

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2023

SESSION OF 2023

207TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 46

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 8 a.m., e.d.t.

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

PRAYER

HON. VALERIE S. GAYDOS, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Good morning, and thank you, members of the General Assembly, for allowing me to share today's morning prayer.

Let us pray:

Blessed are You, O Master Almighty, who have illuminated the day with sunlight and gladdened the night with sparks; who have made us worthy to go through the length of the day and reach the beginning of night. Hear this supplication from us, from all of Your people. And after You forgive us of all of our voluntary and involuntary sins, accept these supplications. Encompass us with Your holy angels; arm us with weapons of Your righteousness; surround us with Your truth; send down upon Your inheritance the multitude of Your mercies and compassion, and teach us compassion for others; guard us with Your power; and teach us to know the things that we ought to know and do, and for those things that we are to disdain and to shun.

Grant to us this day and the upcoming night and all the days of our lives to be holy and without fantasy or temptation, through the intercession of the Holy Theotokos and all the saints who have pleased You from the old. With the grace of the Lord, illuminate our minds today and always. 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, October 4, 2023, will be postponed until printed.

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 requests a leave of absence for the gentleman from Berks County, Representative MALONEY. Without objection, leave will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—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	Sappey
Borowicz	Gillen	Major	Schemel
Borowski	Giral	Mako	Scheuren
Boyd	Gleim	Malagari	Schlegel
Boyle	Green	Marcell	Schlossberg
Bradford	Gregory	Markosek	Schmitt
Brennan	Greiner	Marshall	Schweyer
Briggs	Grove	Matzie	Scialabba
Brown, A.	Guenst	Mayes	Scott
Brown, M.	Guzman	McAndrew	Shusterman
Bullock	Haddock	McNeill	Siegel
Burgos	Hamm	Mehaffie	Smith
Burns	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Smith-Wade-El
C Freytiz	Harkins	Mercuri	Solomon
Cabell	Harris	Merski	Staats
Causer	Heffley	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cephas	Hogan	Mihalek	Steele
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Miller, B.	Stehr
Ciresi	Howard	Miller, D.	Stender
Conklin	Irvin	Moul	Struzzi
Cook	Isaacson	Mullins	Sturla
Cooper	James	Munroe	Takac
Curry	Jones, M.	Mustello	Tomlinson
Cutler	Jones, T.	Neilson	Topper
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Twardzik
Daley	Kail	Nelson, N.	Venkat

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

LEAVES CANCELED—1

Maloney

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

**HOUSE BILLS
INTRODUCED AND REFERRED**

No. 1743 By Representatives MADDEN, PROBST, HILL-EVANS, SHUSTERMAN, T. DAVIS, ROZZI, VITALI, SANCHEZ, GUENST, CEPEDA-FREYITZ, SALISBURY, DONAHUE, PASHINSKI, GREEN, D. WILLIAMS, OTTEN, GAYDOS and BOYD

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in school directors, further providing for school director training programs.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, October 4, 2023.

No. 1744 By Representatives GREGORY, BERNSTINE, MOUL, ROZZI and SMITH

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in wiretapping and electronic surveillance, further providing for exceptions to prohibition of interception and disclosure of communications.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 4, 2023.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 1466, PN 1650

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, providing for a cause of action on protected public expression and for immunity for protected public expression; and imposing a duty upon the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts and the Legislative Reference Bureau.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1634, PN 1918

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in dates of elections and primaries and special elections, further providing for general primary and candidates to be nominated and party officers to be elected.

APPROPRIATIONS.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. GROVE. Point of order.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from York County rise?

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I would like to rise to object to the report of the Appropriations Committee concerning SB 224, HB 1466, and HB 1634.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Grove, has raised an objection to the report of the Committee on Appropriations containing HB 1466, HB 1634, SB 224. Pursuant to the provisions in Mason's Manual, Section 676, the House shall decide whether a committee report is properly reported.

On the question,

Shall the House accept the report of the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the maker of the motion, Representative Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate your indulgence. And I am very jealous of your coffee. I have not had any this morning. Very jealous. I know.

The SPEAKER. The Chair drinks tea.

Mr. GROVE. Oh, tea. I am jealous of that. I would take that as well, Madam Speaker.

I am good, though. Thank you. You are very kind.

When we started this session, I participated in two committees, one of which was in the special session, where the first question I asked the chairman at the time, Chairman Briggs, was how those committees' rules will be set. The response was, the committee, we were not doing committee rules, but we were doing the rules of the House will be the rules of the committee.

When this body finally got together – in March, I think – and committees were designed, I asked my good friend, the chairman, if we will be doing committee rules. The response was, the rules of the House will be the rules of the committee and we will not be doing individual committee rules, which is fine.

Rule 15 specifically provides that, quote, "...roll call votes be taken after 11:00 P.M. unless exigent circumstances exist, as determined by an affirmative vote of three-fourths of the members elected to the House, by a roll call vote on a motion to extend session...."

Mason's Manual, the parliamentary authority of the House, pursuant to House rule 78, provides that, quote, "The rules of procedure in the committee are the same as the rules of the body insofar as such rules are applicable to committee procedure...." Mason's Manual, section 638-1.

There was no motion to extend session made or approved by the House yesterday. Nevertheless, after 11 p.m., in darkness, the Appropriations Committee met and took roll call votes on amendments and bills in direct violation of House rule 15.

The whole reason the 11 p.m. limit exists was a reaction to votes in the middle of the night to enact a pay raise. As an institution, I had hoped that we had moved beyond those days. We are better than this, and our rules reflect it.

I would ask the members to stand with me for openness and transparency, ensuring that we take legislative actions during the light of day rather than dark of night, and vote not to accept this committee report.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The House will come to order.

For the information of the members, the Appropriations Committee is a standing committee. The House rules provide standing committee operating rules. It is inaccurate to say that a committee does not have rules when our House rules contain them; page 99, for those of you paging through right now.

Those who believe the committee report is properly reported will be voting "aye"—

On the question of order, you are able to speak once and you already spoke. It is time for the vote.

Which podium are you using? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I do agree with your interpretation of rule 44, which says each standing committee shall operate pursuant to the standing committee operating rules, which are also the rules of the House. To the best of my knowledge, there is no record of the Appropriations Committee adopting other rules; therefore, the rules of the House would apply. The 11 p.m. deadline would also apply.

Now, I understand that many of the members here in this chamber may not have been here when we adopted the 11 p.m. rule, and I think it is important to have a little bit of history. Madam Speaker, there was a bygone time when lots of things happened late into the evening. The good gentleman from York County referenced one of them, which was the pay raise, but there was lots of other bad legislation that occurred in the middle of the night.

Now, what was interesting, Madam Speaker, was, as we debated other issues yesterday, we were in a rush. We truncated debate. We made motions because 11 o'clock was important. But suddenly when something else needed done, with no advance notice – and it is my understanding that the amendment was provided exactly 3 minutes prior to voting on it to the members of the committee.

Madam Speaker, what we are seeing here is a pattern, a pattern of a blatant disregard for the rules. And as I mentioned yesterday – I will mention again today – while I did not vote for those rules, I had certainly expected those who did to actually follow them.

Now, Madam Speaker, the rules of the House also contain the 11 p.m. start time. The good gentleman from York County read, and he is correct, in House rule 15, absent a three-quarters vote, that does not apply.

But I would like to go a little deeper into the rules, because if we say, as a body, that the House rules do not apply in committee, we are also saying that every other rule does not apply. We are also saying that Mason's Manual no longer applies. We are saying that rules no longer matter and the committees can simply do what they wish. While that may be the practical outcome of the vote, that is not the way to run this chamber.

Madam Speaker, sliding things into bills late in the night with minutes' notice is how business used to be done. If you are proud of those efforts, then I suppose that you will vote to accept the report. But if you believe in transparency, if you believe in openness and the involvement of the public, I urge you to be a "no" vote.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Those who believe the committee report is properly reported will be voting "aye"; those who do not believe it is properly reported will vote "no."

On the question recurring,

Shall the House accept the report of the Rules Committee?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

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

NAYS—100

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

Fink	Krupa	Pickett	White
Flick	Kutz	Rader	Williams, C.
Flood	Kuzma	Rapp	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the report of the Appropriations Committee was accepted by the House.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 1466, PN 1650

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, providing for a cause of action on protected public expression and for immunity for protected public expression; and imposing a duty upon the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts and the Legislative Reference Bureau.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 1634, PN 1918

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in dates of elections and primaries and special elections, further providing for general primary and candidates to be nominated and party officers to be elected.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 224, PN 1160 (Amended)

By Rep. HARRIS

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in the Secretary of the Commonwealth, further providing for requirements relating to voter identification; in dates of elections and primaries and special elections, further providing for general primary and candidates to be nominated and party officers to be elected; in nomination of candidates, further providing for manner of signing nomination petitions and time of circulating, for place and time of filing nomination petitions and filing fees, for withdrawal of candidates, for place and time of filing nomination papers and for objections to nomination petitions and papers; in electronic voting systems, further providing for supplies and preparation of the voting system and of polling places and for statistical sample; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official mail-in ballot, for date of application for absentee ballot, for approval of application for absentee ballot, for envelopes for official absentee ballots, for delivering or mailing ballots, for voting by absentee electors and for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; in voting by qualified mail-in electors, further providing for date of application for mail-in ballot, for envelopes for official mail-in ballots and for voting by mail-in electors; in Election Integrity Grant Program, further providing for funding for elections; and, in recounts and contests, further providing for opening ballot boxes upon petition of electors alleging fraud or error and deposit or bond, for recanvassing voting machines upon petition of electors alleging fraud or error and for correction of returns, decision not to be final and evidence for prosecution.

APPROPRIATIONS.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from York rise?

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is order and may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Last evening the Parliamentarian was advising the House Democratic Appropriations Committee on the rules. Is that the appropriate job of the Parliamentarian?

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives is always available to assist all of the members.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

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

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Good morning. Republicans will caucus at 8:30, and we will be prepared to be back on the floor at 9 o'clock, if that is all right with the good chairman.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Could the gentleman please repeat that?

Mr. DUNBAR. Republicans will caucus 8:30. We will be prepared to be back on the floor at 9 o'clock, if that is okay with the majority.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Madam Chair.

It is actually Northampton County, but we are in the Lehigh Valley, so close enough.

Yes, the Democrats will be caucusing on behalf of Chairman Schlossberg. We will caucus immediately, and anticipate a caucus that will last probably only about 30 minutes, and then we will return to the floor.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House stands in recess until 9 a.m., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

RECESS EXTENDED

The time of recess was extended until 9:15 a.m.

AFTER RECESS

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

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 1466, PN 1650**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in particular rights and immunities, providing for a cause of action on protected public expression and for immunity for protected public expression; and imposing a duty upon the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts and the Legislative Reference Bureau.

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	Sappey
Borowicz	Gillen	Major	Schemel
Borowski	Giral	Mako	Scheuren
Boyd	Gleim	Malagari	Schlegel
Boyle	Green	Marcell	Schlossberg
Bradford	Gregory	Markosek	Schmitt
Brennan	Greiner	Marshall	Schweyer
Briggs	Grove	Matzie	Scialabba
Brown, A.	Guenst	Mayes	Scott
Brown, M.	Guzman	McAndrew	Shusterman
Bullock	Haddock	McNeill	Siegel
Burgos	Hamm	Mehaffie	Smith
Burns	Hanbidge	Mentzer	Smith-Wade-El
C Freytiz	Harkins	Mercuri	Solomon
Cabell	Harris	Merski	Staats
Causer	Heffley	Metzgar	Stambaugh
Cephas	Hogan	Mihalek	Steele
Cerrato	Hohenstein	Miller, B.	Stehr
Ciresi	Howard	Miller, D.	Stender
Conklin	Irvin	Moul	Struzzi
Cook	Isaacson	Mullins	Sturla
Cooper	James	Munroe	Takac
Curry	Jones, M.	Mustello	Tomlinson
Cutler	Jones, T.	Neilson	Topper
D'Orsie	Jozwiak	Nelson, E.	Twardzik
Daley	Kail	Nelson, N.	Venkat
Davanzo	Kaufer	O'Mara	Vitali
Davis	Kauffman	O'Neal	Warner
Dawkins	Kazem	Oberlander	Warren

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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 1634, PN 1918**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in dates of elections and primaries and special elections, further providing for general primary and candidates to be nominated and party officers to be elected.

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—

For what purpose does the gentleman from Lebanon rise?

Mr. DIAMOND. Madam Speaker, my speak light was on both of the past two bills and it was turned off or ignored.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not in receipt of this information except for this moment in time, and no lights were turned off.

Does the gentleman want to give a speech regarding HB 1634, or is the gentleman making the Chair aware of this?

Mr. DIAMOND. Yes, ma'am, on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed on the bill.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, this bill was introduced to move the primary date in Pennsylvania, which I think is a bad idea, evidenced by the letters you have received from our County Commissioners Association of Pennsylvania. As the good leader of the humble majority is apt to say, the hour is late, proverbially, on this bill. It

is too late to change things our counties are already doing. The only thing moving the primary date will do is create chaos for our elections next year in a Presidential year.

That aside, the method by which this bill was amended last night is horrific. I have not seen a more dazzling display of legislative gymnastics and rule-breaking since the midnight pay raise—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BRADFORD. Madam Speaker? I apologize.

Mr. DIAMOND. —of 2005.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Montgomery County rise?

Mr. BRADFORD. Point of order. I think the gentleman might be speaking or going on about something other than the bill in front of us.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken.

The gentleman will confine his remarks to final passage of HB 1634 on its merits.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The gentleman is correct. I was mistaken. Let me speak on HB 1634, on moving the primary date.

Madam Speaker, this primary date is just around the corner, and our counties already have plenty of plans in place already to do this. But let us talk about the reasons that have been expressed publicly for moving the primary date earlier.

We talk about Pennsylvania wanting to have more say in a Presidential primary election, and I understand that, but again, the hour is late, and counties have already made a lot of the decisions: polling places have been secured and contracted; poll workers, many of whom who are snowbirds, will not be available on April 2. April 2 falls right after Easter. I heard from my director of elections yesterday that they send their polling sheets out 5 days before the elections because we do not have employees to work over the weekends to deliver those polling machines. So that means they are probably going to have to move half the polling places in Lebanon County. That is a real problem. Printing ballots, those contracts have already been signed; they are in place. Not sure if we can resecure an earlier printing date from the printer or have to get a new contract.

I do believe there is a philosophical argument to be made for Pennsylvania having more say in a Presidential primary, but let us keep this in mind. Presidential primary in Pennsylvania has no binding authority on the Republican National Convention or the Democratic National Convention. Those folks are free to choose whomever they like as Presidential candidates for the general election, regardless of when or what Pennsylvania's primary election is or does or is conducted.

Further, I highly doubt that there is any doubt about what the outcome of the Presidential primaries for either major party next year will be. Beyond that, Madam Speaker, the date — one of the reasons given for moving the date of Pennsylvania's Presidential primary in 2023 is because it, unfortunately, falls at the beginning of Passover, and that may present some conflicts for observant people of the Jewish faith, and I highly respect that. Pennsylvania was founded on religious freedom and we should honor that religious freedom any time we can. However, it should be noted that the Pennsylvania Constitution, in Article VII, section 14, specifically, for years and years and years and years, has made an

allowance for those who were observing a religious holiday to vote absentee. We did not even need mail-in voting to let those folks vote, and quite frankly, some of the folks who were calling for moving this date, they said over and over and over again that voting by mail is safe and secure, and I take them at their word on that.

But the most important thing here, Madam Speaker, is the burden this will put on our counties. It will cause our counties to have to change their calendar that is already in place, with contracts already secured for various things, and that is going to lead to mistakes. Year after year, election after election, Madam Speaker, we see human error — simple, innocent human error — potentially disenfranchise people when mistaken ballots are sent out with one error on them or to the wrong voters. That can disenfranchise voters. Mistakes in human error, when they disenfranchise voters, or just the news report of them, cause even more doubt to be cast upon Pennsylvania's electoral process at a time, Madam Speaker, when we cannot afford that. We cannot afford anyone else saying Pennsylvania's elections are broken.

Since 2020 we have had a lot of outcry about that, and look, we are just getting back to normal. People are starting to have faith in our electoral process again. We cannot afford to inject any more doubt about our electoral process by allowing for human mistakes by moving the primary date.

Further, Madam Speaker — and this is critical — in the last few years we have lost almost half of our election administrators, experienced election administrators in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, many of whom who have said the reason they are leaving is because of the stress and the pressure that the changes the General Assembly has sent them just prior to busy elections. We cannot afford to lose anymore election directors in Pennsylvania.

Madam Speaker, I apologize for mistakenly speaking on the wrong bill earlier, but there are genuine reasons why moving the primary at this late stage of the game is a really, really bad idea for Pennsylvania. I ask you to join me in voting against this bill so that we can save Pennsylvania's primary date in 2024.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Representative Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

We have spent a lot of time discussing elections over the past last session and beginning of this one. The one thing the counties have said very clearly, regardless of what policy we are pushing — whether you are for something or against something; whether counties are asking for something or not asking for them — the one thing, consistently, they have said: do not pass election laws close to an election. That is the one universal thing; Democrat counties, Republican counties, elections directors across the State.

My former colleague, my colleague from Lebanon County, articulated what has happened with our elections directors and election administration in this State. It has a direct impact on how they run elections. You need time to do that. When you are managing the calendar here, you have to set expectations if you are going to move. We are going to move this date and this date is the final date to get this done. That has not happened at all this session.

This bill should have been in the Senate by June. If you want a serious shot at addressing religious holidays next election cycle – and there were many; I know there was lots of discussion with many different religions and trying to find that sweet spot – this needs done in June. June. It is October 4. We are a month away from an election. Pushing it up – as soon as that election is done, they are running another election. There is not time, and that is what the counties have been saying: "We are out of time," and that is the management of this body that has led to that.

It is too late. It is too late to do these bills right now. It is past time. And this does not have any major reforms except changing a primary, but we are out of time. The elections directors, the counties do not support this. They know what it is going to do to them. It is going to sow chaos. It is going to sow distrust and disinformation – unless that is the goal.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Monroe County, Representative Madden.

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 1634. Fake news aside, that we have had broken elections since 2020, I think one of the most patriotic and honorable things we can do is respect and appreciate our colleagues of Jewish faith and let them have their holiday off. And I also think that more election workers and more volunteers will come out and will fill the space, because during elections, our volunteers who are dedicated to the election process always stand up and they always make it happen.

I do not think we are out of time at all. I think this is an honorable thing to do, I think it is a fair thing to do, and I think it fixes some of – it makes some of the fixes of Act 77 that we have been wanting for years. So I am in support of this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, the floor leader, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, let us discuss the legislative process for a second, because the gentleman from York actually hit on a few good points.

Any time you are working on a piece of legislation, it is important to understand what the scope is and what the timeline is. Unfortunately, we have arrived here today – as he pointed out, in the month of October – merely months before these proposed changes. And I have seen the same letters and heard from the same people, particularly the counties who have indicated that it could be difficult to implement. That is important, because we have a series of counties that have had issues. Allegheny County, they mailed 28,000 incorrect ballots. In my own county, Lancaster County, they have done it twice, where they mailed incorrect ballots out. To rush changes on top of an already compressed timeframe is difficult. And as he pointed out, if this was truly a priority, we should have been doing this in June. We were here plenty of days, yet it was not done.

Let us talk about some of the other issues. I have heard from my school districts and school board directors relating the impact on the Act 1 exemptions and their school budgets, because that is hinged to the primary date. I did not see a mention of a correction in here; perhaps it is, but I do not think so because I do not think that that was considered. Let us also talk about the election law advisory committee, which is bipartisan in nature. They also expressed concerns.

So, Madam Speaker, when you look at the proposed changes – and I know the good gentleman has been working on this bill, but it should have been worked on much sooner. It should have had a better effort. And while I agree that we should respect members of all faith, I am not sure that moving from one religious time period to another puts us in the best position. That is a legitimate concern that I have heard from individuals with polling places that are primarily located in places of worship.

Madam Speaker, I think that it would be irresponsible to rush something like this through so quickly and close to the deadline. Our members, our constituents have raised legitimate concerns, and it is our duty to listen to them. I will be a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

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

NAYS—100

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

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILL CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 804, PN 1305**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 804, PN 1305

An Act amending the act of December 15, 1982 (P.L.1266, No.287), entitled "An act conferring limited residency status on military personnel, their dependents and civilian personnel assigned to an active duty station in Pennsylvania," further providing for residency of students.

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

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 224, PN 1160**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, further providing for definitions; in the Secretary of the Commonwealth, further providing for requirements relating to voter identification; in dates of elections and primaries and special elections, further providing for general primary and candidates to be nominated and party officers to be elected; in nomination of candidates, further providing for manner of signing nomination petitions and time of circulating, for place and time of filing nomination petitions and filing fees, for withdrawal of candidates, for place and time of filing nomination papers and for objections to nomination petitions and papers; in electronic voting

systems, further providing for supplies and preparation of the voting system and of polling places and for statistical sample; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official mail-in ballot, for date of application for absentee ballot, for approval of application for absentee ballot, for envelopes for official absentee ballots, for delivering or mailing ballots, for voting by absentee electors and for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; in voting by qualified mail-in electors, further providing for date of application for mail-in ballot, for envelopes for official mail-in ballots and for voting by mail-in electors; in Election Integrity Grant Program, further providing for funding for elections; and, in recounts and contests, further providing for opening ballot boxes upon petition of electors alleging fraud or error and deposit or bond, for recanvassing voting machines upon petition of electors alleging fraud or error and for correction of returns, decision not to be final and evidence for prosecution.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington County, Representative O'Neal.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to SB 224. I left here yesterday with some optimism at the prospect of a bipartisan floor amendment to this bill to slightly improve the security of elections here in Pennsylvania, but unfortunately, it seems the majority party could not quite help themselves, and those hopes were quickly dashed late last night.

The fact is, their horrendous amendment, added at the eleventh hour in the Appropriations Committee last night, is a poison pill to this bill, and we all know it. We are all acutely aware of the struggles our county elections bureaus face, including keeping our voter rolls up to date and clean of ineligible voters. The amendment last night would guarantee, guarantee that eventually, mail-in ballots would be sent to people who have moved and passed away in this Commonwealth, without the appropriate checks and balances needed to ensure the votes are not cast.

I ask this body, why, why would we ever want to feed into the argument that our elections are insecure and continue to sow doubt in our democratic process? The fact of the matter is, these changes were done in the cover of darkness, which is what we have seen from the Democratic administration and this Democratic humble, gerrymandered majority.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman will not impugn the integrity of this Chair or members on either side of the aisle.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

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

Mr. CUTLER. Recognizing that you recently quoted one of my prior precedents when I was Speaker, and you politely reminded me of it, I also recall rulings where I did allow you and other members of your party to use the term "gerrymandered" during floor debate. Is that precedent no longer applicable?

The SPEAKER. The Chair should be aware, and all the members should be aware, this Chair does not strike words like "January the 6th" from the record, but every debate will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

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

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, perhaps my question was unclear. In the case-by-case basis, will the term "gerrymandered" be allowed or not allowed, as previously expressed here on the floor by multiple individuals who spoke?

The SPEAKER. So all the members are clear, for the second time, it is evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Washington is able to make his remarks in a respectful manner, he may proceed.

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

Madam Speaker, I would agree that January 6 was a day that was unfortunate and abhorrent in our American history, but so was last night. So was last night when we made significant changes—

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Philadelphia County rise?

Mr. HARRIS. Madam Speaker, I believe the gentleman is now impugning my character and likening the committee meeting that I ran to January 6.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The committee report was already objected to, and this House voted to accept it.

And for the members' information, deadly incidents where people were killed should never be compared to civil discourse in this chamber.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin County, Representative Schemel, on final passage, SB 224.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may state his point of order.

Mr. CUTLER. Visually, it would appear that the gentleman from Washington County had not yielded the microphone yet while you were making your statements and rulings. Is he not in order to continue speaking?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was warned that if he could continue his speech in a respectful manner, he could continue his remarks, as everyone is welcome to do so on this floor. Yet the gentleman chose to talk about an incident where a lie that was perpetuated by some people that are in this chamber right now led to a deadly insurrection.

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may state in inquiry.

Mr. CUTLER. Is it the ruling of the Chair that the gentleman will no longer be recognized consistent with Mason's Manual?

The SPEAKER. Consistent with House rule 13, the gentleman is not permitted, on final passage of this bill, to continue.

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, I would like to appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Cutler, appeals the decision of the Chair that Representative O'Neal's remarks were out of order.

On the question,

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

The SPEAKER. House rule 13 provides if any member, in speaking or otherwise, transgresses the rules of the House, the Speaker or any member, through the Speaker, shall call the member to order, in which case the member shall immediately sit down unless permitted by the House to explain. The House, upon appeal, shall decide the case without debate.

Those in favor of sustaining the Chair's decision will vote "aye"; those opposed will vote "no."

On the question recurring,

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Nothing is in order but the vote. Members will proceed to vote. Have all the members voted?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—102

Abney	Evans	Kosierowski	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krueger	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Kulik	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Madden	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madsen	Sappery
Boyle	Gallagher	Malagari	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Markosek	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Matzie	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Mayes	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	McAndrew	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McNeill	Smith-Wade-El

Burgos	Guzman	Merski	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Miller, D.	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Mullins	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Munroe	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Neilson	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	O'Mara	Warren
Curry	Isaacson	Otten	Waxman
Daley	Kazeem	Parker	Webster
Davis	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Khan	Pielli	Young
Deasy	Kim	Pisciottano	
Delloso	Kinthead	Powell	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinsey	Probst	Speaker

NAYS—100

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—1

Maloney

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin County, Representative Schemel, on final passage of SB 224.

Mr. SCHEMEL. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

A lot of events tell my heart to respond, taking a page out of the songbook of the good Representative, the Appropriations chair of the majority.

Only 15 minutes from midnight, think of the stuff we can do; while you at home are asleep, Democrats are here on their feet passing election changes for you.

Thank you. I will be here all week.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Crawford County, Representative Roae.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill. The whole process has been very, very – not very transparent for the public. A voting meeting for this bill was called on this floor, and about 5 minutes later, at the State Government Committee, we were voting on it. Very little notice for the public to contact us.

The bill being voted on at 11:45 last night gave very little opportunity for members of the public to be able to talk with us. We are Representatives. We represent people. We should listen to what our constituents want us to do. Most of our constituents could not contact any of us at 11:45 last night to say, vote "yes" or vote "no."

Really bad things usually happen late at night in legislative chambers, like the pay raise back in 2005, I think it was, 2004. Nothing good happens in the legislative chamber after 11 o'clock at night. The whole process, how this was passed, is bad, but in addition, anybody serious about changing the primary needs to know, the Senate is not going to do this bill. They are not going to take it up.

So I just urge a "no" vote on this, and I think we should get serious about passing legislation that both chambers can support, that our constituents support. And this bill has numerous problems that other people are going to outline, I think, so I am just going to focus mostly on the process of it all. But this has been done in a terrible way and I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland, Representative Eric Nelson.

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

I rise to oppose this midnight manipulation, as it paves the way to dead people voting once again; immediate, permanent changes 1 month before elections. Madam Speaker, this completes a trifecta of manipulation months before a Presidential election year.

Let us quickly review: no more postmarks on ballots; automatic, immediate, permanent mail-in ballots. And this followed up behind our automatic voter registration verbally enacted by the Governor just weeks ago. This is an outright attack on election integrity. Picture it: boxes of ballots brought out and counted again and again until a given party's candidate wins. This is wrong if it would happen on either side of the aisle, and we all know boxes of ballots were brought out and counted in past elections, and that destroyed our State's belief in this election system.

Madam Speaker, we should remind this chamber and our voters that we have a Supreme Court seat on the ballot less than a month away and a Presidential election next year. Shame on this chamber for acting in this way. Oppose this midnight manipulation and protect our election integrity

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Bucks County, Representative Marcell.

Mrs. MARCELL. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Today I rise to speak about SB 224. As a freshman, this has been a great experience so far, learning about the different members of our class and the different areas that we represent in our great State. We are one-quarter of this legislature. We are still learning each and every day that we are in session. So how is it that we as new members can be expected to vote on bills within hours and surprise amendments late at night within minutes? We have had months to consider these bills, and then we are asked to

vote on them in the dead of night at the very last minute. Midnight votes do not serve the people of our Commonwealth.

When I was a school board member, this body created a law to require to sunshine votes for 24 hours before we considered anything. This was done to ensure that community members had time to see what we were voting on, and they could weigh in with us if they wanted to. Yet here in this body, we are rushing to change our primary date at the last minute, while our constituents may not even know about the amendment that was considered last night. The people of my district and this Commonwealth deserve better, and I welcome the opportunity to work together with everyone in this body, including my entire freshman class, on this issue and others to make sure that we are doing the best thing for our Commonwealth going forward.

A vote for this bill is a vote against transparency. A vote for this legislation is for midnight surprise votes. Please join me in opposing SB 224.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Columbia County, Representative Leadbeter.

Mr. LEADBETER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Today I rise, similarly to my colleagues, to speak out against the midnight malarkey, midnight manipulation that took place last night that would impact our election rules with less than a month out from the next election.

This is a crucial issue that strikes at the heart of our democracy and the principles upon which our society is built. It is a matter of utmost importance. Our democracy, here in the Commonwealth and in the United States of America, is a beacon of hope, a shining example to the rest of the world. It is built on this fundamental principle that every citizen has the right to cast their vote and have it counted fairly and accurately. It is the cornerstone of our nation, the very essence of our freedom. But this foundation is threatened when clouded conduct, like what happened in these halls last night, infiltrates our electoral processes.

Election integrity is not a partisan issue. It is a matter of universal concern that transcends political lines. We must all unite to protect the sanctity of our elections, for it is in that integrity our electoral system has faith with the hearts of the people that reside in our democracy. Clouded conduct regarding elections unnecessarily erodes the trust we have in our government and in one another. It undermines the very essence of what it means to be a democracy. When clouded conduct prevails like it did yesterday, it is not just an assault on the electoral process; it is an affront to the very principles of fairness and justice that were part of the founding of this Commonwealth.

In conclusion, the fight against this dishonest conduct and the preservation of election integrity is not just a duty; it is a solemn responsibility that we owe to ourselves, our children, and the generations that will follow us in this hall. Our democracy's strength lies in our collective commitment to fairness and honesty in our election processes, so this morning let us stand together across party lines to protect and uphold that integrity in our elections and vote "no" to the midnight malarkey that took place last night.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The majority whip requests that Representative Maloney be placed back on the master roll call to vote by designation. Without objection, the gentleman will be added to the roll.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 224 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Centre County, Representative Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The good news is, I am not going to sing – because I cannot sing – but if you will indulge me, I want to share a couple of reflections with you.

I consider myself a pretty blessed man for a lot of reasons – being a father, grandfather of nine – but also because some of the people in my life that I had met and had influences on me: a teacher, some nurses I have worked for. I came to this chamber relatively young – not there anymore – and I got to serve under the Speaker named Matthew J. Ryan. I still remember sitting here my first day and his inaugural address and his comments, and one of those comments was, power is only as good as you choose to use it. Being in the majority is power, and it, too, is only as good as you choose to use it.

The second person whom I would attribute some of my better qualities to was my mother; 5 feet 2, adoptive mother. My mother chose to adopt me after adopting another child only 6 months before that. Got married at 16 years old, so you can imagine the extent of the formal education she had. But as many of you probably heard from your mothers, nothing good happens after midnight. I was told that many times, especially when I got a driver's license. Mother was right then and she is right now.

Madam Speaker, I rise specifically to speak on SB 224, specifically as it was amended last night, for two reasons. And I will ask that the chairman be noted that I would like to ask a few questions, but I want to make a comment before that, the majority chairman. I also rise because I am probably one of two of the last members of the Speaker's reform commission that was formed subsequent to the famous midnight pay raise. If you think this is fun, you should have been here then. Almost blew the roof off. As a matter of fact, some of you are here because of that. But I raise this because that commission was put together as a bipartisan commission by then Speaker Denny O'Brien. It was led by two cochairs: Representative David Steil; and Representative Josh Shapiro, our current Governor.

Many different topics were discussed then, but one of the most specific things that came out of that that was felt to have a significant impact on this chamber and future generations, which you are of, was the same advice my mother gave: nothing good comes after midnight. And this chamber should not cast legislative votes as Representatives of the people who predominantly are in bed by then, after 11 p.m. We adopted that bipartisanly, at that point, as the Representatives of the people because we knew it was right and what was done before that was wrong. It was right then, and it is right now, very simply.

Madam Chair, if I could, I would ask the majority chairman to rise, because I was not here for the Appropriations Committee meeting last night. I do not serve on that, and I would just like to ask a couple questions for my own clarification.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates that he will.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for being willing to do that.

If I remember correctly, we left here roughly around 11 o'clock, and I am curious about what time the meeting commenced in Appropriations to amend SB 224?

Mr. HARRIS. The meeting last night started around 11:15, 11:20.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Okay. So that would have been gavelled in about that time. What time would have the members of that committee received an agenda of what was going to be voted on? It does not have to be a number; was that before the meeting or after the meeting was started?

Mr. HARRIS. Before we took votes, members were given the agenda and the amendment.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. In the committee meeting?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Okay, great. Thank you.

And I am not sure if you can answer this, but I do not have the knowledge of it. So for a non-Appropriations Committee member, when would any of us have had access to see that amendment, either in person or electronically?

Mr. HARRIS. So any member not on a committee would see it after the amendment is passed. The rules allow for committees to have typewritten amendments presented during the committee. I would let you know that last night, the minority chairman actually had an amendment that no one had seen that was typewritten as well – he just decided not to offer it – but he actually had a typewritten amendment as well, to be offered at that same meeting last night following the same exact process.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am speaking specifically to amendment 2452, because again, as somebody who has to vote on this, I was just concerned about my own knowledge about when I could read it. I am not necessarily a technological wizard, but my understanding is that it is not something you can pull up on LDPC (Legislative Data Processing Center) or anywhere else throughout the night last night, and in order to get a copy of this – or to see it, pardon me – either in hand or otherwise, I could not find it until I came in this morning. Now, we are scheduled to be back here at 8 o'clock. I guess the question for me would be, what time did the meeting eventually end? I am assuming it did not go very quickly.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the meeting ended around 11:45 or so.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Okay. 11:45. So for the most part, none of us would have had access to that until this morning unless we ran into another member. I mean, obviously, some of us left and we went back to wherever our housing is.

Mr. HARRIS. So LRB (Legislative Reference Bureau) did engross the amendment last evening.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Do we know what time?

Mr. HARRIS. After the meeting and after it was passed.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. I will take you at your word and I appreciate that. Again, maybe shame on me for not coming back and getting to a computer on time to pull that back up.

Madam Speaker, and I am done with my questions. If I could just end with a couple comments?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed on the bill.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I think you know what my point was. At best, it might have been available at midnight. I do not know how long it takes to upload these things. But we have oftentimes heard

from both sides of this chamber about the importance of transparency, access to information, being informed. All of you tell your constituents, you have town hall meetings, that we come here to learn. We have committee meetings; we want to be informed.

Madam Speaker, it saddens me that we are going to vote on something with such little time that the elected Representatives of the people of Pennsylvania had little to no access to read – at least, the majority of them did not except for the last couple hours. And it may not be a 100-page novel, but nonetheless, it has some very serious changes, and many of us would like to be able to call our local elections office and ask their input and their questions, and our county commissioners, those people who have to implement these types of changes this late at night.

Madam Speaker, I do appreciate your indulgence, and I will close with, very simply, we have time limits for a reason. Do you know, you cannot even vote in the general election after 8 o'clock. Well, why is that? Because people think that people need time and there should be timeframes, and those who have to perform the duties subsequent need time to do that. Well, Madam Speaker, I need time to be able to digest this stuff and read this stuff.

So I will close with that I will not be supporting SB 224 as amended. While I do believe there were some things that were well-intended, I believe that there are some significant changes that are not good for the public, not good for the people. Matthew J. Ryan, former Speaker, I suspect would frown on seeing those changes, and I know my mother would not support doing this stuff at the late night and in the darkness for the people of Pennsylvania. Please vote "no."

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Blair County, Representative Gregory.

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

Madam Speaker, you know that it is not often that I will come before you on this floor, but many times that I have, it has been because of life experiences that I have advocated for, legislation that has garnered so much bipartisan support, and you know, Madam Speaker, I am very grateful for that. But I stand before you today to speak on this bill to urge a "no" vote because of yet another life experience. And because the night of the pay raise has been raised and has been discussed so much, I want to share with you a life experience for me with that episode, that dark episode here on the floor of both the House and the Senate.

During that time, Madam Speaker, I worked for the staff of then Senate President Bob Jubelirer, the architect of the pay raise. And I am not joking when I tell you this: To this day, when I think of that time, I think of the literal PTSD (post-traumatic stress disorder) that I experienced, because it was the worst year of my life, working on that staff, to have to defend what was done to the taxpayers of Pennsylvania after midnight. I believe this, Madam Speaker: Smart people learn from their own mistakes; wise people learn from the mistakes of others.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BRADFORD. Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BRADFORD. Parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRADFORD. My understanding is that this bill includes a bipartisan voter ID amendment, some good government reforms, pre-canvassing, and a permanent vote-by-mail provision. I have not heard talk about that in the last three speakers. We are trying to give a lot of latitude, but we are so, so far beyond the substance of the bill and have spent all of our time on a history not just of the House, but now of the Senate. Thank you.

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

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

While members can use analogies about the process that brings us to this final passage, all the members and folks who have requested to speak on final passage of SB 224 are encouraged to talk about the contents of the bill and not get far-fetched on other topics that are not concerned in this legislation.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Lancaster rise?

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Previously, I have been requested to limit my points of order to actual points of order. Hearing the gentleman's recitation of what is in the bill I think is more proper for a speech and not a legitimate point of order. I would simply ask the Chair to admonish the gentleman in the same manner.

The SPEAKER. It was a parliamentary inquiry and the Chair answered him.

Does the gentleman from Blair have further remarks? You may proceed.

Mr. GREGORY. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will be brief.

Passing this legislation in this manner is neither smart nor wise, and ruining the day that we did it this way is in the future for those that pass this bill today.

Thank you, Madam Speaker,

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cumberland County, Representative Kutz.

Mr. KUTZ. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think we can all agree, as members of this body, first and foremost our responsibility is to safeguard our elections. Madam Speaker, I agree with many of my colleagues that election reforms are necessary. There are many things that we can do to make our elections free, fair, safe, and secure. There are many ways we can continue to improve these elections year after year. I encourage a vigorous debate about these issues.

Madam Speaker, changes to our Election Code deserve the opportunity for thoughtful discussion and a thorough vetting. Stakeholder groups, voters, people who administer elections should have the opportunity to weigh in. Amendments to these bills should be considered before the entire body.

Madam Speaker, this bill was originally about moving a date on the calendar – a simple step – yet the amendment that was put before only a small number of members, rather than the whole body, was added 15 minutes before midnight last night. Madam Speaker, we are talking about implementing major changes to our Election Code without being deliberate and intentional and without considering unintended consequences.

Madam Speaker, these changes are massive. They are worthy of a longer debate and discussion and to be done when all members can consider the breadth of these amendments. For that reason, Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Allegheny County, Representative Gaydos.

Ms. GAYDOS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

As Madam Chair had advised all of us that we want to talk about the content of the bill and not the process – we all are frustrated that these changes to this bill were made last night at 15 minutes to midnight – but I am going to talk about the process. The problem is that we are being asked to vote for a bill where almost 16 amendments yesterday were totally tabled. We are here to represent our constituents, and I came here to have an amendment yesterday that was tabled. We want election reform. I fully support election integrity, but there is no integrity in voting for a bill that was amended 15 minutes to midnight, sneaking in language that was not agreed upon, that was not discussed in committees, that was not put before our general constituents – it was put at the last minute. And now I would like to ask, even to my colleagues, how many people even had a chance to read this bill in its entirety, and as maybe previous speakers have mentioned, go back to their election offices and their constituents and ask, what do they really want in there?

There were 16 amendments to this bill yesterday and not one of them was given an opportunity to be discussed on the floor. Let us work together and let us try to solve real problems. Let us clean up the voter rolls. Let us remove people who have moved. Let us make sure that our data and information on voters is correct. And let us allow additional amendments to be put on this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I oppose this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentlelady.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Adams, Representative Ecker.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the good majority leader asked us to focus on the bill at hand. Well, Madam Speaker, the bill at hand and the effective date that we are talking about if this bill is actually signed into law – and let us face it, we are voting on this to send it back to the Senate, because presumably, we want it to be signed into law. So let us work on that assumption that the Governor is going to sign this into law.

If the Governor signs this into law by – in the next couple weeks, the effective date of this bill is immediately; immediately. So I know we have all heard from our election officials already that moving the primary date is a challenge. So why do we not just throw in, 15 minutes to midnight, a new ballot-curing process for them? So while our election officials are trying to set up precincts and find poll workers and get things set up, now they have to develop new processes to handle ballot curing. I know my folks in Adams County – there are four, four election officials in our county – they do not have the ability to do that.

People of Pennsylvania are asking us to pass real election reforms. Passing a bill like this will just send our elections into chaos even more. That is a fact. Our election officials do not have the time before this upcoming November election to implement the things that are in this bill, and if this is signed into law, that will absolutely happen. There is no reason that this had to happen

at 11:45 at night. The people of Pennsylvania had no idea what was happening, the media had no idea what was happening, the committee members had no idea what was happening until maybe 3 minutes after the hearing even started. The challenges of implementing this bill, if signed into law, would be catastrophic to our election system, and for that reason, Madam Speaker, I would like to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may state his motion.

Mr. ECKER. Madam Speaker, I would like to make a motion to revert to prior printer's number 1159.

The SPEAKER. That motion would be out of order.

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. To revert to a prior printer's number is an amendment. It is not in order on final passage, a precedent set in 2002: Amendments may not be offered on final passage, even with a suspension of the rules. That motion is not in order.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. CUTLER. Are amendments permitted on third, according to our rules?

The SPEAKER. They would require a suspension of the rules.

Mr. CUTLER. Further point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. You may state your point of order.

Mr. CUTLER. I have in my possession past precedent which is more recent than yours that was recently cited, from November 19, 2004, which indicates that it is not necessary to suspend the rules before doing a reversion of the printer's number on a motion, made by then Representative Saylor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair's ruling stands.

RULING OF CHAIR APPEALED

Mr. CUTLER. I will appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Representative Cutler, appeals the decision of the Chair that a motion to revert is not in order on final passage, even with a suspension of the rules.

On the question,

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

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

The SPEAKER. On the motion, the Chair recognizes the maker of the motion, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, further parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUTLER. You indicated that a motion to revert would not even be proper with a suspension of the rules?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Further parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUTLER. Would not a suspension of the rules get rid of the rule that says you cannot amend on third?

The SPEAKER. I will repeat the precedent from 2002: Amendments may not be offered on final passage, even with a suspension of the rules.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you. On the motion, if I may, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed on the motion.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

This really is not that difficult: that was a different set of rules. Our rules do in fact allow for this. And in fact, we had intervening precedent since then that says you can revert and amend on third. Many of the members here in this chamber have done that several times.

What we are finding here is a dance amongst past precedent to find the solutions that we want rather than to have a deliberative process on the underlying bill. The good gentleman wanted to have the debate on what happened at quarter of midnight last night; the fact, in the cover of darkness, that a bill was amended, with 3 minutes' notice, that would overhaul our election system. That is worthy of public debate. That is worthy of input. I would have said, prior to yesterday, it was worthy of amendments, but those were tabled.

So that the members fully understand what we are voting on, this ruling and yesterday's actions mean that no single member could offer an amendment if it was tabled. No single member could revert to a prior printer's number on third consideration, even though it is allowed by rule, just because of an old precedent and a desire not to revisit the issues – the issues that I think are worth debating, the issues that I think are worth discussing.

Now, a "yes" vote will be to shut down all further debate and discussion and not allow changes to a bill once it hits third. Making sure that we overturn this improper ruling is not just necessary for the democratic process; it is necessary for us as individual members, because the power that is being wielded with this decision will be wielded against each of us in the future on any issue that other members disagree with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Chester County, Representative Lawrence.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I apologize, I know this was mentioned earlier, but I just want to be clear, because to be candid, I missed it. Could you please – my inquiry is on exactly the matter that is before the House. Is it that we are – this vote is on— Can we or can we not revert to a prior printer's number on third consideration at all, even if there were a vote to suspend the rules? Is that the question?

The SPEAKER. Just so it is clear for all the members, the bill is not on third consideration today; it is on final passage.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order and may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LAWRENCE. And I apologize. My impression was always that third consideration and final passage were the same thing. Are they not?

The SPEAKER. They are separate. That is why the Speaker says in the script: "Will the House agree to the bill? Agreed to." That is third consideration.

Mr. LAWRENCE. So the final passage of the bill is a fourth consideration?

The SPEAKER. It is a separate vote than third consideration.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker?

Could a member ask for a separate vote – we can ask for a separate vote on second consideration. Could a member ask for a separate vote on third consideration and then a subsequent vote on final passage?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I appeal that ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. There was not a ruling made. An answer was provided to an inquiry.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order. He may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Is it the Chair's ruling that we have moved past third and nothing was in order but the taking of the vote? Because it is my understanding that the script that is read at the front, where we would always say, you know, consistent with the Constitution, this bill having been considered three days, members will proceed to vote, that is the end of third consideration and the beginning of final passage.

Is it the Chair's position that the debate has concluded, and was that statement in fact read into the record, because I did not hear it?

The SPEAKER. To repeat what the Speaker read prior to moving to final passage on this SB 224, the Speaker asked, "Will the House agree to the bill? Agreed to." And then the Speaker said, "The clerk will read the title and a brief description of the bill." After agreed to, that ends third consideration and we move to final passage.

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Just so the members are clear, as I stated earlier this morning, if any member ever needs clarification, they are always welcome to speak to the House's Parliamentarian for clarification on this process.

The gentleman is in order and may state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I understand that that opens up the debate heading to final passage, but is that not answered, that question – have all the members agreed to the bill? – answered until the vote is finalized and then recorded by the clerk?

The SPEAKER. When the Speaker says "agreed to," that is the answer.

Mr. CUTLER. Madam Speaker, if I may, I would like to make a motion to rescind third consideration.

The SPEAKER. The House will temporarily be at ease.

The House will come to order.

The Chair requests the floor leaders to come to the rostrum.

The House will temporarily be at ease.

The Chair requests the floor leaders to come to the rostrum.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County.

MOTION TO REVERT TO PRIOR PRINTER'S NUMBER

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And thank you for the further discussion regarding the procedure now before us.

MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. CUTLER. I will withdraw my prior motion and we are submitting a motion to revert, which I believe you have in your possession.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in receipt of a motion. Pursuant to House rule 26, the undersigned members of the House of Representatives make a motion to reconsider the vote by which the House agreed to third consideration. Signed by Bryan Cutler, signed by Tim O'Neal.

Moved by Representatives O'Neal and Cutler that the vote by which SB 224 was agreed to on third consideration be reconsidered.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

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

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, after discussion, the purpose of this motion is simply to allow the good gentleman to make his motion to revert to the prior printer's number. This would enable us to return to the bill in its form prior to the midnight shenanigans, and I would urge support of the motion.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—101

Adams	Gaydos	Lawrence	Rigby
Armanini	Gillen	Leadbeter	Roae
Banta	Gleim	Mackenzie, M.	Rossi
Barton	Gregory	Mackenzie, R.	Rowe
Benninghoff	Greiner	Major	Ryncavage
Bernstine	Grove	Mako	Schemel
Bonner	Hamm	Maloney	Scheuren
Borowicz	Heffley	Marcell	Schlegel
Brown, M.	Hogan	Marshall	Schmitt
Cabell	Irvin	Mehaffie	Scialabba
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	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	Kosierowski	Rabb
Bellmon	Fiedler	Krajewski	Rozzi
Benham	Fleming	Krueger	Salisbury
Bizzarro	Frankel	Kulik	Samuelson
Borowski	Freeman	Madden	Sanchez
Boyd	Friel	Madsen	Sappay
Boyle	Gallagher	Malagari	Schlossberg
Bradford	Galloway	Markosek	Schweyer
Brennan	Gergely	Matzie	Scott
Briggs	Giral	Mayes	Shusterman
Brown, A.	Green	McAndrew	Siegel
Bullock	Guenst	McNeill	Smith-Wade-El
Burgos	Guzman	Merski	Solomon
Burns	Haddock	Miller, D.	Steele
C Freytiz	Hanbidge	Mullins	Sturla
Cephas	Harkins	Munroe	Takac
Cerrato	Harris	Neilson	Venkat
Ciresi	Hohenstein	Nelson, N.	Vitali
Conklin	Howard	O'Mara	Warren
Curry	Isaacson	Otten	Waxman
Daley	Kazeem	Parker	Webster
Davis	Kenyatta	Pashinski	Williams, D.
Dawkins	Khan	Pielli	Young
Deasy	Kim	Pisciottano	
Delloso	Kinthead	Powell	McClinton,
Donahue	Kinsey	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 motion was not agreed to.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Mr. Ecker is in order on final passage.

Mr. ECKER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the point of my prior motion was not to play games; it was actually to help our counties, our county election officials. If this is signed into law, it will send our elections into chaos. I am going to stand with my counties, my election workers, my poll workers, those that are trying to keep integrity of elections in place. A "yes" vote on this bill will absolutely cause that chaos.

Madam Speaker, we had an opportunity to make this bill better and give our counties a little extra time to get ready for a potential primary move. Instead, we are going to create even more havoc. A "yes" vote for this is a signal to your counties and your election offices that you do not care, that you are not supportive of them,

and that you are not hearing them, and those are the folks that ensure the integrity of our elections and the folks that show up at the polls to elect their elected officials.

This is a sad day, Madam Speaker. And I will be a "no" vote, and I urge the same. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lycoming County, Representative Hamm.

Mr. HAMM. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I rise in opposition to the midnight madness that occurred late last evening with SB 224. At 11:45 last evening, votes were being taken to make major election law changes by amendment to SB 224. While hardworking Pennsylvanians were in bed sleeping, resting for the workday ahead, Democrats rammed through midnight election law changes. Madam Speaker, during this midnight madness, there was no transparency. Members had mere minutes to review the amendment and bill at hand. In the cover of night, major election law changes were voted on by the Democrats.

Madam Speaker, we were scheduled to be in this morning at 8 a.m. Why could not that Appropriations Committee meeting happen this morning when we came into session, when Pennsylvanians are awake and watching what their elected officials are doing? Madam Speaker, there is only one answer to that question: the midnight election law changes were intentional. While hardworking Pennsylvanians were sleeping, midnight election law changes were rammed through by the Democrats.

Madam Speaker, I oppose midnight election law changes, I oppose lack of transparency, and I stand adamantly opposed to the disrespect shown to hardworking Pennsylvanians who were sleeping while the Democrats rammed through major election law changes at a quarter to midnight.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Cumberland County, Representative DeLozier.

Ms. DELOZIER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

As we have been talking about, this late-night bill is not what our constituents need. The humble majority of one this week on the floor, with this bill, tabled amendments on this bill that they did not want to debate. They moved the previous question when we did not want to argue. And last night's move of an unseen amendment that changes the impact of this bill, that no one had read, was done after my constituents were in bed.

I support the changes to Election Code to make the changes that our counties do need that they have been advocating for years. But without this amendment, I would have voted "yes." I do not support the amended bill that, as has been said, the Senate will not pass, do not know if the Governor is going to sign, and it removes this bill from consideration as a solution, which is our job: to find solutions, not make more problems.

But we can stand here and we will vote on this bill, and we know the numbers so it will pass, and to many, this checks a box, gets a headline, knowing that this is not the solution, that this will not help our counties, and that our constituents deserve better. Vote "no" on this bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Representative Grove.

Mr. GROVE. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

When I came here as a freshman, I prioritized talking to more senior members to understand this place, learn how things work. Some of those individuals: former Speaker Sam Smith, former

Speaker Bill DeWeese – who is still a pleasure to talk to – Speaker Mike Turzai, to gain understanding about process, how things move, how issues got done. One thing that I always prioritized was a saying – and this may give some people PTSD around here – but Speaker Mike Turzai would say, you have got to set deadlines and meet those deadlines. Once that deadline is hit, no matter where you are at in negotiation, you lock it down and you move. There are too many important things that we have to do in this body to miss those deadlines. If you are negotiating after those deadlines, it is never going to happen. Lock it down and you have got to move.

In June the Secretary of State, former election director, sent out a simple message to this body: If you want to do election reform, you better do it now, because the fall is too late. Our county elections directors have said that repeatedly for 2 years, now going on 3. The Philadelphia city elections board opposes this. It is bipartisan. They do not want massive election changes right before an election.

Today is Thursday, October 5. This bill impacts the election on Tuesday, November 7. In 1 month our elections directors are going to have to rewrite an entire election process. That is what the majority is here to accomplish today.

The amendment last night adjusts how mail-in voting is done. Automatically set to a list; whether you want to be on a permanent list or not, you are automatically set. The government is telling you, this is how you are going to vote in perpetuity. You know what happens if your ballot gets lost in the mail? The rest of the Election Law says you have to bring it to your in-person voting and spoil it. How do you do that? How do you know if it is actually sent to you if you really did not want to sign up for it? Maybe you have to do it one time because you are out of town. Confusion.

I also find it interesting that since we have had mail-in voting, more Republicans – the majority of Republicans vote in in-person elections. It seems the scope of the underlying amendment tries to move away from in-person voting and eliminate it as an option. It is interesting, that data point. And this was all done, this was all done almost at midnight last night.

I will not belabor the ills of this bill. I will not belabor the repercussions of voters if this is passed and signed into law. But I will say this, Madam Speaker: Democracy dies in darkness. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lebanon, Representative Diamond.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I am pretty sure I am speaking on the right bill now.

I will not belabor the point. All the previous speakers have made great points and I concur with all of them. And as someone who was here back in 2005, I know what it is like on the outside, what it looks like on the outside, when the legislature does things late at night.

But let us not talk about it, let us talk about the actual provisions of this bill. They are quite curious. Somebody already mentioned, we are only a month away from an election where some of these provision will come into play. That is not good. It certainly is not good to add on to that already thing that we were already talking about, about moving the primary date up, which counties across the State are already opposed to.

Let us talk about the provision of the permanent mail-in ballot list, the permanent mail-in ballot list. We have actually talked about this when I was on the House State Government Committee

and we have talked about this on the other body that I am a part of, which the minority leader earlier recognized, the Election Law Advisory Board. But we have talked about going the other way. We do not think a permanent mail-in list is a good idea. We think an annual mail-in list should be specified in law, because right now the law calls it permanent but it is only annual, and all the conversations I have had said that should only be an annual sign up, should never be permanent.

Now, let us talk about the impact of that becoming permanent. Look, there are plenty of problems with getting people who are no longer eligible to vote off the voter rolls. People die. I have got a bill to take care of that, but that bill has not become law yet. When people move out of State – people need to miss two Federal elections before they are even notified that they are in danger of getting removed from the voter rolls and being termed "inactive"; two Federal elections. So folks could be moved out of the State, and through eight separate elections cycles, could be mailed a ballot. Who is going to receive that ballot? Anybody who could return it. How do you— Come on; Madam Speaker, this is not a good idea.

Let us talk about one other provision of this bill, which was actually amended here on the floor in a legitimate fashion, the voter ID portion. Look, I am all in favor of voter ID, but it is quite curious that of all the things the humble majority has made immediate upon the election process in this bill, they did not amend voter ID to be immediate. That is delayed in this bill until 2025 – curiously, after our next Presidential election.

Madam Speaker, the underlying bill before we had any amendments was a bad idea. I had some good amendments that would have made it a better idea to move the primary up. Of course, they were tabled. I get it. I get it. But the amendments that are on this bill make this bill horrible, beyond its original purpose to move the Presidential primary at this late stage of the game.

Madam Speaker, this bill is not just bad in its substance; it is horrible when you talk about the process of how we got to this point today. Those who vote in favor of this bill are not just voting in favor of the substance of the bill but are voting in favor of the process used, and that process used, Madam Speaker, was kind of a back to the future, except it is back to the bad old days of bad legislative process, of midnight moves to squeak things in at the last minute.

Madam Speaker, both on process and substance, SB 224, whatever it began as, has become a horrific monster of a bill, and I urge a "no" vote.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. For the information of the floor leader, there are four more requests.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bradford, Representative Owlett.

Mr. OWLETT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this, and last night I was able to be in the Appropriations voting meeting, and it was very much a description of what probably disgusts a lot of people about this building. Calling meetings at 11 o'clock at night is not the time to be doing large election reform. The meeting was over at 11:45, and this was after we had tabled the amendments that were here on the floor, just to go to a private meeting with smaller groups to consider another amendment. Those are the things that, really, you could sense after that meeting disgust on both sides. We all knew what was going on was wrong, but yet it happened. "Transparency" is an easy word to say, but it is a really, really

hard word to do, and that is not what happened last night, and it is beneath this body to make those types of actions in a committee meeting.

I got in my truck and I drove up past the Farm Show Complex and there was a young man – the doors were wide open, the lights were on – and he was getting his sheep ready to show today. That is appropriate work at 11:45 at night. After midnight, that is appropriate work. Doing large election changes at 11:45 under the cover of darkness is not, and it is inappropriate of this building. It is what has caused so many people to think negatively about this body, and we can do better and we must do better.

Tomorrow morning I get to speak with a fellow member on the other side of the aisle at Mansfield University to a political science class. You certainly have given us a lot of things to talk about tomorrow to the next generation of leaders who could fill our seats, and hopefully, they will learn and have better integrity moving forward for this process of this building, because this is beneath this building and we must do better. Vote against SB 224.

The SPEAKER. For the remainder of the members, floor speeches are not for the purpose of impugning the integrity of other members of this august body.

Is the floor leader prepared to speak on behalf of his caucus?

Before going to the floor leader, we will recognize the majority chair of State Government, Representative Conklin.

Mr. CONKLIN. I want to thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, there has been some talk that was not quite on the bill today, but all I want to do is just take a few seconds to thank the Speaker, thank the majority leader. As someone that has a history of this building, I remember those days when the midnight pay raise was voted on this floor in the middle of the night. I want to thank the Speaker for not having a vote in the middle of the night like they did in the past. But mostly, Madam Speaker, I want to thank you.

In the past, after we created the new no-voting rules after 11 p.m., I remember those days when the other majority leader, Speakers of the other party, would try to suspend the rules and go beyond the middle of the night. I want to thank this Speaker and I want to thank this leader for having this vote at 11 a.m., in the morning, while everybody is awake. I want to thank this leadership team for being open. I want to thank you for not trying to slide things in in the middle of the night, but most of all, Madam Speaker, I want to thank you all for giving me an additional 3 hours to read through this short bill again this morning, and I know that I am definitely voting "yes" for it, Madam Speaker.

Thank you for your daylight, thank you for doing this in the morning, and thank you for not following the leads of past Speakers and try to do a floor vote in the middle of the night. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On final passage, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Representative Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I would like to start by mentioning some of the process, which has been covered, but it is very, very important, because in legislation, how we get somewhere is as important as where we ultimately end up.

It was mentioned earlier that you have got to hit deadlines, you have got to work through the language, and you have got to work with all the stakeholders. Unfortunately, I have not seen that demonstrated with this particular example. But I have seen it in action previously. Last session the House and Senate

Republicans passed a bill called the Pennsylvania Voting Rights Protection Act, which did contain several issues that the good gentleman from Montgomery County requested that we speak about, and I will get into those in my following remarks. That legislation was one of the most comprehensive election reform bills in the country. It was developed with over a dozen hearings over several months, with significant input from all sides and all stakeholders. It is a bill that solved a lot of problems. It modernized our elections, it made them more accessible, made them more secure, and yes, that bill carried a lot of the similar things in the legislation we are considering here this morning.

But the bill we have before us followed a much, much different path. It took the midnight train on the fast track. It was developed without hearings, here with an amendment adopted yesterday in a bipartisan way with little debate and a day's notice. Then late last night, after our 11 p.m. session expired, the House Appropriations Committee, at the request of the majority, offered and adopted an amendment to this bill at a few minutes before midnight that substantially changed this legislation.

So yes, as the prior speaker indicated, we might be voting here in the morning hours, but the truth is, it does not hide what was done in the darkness. In fact, many constituents may not have even heard about what happened, because at the time there were only two reporters in the building.

This legislation has significant new impacts and new mandates on our counties, that would be effective immediately, that would impact the upcoming election if signed into law. And I have not heard that the county – and a very important stakeholder, those who actually run our elections – signed off or even reviewed the amendment that was offered at quarter to midnight last night.

This throwback to the pay raise government is shameful. It is not worthy of our institution or the members. Most importantly, it is disrespectful to the people of Pennsylvania, and it is ignorant of the fact that many people have lost faith in our ability to seriously manage elections. And we wonder why people question what we do up here sometimes. They do not have faith in the process. When we worked in a bipartisan way on a lobbying reform bill, you have got to believe in the process to believe in the product, and this one is short on belief. When my friends on the other side of the aisle go searching for those answers, I simply encourage them to look in the closest mirror.

As to the underlying bill, this is more of what we saw earlier this week: a sprinkling of good policy wrapped around with a bunch of bad legislative ideas. Legislative ideas that were not properly vetted, that were not approved by the counties, the very people we are going to ask to implement them, and as was pointed out earlier by one of the reporters who normally is up above us in the seats constantly tweeting, he indicated that the Philadelphia commissioner is against this because of the impact it will have on the immediate implementation. So I appreciate him providing that notice; he clearly is paying attention.

When it comes to moving the primary, there are a number of serious concerns, some of which I highlighted on the other bill but deserve to be highlighted again. There are concerns by the counties in terms of the mechanics of the election; there are concerns by the school districts on what the impacts will be on property taxes and school budgets; and there are concerns expressed by the Election Law Advisory Board, which is bipartisan. The counties' opposition and concerns are bipartisan, and yet we proceed, speeding forward, ignoring rules, ignoring precedent, and simply doing this bill.

We hear a lot about creating free and fair elections, but what this legislation does, it takes a bad process, uses it to create timelines that will help protect incumbents and stifle challengers. I do not believe that is good for democracy. I do not believe that, and I am saying that as someone who had a primary last time. That is how the process is supposed to work. We should not be voting for an incumbent protection plan, and yet we proceed.

Again, this legislation does several things that we have supported in the past, and since there has been a lot of revisionist history talked about on this floor regarding past bills and past rulings in recent days, I want to make it clear: Republicans have voted for pre-canvassing three times. Republicans have passed enhanced voter identification. We passed early in-person voting. We passed ballot curing. We passed increasing the accessibility to our elections for the disabled community and the elderly. But when you take these ideas and wrap them in further bad legislation that has bipartisan opposition, the Democrat majority creates a false choice and another legislative hostage situation. Worse yet, with this legislation, they salted the very earth of transparency before trying to grow a little democracy. That is not how this works. It does not have to be this way. It should not be this way. We are ready to work on something better that we can all agree on. And I will say today, you might win the vote, but you will not win the respect of the members in this chamber or the people in the public. I am a "no."

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

On that question, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery County, Representative Bradford.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And to be respectful of your time, I will be brief, and I will recognize the reality that the former Speaker likes to go last, so he may have a follow-up.

So let me just start with this. The last time I came to this floor and made the comment that sometimes the dog finally catches the car, we were talking about a different bill, but I think Captain Ahab caught their white whale again. That time, I would remind you, it might have been HB 106. There were those who said at that time that what they needed was a constitutional amendment on abortion, and they got it.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

Mr. BRADFORD. And like the dog that catches the car—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. CUTLER. I recognize that leaders are given broad latitude, but that is not before the body.

Mr. BRADFORD. The history of the pay raise was not before the body either, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Sufficient latitude has been given on this day and every day to both parties, especially given the nature of what is contained in SB 224. Latitude will continue to be provided, especially to the leaders of your respective caucuses.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BRADFORD. And much like SB 106 discussion, today we have a discussion about what is not in front of us. They deluded themselves then that that was not about abortion, and today we want to delude ourselves. And I want to give credit to the good gentleman because I believe for the first time tonight,

one of the minority members actually mentioned the word "pre-canvassing," and I want to thank him for recognizing the importance of that. Because we have heard a lot about process, and I would point out that when the minority party went into victory formation about 8 o'clock, they were not too worried about the Appropriations Committee going past 11 o'clock, but they did not talk much about the substance. In fact, speaker after speaker got up and we did not say a word, because it has been 12 hours and I am sure you have all now read this amendment and I am sure you have read the underlying bill. And look, this humble majority let a voter ID bill go up. You got the voter ID bill. Unanimously you voted for your voter ID, your legislation. The majority of my caucus did not, but you know what? That seemed to be the right thing to do to move this process forward. We moved the Kenyatta bill forward earlier because that, too, was the right thing to do because we recognize elections need to roll.

The good gentleman is worried about counties. I am glad he is worried about pre-canvassing. There is nothing, with the possible exception of the activities of some of the members of the minority party, that has done more to sow lack of faith in our elections than lack of pre-canvassing. We should pass that. That is in this bill. So is the voter ID amendment you all wanted for so very long. But like the dog that catches the car, there seems to be those with second thoughts, because they did not talk any about the substance.

So briefly, Madam Speaker, I just want to go through the substance, and I want to say, there is nothing horrible in this bill. I am a progressive Democrat. I do not typically support anything that would look like a voter ID, because typically, it has looked like voter suppression. I want to recognize the bipartisan work that was done to come up with a true compromise that could receive 101 House Republican votes. That is unique, that is historic, and that is progress.

I want to recognize the authors, Democrat and Republican alike, who worked in good faith to get that done. I want to recognize those on both sides who could and could not support it, both the amendment and the bill in front of us now. And when I thought about how I myself would vote, and I was talking to the good gentleman from Easton, and I thought, why do I find myself even troubled by the idea of voting for a bill that I already said the substance is – it is part of the Act 77, right? Do you give up straight-party voting for vote by mail? I voted against that, and I have often wondered if that was the right choice. But I know those are the tough choices that we make when we have Election Code bills.

And now we have this bill in front of us which has the pre-canvassing, that finally puts to bed the voter ID issue that the other side has agitated for for so long. I think about why I struggle with it and I think about the context and I think about, actually, what the good gentleman from Washington said earlier: Why is there lack of faith in our elections? Because there are some who have sowed the seeds of distrust in our elections, and there is no voter ID amendment that is going to solve that, the simple reality is. I sat in this room when I heard about the evil of Dominion voting machines, when members sat somewhere right around there, had a big audit, and the New York Times, and talked about the Pennsylvania election was stolen. And I remember individuals who sit in this body today who wrote letters that would disenfranchise Pennsylvania's electors. And I think about colleagues, past and current, who went to our Capitol on

January 6, engaged in the most despicable, vile violence against our democracy. And then you wonder why we cannot pass this bill, and you wonder why it is so difficult to pass meaningful legislation on such a charged issue, and then you sit there in the most sanctimonious way and say, I do not understand why people are worked up. Some of us know how we wound up here. We had colleagues in that Capitol Building when other of our former colleagues said, "Charge that building." That is what happens when you engage in election lies. And now we are asked—

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CUTLER. Point of order, Madam Speaker?

Mr. BRADFORD. —to support your voter ID so that our people who we lied to and lied to will have faith in the election.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. CUTLER. Checking to see if the gentleman is still within the latitude that the Speaker is providing, because it is customary of the chamber not to use inflammatory language, and given that we have had truncated debates recently, I am curious.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

No one has been more traumatized by the inflammatory language references events than the Chair, on this day especially.

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr. BRADFORD. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I apologize.

So look, there are good things in this bill, and there are compromises that have been reached that we need to move forward on, and an election on a High Jewish Holiday is problematic for many of us, because it is not just the people that need to vote; it is also those that need to administer the election, because there are communities of our Jewish friends and neighbors – and whether it is Squirrel Hill or Merion or communities like Kingston – that we need to make sure that we are not disrespectful of their religion. We have sent one bill over to accomplish that. We have sent this bill to set the parameters for what a discussion about Election Code will look like. No matter what side you come down, understand about how we wound up here. Be honest about how amendments got into this bill and did not get into this bill, and recognize the difficult work ahead to put faith back in our elections. We can do that, but we need to be honest with ourselves. A little bit of honesty would go a long way in this building.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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—26

Bradford	Gallagher	Mullins	Rozzi
Briggs	Galloway	Munroe	Steele
Burns	Haddock	Neilson	Sturla
Cerrato	Kosierowski	Pashinski	Takac
Ciresi	Malagari	Pielli	Venkata
Davis	Markosek	Pisciottano	Webster
Friel	McAndrew		

NAYS—177

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

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—0

Less than the majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the negative and the bill fell.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair is in receipt of some good information. The gentleman from the 35th District is celebrating his birthday today at work. Happy birthday, Representative Gergely.

**THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
(MANUEL GUZMAN, JR.) PRESIDING**

RECONSIDERATION MOTION FILED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members, the House will come to order.

The Chair is in receipt of a motion. Pursuant to rule 26, we, the undersigned, move that SB 224, PN 1160, was defeated on October 5 be reconsidered. Signed by Leader Bradford and Chairman Harris.

For the information of the members, there will be no further votes today.

Some housekeeping matters here.

BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The majority leader moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

HB 327;
HB 636;
HB 1658;
HB 662; and
SB 851.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All right now. Now we are moving on towards rule 17 speeches.

Sorry about that. Members, strike that. Rule 17 speeches have been withdrawn.

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All right, members.

The Chair is in receipt of a motion by the gentleman, Representative Malagari, that the House now adjourn until Monday, October 16, 2023, at 12 m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

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

Motion was agreed to, and at 11:30 a.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.