions.

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 Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

So we have heard a lot over the last couple weeks about the staffing shortages that Pennsylvania has been facing. Raising the minimum wage in Pennsylvania is not about a matter of fairness; it is an urgent necessity that demands immediate action.

The current state of affairs is dire. With low-wage workers across the State struggling to make ends meet and falling deeper into poverty, the time has come for us to raise the minimum wage. One critical aspect that underscores the importance of raising the minimum wage is the severe staffing shortages across counties with the poorest populations in Pennsylvania. These communities are disproportionately affected by the current low-wage landscape, as workers in these areas often earn wages that are far below what is needed to sustain a decent standard of living; as a result, many individuals are forced to work multiple jobs and rely on government assistance to survive, perpetrating a cycle of poverty that is difficult to escape.

When I was the chair of the Philadelphia delegation, we did a study around some of the root causes that our State faced, and one of those root causes was poverty. And as we looked at some of the poorest counties, the ones that kind of sit at the very bottom are Forest County, Cameron County, Fayette County, Elk County, and Lawrence County. And I bring this up because I have heard, over the course of having the debate around minimum wage, that somehow this is only going to be directed at one county, which is the one I represent. And there is also this misinformation that there is only one category of individuals who are going to be affected. Poverty sees no color. Poverty sees no gender. When your community is faced with some of the challenges that these counties that I have just highlighted, it is important that we raise the wage.

Minimum wage was historically established because we had shortages in this country which required us to act. I think we are faced with some of those same challenges today, especially as we talk about these impoverished communities, which are all deep

red counties in this State. So it is not about R and D. Poverty is poverty regardless of where you live, and it is far time for us to address some of these challenges we have as it relates to it.

So I am happy to stand in firm support of HB 1500, which again, is a companion bill to Senator Laughlin's who is a Republican in the Senate. This is their language. This is a compromise. And I make it very clear that when you know you have good legislation is when no one is happy. That is when you know you are fully addressing some of the needs that need to be addressed when you are dealing with a diverse body such as the Pennsylvania House of Representatives.

So with that, I urge support for HB 1500.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Ecker.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Today I rise to speak about the truth about minimum wage. It is an artificial increase of the minimum wage and it will impact Pennsylvania not in the way that it intends.

So as it stands today, nearly 98 percent of Pennsylvanians earn a wage higher than minimum wage. When looking at the makeup up minimum-wage earners, it is a misconception that they are single parents raising children or individuals coming from low socioeconomic households. In reality, 93 percent of these employees have zero children, and a considerable amount of minimum-wage earners are from middle- and upper-class families.

History has shown that forcing businesses to pay higher wages leads to an overall decrease in demand for labor, as businesses are forced to find new ways to cut increased labor costs. Madam Speaker, we have all seen it. Our convenience stores are now automated, technology is catching up; these folks will be replaced.

Another good example of this is our nonprofit organizations. I have heard from my libraries, my other nonprofits who hire folks at minimum wage to reward them for being the best volunteers in their office. They are already faced with declining revenue streams of revenue because of increased costs. So forcing these nonprofit staff in these libraries and churches and other institutions to increase an artificial wage that is set by government will only cut down on services, cut down on hours, and even close these nonprofits that are so vital to our community already.

More importantly, I believe that putting all of our focus on a small percentage of jobs still paying minimum wage, we are ignoring a part of the workforce that provides such an integral part of our community but are already drastically underpaid and underappreciated, such as our direct-care service workers. These workers, who are overlooked and underappreciated, were somehow left out of the budget we passed a couple weeks ago. Instead of making sure that these direct-care workers are provided for and increasing reimbursement rates, instead we want to make sure teenagers flipping burgers can earn \$15 an hour, while our direct-care workers, who are providing the most vital, often backbreaking, and heart-wrenching services to our most vulnerable men and women, are left out.

Instead, we should be focusing on removing barriers to gainful and fulfilling employment opportunities. Let us invest in our current and future workforce by putting our support behind career and tech education – which we have done so in a bipartisan fashion in the past – so that we can get people into

family-sustaining jobs and close the skills gap we are currently facing. Artificially increasing wages will not provide these skills to those folks.

I believe that we are asking the wrong question. It should not be, why are these people earning minimum wage? The question should be, why are they not getting into well-paying jobs that are currently hiring? So instead of trying to force unfunded mandates on our State employers and focusing on initiatives like our energy tax that are killing jobs, let us work together to educate and train citizens of this Commonwealth so they can be employed in jobs well above the minimum wage even proposed in this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Kim.

Ms. KIM. I want to thank the Speaker for bringing this bill up on today's calendar, and I want to thank the majority chair for sending this out of his committee. I want to acknowledge the Raise the Wage PA Coalition, who has worked on this issue for the last 10 years. I just want to mention a couple of folks: John Meyerson and Kadida Kenner, thank you for all of your work.

An African proverb says, "When elephants fight, it is the grass that suffers." I hope that we can put an end to this fight and end the cycle of workers working at poverty wage. We can get fixated on the number of \$15 an hour. It has actually become a trigger word. For some it seems too much, and for others it is too little. If we reframe it, this bill will guarantee a worker, in 3 years, to earn about \$30,000.

Hey, I am grateful that we have the opportunity to vote on a higher minimum wage, but if the average cost of day care in PA is about \$12,000 a year, that is pretty much half of their salary. Add rent, insurance, transportation, and food – even if we raise the minimum wage to \$15 an hour, the grass still suffers.

I support this bill because this is a piece to a larger puzzle that will help working families. I am proud to have voted for my colleagues' bills like an increased child-care tax credit, expanded property tax and rent rebate program, implemented a State-level earned income tax, and so on. If these packages of bills, including this one, goes to the Governor for his signature, the math starts to work for working families. When the math works, there are less evictions, less dependence on food banks and SNAP (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program). Families can start saving a little bit of money and even afford braces for their children. When the math works, the State pays less and workers spend more at local businesses.

Today we can make a positive change. If we pass this bill and it passes through the Senate, we will be the 31st State and DC, to raise the wage above \$7.25. The gloom and doom that others predict did not happen. We are going to be okay. Let us support working families and vote for HB 1500.

Thank you again, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks Representative Kim.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

My county that I represent – one of my counties was mentioned, so I thought I would get up and speak a little bit in opposition to the bill – in Crawford County, virtually every employer is hiring. Nobody is paying minimum wage – nobody. Our county nursing home is trying to hire; our hospital, Meadville Medical Center; our county prison; all the factories; all the social service agencies that help people with intellectual disabilities – you know, mental health, well-being kind of things – they are all hiring. All the restaurants; all the stores; all the landscapers,

carpenters, plumbers, electricians – everyone is hiring at approximately double what the minimum wage is. It is a solution in search of a problem.

In my area, high school kids who have never had a job working anyplace, with zero work experience, barely legally able to work because they are only 15 or 16 years old, they are getting jobs at \$10, \$11, \$12 an hour. So, Madam Speaker, it is a myth that there are all these people out there trying to, you know, eke out an existence earning minimum wage.

According to the Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry, there are 6.3 million jobs in Pennsylvania; 63,600 of them pay minimum wage. I am not sure where that is, because none of them are in my district, but that is 1 percent of all jobs. Madam Speaker, we hear about single moms trying to raise a family on minimum wage. A prior speaker noted that 93 percent of the people who earn minimum wage do not have kids. So if you do the math, that means, you know, 7 percent have kids, which means there are 4,452 people in Pennsylvania that earn minimum wage and have kids.

Now go back to the other number, 6.3 million jobs in Pennsylvania and 4,452 people have jobs that pay minimum wage and they have kids. So it is a bigger question. Why are there people that are 20, 30, 40, 50 years old and they are only earning minimum wage, when high school kids with zero work experience, zero specialized skills, that they have never had a job before – if they are getting \$10, \$11, \$12 an hour, how is it that we do have people that are making \$7.25? Everybody is trying to hire. Everyone is trying to hire.

This is not a thing for government to fix. If I wanted to work for somebody, it seems like I should negotiate with that person what I want to get paid. If I wanted to work with, you know, my good friend from Warren County. If she wanted to hire me, I do not think everybody in this room should decide what that person has to pay me. Why can the employee and the employer not work it out, which is what is happening. In Pennsylvania, 99 percent of the time, the minimum-wage law is not an issue. Employers do not care about what the minimum wage is. They hire people at a wage where they can hire people, and anybody that wants to get a job does not have to take a minimum-wage job. Every once in a while you hear a story about somebody that pays minimum wage. Well, do not work there. Everybody else is – I mean, convenience stores are hiring people with zero work experience for almost double the minimum wage.

So I am not sure what we are trying to accomplish here, but I just wanted to set the record straight that virtually every employer in my district is trying to hire, and I encourage, if there is anybody out there listening that is earning minimum wage, go get a different job, because 99 percent of all jobs pay more than minimum wage. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Fleming on final passage of HB 1500.

Mr. FLEMING. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of HB 1500. I was working for the Rendell administration when the minimum wage was raised from \$5.25 an hour to its current level of \$7.25 an hour back in 2009. If you had told me that it would be 14 years before this body would take another step to raise the minimum wage, I simply would not have believed it.

This legislation is critical, particularly since every neighboring State currently has a higher minimum wage than Pennsylvania, and several States are working their way toward a

\$15 minimum wage. For those who live close to those States that pay a higher minimum wage, what is their incentive to work here? Passing this bill will keep workers who live close to our borders here in the State and patronizing Pennsylvania business.

HB 1500 is also good because even though some employers are paying a higher wage, there is no harm in codifying a floor that gets us closer to a living wage for young workers and working families. A rising tide indeed does lift all boats.

Like many of you, I spent many months talking to voters in order to get here, and while it is imperfect, this was one of my signature priorities as a candidate. I know we can all agree that there is dignity in work, and I am overjoyed that after 14 years, young workers and working families will be closer to achieving dignity in pay. I urge a "yes" vote on HB 1500.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On final passage, the Chair recognizes Representative Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in opposition to HB 1500 and I would like to just review for my colleagues, for the House, for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who exactly earns minimum wage now. These are not my numbers; these numbers come directly from the Minimum Wage Report from the Department of Labor and Industry, released in March 2023.

Madam Speaker, there are 63,600 people who earn minimum wage in Pennsylvania or less, minimum wage or less in Pennsylvania. That is the lowest figure ever; lowest figure ever. That represents about 950 people, on average, per county in Pennsylvania, or for each one of our legislative districts, on average, 313 people; 313 people in our legislative districts that consist of about 64,000 people is about half of 1 percent. The total number of minimum-wage workers in Pennsylvania is less than 1 percent of all employees in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Seventy percent of them work part-time; 70 percent. Thirty-five percent of them have family incomes that are over \$75,000, and as my good friend, the gentleman from Adams, said previously, 93 percent of them have no children whatsoever and not a family to support.

Madam Speaker, those three statistics tell me that most people who are working for minimum wage are doing it for a couple extra bucks, a couple extra bucks. They are not making a career out of it. They are out there for a couple extra bucks. Forty-nine percent of people who earn minimum wage or less work in the food and beverage industry; 49 percent. Forty-nine percent. So who is in the other 51 percent? Well, it may very well be the people who are exempt and will still be exempt if HB 1500 becomes the law. That includes farm labor, domestic service in or about the private home of the employer, newspaper deliverers, golf caddies, and another extensive list of people who are exempt and will remain exempt if HB 1500 becomes law.

Now, let us go back to the 49 percent of these workers who work in food and beverage. I do not know about you, Madam Speaker, but I know I go out to eat a whole lot less now than I did a few years ago because the cost, thanks to the President's administration's inflation, has either doubled or tripled at my favorite restaurants, and that means these folks are earning fewer tips from me, their usual customer.

But, Madam Speaker, let us talk a little bit about the economic theory, or the economic ignorance, behind this bill. Look, these businesses, these evil and greedy businesses that you are targeting with the minimum wage increase, they are not going to

eat those costs. They are going to pass those costs along to their customers. The price of everything else will increase, compounding what we are already seeing from Washington, DC, as an incredibly harmful inflation rate. And because all the price of everything else will go up, by the time this bill would actually go in effect, you are going to hear hues and cries for an even greater minimum wage.

Now, Madam Speaker, I am generally on the side of if the Federal government is not doing something right, we as a State should act. But here, Madam Speaker, the Federal government is the cause of this problem through the authorization of the printing of new money from thin air. Congress should take responsibility for that policy, and if they want to raise the minimum wage – because they are the ones responsible for the printing of the money that makes your dollars less valuable – they should take the responsibility. We should not be on the hook for their irresponsibility.

Well, Madam Speaker, let us talk about the real impacts of raising the minimum wage, and unlike what might my good friend, the gentleman from Dauphin County, says, in this case, a rising tide will not lift all boats. Some of those boats are going to sink, and here is why. There will be fewer customers, especially in the food and beverage industry. There are going to be fewer sales, and jobs will be eliminated. How many? Well, the National Federation of Independent Business says, over the next 10 years, 100,000 jobs will be lost, 57,000 of them in small business. One hundred thousand jobs will be lost over the next 10 years – far more than the 63,600 that earn minimum wage or less.

Like something else – a topic I am not allowed to speak of here on the floor – it sounds like the cure is worse than the disease. Jobs will be eliminated. And, Madam Speaker, it does not matter what minimum wage is if the job you had does not exist tomorrow. It does not matter what the minimum wage is.

There will be fewer opportunities for those who are entering for the first time, or reentering after a long period of pause to the workforce; fewer opportunities. Hours are going to be cut for those jobs that remain. And, Madam Speaker, 5 years ago I asked around my own legislative district. I wanted to find an employer who actually paid the minimum wage. I could only find one, one employer who actually offered any jobs at minimum wage. Why? Because unfortunately, she had to actually train these people on the fact that you actually have to show up to work, you have to be on time, and you have to dress appropriately to deal with the public. It is unbelievable that now we are going to penalize her because she is trying to get people in the gear of actually being a good employee.

Madam Speaker, let us talk once again about restaurants and the beverage industry. If you care, if you care one iota about revitalizing our cities and our towns in Pennsylvania, passing along a hit like this – which essentially is tripling, tripling, tripling, Madam Speaker, the hourly wage of restaurant servers and folks like that – if you care about revitalizing our cities and towns, you will know that, generally, the rebuild and revitalization of a city and town begins with it becoming a destination for food and beverage. That is generally the genesis of attracting other businesses to your city or your town. As we look around, and I look around my county and I see the small towns that are being hollowed out. I see the third-class city in my county that has been hollowed out. What we need is to revitalize those cities and towns, and the way to do that is to first build yourself as a food and beverage destination. That is the genesis of revitalization.

Madam Speaker, I know there are times on this floor I get a bit dramatic. I am not being dramatic here. I am just talking to you about common sense; common sense. If you want to kill our small businesses and our chance to revitalize our cities, if you want to kill opportunities for people who are entering for the first time, or reentering after a pause, the workforce, by all means vote for HB 1500. But if you care about actually doing what is right for Pennsylvania, what is economically smart and rebuilding our workforce, then I would ask for a vote of "no."

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Haddock on HB 1500, final passage.

Mr. HADDOCK. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Today I rise on the House floor in support of HB 1500. It has been since 2009, 14 years since our \$7.25 minimum wage has been raised in this great State, and I think it is time we give our lowest wage earners a raise. Like 20 percent of this hall, I represent, in the 118th District, two counties, Luzerne County and Lackawanna County; 10 towns in Luzerne, 9 towns in Lackawanna, as close to a 50-50 district as we have here on the House floor. The cost of living in both counties, in Luzerne and Lackawanna, is \$15.16; that is for a single individual, not a family, a single individual to earn a decent living wage.

I think it is time we support those people. And I thank the gentleman from Philadelphia city for making this bill and doing it over a stepped process: \$11 in 2024, \$13 in 2025, and then finally, \$15 in 2026. This gives our economy a chance to adjust, it gives our employers a chance to adjust, and it gives our workers the well-deserved raise that they need.

I ask this House to support HB 1500. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes Representative Gaydos.

Ms. GAYDOS. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

First, this legislation was rushed out of committee, not allowing all stakeholders to weigh in and explain what the makers of this bill, exactly what it will do to their professions, specifically restaurant workers. This is the sort of thing that taxpayers and citizens of Pennsylvania are absolutely sick and tired of.

While I absolutely agree that everyone should be enabled to earn a living wage, this legislation is poorly crafted. Look, companies are not allowed to fix prices; likewise, governments should not be allowed to fix wages.

I believe in the free market. I ran a business prior to getting elected. I had employees. I provided health care, which I paid for. I also gave 6 weeks' maternity leave to my employees. Why? It was the right thing to do. But it was the free market. If I wanted employees to stay, I had to offer positive things in the workplace, and I did that. But that is the free market.

In this situation, this particular bill added a couple things in, not just adjusting the minimum-wage increase, but also adding in an increase in the tipped wage. The tipped employee wage was at 60 percent of the minimum wage. That is more than a 200-percent increase. Are you kidding me? How are restaurants supposed to be able to handle this, particularly on such short notice?

The restaurant industry and the lodging industry went through so much in COVID and are just beginning to recover after all of the COVID policies that put them out of business. It is just

absolutely stunning to me that this bill would target, once again, and put an assault on this sector and the restaurant industry. It just does not seem to stop.

Please vote "no" on HB 1500. Let the free market take care of the industry.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (ROBERT F. MATZIE) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and recognizes the gentlelady from Philadelphia, Representative Green.

Ms. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise in support of HB 1500. This bill is a work in progress leading in the right direction. Is it the \$18 or \$15 minimum-wage, right-now bill that we need? No, it is not. Is it a path to get to an \$18, \$15 minimum-wage bill that we need right now? Yes, it is. Can we accept anything lower than what is being proposed here today? Never.

It has taken us 14 years to get to this point and we will continue to champion this issue year after year to come. No jobs will be lost, as our counterparts will have you to believe. More jobs will be created. Good, sustainable, living-wage jobs will be created, not the slave wages offered today. Rising tides will lift all boats. Today we will lift all boats for low-wage workers.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and recognizes Representative Klunk.

Ms. KLUNK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise to oppose HB 1500. I understand that the advocates for this legislation want to help people; however, I urge everyone to carefully consider the unintended, but real, consequences this legislation will have on real, average, ordinary Pennsylvanians and family-owned businesses across this Commonwealth and in our local communities.

We have heard the negative economic impacts about this bill from the economists at the Independent Fiscal Office, and we can hear from economists all day. But what about the mom-and-pop shops that will end up having to pay the wages set forth in this bill? Where do they stand on this proposal? Now, I have heard from a number of those family-owned businesses in my district that will be negatively impacted by this bill, and I think it is important that we hear those concerns of those small, family-owned businesses in the Commonwealth and the people whom they employ.

One of those family-owned businesses is the Famous Hot Weiner shop, a nearly century-old business in my district that serves its hot dogs with its famous sauce and later this year will celebrate 100 years in business. George and Tim Keriazes, the brothers who now own the Famous Hot Weiner, cited the negative effect that the tipped minimum wage increase in this bill will have on their employees, on their business, and their family's legacy of serving our local community.

In 2022 the Famous Hot Weiner had its least profitable year in its 99-year history due to the increased cost of wages, food, supplies, and other resources. The brothers said that it was extremely difficult to manage those compounding expenses, and I will never forget Tim looking at me, that one day I was there for lunch, and telling me how he could not keep up with the rising cost of potatoes for their famous chili fries. Like many other

small restaurateurs, the Famous Hot Weiner was forced to raise its prices by six times last year, Mr. Speaker – six times – and yet they still had difficulty trying to avoid those losses. The economics are simple: Increased costs, including wage costs, get passed on to the consumer buying that famous hot dog with everything that we all love.

Despite improved sales in 2023, George explained to me that those increased expenses are still making it very, very difficult for their family business to return a profit, not to mention the lingering impacts of COVID-19 – the forced government shutdown, skyrocketing inflation, and the other factors that have diminished the restaurant's bottom line, which has resulted in less tax revenue at the State and Federal levels.

Tim and George now find themselves in a position where they must choose between profitability and potentially pricing their family restaurant out of business. HB 1500 could possibly put an end to this beloved Hanover area family business that has served generation after generation. I believe many other businesses across our Commonwealth and in each of our districts are facing these very same challenges.

This bill is not what my district sent me up here to do, Mr. Speaker. When we took this oath of office, we made a pledge to represent our constituents and keep their best interests at the forefront of our decisionmaking, and I cannot support a bill that would put a local family restaurant out of business, and along with it, the many employees who make a living at their three locations.

Our tipped-wage employees do not want the tipped minimum wage to increase either as stated in this bill. Servers at full-service restaurants currently make an average of \$27 an hour – well above the proposed mandated wage – and Tim and George both attested to that. Raising the tipped minimum wage will lower take-home pay for these workers who are dependent upon that money to support their families. Servers know this and are speaking out against HB 1500, and I have heard from them.

HB 1500 does not improve Pennsylvania's overall economic health and it does not make living more affordable for Pennsylvanians. The Famous Hot Weiner that has been passed down through generations will likely have to close its doors if this bill goes into law, and if that happens, those who work there will no longer have a job to take care of their families, and those who patronize it, like myself and some other Representatives here in this body today, will no longer enjoy gathering there with friends and family like we have for generations.

The impact of this legislation is truly far-reaching, Mr. Speaker. It will not just impact the Famous Hot Weiner, but all small family-owned restaurants and businesses across my district and in this Commonwealth who employ our friends and our neighbors. We should listen to the economists at the Independent Fiscal Office and to our friends and neighbors who run our local mom-and-pop shops and restaurants who truly understand how this legislation will harm our workforce and our economy.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this legislation so we can preserve our economy here in Pennsylvania, so we can preserve the countless jobs that sustain and support Pennsylvanian families, and so we can preserve the heritage and the legacy of small family-owned businesses like the Famous Hot Weiner that may otherwise be forced to close their doors. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Representative Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am not an economist, and so I come at this as a former minimum-wage worker and a former business owner. When I was 13 years old, I went to work at the only job that was available to me because it was the only business that was within a bicycle's ride of my house in rural Lancaster County, and I started washing dishes in a restaurant for minimum wage. And by the end of the summer, when the cook quit, the boss said to me, hey, you have been helping out when we get busy. You are now the cook. And so at age 13 – and I do not even know what the child labor laws were then – but you know, at age 13, I started cooking in a restaurant. And I got a whopping ten cents an hour raise, and guess what? I was no longer making minimum wage. I was making all of a buck fifteen an hour, I think it was at the time.

So when we get those statistics that there are only 63,000 minimum-wage workers, that is probably true, but how many are there at minimum wage plus 10 cents an hour or minimum wage plus 20 cents an hour or minimum wage plus a buck an hour or minimum wage plus \$2 an hour? None of those statistics were presented today. I can tell you, it is more than 63,000.

But I wanted to point out that I rode my bike to work because it was the only job that I could get to. That winter there was an electrical fire at the restaurant and it burned to the ground, and I was out of a job. My sister finally turned 16. She got her driver's license, got a job in a restaurant in the next town over, and I had a way to get to work. But it was only in the hours that she was going to work in that restaurant, and because I was only still 13 years old, they said, we do not believe you actually know how to cook even though you had been a cook in a restaurant, so you get a job as a dishwasher, again starting at minimum wage. And so I did, and that was so that I could pay, as the deal was with my parents, that I could pay, along with my three other brothers and sisters, for half of my college. So I was not working because it was nice, easy change on the side, so I could go buy candy or sodas. I was working so that I did not have a student debt that was astronomical when I graduated from college. I was working so that I could put money in a savings account at \$30 a week so that I could help pay for my college 5 years later. It was not about, this is just a fun thing to do for me on the side; it was about, this is the difference between me going to college or not. So the idea that I was, under any circumstances, willing to catch a ride to the next town so that I could keep my job, there are many, many people out there that are not even 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17, that are 20 or 30 years old, that do not have a driver's license, that for some reason or other, because of a medical condition, cannot drive a vehicle. And for them, the choice of – I heard one member say, you know, if you do not like the job you have with your employer, just go and get another one. That just "go and get another job" does not exist for thousands of workers in the State of Pennsylvania because they do not own a \$30,000 car that they can drive that gets them to work. It is just not that simple.

Now let me speak from the perspective of a small businessman, because I ran a business for 13 years. Never once, never once in that 13 years did I employ someone just because the labor was cheap and I could pay them minimum wage. There

was never once that I said, you know what? Minimum wage is pretty low. Let us just hire a couple people and have them sit around the office. If we have work for them, fine; if we do not, well, so what, they are cheap. Just hire people. The reason I hired people was because I had a job to get accomplished and I needed human capital there to do that. Labor is labor is labor. I needed that labor in order to get my job accomplished as a businessman and in order for me to make a profit.

Now, I have seen businesses that have operated on the notion that you hire cheap labor, and when that person cannot put food on their table or cannot pay for day care or cannot do the multitude of other things that working men and women do in this State, well, then the government will kick in and subsidize that. And I always viewed that as a really bad business model. It was not the worker's fault that they were working at a low-wage job; it was the business's fault that they had an unsustainable business model. But for the government program that paid for that person's food or their day care or their transportation, that business model did not work. It was a bad business model. So when I hear people say, if people actually had to pay somebody a decent wage, they might not be able to be in business – there is no such thing as a God-given right to own a business that requires the government to subsidize it and that is what we are talking about here. We are talking about paying people a wage that – we are not even talking about a living wage, we are just talking about something that is remotely close to reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue. The COLA (cost-of-living adjustment) in it, the escalator, the cost escalator every year, is long overdue. And this will move Pennsylvania forward in a manner that provides dignity for people who are willing to work; for people who are willing to work.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Carbon County, Representative Heffley.

Mr. HEFFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would increase the minimum wage up to \$15 an hour over a few years. When I talked to folks back home, first off, when I talked to all my tipped employees, folks that are bartenders and waitresses, every single one of them is opposed to it because they know that it is going to affect their bottom line and they are going to earn less tips. Not any one of them supports it.

I think the other thing to remember is a minimum wage is 1 percent, 1 percent of all employees. It is an entry level. We are not talking livable wage; it is minimum wage. The majority of people that earn minimum wage are students ranging from 16 to 24 years old. Those are entry-level positions coming into the workforce.

The good gentleman from Lancaster spoke about his time working when he was 13 years old. If you are 13, I do not know if you qualify for the minimum wage. I do not even know that they would allow you to work these days with some of the regulations that are out there. But I think it is important that when somebody turns 16 years old that there is an opportunity for employment. If it is \$7.25 an hour – which you would be hard-pressed to find any job paying that anymore; most of them are starting at \$11 or \$12 an hour – but when you raise that ceiling to \$15, you are going to really pinch out those entry-level positions. When somebody is 16 years old and they get that first job, they learn to work. They learn the responsibility of punching a clock. They learn a new job. Those things are so important.

In Carbon County, we have many industries up there. Tourism is our number one industry, so we have a lot of tipped employees who earn a good living at the current rate. We have a lot of high school students who work part-time – part-time – maybe only a couple months out of the season at a ski resort or at a rafting company, where they are earning a minimum wage but they are learning. They are learning to work. They are learning how to be responsible. It is so important that we teach those lessons, that those kids, young people have that opportunity so that they can go on to get a raise, get a promotion.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, if passed, will deny young people the opportunity to get those entry-level jobs. More companies will just shift to AI (artificial intelligence). We have already have seen it at McDonald's, where you go in and punch a screen to order food instead of actually somebody being behind a counter. This is counterproductive, and basing it to the rate of inflation means that that ceiling keeps raising and it even puts a harder crunch on those younger workers to ever get a job.

And the other folks that this really hurts are senior citizens, many senior citizens who retire but they still want to work part-time. Maybe they are working at a nonprofit, at a library, and they are happy to make \$7.25 an hour or \$12 an hour. They do not need to make \$15 an hour, but they use that extra money so they can buy their grandkids something or they can pay their taxes.

And going back to taxes, many seniors go back to work so they can help to pay their property taxes, which will be going up, because when you increase the minimum wage, you increase all wages. So those people on a fixed income will be doubly punished. Their property taxes, which the majority party does not care about, will be going up, and they will be hard pressed to pay their property tax bill and then be forced to sell their home because they cannot get a job.

Mr. Speaker, this is bad economic policy. The current wage, starting wage, in this State is much higher than \$7.25 an hour. We do not need to inflate it. All we are going to do is punish seniors and make it tougher for young folks to get that first job. I would ask for a negative vote on this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Representative Friel.

Mr. FRIEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this bill today for slightly different reasons. Now, I am an unabashed capitalist and small business owner and have been for my entire life, and I have heard a lot of discussion today about minimum wage and that 1 percent, the 60,000 folks making and earning minimum wage.

But if you look a little further, this bill impacts much more than that, because from \$7.25 an hour to \$12 an hour, there is another 18 percent, or 571,000 Pennsylvanians, that earn that. When you look beyond that to \$12 an hour to the \$15 an hour from those same statistics, it is another 20 percent. So almost one-third of hourly wage earners in Pennsylvania could be impacted by this bill, and that is significant. That is not retirees. That is not high school kids. That is wage earners providing for their families. That is why it is important that we look at and say, what is the impact of this bill and how does it affect our economy?

And I think it does one important thing. I believe in the market. The market is really efficient. As technology has grown, we have gotten more and more efficient, and the reason our businesses are able to put more profits in the bottom line is

technology has changed it. And when you buy goods and services, and if I can afford to pay a little more for something, I am going to ship it across the State. I can move goods and services everywhere in the State, and so that market adjusts really quickly. Technology and transportation allow that market to adjust.

You know what does not adjust really quickly? Human capital. Human capital is the hardest and slowest to adjust. So it is incumbent upon us as a State legislature to look at that and put safeguards in place. And I think these are smart safeguards, because what happens, it does eventually move, and we see it when the economic engine of a small community, as wage earners leave, they go where they can make more. So we need to put these safety nets up to make sure that the human capital in Pennsylvania and that market is given time to adjust, and that is what this bill does. It steps it in responsibly, it starts reasonably, it moves it up, it goes on an index and allows human capital to start moving at a pace that can catch up with the other paces of our economy like technology, like goods and services.

So I think, as a business owner, and I have seen it firsthand in my own community – to be honest with you, this bill probably does not affect my community much because my community probably does not pay minimum wage anywhere. But if you take one example – because we talked when we heard about the wage earners in bars and restaurants – in Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, which was an old coal town that 10 years ago was a ghost town, and if you look today, with some investments from this body, from grants and stuff and service about \$25 million, it started a path to regrow this town, to revitalize this town. We are looking at almost \$1 billion of additional add-on investment of private capital, and these restaurants are thriving, these bars are thriving, the nightlife is thriving, and you know what they do not pay in Phoenixville? Minimum wage.

So I rise in support of this bill. I think it is a great investment for Pennsylvania, and I urge a "yes" vote for 1500. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Representative Mackenzie.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Currently I serve as the Republican chair of the Labor and Industry Committee here in the House of Representatives, but I started my career as a minimum-wage employee. And minimum wage, which we are going to talk about – I am going to give a little bit of background on our current economy. I am going to talk about the process, how we got here, the positive and negative impacts of this legislation, and ultimately, what I think is a better path forward than HB 1500. But the minimum wage should not be viewed as a wage that people are staying on for their entire lives. We want to be providing opportunities for people to enter the economy, to learn, to grow, to get more skills, and to earn more wages so that they can sustain themselves and their families.

Right now let us talk about the background and the current law here in Pennsylvania. We have heard about how parts of the State are booming and the economy is doing well. We see it in the wages that are going on and being paid right here in Pennsylvania. A cashier at a convenience store or a fast-food restaurant is being offered \$15 an hour right now; regardless of what the minimum wage is, they are being offered \$15 an hour right now as a starting salary. If you have more skills, you can go to work in a manufacturing facility, right now if you are in Pennsylvania, and make \$29 an hour as a starting salary.

Why is that? There are two main reasons why wages are significantly beyond the minimum wage. The first is the retirement of baby boomers. We have seen that decline in the supply of labor as those individuals have moved into retirement. The second is the strong demand in our economy here in Pennsylvania. We hear repeatedly that the minimum wage has not been raised for 14 years. What has been happening here in Pennsylvania over that period of time is that we have been advocating, promoting, and advancing pro-growth policy that has grown our economy and our businesses, and so there is strong competition in the marketplace for employees, and wages have responded correspondingly by going up. Only recently, out of that time period of the last 14 years, only recently has inflation exceeded the rate of wage growth here in Pennsylvania. So up until that time recently, workers have been seeing wage growth beyond the rate of inflation.

All right, now let me talk about HB 1500 and the process to how we got here. HB 1500 was introduced and rushed through committee under "any other business." It was not put on the regular agenda. It is a totally new proposal from previous sessions. We did not get an economic impact analysis on this legislation and what it would mean. So any data or any other anecdotes, those are from other places outside of Pennsylvania and outside of this legislation. But we can talk about what those studies say. In other States, in other jurisdictions across this country, we have seen two negative impacts of increasing the minimum wage, so while we may help some people marginally increase their wages, there are tens of thousands of people here in Pennsylvania that put their jobs at risk because of HB 1500. We have seen it time and time again, and anecdotally, in Seattle is one of the most devastating cases, I would say, where restaurant workers were forced, through their unions, to advocate for a minimum-wage increase. They went out and advocated for it, and very quickly, businesses and restaurants started closing in Seattle. You can look up the studies. You can look up the newspapers. There are direct quotes from employees in that industry who said, I advocated for this change, but I never thought that it was going to be my business that closed. It is a very sad story and a very sad set of circumstances that we want to avoid here in Pennsylvania.

But job losses are only part of the negative impact. The other thing is that prices will go up with HB 1500. Even those who advocate for HB 1500 have acknowledged in their communications to us that prices will go up. They say, well, they will not go up by much, like that is supposed to be some consolation in a high-inflation economy when prices only go up by a little bit more. So for people that are already struggling to make ends meet, they might lose their job, but they will definitely see their prices go up with HB 1500. That is what even the advocates for this legislation are telling you. And if you are lucky enough to keep your job under HB 1500, if you are not a salaried employee, if you are somebody who is working on the margins in a tough industry like the restaurant industry, you might see your hours decline. And what has happened in study after study of other locations that have increased their minimum wage, the increase in wages was less than the reduction in the hours that they worked, so the net effect for many of those marginal employees was that they actually saw less take-home pay.

So what should we do? It is not just good enough to say what is bad about legislation. I think we also need to put forward our own proposals. As I have talked, during the 10 years that I have been here, I have continuously advocated for pro-growth policies

which have helped grow our economy, have helped create this competitive market for wages for employers, but going forward, we should continue to invest in our CareerLink system. We have lots of tremendous workers across the State that are helping people find jobs and find better paying jobs, and if you are somebody out there at home who is only making the minimum wage, I encourage you to contact our CareerLink. We have centers all across this Commonwealth, which the State already pays for, to help people find more jobs, better paying jobs, and get into those jobs. They are out there and they are available right now, again, in the marketplace – cashiers, \$15 an hour; manufacturing, \$29 an hour. If you need help finding one of those jobs, contact your local CareerLink and we will get you into one of those jobs.

If not, if you need to increase your skills, we have community colleges all across this State. There is only one part of the State that does not have a community college and they should have one, but our community colleges are there to increase workers' skills, to help them get a CDL (commercial driver's license) license, to help them move up that ladder of education and into a better paying job. So we can and we should continue to invest in workforce development, career and technical education, all of those great things which are out there and across this Commonwealth available for individuals right now.

The other thing that we should do is we should be investing from a State in our workers and those that we set the wages for. For instance, one example is direct-service providers. This legislation does not help that community because what we are going to do is we are going to raise everybody's wage to \$15 an hour. Under this legislation, everybody would be making that same minimum wage, so we would increase direct-service providers and the wages that they make, but at the same time, they are now going to be competing with other employers that are going to correspondingly raise their wages, and all of sudden, they are going to be in the same trap that they are in right now where they cannot attract workers to those very difficult positions.

We should be taking a more targeted approach raising just those individuals' wages. We can raise it to \$15 an hour, \$20 an hour for those very tough jobs, but that is our decision to make. That is not interfering with the free market. We as a State set the wages for those employees and we pay their employers, the service providers, to pay that rate. That is something that we should be building into this budget, but it was not included in the budget. An increase for direct-service providers was not included in the budget. So instead, in an era where we have so much data and we can really pinpoint problems, we are fighting the last battle. The market has moved way beyond the minimum wage – way beyond the minimum wage – yet we are using an old, antiquated system, going back and saying we want to use a broad-based approach to increase everybody's wages. It is not the right approach. It is going to lead to tens of thousands of job losses, higher prices for everybody, and that is even from the advocates of this legislation. And it is not going to help those most in need like direct-service providers. The better approach, again, is a much more targeted approach: continue to invest in workforce development, our community colleges, our career and technical schools. And in the instances where we as State government set the wages, we should be raising the wages in those particular fields, not for everybody across the board, because again, you are not going to help everybody with this legislation; in fact, you are going to hurt a lot of people.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for allowing me to speak in a comprehensive fashion on this legislation. I would encourage a "no" vote on HB 1500 because I think we can be doing a much better, more targeted approach that will actually help people, those that are most in need, and help our Commonwealth advance forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Representative Pielli.

Mr. PIELLI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand and speak in support of HB 1500. Mr. Speaker, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Ohio, West Virginia – yes, even West Virginia – pay more than our minimum wage. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is the cost of living higher in West Virginia than here in Pennsylvania? Or perhaps their legislature has shown that they care about the value and the worth of their workers. Have New Jersey, New York, Delaware, have their businesses gone bankrupt? Are they hurting? I have not heard that, and all indications are they have healthy and robust economies.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with my colleagues in support of our hardworking families. I have heard a lot about children working today. Let us talk about their worth. How about that 16-year-old cashier during COVID who had to stand and take abuse, who had to expose herself to possible disease. What is her value? What is her worth? For the mushroom workers and the landscapers, for all those who do jobs many will not because they feel it is beneath them. They have worth, they have value, and the dignity of their work should be a living wage. That is what a minimum wage is, a living wage, and I challenge anybody here to tell me that \$7.25 is a living wage.

How sad and ironic, we privileged few, well-paid servants of the people, receiving increases in our salary every year, and we cannot bring it upon ourselves to meet our neighbors and raise a working wage for working people. Our colleagues here should be standing with working people; that is who we represent, and that is why I am here in support of this bill. And I ask each and every one of you, please vote "yes" on HB 1500.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from York County, Representative Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today we take up HB 1500, which by the Governor's own estimates, a lowly \$12 minimum-wage increase will create a loss of jobs and reduce wages for workers, and actually, the Governor's estimate of \$150 million of lost wages for just \$12 minimum wage, '23-'24; '24-'25, \$300 million of lost wages for workers, 12,807 jobs lost. That is from the Governor's Office. Reduced profits for small businesses, \$1.4 billion in the first year; \$2.7 billion in the following years; capping out at \$2.8 billion a year of lost wages for small businesses. Jobs lost, reduced wages, reduced profits, that is the result of HB 1500, even more as it actually goes above the \$12 rate, and with a CPI (Consumer Price Index), the loss of wages, loss of profits, loss of jobs are completely unknown. Personal income tax will be reduced \$26 million. Decrease from wage earners, \$4.6 million in just one first year alone. That is a net result, Governor's Office, \$12 minimum-wage increase.

This bill also will hit the fiscal health of the Commonwealth. HB 611, which passed this chamber on party-line vote, does not account for the cost of this bill. If minimum wage was my number

one, top priority, I would put it in the number one, top policy document this general body has to do every year. It would literally be in my planned budget, but it is not. Cost increases, cost decreases, do not account in HB 611. This means more spending, which will add to our structural deficit already encountered in HB 611.

I recently attended a local chamber of commerce breakfast in my district. I asked this question to all my business owners during my remarks: How many of you pay your employees minimum wage? I have asked that – I have asked it during budget hearings, I have asked DCED (Department of Community and Economic Development) and L&I (Labor and Industry) Secretaries – who is making minimum wage in the Commonwealth? What is that job today? The answer was astonishing. One business, one single business out of the dozens of employers said they pay minimum wage. The business is a miniature golf course, and those minimum-wage workers, Mr. Speaker, they were high schoolers. So my colleague's amendment renaming this the "Youth Unemployment Act" would be the actual net result of this bill. Would raising the minimum wage affect this business? Absolutely, the business owner told me. This is a seasonal job. Requiring her to pay \$15 an hour would mean raising the cost of admission. Prices are already high, families are struggling. This bill is only going to result in the cost of playing miniature golf to rise. When prices go up, less families will play; when less families play, the business will fail.

Mr. Speaker, market forces have dictated a rise in pay for many industries. Fast-food restaurants, convenience stores, grocery stores, clothing retailers – these are employers a generation ago, many children would work their first job making minimum wage; now paying far above \$7.25 an hour, most double that.

McDonald's introduced their first workerless business. Why? Because they are reducing the cost of labor. I remember when the first kiosk came out at a Panera Bread. I looked at the poor high school worker behind the counter, I looked at him and said, "You know these kiosks are eventually going to replace you. They are going to replace you. They're not going to hire you anymore," and that is the case.

As demand increased, wages went up, because the market dictated it. Raising the minimum wage will not force corporate America to pay more. If large corporations are not already raising their wage, they will simply pass that cost on to consumers. All this does is target small businesses for extinction, something big corporations would love to see to gain market share, and they can afford the cost. Raising the minimum wage will hurt local small businesses. It will hurt the miniature golf course in my district, and, Mr. Speaker, I am sure if each member in this chamber talked to their local businesses, they would hear the same story.

COVID-19 destroyed small businesses. There are businesses here today that do not exist because of the draconian policies passed. This is just an extension of that. If your goal is to destroy small business, HB 1500 is that path forward.

For these reasons I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on HB 1500. There is a better way – actually, a very easy way. If you are concerned with low-income wage earners – we spend over \$1 billion in Federal workforce development programs, \$157 million minimum, through our budget in six agencies – take those dollars, give it to those low-wage earners you are worried about and give them open jobs making \$30 an hour. You know what that is going to do? It changes the dynamic of the financial impact of this to our Commonwealth. Instead of wage losses,

instead of reduced profits from small businesses, instead of reduced wages from workers, instead of jobs lost, you take care of all the negative side effects of this and only benefit with increased wages moving forward. That should be our goal. For those individuals, for that single parent with kids, if you are worried about them, attach them to one of the multiple government jobs we have and get them a job making \$30 an hour instead of working three or four minimum-wage jobs that you are worried about. That is the goal.

But it also shows you the disconnect between State government programs and what is happening in real life. If in fact the over \$1 billion we spend on workforce development worked, we would not be having this discussion today. We would have State agencies doing what they are supposed to be doing: coordinating and working with businesses to move people out of those lower wage jobs and into jobs that we have open; great family-sustaining jobs, whether it is a trade union job on a pipeline, or, you know, a welding job on a pipeline that may not be union. It really does not matter because those jobs are open. Harley-Davidson in York County is hiring, \$30 an hour starting wage; \$30. They even provide the training. But getting these people connected should be a commonsense solution for government, but we have not been able to do it and that is the real shame.

So I urge a "no" vote on 1500. I urge a vote on reforming our workforce development program to actually benefit the Commonwealth without any downside impact to our finances or to small businesses or to workers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes Representative Kenyatta, from Philadelphia.

Mr. KENYATTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Marie Antoinette, if she was still alive, would have loved so much of this debate because a lot of it really sums up as just "let them eat cake." Who cares about the struggling workers who are at home right now who are really only asking one question: Why has it taken us this long? Why has it taken us this long?

So many of the arguments that you have heard today, they are difficult to decipher, because in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, they do not make a lot of sense. So in one breath you have heard, Mr. Speaker, from previous speakers that nobody pays the minimum wage; everybody pays above the minimum wage. If that is true, then what fear do you have of raising the minimum wage?

We have also heard, Mr. Speaker, that raising the minimum wage – the Chicken Little song and dance is out again – the sky is going to fall. There will be no more jobs. Why has that not happened in West Virginia? Why has that not happened in Ohio? Why has that not happened in Delaware? Why has that not happened in New Jersey? Why has that not happened in New York? Why have we not seen our border states flooding into Pennsylvania because we still pay \$7.25, which really, we should stop calling a minimum wage; it is starvation-level wage. It is unconscionable. It is unconscionable. And we keep hearing from folks that this is economically smart to have a starvation-level wage. Maybe it is in some factory in another country where they are not paying workers what they ought to be paid, but here, we should not say paying workers less than what they deserve is a part of a good economic strategy. It, frankly, makes no sense.

A part of what drives our economy's growth is, in large part, consumer spending. What is going to happen if we raise the minimum wage? There are going to be a lot of folks who are

going to actually have a little bit of wiggle room to go out and eat at that restaurant. Somebody is going to be able to buy the basic supplies and necessities, which is what most low-wage workers do. They invest that money right back into their communities, buying things like food for their families, buying things like clothes for their kids who are getting ready to go back to school. I know they just got out, but parents are waiting for them to go back into school very soon.

We know that right now, we are in a position to do what has not been done in this body, and today you are hearing from the minority party all the things that we could do in lieu of raising the minimum wage that could help low-wage workers. You had over a decade, why did you not do it? Why did you not do it? But now when we are bringing up an actual solution, you have all the part-time economists who want to come in and tell us what this is going to do for our economy. What this is going to do, plain and simple, is to say that every job has a level of dignity, and that dignity should be reflected in the paycheck. That dignity should be reflected in the paycheck.

And I want to make one final point, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the economy. The economy is not this amorphous thing that we are just supposed to be here at the altar of. The economy is people. The economy that we are talking about is people. People who right now, too often than not, do not even have enough savings to cover an accident on their car or a medical expense, should it happen. People who have had to work more than one job because \$7.25 is not nearly enough. People who are sick and tired of politicians promising to do something and never delivering. Well, guess what? House Democrats are delivering. I urge a "yes" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady from Warren County, Representative Rapp.

Ms. RAPP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak because I represent Forest County, and Forest County was mentioned in someone's remarks today as one of the poorest counties in the State, and that is true, Mr. Speaker. Forest County has a population of 7,032 people, with a State corrections facility that houses a little over 2,000 of those people. Forest County is unique, just as the gentleman from Philadelphia said, I probably – he did not say I meaning me, but in general – I do not know a lot about Philadelphia, and I would say there are a lot of people in this room that do not know a lot about Forest County either.

So Forest County has two major communities, Marienville in the eastern part of Forest County and Tionesta on the western part. It is one school district. Forest County does not even have a traffic signal. It is a small county with a very small population. The other thing about Forest County, Mr. Speaker, there is a Federal entity that owns most of the land mass in Forest County, and that is the Allegheny National Forest.

So there are lots of reasons in Forest County, Mr. Speaker, why Forest County is poor, why they are not paying maybe the wages that you see in other counties – including my own county, because I have constituents from Forest County who work in other counties. If they are fortunate, they may have a job at the State correctional facility where they are getting paid more than minimum wage already.

But the heart and soul of Forest County is the family-owned businesses, the family-owned businesses that provide services to a small population that cannot afford to increase those wages.

They are the heart and soul of the two major communities in Forest County, and I am very thankful for those two businesses.

The Allegheny National Forest does not look favorably on developing any of the land within the Allegheny National Forest. It has been a big barrier for us as far as developing, for manufacturing, or for any other major business coming to Forest County.

Those small businesses, Mr. Speaker, cannot afford an increase in the minimum wage. Some of them already pay higher than the minimum wage. But if you want to make a county like Forest County even poorer, then this is the bill that can do it.

So again, if you want to make a county like Forest County, two communities in the county, one school district that actually pays better in teacher salaries than a lot of other school districts in the area because they have to pay more to attract teachers, Mr. Speaker. But again, if you want to make a county like Forest County poorer, then this is a piece of legislation that can do that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady and recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh County, Representative Siegel.

Mr. SIEGEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, we have spoken a lot today about the economic pain of our constituents, and I think that there is no greater dereliction of duty as elected Representatives than to look in the eyes of those we are tasked with representing and fail to actually address the pain in their lives.

We know that working people across this Commonwealth are struggling to pay their bills, to make their rent, to put food on the table, to save money for that emergency in their life, and we have repeatedly in this chamber taken steps to address that economic hardship. We have passed a tax credit for child care. We have created the earned income tax credit to put more money in the pockets of working people. And here today, we have an opportunity to address the long-standing injustice of arbitrarily paying our workers, as the good gentleman from Philadelphia County said, starvation wages. All the other States around us have acted boldly and audaciously, and with what consequence? New York, New Jersey, West Virginia, Ohio – no economic collapse, no economic apocalypse.

Let me put into dollars and cents the difference between political courage and political cowardice, because across the border in Port Jervis, New York, the average hospitality and leisure worker makes \$5200 more a year; that is \$400 more a month, \$100 more a week. That is the difference between a grocery budget being made, a car repair being paid, and perhaps keeping a roof over the heads of their family.

We have talked a lot about rising costs and inflation, but here is what is so often not stated in that discussion, that 50 percent of the increase in prices is due exclusively and entirely to corporate greed, to companies raising costs, taking advantage of situations like the pandemic, and it is time now that those increases in profits and corporate fortunes translate down to the average Pennsylvanian.

The good gentleman from Philadelphia was keen to point out that the economy is made up of working folks, frontline workers and single moms who go in to work day in and day out, earn an honest wage, and support the economy, and it is imperative that we stand with those workers.

This bill is as much of an economic imperative as it is a moral one. And so I urge all of my colleagues to support HB 1500 and

give Pennsylvania workers the raise that they deserve, because it is high time we stand with working families. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Union County, Representative Rowe.

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

Mr. Speaker, a previous speaker attributed a quote to Marie Antoinette, "let them eat cake." But, Mr. Speaker, that was a quote that was actually coined in 1765, 9 years – when Marie Antoinette was just 9 years old and before she had ever even been to France. So just like that convenient misattribution, most of the arguments in favor of this bill are equally conveniently misleading.

Mr. Speaker, the data has been reviewed time and time and time again. We know this bill will cost jobs. The exact number – the Governor says one number; the Economic Policies Council, the National Bureau of Economic Research, they say some different ones – but we know it is going to be in the six figures. Over 100,000 Pennsylvanians are going to lose their jobs because of this bill, and the rest of the Pennsylvanians, they are going to see their cost of living go up, as we see everything from retail to hospitality and everything in between, costs are going to go up, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reality of what this bill will do. That horse has been beaten, so there is no need to revisit it.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear about something. I have lost track of how many proponents of this bill have said, let us give Pennsylvanians a raise. Let us give them more money. Let us be clear, Mr. Speaker, you all are not giving them anything. Nobody over there is giving them anything. The government does not create wealth. The government does not create opportunity. You are putting a mandate on the small business owners. You are making other people pay for what you consider to be, in your words, a quote, "living wage."

Mr. Speaker, I have great news. Every single member of the majority caucus has the opportunity to set the example that they want every business owner in Pennsylvania to abide by. Every single member of the majority caucus can leave here today, go start a business. They can abide by OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration) requirements. They can provide panic buttons. They can pay \$18.50 an hour, which we know now is the objective. They can go ahead and they can provide socialized medical leave. They can do all of those things that they are making Pennsylvania employers do. And great news, you all only have to employ 1,323 people with all those benefits to make up for the jobs that you are going to cost Pennsylvanians by passing this bill. That is the reality.

Mr. Speaker, one former speaker did make a very good point. He said the cost of living keeps going up, and that is correct. But, Mr. Speaker, if the majority caucus is concerned about the cost of living, why did they pass a \$700 million tax on Pennsylvania energy? Mr. Speaker, if the majority caucus is concerned about the cost of living going up, why did they vote against property tax relief for every Pennsylvanian?

Mr. Speaker, there are challenges facing Pennsylvanians, and, Mr. Speaker, we are not making their lives any easier by passing this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentlelady from Monroe County, Representative Probst.

Mrs. PROBST. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just do not understand. It is okay that we give corporations more money by maybe not taxing gas drillers, but every other State does. It is okay that we allow the cyber charter thievery that takes over \$1 billion a year out of your taxpayers' pockets—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlelady will suspend.

Mrs. PROBST. —but yet— Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the minority leader rise?

Mr. CUTLER. I believe the good lady is not on the bill. I would simply encourage her to get to the underlying substance of the bill, as was encouraged previously.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair did give the previous speaker some latitude but urges the current speaker to stay on topic.

Mrs. PROBST. Sure. Thank you. I will.

So my point is, we can put money in all these corporations' pockets, take them from our taxpayers for cyber charter school, but we cannot put a couple extra bucks in the hands of working families so that they can feed their family and they can actually have a couple extra dollars to go support local businesses, in which you say are going to go out of business. It makes no sense, and we need to make sure that we fund our families in Pennsylvania for the hard work and dedication that they do. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

Before recognizing the prime sponsor of the bill and the leaders, are there any other speakers on the bill?

Seeing no other speakers on the bill, the Chair recognizes the prime sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Philadelphia County, Representative Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So I will be brief because I believe the minority party has made our case considering that no one makes minimum wage but somehow we are going to lose all the jobs in Pennsylvania if we pass HB 1500. You have to pick a side here. Are you going to stand on the side of workers, or are you going to stand on the side of rhetoric? But it is high time to pay a price.

You had 12 years to make a choice, and in that 12 years, Mr. Speaker, you have held the governorship and both Houses of this chamber and moved not one piece of legislation in which you are going to dictate to us today. Not one. But somehow you have all the solutions when House Democrats have the gavel. It is interesting that you now have solutions for low-paying workers. Somehow you have all the answers, but you had none for 12 years. I find it ironic that you have seen voters come out and make a clear choice who they want to lead this State, and these are the same workers you have overlooked for far too long, and guess what? Rent has come due.

Mr. Speaker, we need to not belabor this point any longer. Let us pass HB 1500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the minority leader, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of partisan rhetoric on this discussion, but let us actually discuss the facts. The question was

asked, what have we done? Well, the truth is, for the last 12 years, we have actually watched the market move well beyond minimum wage. In fact, driving up here today, at both gas stations that I passed, they had signs out for \$14 or \$15 an hour. Here is the truth: Government does not need to set the wage, the market already did. I drove past Buck castings today, starting salary of \$17 to \$21 an hour, just to get you in the door.

Mr. Speaker, respectfully, what have we done? Through good financial management, targeted economic development, we have created a system where there are good-paying jobs here in the Commonwealth. And to be equally clear, that economic growth has not happened everywhere. We have heard from the rural areas and the urban areas where there needs to be more work. That was the effort that we worked on collaboratively, and not in a partisan manner, but in a bipartisan manner, with 184 votes last session regarding highlighting those areas of our economies in each region of our State to incentivize growth and jobs in those areas. So to somehow imply that this bill is the silver bullet to our economic problems is simply wrong.

I rise today in support of our workers, but also in support of our small businesses and our nonprofits. As I have said before, we may agree on a problem and we can disagree on the proposed solution, and this, for me, is the perfect example. We all agree that we must make it more affordable to live in Pennsylvania. If you get down to the root cause of most of the comments here, it is discussing the affordability of living in the Commonwealth, but when I look at a proposal like the one contained in HB 1500, I see a divergent view of solutions. Never before has looking for work in Pennsylvania had a better bargaining position. We have got record-low unemployment, record-low unemployment and wages that are substantially higher than the mandated wage. Natural economic forces have combined to create a situation where local fast-food restaurants, gas stations, for example, are already paying \$14 or \$15 per hour, with additional opportunities – and I think this is important – for scholarships, retirement, and paid time off. All of that has been done to try to attract workers.

In fact, my own kids, who have all applied for jobs, not one of them has started at minimum wage, and they are all service-oriented jobs. And I would simply point out that the server area, those individuals who earn tipped wages, which this bill I think does not appropriately help, those jobs are immensely competitive.

So the problem is not the minimum or the mandated wage; the problem is inherently one of affordability. It is unaffordable to live in Pennsylvania, and proposals like this one, and proposals like the budget passed exclusively by the other side of the aisle, contain unsustainable spending that will only make this problem worse. Raising the mandated wage will create numerous problems, many of which were outlined here earlier today on the floor, not only for small businesses, not just for nonprofits, not just for government workers, not reflected in the budget that was passed, but for the overall economy. In fact, without addressing the root cause of why it is increasingly unaffordable to live in Pennsylvania, we will be back here in 5 or 10 or 15 years, again saying that once again you need to raise the mandated wage. The truth is, whatever number you pick at any point in time is just a snapshot, and the success rate of government getting that right is simply wrong.

So rather than making a problem worse, maybe we should be focused on how to make it more affordable to live in Pennsylvania. How can we do that? Not by bloating State government through increased spending and taxes, more

stimulus, more mandates, without related economic growth. We do that through fiscal responsibility, by driving investment, by paying workers for their skills and making Pennsylvania more competitive, and by being great at what we already do well. That, Mr. Speaker, is what those proposals over the last 12 years have been all about. To create a thriving economy, we can make it more affordable to live in Pennsylvania naturally. When people have the opportunity to experience earned success, have access to family-sustaining jobs, and are trained for the competitive positions of tomorrow, they will have what they need to make ends meet.

As State government and as policymakers, we should not be focused on what this bill is attempting to do, which is simply set the minimum wage. I would dare all of us to focus instead on how high can we go on breaking down the impediments to growth, getting government and regulations out of the way instead of inserting ourselves only to harm small businesses, nonprofits, and the future of Pennsylvania, like this bill would today.

But do not take my word for it, take the word of the supporters who have spoken here previously. The lady from Philadelphia said this is not enough. This bill is not there. It is not complete. It is not ready. And I agree. This process has led to a half-baked product and one that will not have my support.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the majority leader, Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I, like many members on our side, have pointed out the juxtaposed positions that have been taken by many of the speakers on the side opposite as to why we should continue to pay people \$7.25 an hour. Some have taken the road that everyone makes more than \$7.25 an hour, that this is all unnecessary. And then there is the other side of the argument, which I believe the good lady from York said, that business will be crushed, this will be the end of the world, and the sky will fall – and the good gentleman from Philadelphia I think rightfully pointed out the absurdity in those two views.

Unfortunately, this is not a new position. And I was looking back as a little bit of a student of history and to the time of the first minimum-wage bills, when Franklin Roosevelt was our President, and he pointed out at a time where government allowed the free market to do its will. And the lady from Allegheny says the free market will solve the problem. Franklin Roosevelt said in 1937: "All but the hopelessly reactionary will agree...government must have some control over maximum hours, minimum wages, the evil of child labor and the exploitation of unorganized labor." I guess Adam Smith has some limitations, because \$7.25 an hour in today's America, in today's Pennsylvania does not get the job done for way too many Pennsylvanians. But again, I would point out that our friends on the other side of the aisle say they do not exist or there are too few of them or business will crater.

And you know, I made a real effort to listen to every one of the points that were made by the party opposite. The gentleman from Lehigh says we need to reopen our budget immediately and pay direct-support professionals \$15 to \$20 an hour. I want you to know, message heard. We are going to take it back to our friends in the other chamber and we are going to talk about why we need to be paying direct-support professionals \$20 an hour. You are going to find common cause in this caucus for that proposal. Now, it is going to cost, because this gentleman rightfully points out that we need to balance our budget. And

when it comes to the political rhetoric, we are free with spending money, but when it comes to the actual budget process, not too many have joined us to help those direct-support professionals. We need to do that, and you are right to make that argument and you are going to have an opportunity soon enough to vote on it. We want to make sure that happens for you.

Now, right now business in Pennsylvania, if you are paying your employees \$7.25 an hour, you are taking full advantage of a lot of government programs to subsidize your poverty wages. LIHEAP (Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program) and WIC (women, infants, and children) and SNAP are part of the benefit package provided to your employees but not paid for by that business. It is paid for by taxpayers, who subsidize the very poverty wages that you defend when you support a \$7.25-an-hour minimum wage.

And the good minority leader makes sweeping comments that his caucus does not support this proposal. Well, I would point out that an amendment that was offered by the good lady from Northampton proposed raising the minimum wage to \$12 an hour. I believe almost nearly half of the minority caucus voted for that very proposal. I guess they were not waiting for Adam Smith and the "invisible hand" to raise that wage. They were willing to vote for it, and we thank them for what they did. They showed political courage.

So when you get past the political rhetoric—overheated—and frankly, when you take off the dressing, you quickly realize that this is really about, as the minority leader said, what is the right path forward. There is only a handful who can honestly, in their heart of hearts, say that anyone should be condemned to making a \$7.25-an-hour wage. What we put forward is a path to \$15. Not soon enough for some, but certainly too long delayed. We can do that. We have been trying to do it for a decade.

I would point out, it was not a Democrat, it was Tom Ridge who helped us with the most recent largest increase of the minimum wage, because there was a time that the GOP would work with our Democratic friends to truly say, we care about working people. And the line that has been used a lot about the dignity of work, we believe in it so strongly that we want to make sure that if you go to work every day, 40 hours a week, for your family, that you can afford to provide for that family.

The gentleman says we will lose jobs if we go above \$7.25. I would point out, if that were true, we would have the market cornered. We would be cutting, cutting down Cambodia and every third world country. We would be— We would have the market cornered on \$7.25-an-hour jobs. I am here to tell you, at least from Montgomery County, from southeastern Pennsylvania, frankly, from the United States of America, I do not want to live in a country that literally looks for how we can compete with countries that are without child labor laws. That does not strike me as a battle worth winning.

So let me tell you what this majority has proposed. What we proposed is paid time off for workers and child care and an earned income tax credit that provides the very dignity of work. And with this bill, 1500, we are providing a path to \$15 an hour, a living minimum wage that is good for Pennsylvania, that is, frankly, being done in States surrounding us. It is long past due, but this afternoon we are going to make the path to \$15 a reality in the Pennsylvania House. Join with us and vote "yes."

THE SPEAKER (JOANNA E. McCLINTON) PRESIDING

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—103

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

NAYS—100

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

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.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 155 By Representatives T. DAVIS, KHAN, HILL-EVANS, GALLAGHER, VENKAT, MADDEN, SCHLOSSBERG, SANCHEZ, KINSEY, VITALI, SAPPEY, SCOTT and GREEN

A Resolution recognizing the month of June 2023 as "National Aphasia Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, June 20, 2023.

No. 156 By Representatives BOROWICZ, HAMM, SCHMITT, KRUPA, ROAE, RAPP, KINSEY, KAUFFMAN, COOK, M. BROWN, IRVIN, SCIALABBA, PICKETT, DIAMOND, GLEIM, JAMES and T. JONES

A Resolution designating the month of June 2023 as "Life Month" in Pennsylvania.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, June 20, 2023.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1435 By Representatives GROVE, MOUL, KAUFFMAN, TOPPER, ARMANINI, ROWE, GILLEN and KEEFER

An Act amending the act of October 27, 1955 (P.L.744, No.222), known as the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, further providing for procedure; providing for reimbursement against wrongful claims; further providing for construction and exclusiveness of remedy; repealing provisions relating to local human relations commissions; and prohibiting local human relations commissions.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 20, 2023.

No. 1436 By Representatives KUTZ, BURGOS, GAYDOS, JAMES, KHAN, METZGAR and PICKETT

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in inspection of vehicles, further providing for inspection by police or Commonwealth personnel.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 20, 2023.

No. 1437 By Representatives GROVE, GREINER, STAMBAUGH, STAATS, KEEFER, JAMES, FLICK, MOUL, ROWE, GLEIM, LEADBETER, SCIALABBA and STRUZZI

An Act amending Title 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for liability for false claims, for adoption of congressional intent of the Federal False Claims Act, for damages, costs and civil penalties, for powers of Attorney General, for qui tam actions and for civil investigative demands.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 20, 2023.

No. 1438 By Representatives GROVE, GREINER, STAMBAUGH, STAATS, ZIMMERMAN, KEEFER, MOUL, ROWE, STRUZZI and WARNER

An Act amending Title 72 (Taxation and Fiscal Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for preliminary provisions, for taxation, for fiscal affairs and for Commonwealth budget procedures; establishing the Joint Revenue Estimation Committee and the Performance-based Incentive Account; and making repeals.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, June 20, 2023.

No. 1439 By Representatives KAUFFMAN, PICKETT, FLICK, MOUL, ZIMMERMAN and GILLEN

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in fraud and abuse control, providing for false or fraudulent Medicaid claims and civil enforcement; and establishing the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit Fund.

Referred to Committee on HUMAN SERVICES, June 20, 2023.

No. 1441 By Representatives BOROWSKI, SCHLOSSBERG, KINSEY, MADDEN, GUENST, KHAN, SANCHEZ, PARKER, HILL-EVANS, KAZEEM, ROZZI, KRAJEWSKI, GILLEN, CERRATO, GREEN and MAYES

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1951 (P.L.69, No.20), known as The Landlord and Tenant Act of 1951, providing for tenants' rights in cases of violence.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 20, 2023.

No. 1442 By Representatives BOROWSKI, KAZEEM, KRUEGER, SAPPEY, MADDEN, HANBIDGE, GALLAGHER, SANCHEZ, HILL-EVANS, KRAJEWSKI, D. WILLIAMS and GREEN

An Act amending the act of April 14, 2006 (P.L.85, No.28), known as the Water Services Act, in municipal authority approval of actions, further providing for definitions.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 20, 2023.

No. 1443 By Representatives GREEN, MADDEN, PROBST, KAZEEM, ABNEY, KINSEY, BURGOS, SANCHEZ, CEPEDA-FREYTIZ and PARKER

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for playground safety; and imposing duties on the Department of Community and Economic Development.

Referred to Committee on CHILDREN AND YOUTH, June 20, 2023.

No. 1444 By Representatives KUTZ, KAUFFMAN, MARCELL and C. WILLIAMS

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 61 (Prisons and Parole) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in wiretapping and electronic surveillance, further providing for definitions; and, in

Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, providing for exception to prohibition of interception and disclosure of communications.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 20, 2023.

No. 1445 By Representatives KHAN, SALISBURY, GIRAL, KENYATTA, HOWARD, BURGOS, CEPEDA-FREYITZ, GREEN, KAZEEM, STEELE, HILL-EVANS, KINSEY, WAXMAN, SCHLOSSBERG, MADDEN, FLEMING, ISAACSON, SANCHEZ, HOHENSTEIN, CIRESI, INNAMORATO, CERRATO, PARKER, O'MARA, CONKLIN, PROBST, PIELLI, HANBIDGE, MERSKI, KRAJEWSKI, SHUSTERMAN, OTTEN, CURRY, FRIEL and DELLOSO

An Act amending the act of June 13, 1967 (P.L.31, No.21), known as the Human Services Code, in departmental powers and duties as to public assistance, providing for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) study.

Referred to Committee on HUMAN SERVICES, June 20, 2023.

No. 1446 By Representatives R. MACKENZIE, CONKLIN, FREEMAN and M. MACKENZIE

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

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, June 20, 2023.

No. 1447 By Representatives KEPHART, HAMM, D'ORSIE, SMITH, M. BROWN, BERNSTINE, OBERLANDER, IRVIN, FLICK, KUTZ, SCIALABBA, KEEFER, PICKETT and M. JONES

An Act amending the act of March 4, 1971 (P.L.6, No.2), known as the Tax Reform Code of 1971, in corporate net income tax, further providing for imposition of tax.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, June 20, 2023.

No. 1448 By Representatives BELLMON, McCLINTON, GALLOWAY, MADDEN, RABB, PROBST, PARKER, HOHENSTEIN, BRENNAN, KHAN, SANCHEZ, CERRATO, BOYLE, ABNEY, HILL-EVANS, McNEILL, KINSEY, D. WILLIAMS and GREEN

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

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 20, 2023.

No. 1449 By Representatives SIEGEL, KRUEGER, MALAGARI, PIELLI, HILL-EVANS, McNEILL, MADDEN, PROBST, SCHLOSSBERG, D. WILLIAMS, NEILSON, SHUSTERMAN, GUENST, DONAHUE, SANCHEZ, MERSKI, D. MILLER, CERRATO, CEPEDA-FREYITZ, BOROWSKI, DELLOSO, WEBSTER, CIRESI, BRENNAN, OTTEN, KHAN, T. DAVIS, PISCOTTANO, O'MARA, DAVANZO, BOYD and SCOTT

An Act amending Title 62 (Procurement) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in source selection and contract formation, providing for additional qualifications for public work projects; imposing duties on the Office of State Inspector General; and imposing penalties.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, June 20, 2023.

No. 1450 By Representatives DONAHUE, HILL-EVANS, MADDEN, SANCHEZ, DELLOSO, PIELLI, HOHENSTEIN, HADDOCK and MALAGARI

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in decorations, medals, badges and awards, further providing for authorized decorations, medals, badges and awards.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, June 20, 2023.

No. 1451 By Representatives HOHENSTEIN, SANCHEZ, KULIK, WARREN, HOWARD, SHUSTERMAN, HANBIDGE, ISAACSON, PIELLI, DELLOSO, SALISBURY, HOGAN and GREEN

An Act amending Title 34 (Game) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in special licenses and permits, further providing for definitions, for exotic wildlife possession permits, for menagerie permits and for exclusions.

Referred to Committee on GAME AND FISHERIES, June 20, 2023.

No. 1452 By Representative KULIK

An Act amending the act of December 19, 1988 (P.L.1262, No.156), known as the Local Option Small Games of Chance Act, in games of chance, providing for payment and for online raffle sales; and abrogating a regulation.

Referred to Committee on GAMING OVERSIGHT, June 20, 2023.

No. 1456 By Representative HARRIS

A Supplement to the act of April 1, 1863 (P.L.213, No.227), entitled "An act to accept the grant of Public Lands, by the United States, to the several states, for the endowment of Agricultural Colleges," making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure; and making an appropriation from a restricted account within the Agricultural College Land Scrip Fund.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, June 20, 2023.

No. 1458 By Representative HARRIS

A Supplement to the act of July 28, 1966 (3rd Sp.Sess., P.L.87, No.3), known as the University of Pittsburgh—Commonwealth Act, making appropriations for carrying the same into effect; and providing for a basis for payments of such appropriations, for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, June 20, 2023.

No. 1459 By Representative HARRIS

A Supplement to the act of November 30, 1965 (P.L.843, No.355), known as the Temple University–Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of such appropriation; and providing a method of accounting for the funds appropriated and for certain fiscal information disclosure.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, June 20, 2023.

No. 1461 By Representative HARRIS

A Supplement to the act of July 7, 1972 (P.L.743, No.176), known as the Lincoln University-Commonwealth Act, making an appropriation for carrying the same into effect; providing for a basis for payments of the appropriation; providing for a method of accounting for the funds appropriated; and providing for certain fiscal information disclosure.

Referred to Committee on APPROPRIATIONS, June 20, 2023.

SENATE BILLS FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 290, PN 264

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 20, 2023.

SB 607, PN 657

Referred to Committee on AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES, June 20, 2023.

SB 621, PN 738

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 20, 2023.

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 404;
SB 202; and
SB 262.

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

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 580;
HB 767; and
HB 1300.

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

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in receipt that there are no birthdays today; however, I hope that all the fathers had a wonderful Father's Day this weekend.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY REPUBLICAN LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Cutler for a committee announcement.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and thank you for the well wishes for Father's Day.

For the Republican chairmen, our regularly scheduled end-of-session meeting, please check your e-mails for the details regarding the reschedule for tomorrow.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

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 Representative Dawkins that the House now adjourn until Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 11 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 6:02 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.