

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
Legislative Journal

FRIDAY, JULY 8, 2022

SESSION OF 2022 206TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 34

SENATE

FRIDAY, July 8, 2022

The Senate met at 9 a.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Senator Jacob D. Corman III) in the Chair.

PRAYER

The following prayer was offered by Hon. MEGAN MARTIN, Secretary of the Senate:

Good morning. Let us pray.

Today, I offer a prayer of thanksgiving to the Lord, for He is good and has bestowed rich blessings upon all of us. It is not always easy, when we are in the midst of busy Session days, to count our blessings. So, let us reflect today upon the goodness of the Lord, and all the blessings for which we are truly thankful. Lord, thank You for this new day. A day of hope and possibility. Help us to put our trust in You and to keep the faith as we work together this Session day. Thank You, Lord, for the privilege of serving in this Senate. Public service is a calling, and we all have been called to serve. We are blessed to serve the people of Pennsylvania each and every day. Thank You, Lord, for our loving families who support us so that we can be here, especially now during these long budget Session days. Thank You, Lord, for giving us strength when we are weary, hope when we are discouraged, and peace when we are distressed. Thank You for Your divine intercession in our lives, which results in these blessings and so many more. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by those assembled.)

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I request legislative leaves for Senator Gordner, Senator Stefano, Senator Gebhard, Senator Brooks, Senator Regan, Senator Yaw, and Senator DiSanto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Costa.

Senator COSTA. Mr. President, as of right now, no leaves.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Kim Ward requests legislative leaves for Senator Gordner, Senator Stefano, Senator Gebhard, Senator Brooks, Senator Regan, Senator Yaw, and Senator DiSanto. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

WEEKLY RECESS

Senator K. WARD offered the following resolution, which was read as follows:

In the Senate, July 8, 2022

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

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

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

On the question,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I request a legislative leave for Senator Martin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Kim Ward requests a legislative leave for Senator Martin. Without objection the leave will be granted.

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate adopt the resolution?

The yeas and nays were required by Senator K. WARD and were as follows, viz:

YEA-50

Argall	Dillon	Laughlin	Schwank
Aument	DiSanto	Martin	Stefano
Baker	Dush	Mastriano	Street
Bartolotta	Flynn	Mensch	Tartaglione
Boscola	Fontana	Muth	Tomlinson
Brewster	Gebhard	Phillips-Hill	Vogel
Brooks	Gordner	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Browne	Haywood	Regan	Ward, Kim
Cappelletti	Hughes	Robinson	Williams, Anthony H.
Collett	Hutchinson	Santarsiero	Williams, Lindsey

Comitta	Kane	Saval	Yaw
Corman	Kearney	Scavello	Yudichak
Costa	Langerholc		

NAY-0

A majority of the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate present the same to the House of Representatives for concurrence.

CALENDAR

**BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN HOUSE
AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED**

**SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE
AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED**

SB 106 (Pr. No. 1857) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

On the question,

Will the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House, as further amended by the Senate, to Senate Bill No. 106?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 106, as further amended by the Senate.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Berks, Senator Schwank.

Senator SCHWANK. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to this legislation, particularly the inclusion of a constitutional amendment that would lay the groundwork for a total ban on abortion in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Legislators, Republicans in this building have for years, if not decades, worked steadily to diminish the rights of women in Pennsylvania. The Supreme Court's decision last month has only emboldened the Majority. Make no mistake, this is the beginning of the end of women having the right to make decisions about their own bodies in this Commonwealth. Let me be clear about this, Mr. President, I understand that people stand on all spectrums of this issue, but one thing people do understand is that their right to determine what happens to their body, to make healthcare decisions for themselves--and sexual reproductive healthcare is healthcare--they do not want anybody else messing around in it. This matters to them. This is such a personal decision. We are making a huge mistake here by thinking that people, particularly women, are just going to lie down and let this happen to them. I do not think so. I

have heard many times from our colleagues on the other side that this is no big deal and that we have nothing to worry about. But let us face it, if this was no big deal you would not have been going to all the trouble of passing this out of committee in the middle of the night, the dead of the night, quite frankly, in terms of a legislative Session. That sends a clear signal that this is something that we need to be concerned about, and that you know that this is not what people expect from their government. There is an endgame in sight, and no amount of reassurances will stop us from pointing that out. This one proposed amendment is more than troubling, but so is the continued trend of governing by constitutional amendment.

The Pennsylvania Constitution is not your to-do list. It is not the place you run to just because you want to circumvent a veto. And let me tell you about an obstacle that you may not have thought of that is in your way in regard to what will happen to this. None of us were around when it happened, but in 1971, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, this legislature, passed an ERA, an Equal Rights Amendment. It was not done on the Federal level, but we did it in Pennsylvania. And for those of you who carry around a copy of the Constitution in your suit pocket, if you look at it, it is Article 28. This is what it says: "Prohibition against denial or abridgement of equality of rights because of sex. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania because of the sex of the individual." This is about the right to self-determination. This amendment to our Constitution is one that has stood the test of time since 1971, and a lot of us are counting on that to continue to do that as you attempt to pass this particular amendment. And before someone gets up and says this is about letting the voters decide, then tell me why this would not be put up, if it has to be put up, in the 2024 General Election, the presidential election. Put it up when we know voter participation is highest. If you are not willing to do that, I do not want to hear about letting voters decide, because that is not the true aim here. We all know that the earliest this could be voted would be the primary of May 2023, and that is what it is queued up for, just like the constitutional amendment on the Governor's emergency powers, with the hopes that low voter turnout will allow this unpopular measure to slip through. With this amendment, a line has been drawn. To the women and men who are shocked and dismayed and outraged that something like this could happen here in the Commonwealth, let me tell you something: forget the outrage. Turn that into action. An election is coming, and let us first talk about the process for this.

So, today this will be voted here in the Senate, it will go over to the House. Sometime right before the General Election this fall, you will see a notice of this. If you read a newspaper, you will see a notice of this, and you will know that this will be coming in another election. It has to be voted on in another election. So, that would be in the next Session, which will start in January of 2023. So, it is a long time. It is enough time for people to forget about it, right, and for their outrage and their shock to kind of go away. But you do have an opportunity to do something, and I will tell you what it is for those of you who are listening to this and want to know, because I have heard from women and men: tell me what I can do to stop this from happening. Understand that on the ballot in this General Election coming in November of 2022, the governorship will be up for election, the full House of Representatives will be up for election, half of this body will be up for

election. Remember, remember, it is not so long, it is just a couple of months. Remember--

POINT OF ORDER

Senator K. WARD. Point of order, Mr. President. We are bringing elections into--

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. Please suspend. What is your point of order?

Senator K. WARD. We are talking about political elections while we are trying to work on a bill. This is not the proper place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I would just ask the gentlewoman, as always, to keep your comments to the content of the legislation as best you can.

You may proceed.

Senator SCHWANK. Understood. May I respond, please. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentlewoman has the floor.

Senator SCHWANK. Mr. President, I understand what the point is, but we are talking about a constitutional amendment, which is part of a political process. I think I have made my point, and I will continue to make my point off the floor, so, understood. Thank you. However, it is important for people to understand that they are not helpless. You are not alone. You are not helpless in terms of determining what happens next and the direction of the leaders in this Commonwealth. Again, turn that outrage into action. You absolutely need to be talking to other people and making sure that you understand what is on the line, not only for you, but for others.

Mr. President, I am a woman who fought this original issue back in the 70s; that is the generation I am from. And like many other women who are from that generation as well, we thought we were done with this. We thought that we had resolved this. So, particularly to those individuals, the men and women who stood up for the right to self-determination in terms of your healthcare, the battle is here again. Stop bemoaning it and get ready to fight. This is what we will have to do in order to preserve our rights as a people, as a free people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I want to end, Mr. President, by making one thing very clear: abortion is still safe and legal in Pennsylvania despite the efforts of some in this legislature, and it will continue to be if we take the action that we need to do, no matter what the vote is here today.

Thank you, Mr. President.

POINT OF ORDER

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Point of order.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in reference to the last comment with regard to elections. Not on the issue. Not on the substantive issue clearly, but on the issue of discussing elections. Democrats and Republicans historically discussed elections in a nonpartisan way. That is what was commented on this side of the aisle. If we are not to discuss anything related to elections, then we are going to establish a new precedent, and if that is to be done--

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not rule the gentlewoman out of order.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. No, I understand that. But this is for the record. For those who are listening, and for those of us who are here.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is your point of order?

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. My point of order is simply this: as we continue this conversation today, if one indeed does bring up the right to vote and the power of an election, the process, as long as they do not bring it up in a partisan way, I think it is appropriate to have that part of the conversation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Montgomery, Senator Cappelletti.

Senator CAPPELLETTI. Mr. President, normally I would come up here with prepared remarks. I have a pretty great team, but I think you all know my background. I came from Planned Parenthood, so this is an issue that is really personal to me and something that I am very passionate about. Two weeks ago, the Supreme Court stripped me of a right that I grew up knowing that I had--35 years--autonomy over my body. To be able to make decisions about what happens to me if somebody forces themselves upon me, if contraception fails, or if I am not ready to start a family, or even if I do not want a family, which I think you guys know is not the case. And now they said, no, no, it goes to the States. So, here we are at the State level. And I was so proud to be sworn into this Chamber, so proud; and every day since I have been sworn in, you all have disappointed me, because we continue to fail our constituents. We know that we are doing things behind their backs. There is no reason that we did what we did last night at 10, 11 o'clock at night, when our constituents were asleep, and they were not paying attention. No, there was no reason for that other than to get this hidden. Hidden and done and out of the way and hoping that maybe nobody will pick up on it. But we will not let that happen, no, because when I look at what we have amended into Senate Bill No. 106--and it is not just about abortion, there are many other awful things, and there are some good things, which is the frustrating part about all of this. There are good things that are part of this, but we have to put the good and the bad all into one bill? We cannot say, look, we did something bipartisanly. No, we are going to push something that looks terrible, with all kinds of pieces to take away all kinds of rights. But when I look at that piece about abortion access and what that means, and it says that our Constitution guarantees no other abortion right.

You all were here when I cried on the floor of the Senate talking about Pregnancy and Infant Loss Awareness Month, because I had gone through two miscarriages in 4 months. That last piece of what we put in there--do you know what that signals to me? That the medication that I was given by my doctor to make sure that my body released everything about that miscarriage, and I could go on to have a family later, may not be guaranteed to me. The procedure, a D&C--which I know there are people in this building, in this Chamber even, who have had those to help ensure that their body was clear of a pregnancy that was not viable and that they could go on to start a family--that is not guaranteed. That is healthcare, because when you do not do those things, a pregnant person, a woman, me, I could die because that is rotting tissue inside of me that I cannot do anything to get out if you say I have no right, there is no guaranteed right to those medications and those procedures. No, what this amendment would do is a

guaranteed death sentence for many people. It paves the way for that. But I am not that concerned about myself. I am also not that concerned about the people in this Chamber, because I have the resources, everybody in this room, all of the Members here, you all have the resources, whether it is for yourself, your daughter, your wife, your granddaughter, to send them to a State that has guaranteed the right to abortion care to make sure that they have access to it if they need or want it. You have those resources. How many of our constituents do not have those resources? You are signing away their lives because of an ideology that belongs to one faith, and I say that for a reason.

I happen to represent a fairly large constituency of Jewish people. Now, I am not Jewish, and I am not going to stand here and pretend to speak for everybody of that faith, for Judaism, but I have had quite a few conversations with constituents and Rabbis. Rabbi Stacy, she was wonderful and took the time to explain to me, in detail, her faith in the Talmud, which is an ancient document that has provided laws and guiding light for Judaism for centuries. And in that, it explicitly states that the life of the mother comes first. So, what we are doing right now is anti-Semitic. We are saying to the Jewish people of our communities, of the Commonwealth, that we do not guarantee their right to practice their religion because their religion guarantees them the right to abortion care at a time when they are already facing an incredible uptick in attacks. And I am willing to give everyone the benefit of the doubt that you did not know that about Judaism because I will tell you, before representing this community, I did not know that about Judaism. But now that we know that denying the right to abortion care is anti-Semitic and against our Constitution, our First Amendment--Federally, we have it here at the State level as well. What do we do with that? If we can stand here and make decisions that reflect that we support their right to practice their religion, then we do truly believe in freedom of religion, and we are not forcing Christianity upon anybody. Voting any other way is a dangerous precedent.

I would like to finally end with echoing the sentiments of my colleague from Berks County and co-chair of the women's health caucus about the importance of people understanding the process of the constitutional amendment and what happens, and that we all have a voice in this. I know everything feels overwhelming, sad, scary. I started wanting to cry when I stood up, and now I feel the anger again. I feel the sheer anger and the weight of all of this. Do not let go of that anger because there are things you can do, and we will continue to make sure you know what you can and should be doing to stop something like this if my colleagues do continue to push this awful, awful amendment forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Chester, Senator Comitta.

Senator COMMITTA. Mr. President, like my colleague from Berks County, I too am a baby boomer. We fought for not only women's reproductive rights, we fought for civil rights, we fought for LGBTQ rights. And we are still fighting, and we will always fight. My colleague from Montgomery County, who just spoke, who is a young person, probably never thought she would be re-fighting these battles. We are alongside, walking alongside, and fighting alongside each of the women, and the men, and every individual in Pennsylvania who stands up for the rights of each person, every person, unborn, born, female, male, all genders. I

was thinking this morning about this vote today, and I thought, wow, this is the United States of America, and we just stood up and did the Pledge of Allegiance. We have liberty and justice for all, unless you are a pregnant woman, and you cannot afford to go to another State. Your State has banned abortions. How about the Preamble to the Constitution? "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men [they said, of course, we all added in women and all people] are created equal." It is deeply disturbing and troubling to think that these fundamental truths of our country are being questioned in this very Chamber and also across our country. We are elected to represent the people and to uphold the Pennsylvania Constitution, the U.S. Constitution, and so on.

My concern, as expressed by my colleague from Montgomery County, among many other things, is not only are we eroding fundamental rights--and we have heard, you know, I forget who it was who said, if one right is taken away, you better watch out and see which of the rights that you enjoy will be taken away next. We have heard this discussed at length. But something that I think is important to remember is that abortion bans are dangerous for all women, not only women who are pregnant and would seek abortion care, but some of the very same procedures that are outlawed through abortion bans, as we have heard from my colleagues, are not exclusively used for elective abortions. Did you know that they include safe procedures for those who suffer miscarriages, safe treatment of those who experience ectopic pregnancies, safe and legal fertility treatment, safe and accessible postpartum and birthing care, and safe and effective methods of contraception? We also heard most of the people in this Chamber, if they needed to go to a State that provided abortion, which, as my colleague also reminded everyone, let us remember abortion remains safe and legal in Pennsylvania--and, of course, we are going to do everything that we possibly can to keep it that way--but should Pennsylvania pass a constitutional amendment to ban abortion, we know there is already a socioeconomic gap in access to reproductive healthcare and abortion. It is another case of the haves and have-nots. If you have, you have choices. If you have not, you are stuck.

This ruling will put reproductive healthcare, including abortion, out of reach for those in unrepresented and marginalized communities. Speaking of representing the people, let us not forget public opinion is on the side of reproductive healthcare and abortions. As of April 2022, more than 8 out of 10 registered Pennsylvania voters think abortion should be legal. Either in all circumstances or under certain conditions, 8 out of 10, that is not a small majority; that is a huge majority. And recent polling shows that 75 percent of Americans believe that decisions about abortion should be left to a woman and her doctor, not to lawmakers. Abortion is healthcare. We need more healthcare, not less. We need more access and coverage options, not less. So, to the 8 of 10 Pennsylvanians who we represent, I want to thank you for standing up, not only for women's reproductive rights, but for the rights of every Pennsylvanian and every American. And I want to say I stand alongside of you, my colleagues who have spoken, and we will fight, and we will protect your rights and all rights. As the League of Women Voters says--nonpartisan organization--your vote is your voice. So let us speak out, speak loudly, and let us make sure that we protect reproductive rights for women, which will also be protecting the rights of every Pennsylvanian.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Senator Pittman.

Senator PITTMAN. Mr. President, 57 times this General Assembly has posed the question to the voters as to whether or not they want to amend the Constitution of this Commonwealth, and in this legislation today, we have constitutional questions. Constitutional questions that will be ultimately answered by the voters. So, here we are at 9:55 in the morning, in the bright sunshine, with sunlight coming through these windows, debating these very significant constitutional questions. One constitutional question, in particular, has gained much focus so far in this debate, and I will talk about that one, but I think it is important to talk about another constitutional question within this legislation, and that is whether or not those who choose to participate in the electoral process should be considered to demonstrate that they are who they say they are. There is a constitutional question to be presented to the voters, if this is passed in the next legislative Session, to determine whether or not we should have voter identification in this Commonwealth. Now, we have heard much over the last several years about the concerns of the integrity of the electoral process. We moved to address some of that yesterday, and we moved to address it here further today. You know, Mr. President, the need for identification in our society is quite ubiquitous. We need it to get on an airplane, we need it to purchase alcohol, we need it to purchase cigarettes, we need it for many sporting venues, and in many times, we need to show identification to purchase a firearm. And I will point out that our Constitution currently indicates that our right to keep and bear arms shall not be questioned, and whether or not the requirement to present identification is questioning that right--that, perhaps, is a conversation for another day--but I bring that up as a fundamental point, Mr. President, that identification and the need to provide identification is one of the most common things that we must do in our society today.

And so, if we view the need to identify oneself in the most fundamental part of our electoral process, electing those who lead this Constitutional Republic, then maybe we should not have voter identification for anything. Maybe identification in and of itself should be prohibited for anything we do. Why should there be a barrier for anyone to do anything as a requirement to have identification? But again, Mr. President, I point out that, ultimately, this is a question similar to what we have posed 57 other times that will be brought before the voters.

Now, Mr. President, we have talked significantly about the issue of abortion, and the reality is, *Roe v. Wade* is in the history books. And whether we like that or not, the United States Supreme Court has made it very clear that the issue of abortion and how that policy, that very significant issue, is managed here in our Commonwealth, now, is here in the General Assembly, and that is the reality. So, Mr. President, I cannot think of a more proper approach than to pose the question to the voters as to how we should continue with such a significant policy. Mr. President, we all come here with very personal situations that formulate our sincerely held beliefs, and regardless of whatever corner of this Chamber we stand in, I do not think that any of us here have any doubt in what we hold as sincerely held beliefs. And a lot of those sincerely held beliefs are built on personal circumstances, and I will tell you that my belief in the need to protect the unborn and

to provide a voice to the voiceless is based on my personal experience, my difficult experiences that my wife and I shared together.

You know, nine years ago, Mr. President, my wife and I had the difficult experience of delivering a stillborn son at 20 weeks, and I counted his 10 fingers, and I counted his 10 toes, and I saw every facial feature of a human being. And in that difficult moment, the doctor came in, and as he consoled us about the loss of our child, he informed us that we had to give him a name, we had to get a birth certificate, we had to get a death certificate, and we had to choose a method of proper burial. And so, for me, Mr. President, my sincerely held belief is that I will stand and be a voice for the voiceless. I will stand to protect what I believe is unborn life, because that is what I believe. And I was brought here by the constituents who I represent to not only represent their voice, but to also hold my sincerely held beliefs in my heart and to do what I believe is best for this Commonwealth. But that is my personal point of view, and if this constitutional amendment comes before the voters, I will exercise my right to vote just as every other eligible voter in this Commonwealth will do the same. And at that point, the will of the voters will be heard, and we as a General Assembly will have direction on how best to pursue and manage this most significant issue here in our Commonwealth. For those reasons, I will be voting to advance all of these constitutional amendments in the hopes that they do reach the hands of the voters, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Allegheny, Senator Lindsey Williams.

Senator L. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, last week I spoke during Ps and Rs about my favorite movie, *Dirty Dancing*, and I talked about how that story was centered around a botched abortion and that I was angry and scared that we were on the edge of that cliff here in Pennsylvania, where we are going back to that time of *Dirty Dancing*, going back to women dying in back-alley abortions. And late last night, we took a large step in that direction, towards making that horrifying future a reality by banning abortions that are a result of rape or incest, banning abortions that are medically necessary to save the life of a mother, and banning abortions because a woman does not want to be pregnant. Women should have the right to their own bodies, full stop. Full stop. If you do not want to have an abortion, do not have one, but do not take away my right or the right of other women in this Commonwealth to make that decision for herself. I would like to read something written by one of my constituents, who talks about that very personal decision way more eloquently than I ever could. "I don't have a 'good' abortion story. And that's OK," by Jessica Semler (*Reading:*)

I turned 35 on the day before the U.S. Supreme Court [overruled] *Roe v. Wade*. My belated birthday gift was waking up on the morning of the ruling to bitter waves of sadness, hopelessness, and anger. Although reproductive freedom activists, [like] myself, have known for years that this was coming, the decision still felt like a stab in the heart. Until that point, the right to have an abortion had been the law of the land for nearly 50 years. But, as a former employee of Planned Parenthood, I was perpetually reminded for years that the lifesaving care patients came to receive was continuously under threat of being taken away. Liberal politicians treat abortion rights like a fundraising tool. Conservatives treat abortion rights as a wedge issue when one in four people will have or have had an abortion.

And I am one of them.

Within an hour of the news dropping, local activists organized a rally in Downtown Pittsburgh, and I was asked to speak. I grabbed my laptop and headed to my favorite coffee shop to start writing. The barista and I made eye contact when I walked in, and we both immediately started crying. She walked around the counter, and we shared a giant hug. I couldn't open my mouth without crying and didn't know what to say even if I could speak. I [started] staring at my laptop for about an hour with only one sentence nailed down: I am so angry.

Within just three years of the 1973 *Roe* decision, conservative lawmakers, including U.S. Representative Henry Hyde, did everything they could to create barriers for folks trying to access abortion; the Hyde Amendment, for example, barred Medicaid dollars from covering abortion. These and other TRAP laws (Targeted Regulations of Abortion Providers) implemented unnecessary waiting periods, admitting privileges, and building requirements in the name of "safety," even though abortion is a medical procedure that is 40 times safer than a colonoscopy.

Did the Supreme Court just take us back 50 years?

I decided to use my speech to share my abortion story because smashing the stigma around the common procedure is crucial in this fight. The thing is: I don't have a "good" abortion story. I was not raped. It was not even medically necessary for my health. I simply found myself pregnant and didn't want to be. I used to share this story in great detail, outlining the circumstances of how I got there, what my life looked like...the physical and emotional feelings I had when I was pregnant, and so much more. In hindsight, I wasn't going into this detail only to make folks empathize; I was trying to justify the decision to myself, too.

Nowadays, I hold sacred that sharing my story is brief and to the point, with no added moral qualifiers or tugging on heartstrings, hoping the listener can find some empathy for me. At the rally, I kept it simple and told people I had an abortion, and it was OK if they had one too: full stop.

At Planned Parenthood, I witnessed a barrage of attacks as we worked through cumbersome regulations to ensure we didn't lose our government funding to provide crucial healthcare, battled waves of anti-choice bills, and fought President Trump's dangerous executive orders during his tenure. On top of that, nearly every day, walking into work meant wading through a group of protesters who made comments that ranged from patronizing to threatening. But the fact is: all types of folks have abortions: women, trans people, nonbinary folks, Christians, Muslims, atheists, parents, young people, older people, teachers, clergy members, spouses, and single people. And there are as many reasons as there are people who choose abortion.

You are the expert on your life and experiences. You deserve respect and understanding. Hiding something so personal and intimate, even from the folks with whom you are closest, gives that secret so much more power than it deserves. I've heard from numerous folks in the last couple of days who are having conversations about abortion with people who are typically unplugged politically but are very disturbed by the overturn of *Roe*. If you feel you're in a safe situation to do so, share your story. Sometimes, people surprise you, and you may surprise them.

A few months after my abortion, I cried in the breakroom at work. I was in the process of a text break-up with a good friend because of the way they shamed me when I told them about my abortion. A coworker of mine came in and asked why I was crying. Feeling vulnerable, I let her know. She nodded and very matter-of-factly said, "You know, I had an abortion in my early twenties. And if I hadn't, I wouldn't have my two kids now." She walked out of the room, not realizing what a tremendous gift she'd given me.

Storytelling helps others feel less alone and creates so much space for others to own their story. Keep an eye out for folks who care, have empathy, and affirm the autonomy and agency of all people to make their own healthcare decisions. You might not only find an ally and supporter you didn't know about, but you may also spark belonging and acceptance for someone else.

Be someone your friends and loved ones can confide in. Everyone loves someone who's had an abortion.

Once again, that is from Jessica Semler, a constituent, a reproductive freedom activist, an Etna Borough councilwoman, and one of my staff members, and I am so lucky to have her and so proud of her for sharing her very personal story and allowing me to share it with you all today. So, with that, I will just urge my colleagues to be a "no" vote on this bill. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Senator Mastriano.

Senator MASTRIANO. Mr. President, we are taking up several key issues here today with the constitutional amendments being discussed. There are several in the package. I am going to focus in on one in particular, the aspect that requires a voter ID, which is interesting that this is still a debate when the majority of folks on both sides of the aisle, when they are polled, support voter ID. If you think about this, for those of us who served in the Balkans, whether it was in Bosnia or Kosovo, Afghanistan or Iraq, during the wars there or the peacekeeping missions, some of the responsibilities and duties of our soldiers were to monitor elections to ensure they were free and fair and that each person willing to vote had an equal say. Obviously, the international community went to great pains and great lengths with observers and IDs and how to ensure people only vote one time, and to oversee these elections. These elections in former Yugoslavia and in Iraq and Afghanistan, under international eyes--largely the United States, but other coalition allied members--went off really well. Security was provided and means were taken to ensure one person, one vote. These societies that, at one time, had tribal ruling, like in Afghanistan or in Iraq, where they had a dictator who got 90 percent of the vote in his elections. So, it was key to ensure, for the stability of these countries and for the satisfaction of the people, that they knew they had an equal share if they voted with everyone else who voted.

So, it is interesting that this remains a controversial issue. We are told that it is, you know, targeting segments of society and is undermining our elections, when all it does is actually strengthen our election. If you think about what today, in Pennsylvania, you need to show an ID for--I think this will clear any of the ad hoc or ad hominem arguments against this. For instance, to buy alcohol, you have to show an ID. To buy cigarettes, you need an ID. That is not racist. To open a bank account, you have to show an ID. To apply for food stamps, you need an ID. To apply for welfare, you need an ID. To apply for Medicaid, you need an ID. To apply for Social Security, you need an ID. To apply for unemployment, you have to have an ID. To rent a car, you need an ID. To board an airplane, you need an ID--to get through the security control point, as well. To get married, you need an ID. To purchase a weapon, of course you need an ID. Even to adopt a pet, which we did from the shelter, two cats, and we had to show IDs and all kinds of information to ensure that the cats were going to be treated properly. To get a hotel room, you always have to show an ID. To get a fishing license, you have to show an ID. To buy a cellphone, absolutely, ID. Picking up your prescriptions? You have to have an ID, and even some over-the-counter medicines like cough medicines and others, you have to show an ID. Even buying spray for your computer, you have to show an ID.

So, one of the most important things we do in this Constitutional Republic, of course, is we get to select and prefer our

leaders, or representatives. So, how do we ensure that the leaders are selected fairly? I mean, there are many things that can be done, but the basic, rudimentary aspect we can approach is simply requiring people, when they vote, to show an ID. Being in the military most of my adult life, I still, when I go to the polling station, have my ID cracked out, just like in the Army where we show ID, and they are like, oh, sir, we do not need that, just sign right here. It makes me very uneasy that we do not have that level of security. It is a basic level of security. It is not asking for much. It is just asking, is that you? Yes, that is you; that is your ID. Please go forward and vote. It is really important in our Constitutional Republic that people have faith and trust in our election system and that they have an equal share in the vote.

So, let us hand it to the people to decide. Let us put it on the ballot. There is nothing controversial about that. Let the people have the last word. If we are wrong on this here, the vote will be "no," and we will stick with the system that we have now that I do not necessarily like, but the people get to choose. And if the people agree with what I just said here, showing an ID is so germane and common in our society, if they think it is a logical, reasonable level of security to simply show your driver's license or other ID--and there are many options available, it is pretty loose actually--but you will get a chance to vote and just simply show who you are. Let the people decide, and if they agree with us, they will vote in support of it. And I believe our elections will be better as a result. So, I ask for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Montgomery, Senator Collett.

Senator COLLETT. Mr. President, I did not expect this body to be here on Friday, July 8, more than a week after the budget deadline, and I certainly did not expect our attention to be diverted from the urgency of finalizing a budget that adequately provides for the people of Pennsylvania with the ill-timed and extreme Senate Bill No. 106, an already troubling bill aimed at restricting voting rights that was amended late last night to include an even more troubling abortion ban. Whatever explanations have been given for this frenzied rush of activity over the past 12 hours, they cannot explain away the facts.

One, Senate Bill No. 106 aims to accomplish through constitutional amendment what has failed to pass through the legislative process. Two, Senate Bill No. 106 was amended at the last minute to include a proposed abortion ban, and, yes, when you say nothing in this Constitution grants or secures, it is a ban. Three, the majority of Pennsylvanians support abortion rights in at least some circumstances. Four, contrary to the notion that constitutional amendments are the most democratic means of assessing the will of the people, the reality--particularly in Pennsylvania--is that voter participation in the constitutional amendment process is much lower than voter participation in presidential, gubernatorial, even State legislative elective decisions. Five, low turnout can largely be explained by the fact that the constitutional amendment process, by design or not, routinely places such questions on the ballot during primary elections, often in off years. Statistics consistently show that Independent and third-party voters, young voters, and voters of color are far less likely to participate in primary elections.

The constitutional amendment process at both the State and Federal level has historically been sacred and reserved for topics

of such importance to our lives as racial equality and the largely unrestricted right for adults in our nation to vote. It is meant to be difficult. It is meant to be an exception and not the rule. It is meant as a complement to our three-pronged system of government and not a tool to circumvent it. The three-pronged system is critical to the idea of checks and balances, particularly in a State like ours with such a wide array of people and viewpoints. What we are witnessing in this General Assembly and in States across the nation is the notion that when the people no longer agree with your policies, you can change the process or you can limit the voice of the people, rather than let go of your unpopular policies. It is antithetical to the very idea of representative government. My colleagues have argued that this is how we allow voters to have their voices heard, but voters have made their voices heard by electing a governor and placing a veto pen in that governor's hand. Legislating by constitutional amendment necessarily undermines the will of the people in our Commonwealth. I urge a "no" vote on Senate Bill No. 106 today, and I urge my fellow Pennsylvanians to elect leaders who will respect the legislative process and will not seek to undermine it with late-night, last-ditch efforts to subvert your will.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jefferson, Senator Dush.

Senator DUSH. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senate Bill No. 106, and I want to speak on one of those provisions. Specifically, the provision to ensure that the effort that is ongoing right now before our Supreme Court to create a right that has not been on the books does not subvert the legislative process here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We have seen it done in *Roe v. Wade* on the Federal level. And Justice Alito, in his opinion, actually did an excellent job of explaining how the court in *Roe* legislated from the bench. He described how they created trimesters as an example of at what stage. That type of stuff is legislative in nature. That is not something that is done through the courts to create law.

So, the effort right now before the Pennsylvania Supreme Court is an effort in response to what we suspected was going to finally come about with the correction to *Roe*. That right was never enumerated by the people in a democratic process. It was never enumerated in the Federal Constitution. It is not enumerated in the State Constitution, and in contrast to previous speakers who have said this is an effort to subvert the legislative process, it is an effort to ensure that the legislative process is not subverted again by a court system. The legislative process is where these decisions need to be made, and there is no prohibition against abortion in this amendment. Again, in contrast to previous speakers, it is not there, just like the right to an abortion is not there within the--let me correct myself--the right to kill babies in the womb is not there--

POINT OF ORDER

Senator COSTA. Point of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend. Please state your point of order.

Senator COSTA. I think the nature and the description that was described by the gentleman as it relates to women's

reproductive health choices is inappropriate in the way he constructed that phrase. I ask them to be stricken from the record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be at ease.
(The Senate was at ease.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I would just, as we proceed--and it has been a very healthy debate so far and will continue to be so. It is obviously a very emotional debate, and it will bring out emotions in all of us, and I would ask all Members to continue, as we move forward, to show respect for not only every other Member and their views in this Chamber, but also the institution in which we serve. The gentleman may proceed.

Senator DUSH. Mr. President, I realize that my comments might have been perceived as inflammatory, but equally inflammatory, on my perspective, is the repeated use of terms like "women's healthcare" when we are talking about the fetus, which is the Greek word for child. Equally inflammatory are some of the other comments which totally exclude the child that we are discussing and that child's rights. We need to keep this in the body in which all of these types of issues were intended to be discussed, and the amendment which the gentlewoman from Blair County has offered is definitely a means of ensuring that the will of the people and the decision as to whether or not something is a right remains with the people through the constitutional process. The decision whether or not we legislate different perspectives is something that belongs in the legislative process, not the judicial. I thank the President for his understanding. I thank the gentlewoman from Blair County, as well as the others who have offered these amendments that are part of Senate Bill No. 106, and I encourage a "yes" vote.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Philadelphia, Senator Tartaglione.

Senator TARTAGLIONE. Mr. President, colleagues, look at me. Look at me. It is no secret that I have had my fair share of conversations with doctors and my care team about what is best for me regarding my health and my life. These conversations were often passionate and sometimes, most times, hard. But do you know what absolutely would not have made them any easier? Interference. Interference by government into my personal medical decisions. Look, right now we are debating whether or not a woman, under the guidance of a physician, is allowed to decide on what is best for themselves. Mr. President, I do not get it. No other medical procedure has so much misinformation and volatility around it. You want to get a vasectomy? Go for it. Do you have kidney failure and want to have a kidney replacement? Go for it. Are you or the fetus you are carrying potentially going to die due to a high-risk pregnancy? Absolutely not.

Why are we standing here debating whether we should mandate a woman to give birth to a child that cannot or will not survive outside of the womb? Why are we saying you must birth this child in just a day, or maybe a week, or a month? Now, you can say I have to remove that child from life support so it maybe can compassionately pass. That is not pro-life, that is pro-birth and nothing else. We need to stop with the myth that stopping safe abortions in Pennsylvania and across the nation is pro-life. It is not pro-life. Being pro-life is supporting the child after it is born; preventing mass shootings in schools; ensuring no child goes to bed hungry; providing healthcare for all women and children; making sure the foster system is not overrun with children

begging for homes. Those are pro-life policies. Ending abortion is not pro-life, it is anti-choice, and I ask for a negative vote, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Montgomery, Senator Muth.

Senator MUTH. Mr. President, it feels a little bit like déjà vu. We were just here a few short hours ago discussing this same legislation, and in my short time last night to rest and reflect on what occurred on this floor, what came to mind was one thing: freedom. What occurred in this Chamber last night was a direct attack on women's freedom. This occurred in the middle, late hours of the night when a ban on abortion rights was passed out of the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations on a party-line vote. Everyone's freedom, no matter who you are, depends on access to healthcare. Health is a life and death issue for every single one of us. Everyone's freedom depends on having direct access to high-quality healthcare for whatever their needs may be. You cannot be free if you do not have access to healthcare for a medical condition, a serious injury, an accident. Without medical treatment, your freedom is impossible. The cure for anyone suffering from a health condition is guaranteed access to healthcare. As Americans and as Pennsylvanians we are supposed to care about each other. This is the basis of our democracy. Patriotism--we hear that word a lot--it requires healthcare for everybody, because if you are a patriot and you care about everyone's freedom, that means everyone has access to healthcare. And let us talk about healthcare. What is that? Healthcare is you and your doctor deciding how to manage health decisions: the best way to manage your care, your health, and well-being. That includes reproductive healthcare. Abortion is a part of reproductive healthcare. Whether or not you like it, whether or not you think it is appropriate, whether or not it follows your religious, whatever, it is healthcare, it is a--

POINT OF ORDER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman suspend?

Why does the gentleman rise?

Senator DUSH. Mr. President, the point of order that was raised on myself--

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are you raising a point of order?

Senator DUSH. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. State your point of order.

Senator DUSH. The point of order is the same that was raised against me when it came to objectionable and offensive use of the terms, like, for this case, would be this is healthcare for someone when it comes to the termination of a child. If it is going to be raised, the offensive language, as a point of offensive language against my speech, I would equally raise that this speech that is being given now is just as offensive.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be at ease.

(The Senate was at ease.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Jefferson, Senator Dush.

Senator DUSH. Mr. President, I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman, the gentlewoman may continue.

Senator MUTH. Mr. President, thank you, I believe I was talking about abortion being a medical procedure, a form of healthcare, so I will go back to that. This, what is being voted on right now, is a combination of a multitude of things. And Senate Bill No. 106, as amended last evening, added in that the Constitution, and I am quoting, "does not grant the right to taxpayer-funded abortion or any other right relating to abortion." This is a direct attack on women's freedom. Women cannot be free if they cannot make decisions about their own bodies. I am sure the men in the room would not be real thrilled if we had the reverse: mandating vasectomies at age 18, telling you what to do with your reproductive health. Imagine how that would go over. I am sure there would be plenty of points of order. Women cannot be free if they have to live in economic struggle because of access to healthcare. Women cannot be free if they are denied the healthcare they need to survive and live. That is a fact. When women are denied healthcare, any access to healthcare, including reproductive healthcare, they are stripped of their freedom to make decisions about their own bodies, and they have been denied their liberty. Last time I checked everybody in Pennsylvania, we are all free people. But right now, what is about to pass out of this Chamber makes women second-class citizens. Saying that we are not responsible enough, we do not have the right, to make decisions about our own body. I do not know if I said it loud enough last night, but the women of Pennsylvania, including myself, do not need anyone in this room to help with their healthcare decisions. One thing they do not need is this legislative body helping them with that. Certainly, there are other things they could be helped with, but I am sure I will be called out of order for talking about something outside of the bill. We know that our democracy is built on the ethics of citizens taking care of each other. Government is supposed to empower all citizens equally. It is the purpose of government to protect and empower the people that it serves. You cannot protect or empower women when you are literally taking away the freedom to make decisions about their own body.

I do not know if the whole collective population of Pennsylvania understands this constitutional amendment process fully, but when we talk about letting the people decide, this was something I learned real early, because part of this Senate Bill No. 106 is about making the lieutenant governor a no-longer-elected position. I was the single "no" vote, in both Chambers, two Sessions, and I remember another legislator, here longer than I have been, saying to me, Senator Muth, do you not get constitutional amendments? We pass them so that the people can decide. I remember thinking, but you are allowing them to make one less vote for someone who is going to represent them in government: they are the second in command of the governor. Why would we not want people to vote for that position? And so, I did not change my mind, I stood my ground, and here we are. You are going to let the people decide, but the people do not get to decide on both parties' constitutional amendments. Last night, there were multiple constitutional amendments that our Caucus tried to put forth, all voted to be tabled. So, if you really want the people to decide, that means our people, the people we all represent. There may only be 21 of us, but that is a lot of Pennsylvanians. Their voices do not get to be heard; they do not get to decide on issues that matter to them. We come here and talk about those things, fight for those things. So, when you jam in voter ID, and now you are

going to take away women's freedom, and we are going to have no campaign finance reform and have someone who is running for governor pick the lieutenant governor, this is a disgrace to democracy, plain and simple. And I hope that the voters, should this pass out of the other Chamber and next Session, that they realize that, and they realize that democracy's sacred mission is to protect and empower everyone equally; this entire bill does none of that. Not at all. So, when we talk about freedom on this floor, I want everyone to remember that means women's freedom. That means freedom to vote without outside influence. That is it. We deserve a free and fair democracy, and every one of us took an oath to do that and uphold the Constitution and represent our constituents. So, we can disagree on things, but please do not stand and say that this is for the people to decide when only one side's legislation ever makes it to the ballot. So, I encourage a "no" vote, and I encourage future participation that is actually bipartisan so that the people really do get to decide.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Schuylkill, Senator Argall.

Senator ARGALL. Mr. President, this bill addresses five separate, five separate constitutional issues which will each be decided by the voters. They will vote "yes" or "no" on each of these five: the office of lieutenant governor; should voters be required to present some shape of identification; election audits; regulatory reform to limit the governor's powers to act unilaterally without the support of the House and the Senate and the people we represent; and yes, finally, as we have heard so much about today, allowing the voters to decide on whether or not the taxpayers should be required to pay for abortions.

The bill, as has been noted, began quite simply with an effort to fix the dysfunctional relationship between the governor and the lieutenant governor. My daughter's soccer team, the coach and the assistant coach worked together. We have seen, too often in this building, governors and lieutenant governors who did not even talk to each other, let alone work together, and this is an effort to fix that problem. Some of us have seen a lot of governors come and go in this building. Some of us date back to what we saw with the efforts by Governor Thornburgh; and then Governor Casey; and then Governor Ridge and Governor Schweiker; and Governor Rendell, the original "let's make a deal"; and Governor Corbett. Past governors, Republicans and Democrats, have worked with this General Assembly, frequently coming to the negotiating table again and again to find bipartisan solutions to the problems facing Pennsylvania. Why are we here today? We are here today because that has not been the case with this governor, who has now issued 58 vetoes, more than any governor since the 1970s, including many bills that were passed by this House and Senate with significant bipartisan support. He has vetoed improved educational opportunities for Pennsylvania students. He has vetoed many, many different bills to limit his unilateral shut-downs on employers and employees. He has vetoed bills to modernize our Election Code, and he has killed bills that would have overturned his regulations so that we could save people money on their energy bills. Why are we here today? We are here because this governor has refused to work with the House and the Senate, so we have no choice but to proceed via the constitutional amendment process and give the voters of Pennsylvania the final say.

Look around this room, look at all these beautiful Violet Oakley paintings. Perhaps some of you have been in similar buildings in Ottawa or London, or elsewhere on the planet. Notice today that there are no kings or princes or earls or dukes. That is not the Pennsylvania way. We did not want a king in the 1770s, and I do not believe we want one today. When this governor refuses to work with us, our only remaining option is to bypass him via the constitutional amendment and take it to the people of Pennsylvania. They will have the final say on each of these separate issues, not some governor who seems to have forgotten his college classes from many years ago on checks and balances.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator COSTA. Mr. President--

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For what reason does the gentleman rise?

Senator COSTA. In response to the comments that were made by the previous speaker.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do you wish to be recognized to speak? I mean--

Senator COSTA. Yes, I do--

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This will be your first time--

Senator COSTA. At this moment in time. I apologize for disrupting the order of speakers, but I just--

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Costa.

Senator COSTA. Mr. President, the previous speaker got up and spoke about the frustration that he experiences with respect to the checks and balances system we have here in Pennsylvania. And I just find it tremendously ironic that as they are standing in this room saying: we need to do an end run around the Governor; we found a way to do that, and we are going to legislate by constitutional amendment; we are going to delegate our authority to make changes in the law in our Constitution. Matters that should not even be part of the Constitution that we are putting into the Constitution through this amendment process today and others that we have done. But in terms of the frustration, if you are so concerned about the people of Pennsylvania voting on matters that are important to them, allow our amendments to be offered, and vote on our amendments as well. As the previous speaker spoke, our amendments were all tabled last evening. The number of bills that Democrats get passed in this legislature--it is like 400-4. Let us be clear, it is one-sided, and you all do what you want to do when you want to do it. We understand that, but if you are going to be sincere about your beliefs about the people of Pennsylvania making a decision about how we operate and what policies we advance, allow both parties the same opportunity. You all deny that opportunity to us, and I cannot help but remember last evening.

Today, we had speakers on this floor who talked about voter integrity--we have to do voter ID for the integrity. One of the gubernatorial candidates--we have to do this; we have to fight to be able to protect voter integrity. Other folks spoke about it. Last night, you had the opportunity to address an issue that has been around for decades about voting integrity: the influence of campaign dollars into our elections. Last night we had that opportunity, and you all did not vote for it. You voted to table it, to not give the people of Pennsylvania the right to address that issue as it related to the public's faith in our ability to do elections or our ability to do other things. That, to me, is the height of hypocrisy.

That is my view. That is how I feel. That is what I find so offensive; that we are going to stand up and say that we think people in Pennsylvania should make decisions, but only about the things that are important to us, not about the things that are important to you Democrats. I find that offensive. I apologize for interrupting the flow of the conversation on the bill, but we will return to the normal order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Northampton, Senator Boscola.

Senator BOSCOLA. Mr. President, before I speak on the bill, I wanted to take the opportunity to highlight the missed opportunity that was presented last night on the constitutional amendment that was offered by my colleague to eliminate property taxes as part of this. This is the second time that amendment to bring forward to the voters to decide the elimination of property taxes was tabled in this Chamber. I offer it every single time we talk about constitutional amendments. If we are going to legislate by constitutional amendment, property taxes should be part of that initiative for voters to decide because it is the number one issue. I do not know about every district, but in my district, it is the one issue people really do want to weigh in on. But, no, Senate Bill No. 106 asks about the lieutenant governor, voter ID, abortion. We missed the mark by not bringing that question of property taxes to the voters, but it is what I have come to expect these days. We do things that, you know, most people do not really care about. They really do care about their property taxes, though, and we can really help them if we really wanted to. So, we are avoiding the question in this Chamber, once again, to help homeowners and seniors who continue to struggle with onerous property taxes because this Chamber refuses to act.

However, Mr. President, I do differ from my colleagues in some respects in that I do have a clear record of supporting the right for people to weigh in on ballot initiatives. This is a democracy, and I am a firm believer in ballot initiatives, but my support for this should not be mistaken for support of the questions, but more of a desire to empower people because we just cannot do things right in this Chamber anymore. I want to have this fight going to the ballot. Pennsylvania's law on abortion is pretty balanced, and I believe the overwhelming majority of Pennsylvanians would agree with me. I know people will try to game the system and place this on the spring primary ballot in an attempt to manipulate the outcome. I have seen it before. But, Mr. President, voters are smarter than that. I have come to realize that they can become educated on issues, and when we place these issues on the ballot, some will fail, and some will be enacted. But on this one, on the abortion issue, Mr. President, I am ready for this fight. I will be there, as well will voters. We will exercise our right to vote and demonstrate once and for all that a woman's right to choose is a fundamental right here in Pennsylvania. I am ready to put an end to this debate and vote it down. I am a "yes" on this bill because I am tired of the demagoguing in this place, of the based political gamesmanship our democracy is evolving into. Let the voters reject this, let them deliver a message once and for all. A woman's right to choose deserves protection.

Thank you, Mr. President.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Regan and Senator Martin have returned, and their legislative leaves are cancelled.

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from York, Senator Regan.

Senator REGAN. Mr. President, we have heard today so many activities for which you need photo identification. In my career as a criminal investigator, in every case where one tried to conceal or withhold their identity, a nefarious or criminal act was trying to be hidden. I do not understand that in today's world, where an ID is used for daily activities, that there are those who oppose voter ID. Showing ID is not a controversial topic for any of the activities we have heard about today, including to exercise fundamental constitutional rights. This amendment is the first step in protecting our voting system; to preserving the right to vote; to make sure our elections are fair. Mr. President, that is all we are asking for. There is no justification not to do this. Everyone who wants to exercise their right to vote will have access to an ID so that no one is disenfranchised. This is about making sure that every legal vote counts. In this nation, we hold sacred the principle of one person, one vote. Voter ID allows us to ensure that every citizen is afforded equal protection under the law. Now, we have heard a number of acts that require photo identification to prove that you are who you say you are: to buy certain goods, travel, buy medication, donate blood, to adopt a pet. As a matter of fact, I adopted a cat one time from a shelter, and they came around and talked to my neighbors to see if I was okay. Adopting a cat that was deaf, by the way. One of my personal favorites is: I have a small municipality in my district where, in order to deposit your grass clippings or your broken tree branches, you need to show photo ID. Why are some so afraid to authenticate themselves at the polling place? Is it possible they are not who they say they are? Are they wanted by the law? We have a responsibility to ensure faith, trust, integrity, in all aspects of government, most importantly in how those who govern are chosen. We need voter ID to ensure that trust is not eroded. Thank you, Mr. President. I urge a "yes" vote from all my colleagues. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Bucks, Senator Santarsiero.

Senator SANTARSIERO. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this question. Mr. President, it has long been an ideological difference or debate among scholars of our Constitution, conservatives and liberals on either side, as to the proper role of our courts. And we have heard that debate echoed in the comments here in the Senate today--and we have heard it in recent months with increasing frequency--the debate about whether courts should be legislating. It is, in my view, largely a misunderstanding, willful or otherwise; I will not hazard to offer an opinion about the nature of our constitutional system here in the United States. In fact, one of the earlier speakers on the other side of the aisle made the comment which, I think, explains the problem. He was talking about enumerated powers. Well, the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of every State in this country does have enumerated powers, but they also have implied powers, and, in fact, the genius of the drafters of those

constitutions was to set up the system exactly that way so that not every right that we enjoy as citizens has to be specifically enumerated in our constitutions. And why is that genius? Because if that were our model, it is pretty obvious that we would never be able to think of every instance, every possible right that a human being in our society should have. And when you think about the long scope of history and also of the future, it is pretty clear that you see very quickly that there are things today, here in the year 2022, we cannot possibly foresee 50, 100, or 200 years from now, just like the framers of the United States Constitution back in 1787 could not have foreseen about today. And the framers of the constitutional amendments, including the first eight in the Bill of Rights, and of course the 14th Amendment, could not have foreseen about today. And likewise, that the framers of the 1968 Constitution of Pennsylvania could not have foreseen about today. That is why these constitutions are not historical artifacts; they are living, breathing documents, and that is why courts, including the United States Supreme Court, have, over the decades and centuries, interpreted those implied powers in reaction to the questions of the day.

Now, we are debating a proposed amendment to the Pennsylvania Constitution, but this debate does not happen in a vacuum. This debate is a consequence of a United States Supreme Court decision handed down just a couple of weeks ago in the *Dobbs* case. And in that case--perhaps not surprisingly, but breathtakingly amazing when you think about the history of our country and of the world--the United States Supreme Court's majority talk about history, and they make the comment that the parties arguing against the Mississippi statute at issue in the case were arguing that history is irrelevant, and I do not believe that was the case. But what they were arguing is that history has to be taken in context. The U.S. Supreme Court majority goes on to say that there was no right to abortion historically in the United States. In fact, abortion was criminalized, therefore abortion cannot be a fundamental right implied in any part of the U.S. Constitution. There were a lot of things that were criminalized in the history of the United States, which I think all of us on both sides of the aisle would not and should not serve as a prohibition to those rights today, most particularly the right for everyone, every adult in this country to be able to vote. So, the fact that abortion may have, sometime in the history of the United States, been criminalized cannot be the reason why we conclude that there is no fundamental right to an abortion under the United States Constitution or the Pennsylvania Constitution. (*Reading:*)

No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny [to] any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Section 1 of the 14th Amendment. That clause, particularly the Privileges and Immunities Clause, in fact, confers upon people privacy rights, whether it is a right to use contraception, whether it is a right to marry whoever you love, or whether it is a right to have an abortion. Now, the fact that the current majority on the U.S. Supreme Court has gotten that wrong--and they did, and I believe one day their decision will be overturned, and I hope that happens sooner rather than later--should not cause us now to add injury to the insult. And that is exactly what this proposed

amendment does, because this proposed amendment sets up, as the gentlewoman from Berks County said at the beginning of our debate today, a new constitutional order in Pennsylvania that will enable this General Assembly to outlaw abortion. That is what it will do. So, let us not pretend otherwise.

Now, I understand that this is an issue that elicits very heartfelt feelings, and I understand that there are people with very strong beliefs, religious beliefs, relating to this issue. But we should not forget that the Constitution of the United States, and indeed the Pennsylvania Constitution, also addresses how we balance those religious beliefs. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Neither shall the States. What you may believe from a religious standpoint does not give you the right to abridge someone else's right, and Congress and the States do not have the right to enshrine that religious belief into law. But that, I believe, is exactly what is happening here. There is a fundamental privacy right that every American enjoys. The State Constitution goes even further under Article I, Section 28: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania because of the sex of the individual." That Equal Rights Amendment, which unfortunately has not been adopted at the Federal level to date, has been adopted here in Pennsylvania. So let us be clear. What this proposal before us today would do, were it ever ratified, would be to, in part, repeal Article I, Section 28, and do away with one of those consequential rights; that right to privacy that affords the women of this Commonwealth the right to an abortion. We are here in 2022; it is almost inconceivable to me that we are having this debate, but we are. We are because, as I said, of a flawed--no, not flawed--erroneous decision of the United States Supreme Court just a few weeks ago. We are here now because there is an attempt to undo these rights here in Pennsylvania as a consequence of that decision.

Mr. President, we should be standing up for the rights of all Pennsylvanians. We are at a point in our history, having witnessed so many instances in our history where rights were attempted to be taken away, that we should not be engaged in yet another effort to do that, and that is exactly what this proposed amendment does. There is a fundamental right to reproductive freedom under the United States Constitution and under the Pennsylvania Constitution as it currently exists. And I believe if this amendment were actually passed by the General Assembly in this Session and the next and were to go on to the ballot and be approved, which I have faith in the people of Pennsylvania that it would not be, but if it were, that we would then be in violation of the United States Constitution, and there would be a United States Supreme Court one day that would so rule. But I do not want to wait until that day, nor should any woman in this Commonwealth be forced to wait until that day. We should have the ability to stand up and understand that this right should be protected; that we have no right to legislate our personal beliefs, as personal, indeed, as they may be to some. But that we need to represent all people in this State and safeguard the rights of all people in this State.

And for that reason, Mr. President, this measure should be voted down resoundingly, and we should focus instead on protecting the rights of all Pennsylvanians, on enshrining in our Constitution and continuing to enshrine in our Constitution the rights of every person in this State to life, liberty, and happiness, to privacy, to be able to enjoy those rights unfettered by the

government restricting them. I believe the people of Pennsylvania will demand no less. I think their voices are going to be heard loud and clear, as they already have begun to be, from every corner of Pennsylvania. And if this General Assembly takes this step today, there will be a reaction. I urge a "no" vote.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from York, Senator Phillips-Hill.

Senator PHILLIPS-HILL. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senate Bill No. 106. This legislation, it is very simple. It is a mechanism to give the decision-making power back to the people of this Commonwealth on a host of issues that are very important. Now, I have been part of several debates on the issue of life during my tenure, first in the House of Representatives and now here in the State Senate. In every one of those debates, legislators have referenced what we think the people of this Commonwealth want when it comes to abortion. And what I think is: it is time that we actually hear from the people of Pennsylvania, our constituents, on what they want on this issue. Mr. President, I need to address one misconception that has been said many times this morning. This constitutional amendment is not about taking away the right to have an abortion in Pennsylvania. In fact, this legislation maintains the status quo. Abortion laws in the Commonwealth, should this pass today, will remain completely unchanged. Neither the Supreme Court of the United States, nor the vote we cast today changes anything about Pennsylvania's current abortion laws. I will say it again. The vote we are making today is a vote to give the power back to the people of this Commonwealth. In fact, let me quote exactly what is said about abortion within this bill, and I quote, "This Constitution does not grant the right to taxpayer-funded abortion or any other right relating to abortion." This is the only sentence in the entire bill that references abortion at all. And what the sentence does is prevent a court from forcing taxpayers to pay for elective abortions and maintains the status quo. That it is up to the people, not the courts, to decide what this State should do on the issue of abortion, and that we will allow the duly-elected Representatives and Senators of the people to determine whether or not to use taxpayer dollars to fund elective abortions, not the judiciary, not our State Supreme Court, to regulate abortion.

What is missing from the conversation today, I believe, is the other side of the story. So, when the Supreme Court gave the issue of abortion back to the States, they also gave the potential to obtain an abortion right up until the time of birth, 40 weeks. A full-term, fully formed baby could be aborted because the law could be written to allow that. Time and time again, here in Pennsylvania, we have heard and continue to hear from our constituents that they feel there must be some protections to prevent that from happening. What happened in Virginia, what happened in New York, abortion on demand up until the point of birth. So, today we are listening to those constituents. Today, by casting an affirmative vote, we are giving the people of Pennsylvania the opportunity to weigh in on this very important process. I have said these words before, I will say them again, that the beauty of the Constitution is that it does not belong to the governor; it does not belong to the legislature; it does not belong to the Supreme Court; it belongs to the people. And today, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to please join me in casting an affirmative vote for Senate Bill No.

106 and empowering the people of Pennsylvania to speak on their Constitution.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Street.

Senator STREET. Mr. President, I rise on this occasion because, once again in history, we as a legislature are looking to alter the rights of so many. I move to reflect on the comments of a previous speaker who asked us to look at the images on the walls of this great Chamber. He asked us to look at the images and, you know, it is interesting, but they say truth is in the eye of the beholder. And some of us look at these images and they see only the greatness of our country. But others of us look at these images and they serve as a daily reminder of how far we have come, and where, in fact, we could be going. When I look at the image that was referred to in Philadelphia it says May of 1787--that was referred to by a previous speaker--I look at it and I see only older white men and a brother, a Black guy, who was clearly a servant, because at the time that our Constitution was adopted, women's rights were not enshrined in the Constitution, and nor were the rights of people of color. And yes, I know some are saying he is about to get far afield. So let me make sure that this is germane. It is germane because the bill before us enshrines constitutional amendments that would both strip away rights of people of color--we have all heard the discussions that voter ID laws disproportionately impact people of color, people who were not, when the Constitution was adopted in this great Commonwealth, the Constitution of the United States, allowed to vote--and simultaneously strip away the rights and protections of women who were also not granted rights at the time of the adoption of this Constitution. And it is striking that folks could ask us to reflect upon those images and not notice that the images excluded us. But it is telling, because sometimes folks can benignly misunderstand when what we are doing, in fact, impacts us. There is a concept familiar to many that Founding Fathers talked about, and we have talked about Founding Fathers so much. Founding Fathers were concerned about the tyranny of the majority. The tyranny of the majority is a term used to refer to instances in which those who have the right to make decisions make those decisions in such a way as to limit and restrict the rights of others. In fact, we are on the precipice of moving down that path once again.

We wish to subject the rights of some to be limited by others. We wish to allow a legislative body that is primarily made up of men to make decisions that could, in fact, limit the rights of women over their own bodily autonomy. And we even question whether healthcare is healthcare; fortunately, we got a good ruling on that. We wish to put restrictions on the ability of people to vote, and the question was asked, and I will answer and will stand for interrogation if somebody wants to interrogate me about why somebody will be concerned about something as simple as just being asked to show a piece of ID. There were laws called the Black Codes--and later on that were rereferred to as Jim Crow laws--that were designed to get around the fact that the voting rights amendments required all States to allow Black folks, people of color, to vote. And what they attempted to do was to take things that would sound benign, would sound like there was nothing wrong with them, and create opportunity for people running elections to disenfranchise voters of color. That is the concern that many of us have. That when a person who is standing at a polling

place, a person who is standing at a county board of elections, has an opportunity to exercise a measure of discretion as to whether somebody will be able to vote, that that discretion will be exercised in a way to disenfranchise people of color. And why are we concerned about that? Because that is what has happened historically, and that is what is happening today across this country.

I went to college at Morehouse College in Atlanta, and in Georgia there were laws passed to say that you could not even give bottles of water out to people who were standing in line to vote, and those laws were enforced only in Atlanta and in the places where you had large populations of Black folks getting ready to vote. There is concern about disproportionate impact and that is the nexus between why are we concerned about voter ID laws? A voter ID law was proposed in House Bill No. 1300 that would have said that my Senate ID was not sufficient criteria for ID. So, when we have a blanket statement about the need for ID, as we have already seen the House Chamber passed a voter ID law that was so restrictive that many things that we would routinely use for ID would not qualify. That is why we have concerns. And we could go on about this for a long time because there are certainly lots and lots of examples, but I want to point out a few things.

Women in this country have been concerned about being disenfranchised since its very inception. In fact, on March 31, 1776, in a letter to her husband, Founding Father John Adams, the future First Lady, Abigail Adams, makes the plea to him and the constitutional congress to "remember the ladies," she quoted. (*Reading:*)

...[to] be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors. Do not put such unlimited power into [the hands] of the husbands. Remember all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies [she said] we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by [any] laws [in] which we have no voice or representation.

At its very inception, the women of this country understood that they were being left out, even a woman who is married to a man who would go on to be our President. She understood that those laws left her out. People of color have often understood what it is like for people to be left out. And so, when you look at May 15, 1869, just a couple of years after slavery was ended, when Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton founded the Women's Suffrage Association among those folks--I am sorry--in 1848, when the first convention for women's suffrage was moved forward and Elizabeth Cady Stanton convened it along with Lucretia Mott, Frederick Douglass attended and was 1 of 32 men to do so, because he understood that those who would deny the rights of others would deny them to themselves. And even in those times, the rights of people of color were being limited by the same folks who wish to limit the rights of women. Today we follow, unfortunately, in that same tradition, by embedding in one bill practices and principles which would have the effect to make women across this Commonwealth, as well as people of color, feel a little less free, a little less respected, and a little less cared about and protected in the place that we call the birthplace of democracy. We should not, we must not do that.

So, I call upon you, colleagues, regardless of your party, but understanding who is in the Majority, I call upon you to vote against this proposal, this bill. I call for you to stand on the side

of freedom because the right--when we wrote in the Constitution that all men--and yes, we imply, we read into it today, women--are created equal and are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, those words were aspirational, meaning that we as a society believed that we should be moving towards them and always forward and never back. In the birthplace of American democracy, we should not, we must not move backwards. So, I ask that this Chamber vote against it and should this ever be put before the people of the Commonwealth, if you are watching out there, I ask that you vote down these unconscionable measures.

Mr. President, I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from [Philadelphia,] Senator Haywood.

Senator HAYWOOD. Mr. President, I rise to review a few of the concerns I have with respect to the legislation. I am going to go in order, first with respect to voter ID, and then second with respect to the restrictions on abortion rights. So, all those who are permitted to vote in Pennsylvania already get voter identification qualifications. That is, to register to vote, Pennsylvanians have to show some level of identification. So, the voter identification is accomplished through the voter registration system. Second, much that has been written to describe how the voter ID rules result in voter suppression. There is one report that indicates that for older Americans, 65 and above, 18 percent do not have an ID. That may be because they may not drive, may not have a passport that would be for international travel, may not be still in the workforce and have a job ID. Sixteen percent of Latinos are reported not to have IDs; 25 percent of African Americans--and I am speaking about those who are voting age in all these categories--may not have IDs; and 15 percent of those who make under \$35,000 a year may not have IDs. Although most of us in this Chamber, I am certain, are likely to have a driver's license, many folks do not drive and have driver's licenses. Many of our colleagues and neighbors do not travel internationally and do not have a passport, and there are many who do not have a job identification. It is because there is a disproportionate number of elderly, Latino, African Americans, and those earning under \$35,000 a year who do not have the identifications that this is considered voter suppression, since those individuals without IDs would not then be in a position to vote.

I would also like to share, Mr. President, that the concerns about election security are important. Of course, more individuals are voting by mail, and as a result, fewer people are voting in person. So, this voter ID concern about election protection is probably at least 5 to 10 years too late if, in fact, that is a concern given the level of mail-in ballots. But I also share, Mr. President, that the chief concern about election integrity can be resolved as we have respect for election results. And the more Members of our Chambers who respect election results, when you win or lose, the more likely there will be the public recognition that our elections, as determined by city and State officials, are fair, without fraud, and that the election results must stand.

Mr. President, I would like to now turn to the abortion restrictions. What we have before us, for those who need Medicaid assistance to cover abortions, is a proposal that, in fact, will require birth for those who cannot afford an abortion. This legislation is compulsory birth legislation. The State mandating that birth must happen. This is worse than communism; worse than Stalin; worse than Mao. Compulsory birth is now what is being

proposed in Pennsylvania. There are some questions about whether this was a medical procedure, and I did want to refer to the Medical Society of Pennsylvania as opposing this legislation. It is full of physicians. I also wanted to highlight the American College of OBGYNs. They oppose the legislation. These are all medical professionals taking a medical position, a healthcare position.

Finally, Mr. President, I do want to echo the statements of my good friend, Senator Boscola. This is our cause, and this cause will be executed in the elections that are forthcoming. This is our cause, and I want to thank all those who brought this cause to the attention of the Commonwealth so the individuals will see that it is just not about who is the governor, or that it involves who is in the General Assembly. This has been a tremendous motivating cause, our cause, and the vetoes of the Governor that we seek to get around are really not the core challenge of the power of the governor. The problem in this Chamber has been that the Members required to override a veto have not been present. To get the number of Members in this Chamber to override the veto has not been accomplished. That is a standard procedure that we have in our Constitution that allows for overrides of vetoes. And, really, Mr. President, it is the failure to reach bipartisan support that causes this end around.

Thank you, Mr. President, for allowing these comments. I urge a "no" vote, and I rally all those for this cause.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Saval.

Senator SAVAL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to this cynical maneuver, which will have the breathtaking effect of stripping rights that we once had, of introducing barriers where there were once freedoms such as the freedom to vote, of denying medical options where there was once the possibility of care. This tyrannical exercise of circumventing the legislature is familiar from authoritarian States and will go against the vast will of this Commonwealth, and its fashioners will meet their comeuppance. The right to abortion is one that is increasingly widely held around the world. It is upheld in Western Europe, it is upheld in my ancestral country of India, it is upheld in our neighbor to the north in Canada, and it was recently decriminalized in Mexico. This effort is an attempt to criminalize this practice, and it will isolate our State and our country from the world. It is not the only way that our country and State are isolated. It is no coincidence that this legislature, seeking to strip the right to abortion, has also failed to deliver other rights to ease the burdens of families and women; the right to paid leave, the right to childcare. To deliver those rights would be to be on the side of life. This is a clarifying moment for many. It is a clarifying moment for me. Which side are you on? Are you on the side of repression, control, and ensuring women and those who bear children are a permanent second class in this country, or are you on the side of ensuring the right to bodily autonomy for women, for those who bear children, for families, for individuals, for all Pennsylvanians? I know which side I am on. There are dozens of us in this Chamber, and we represent millions. We will come back in November as millions.

Mr. President, I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Blair, Senator Judy Ward.

Senator J. WARD. Mr. President, there has been a lot said on the floor today about this amendment and abortion policy in

Pennsylvania. Let me be very clear and set the record straight: this amendment changes nothing. It does not change the law, and it does not affect any abortion law or regulation currently on the books. It simply maintains a status quo. This piece of legislation does not say that you cannot have a D&C or deal with an ectopic pregnancy; nothing will ban that. You can still have fertility procedures; nothing would ban that. You can still have an abortion to save the life of a mother; nothing would prohibit that. In fact, a woman can still have an abortion up to 6 months of the baby's gestation, when the baby has a heartbeat, sucks his thumb, and breathes on its own. Let me be clear about another thing: a majority of people in Pennsylvania do not support taxpayer funding of elective abortions, and polls demonstrate that. Without this amendment, the courts would be able to go against the will of the people and not only allow for the funding, but find it as a constitutional right. This is wrong, and this is not how democracy works. The people of Pennsylvania should have a say in issues they feel strongly about. It is the legislature that is tasked with making the law, not the judicial branch. The people's elected representatives should be the ones who decide what are the legal parameters on these abortion issues. This constitutional amendment allows the people of Pennsylvania, through their elected officials, not a judicial body, to decide what abortion laws are best for them. You can actually be pro-choice and still support this amendment because the only issue is whether it is the courts or the legislature that makes the laws. And I submit that the balancing of interests that occurs through the legislative process is better than keeping the people's representatives out of the process. I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this legislation to ensure that the people of Pennsylvania have a say in this important issue.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, for the benefit of those who are watching and listening, there are a few facts and details that I would like to enhance or illuminate for the benefit of the public's understanding. It was mentioned that the use of the constitutional process of changing our Constitution of Pennsylvania has occurred only 57 times, which would suggest that this is a rare, respected, and infrequently used mechanism because we have a fully funded General Assembly. I want the public to understand something--57 times. In the last 2 years, the Republican-controlled legislature has used this process 41 times. Forty-one times in less than 2 years, a Republican-controlled General Assembly is standing upon a rarely used mechanism and suggesting that it is infrequently used--41 times. It is called a wolf in sheep's clothing. A body that, by the way, is scheduled to meet nine times. A fully funded General Assembly will meet nine times on these issues that could be resolved legislatively and cast a vote. And the Members of this body are suggesting that, you know, we are simply allowing for the public to weigh in. Then why do we not just do this: allow for the public, as in some other States, to have us meet once every 3 years, cut the General Assembly, require us to meet a certain number of days, and then allow the public to do that work? Because if we are going to consistently make decisions like this in a process of hide and seek, or, frankly, just simply hide, then I would suggest that that is what deserves to be on the ballot. Should we, as a General Assembly, survive in our

current construct, because it seems to me that we are hiding a lot. Forty-one times for a process that has been used 57 times in our existence would suggest to me that we do not desire to make decisions here; we would rather hide. We would rather bait and switch and pretend like we are doing something of substance on behalf of the public when, truthfully speaking, we would rather get paid a lot of money, expense all of our items, and run home and say to the public, look what we did. That is a cruel joke.

Voter identification--it would seem logical that we should have safeguards of identification. Who would not agree with that? Unless you sort of forgot that we actually did that in order to be registered to vote. I do not know about you; I do not know where you all registered to vote, but I know what I had to provide in order to get registered to vote. I had to declare who I was and verify who I was, and, by the way, when I went to go vote, I had to verify that. Then, after that, when that was questioned, it was certified and verified. I do not know where the hell you all are. In Pennsylvania, you sign up to register to vote, you identify yourself with appropriate identification, then when you vote, you further verify who you are. And if that is questioned, you then verify that. Stop, come on, stop. I am way too old to understand what this is. Voter identification is not voter identification. And, yes, you will run out the polls where it says African Americans believe that you should have voter identification, because they do. That does not mean they also did not remember that they actually had done it. Voter identification has turned into voter suppression; that is what this is. Finding all means and mechanisms by which to say: you know what, we think you should have the right to vote, but you do not look like the right person to vote so, therefore, we will make sure your identification lines up with you not getting to vote. In every State that has done it, that is where it has worked. Certain people do not get to vote. That sounds like a poll tax to me. Oh, you all do not know what a poll tax is? Remind you, in the South, where certain Americans decided that you were not American enough, they introduced something called a poll tax, and you were not allowed to vote because you did not qualify by paying bills or a variety of other mechanisms. I know there is--look, we are generations past this. So, most of us who get up every day, who suggest that we are good people and think we truly are good people, do not remember the history of this country is still what it is. So, when you talk about voter identification, I am for it. We have already done it, and by the way, we have run several elections that verify it. There are a few people here who do not believe that it has been a fair election. By the way, the birthplace of that claim comes from a former elected President of the United States who has not only lost his position, but has now disgraced his position because he not only runs around talking about how the election was stolen from him, but now we are proving that he has tried to steal the election himself.

So, voter identification comes from a largely one single individual who has a beef with most of America who said we do not like you, we do not want you, and we do not want you to represent us. So, like any baby or child would do, he stomps his feet, runs off, and says: you know what, it is not right, it is not fair, and I am rich so, therefore, I am going to claim it is not right and not fair. For those who will say: well, Tony, you know, I am a veteran, and we have done this in other countries, and we have been through systems where we actually use voter identification. Well, while I respect my friend's service, I want to remind all of us and

him: we are not a third world country. We are the leader and elite of the world. We were born into democracy, and our Constitution has evolved to allow more and more Americans to participate in that constitutional right to vote. That is why we have the best process of anywhere in America. When you go to vote, you do not get intimidated because we have written laws to make sure that does not happen. And, yes, we identify who the heck you are before that occurs. That dog simply does not hunt, and it never will.

And to my friends who are debating this issue regarding abortion, let me be very clear. To the colleagues on this side of the aisle who are women, I can tell you in no more profound words that I am grateful that I am an ally and a friend to fight for women of color, who are not represented in this General Assembly, but fight for them as they are fighting for you. Their words are more articulate than mine, and I will let them stand for what it means. But I want to say this for the record, for everyone who keeps saying that, you know, this vote does not change anything--and I will tell you, I will admit publicly, I overheard this from one of my female colleagues--that is mental gymnastics. That is a great line. You are right, it does not change anything today, but like all of us know, when you go out to warm up the car, you are not there warming it up in subfreezing weather because you are not planning to drive it. Then to slip and talk about the fact that, you know what, taxpayer polls do not support taxpayer-funded abortion means that you are going to start the car, and we know where the hell you are headed: to my district where single moms depend upon taxpayer-funded abortions to make sure that their physical health and their families are constructed in the way that is economically feasible and emotionally supported and respects their individual rights to their body.

So, let us not play the game of, this does not change anything. No, it sets the stage for everything, and you should stand by that. You should stand by it, introduce a bill, and then vote on it, and then go back to your district and say I voted for this; I voted for the right to take away one's individual liberty to express themselves through the vote and suppress it. You should go back to your district and say, you know what, I am opposed to the individual woman's liberty and right to decide her health. You should vote upon that in a bill here, not hide behind the mental gymnastics of what you are proposing would not hurt any individuals in Pennsylvania. As it was said by my friends, it hurts a whole heck of a lot of Pennsylvanians in Democratic and Republican areas of Pennsylvania.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Hughes.

Senator HUGHES. Mr. President, I am flooded with a lot of ideas, issues, points I would like to make on the matter in front of us right now, but, as I am reminded by the Reverend, we should always make sure that we reduce--sometimes when we have these conversations, we need to reduce the conversation to its irreducible self. Women should have the right to control what happens with their body, full stop. Women should have the right to control what happens with their own body, full stop. Now, I am obligated to speak to the voter ID issue that was so eloquently stated by some of my colleagues previously; that we already have voter ID in Pennsylvania. You have to identify yourself appropriately to get a voter registration card. Then, when you go to vote, you must identify yourself there if requested. You have to provide

it. It is there; it is obligated; it is in the law. So, that is already there. We know why the whole notion of changing the Constitution around voter ID is in place. It is an effort to provide constitutional suppression. But, let me not get too far away from the most important and the most salient point in this conversation, why we are here right now: women should have the right to control what happens with their own body. I come to this conversation about women having the right to control what happens with their own bodies with a significant history attached to it. I served with Governor Robert Casey. He and I took our oaths of office in the same month in January 1987. But, before I get too far afield, women should have the right to control what happens with their own body. I am going to come back to Robert Casey. What is happening with this issue right here is very simple. The Majority in the General Assembly--House and the Senate--cannot pass a ban on abortion in the legislature and cannot get it all the way home because the current sitting Governor, Tom Wolf, has said he will veto anything that gets to his desk, and, prayerfully, the next governor will do the same.

So, instead of going through the process that has been written into the State Constitution about how we conduct our business, the Majority, frustrated by that reality, is usurping that process in the Constitution that they want to amend and try to amend the State Constitution. But, before I go too far afield, Mr. President, I am reminding myself and those who are paying attention to the most salient point about this: women should have the right to control what happens with their own body. I will go back to Bob Casey, Governor Casey, I served with him. Mr. President, you may have had, probably as a youngster, some interactions with the former Governor. He was right about most everything that he did. He was wrong about this issue. He was wrong about this issue, about women having the right to control what happens with their own body. He was an excellent governor on everything else, but he was wrong on this issue. But even in his wrongness, even in his wrongness, he never attempted to change the State Constitution to achieve his end. That was never part of his agenda, and I served with him throughout both of his terms as Governor. For some of you who do not know Governor Bob Casey, he was referred to in the *Dobbs* decision. He had a history--a rock-solid history, wrong history--on this issue, but he never attempted to change the State Constitution to achieve his end. But, let me not get far afield. I am reminded in this conversation, in the 35 years that I have served in the House and the Senate in this building, that women should have the right to control what happens with their own body. Men have the right to control what happens with our own body. Women should have that right as well, and this attempt to amend the State Constitution is an attempt to deny women the opportunity, the right to control what happens with their own body.

Now, let us go to the process of how we got to this conversation right here. Twelve hours ago, 12 hours ago, this amendment was brought up in the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations in the dark of night, 11:30 last night. This amendment was brought up in the Senate Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations to change the Constitution. Hardly, no public notice on a matter of such significance; no public hearings, no bringing in individuals who are experts on the issue on either side, no public dialogue. I mean, we are talking about changing rights here, and in the idea of changing rights, you would think there would

be some outreach to experts and to individuals who are well-researched and well-documented on either side of the conversation. You would think that that would be the case but, no, in the dark of night, without any lead-up to the moment--and lead up to the moment, for those who may be paying attention, is usually when we have issues of such significance, we have lots of conversation. We try to bring in the experts in the field; we try to learn from people so we can make the best decision. But that did not happen at 11:30 at night when no one knew it was coming, or at least the public certainly did not have any idea. The Democratic Senators had no idea. We were not notified until the very last moment. But, before I go any further, let me remind myself that women should have the right to control what happens with their own body. Men have that control. Women should have that control as well. My good friend, the Democratic Leader of the Senate Democratic Caucus, Senator Costa, informed us that at least on 15 different occasions yesterday, yesterday, from early in the morning until late in the afternoon and until the evening, he asked the question: will we have to deal with the issue of a constitutional amendment on abortions today or before we adjourn our business? Am I correct? One hundred percent correct. He asked that question 15 different times, and no answer was provided. Now, that is beyond the issue of common courtesy, beyond the issue of respect, one Leader to the next, on an issue of such importance: denying people, women specifically, the control of their own bodies to constitutionally taking away rights. You would expect that at the very least, at the very least, we would have been notified during the course of the day so we could appropriately prepare ourselves; you would expect that, but, again, consistent with what I have to make sure that I do not lose sight on, is that women should have the right to control what happens with their own body. It is fundamental. Men have that right. Women should have that right as well. But, last night at 11:30, this body, in the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations, moved the constitutional amendment forward. And now here we are, 12 hours later, noon to be exact, where we are in the process of moving a constitutional amendment--not a simple piece of legislation that requires the constitutionally-created checks and balances of a governor, a legislator, negotiation, and what have you--this is a straight-up attempt to change the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to deny women the right to control what happens with their own body. It must be reduced to its irreducible self. The end effect of this amendment is to deny women the right to control what happens with their own body to, in effect, make them second-class citizens. That is what is happening here. No more and certainly no less. To the pro-life community, your greatest champion in Pennsylvania was Bob Casey, Sr., the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; your greatest champion, and if you do not know it, search the history books. He was referred to in the *Dobbs* case; it is history. Every lawyer who studied on this matter knows of his significance on this issue, and even he did not choose to amend the State Constitution to advance this agenda. This is a bad day for this State. This is an even worse day for this Chamber to go down this path. Changing constitutions is supposed to be about empowering people, giving people rights, not removing them. But do not get too far afield. When you get asked the question, when people talk to you about this, when sometimes they might try to get nuanced about this conversation, remember what the end result is. Women will be

denied the right to control what happens with their own body. Men, on the other hand, will have full rights to do whatever we want whenever we want, but women will be denied the right to control what happens with their own body. This requires a negative vote, Mr. President. This requires a negative vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Senator Martin.

Senator MARTIN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senate Bill No. 106, and amongst this debate, which is appropriate in the light of day at about noon, where we are supposed to be debating issues such as this and not about what came out of a committee last evening that everyone voted to proceed with. But what I am most amazed at, Mr. President, is listening to this debate--the same, I listened to it last night, even though I am not on the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations--and listening to people flat out say that, basically, the Abortion Control Act is what is going on the ballot for the voters to decide. That could be absolutely nothing further from the truth. So, let us talk about why we are here today, because in all the debate I have yet to hear of the real reason why this is going on, why this bill moved out of committee back in January, and, most importantly, why it is being done constitutionally. So, for the public who is watching or the media who is reporting, in 2019 the abortion industry moved forward through a case called *Allegheny Reproductive Health Center v. Pennsylvania Department of Human Services* in Pennsylvania. What they were filing for was to say that there is a taxpayer-funded right to an abortion in our Constitution. That case was kicked out of Commonwealth Court, saying that the Allegheny Reproductive Health Center lacks standing. But now, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has agreed to hear this case upon its appeal in fall or sometime in 2021. So, the gentlewoman from Blair County who has been working on this constitutional amendment is actually, in a lot of ways, you could say, playing defense. And why would you play defense? Is it because we have a history of courts reinterpreting constitutions, or as one Member stated earlier, who I heard, that the Constitution also counts as to what is implied in order to create a new right for the taxpayer funding of abortion? I also heard discussion about the Hyde Amendment. The Hyde Amendment which addressed the taxpayer funding of abortion in this country, mainly through Medicaid. And do we know why the Hyde Amendment has had such longevity over the decades since its implementation? It is because it has enjoyed strong bipartisan support, whether it is pro-life people who do not support their tax money being used to pay for something that they think is really wrong, even over to pro-choice folks who are in favor of an individual's right to an abortion who still may think that tax dollars should not be going to fund for it. That is what this discussion is about, Mr. President. And so, when I hear that people will no longer be able to have an abortion because of rape and incest--currently under Medicaid in Pennsylvania, those are the exceptions when they can use Medicaid to fund abortion in Pennsylvania.

So, if the people of Pennsylvania want to know the truth about what is at stake, I would encourage them to look at the court case that is moving through. When the Constitution is being pointed to as to create a new right that will argue that it impacts people's rights of conscience that have so long, for decades, been protected from utilizing public tax dollars to fund elective abortions and protecting people's rights of conscience, this is what the lady from

Blair County's constitutional amendment is looking to address. This is the reason why it is going through a constitutional amendment process and not the Abortion Control Act in statute. Mr. President, it is important to realize what is going to come before the voters, and the people have their say. And the polling that I have seen in Pennsylvania and across this country when it comes to taxpayer funding of abortion--or why people have supported the Hyde Amendment over the years--is going to remain strong, but we will know when it goes to their vote, and I encourage my colleagues to please vote "yes."

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes, for a second time, the gentlewoman from Berks, Senator Schwank.

Senator SCHWANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity, and I will be brief. I happened to be on an amicus brief for the case, which my colleague from Lancaster County talked about. Both Senator Haywood and I are actually the lead on the amicus brief. So, I know a little bit about this, and there is a reason why I am on this case. But let us go back to the constitutional amendment. The original amendment--nobody, perhaps, even bothered to talk about this--that was on Senate Bill No. 956, where this original amendment to the Constitution was made--let me read this to you. *(Reading:)*

The policy of Pennsylvania is to protect the life of every unborn child from conception to birth, to the extent permitted by the Federal Constitution. Nothing in this Constitution grants or secures any right relating to abortion or the public funding thereof. Nothing in this Constitution requires taxpayer funding of abortion.

The reason why I and many of my colleagues have stood up and been very concerned and said: this is just opening the door; it is like a Trojan Horse. It is because of that language that was the original part of this. And no matter what anybody says to me, I am not going to believe that that is not where we are heading with this. As my colleague from Philadelphia said, and I loved it: you start the car on a cold day, warming it up, you are doing it because you are going somewhere, otherwise why would we be considering this? But let us get back to the issue of taxpayer funding as well. Here is what is so important, the stories that individual people have to tell. We are not there. We are not there at the clinic where a woman is going, perhaps a woman of color, who knows about the issues of maternal mortality, who has high blood pressure, preeclampsia, and understands that there are a number of issues that she has faced even in prior pregnancies, and she may need an abortion after a discussion. She may need to end that pregnancy after a discussion with the physician, with the doctor. Why should she not be able to have that procedure? If it is a life-or-death situation, or even if it is close to one, the doctor and that woman need to make the decision. Would I, would you, would we pass a constitutional amendment to say that you cannot get treatment for prostate cancer because you are on Medicaid? This again goes back to what I started with before, too, about equal treatment under the law no matter what your sex is. We have not, in the past, limited what individuals on Medicaid coverage need to have, and if they are there, they are there for a reason, correct? This is a grave mistake, and I needed to stand up and speak about where all of this has evolved and come from. It is cruel and unusual punishment, in my estimation, to deny a woman the treatment that she may need just because she is on Medicaid. That is

wrong; that is just wrong. And that is why all of us are standing up here and speaking about this in the way that we are, with the urgency that we are, because this is an urgent matter. This is something that is going to happen in a day when there are 10 people in the Chamber, not a lot of people paying attention, but they sure should be because the rights of people to healthcare, in the broadest sense of the word, are on the line.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes, for the second time, the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Costa.

Senator COSTA. Mr. President, I am going to submit my remarks for the record, and I want to thank, certainly, my colleague, Senator Schwank, for her impassioned remarks, but also all the Members of the Senate Democratic Caucus for their remarks today in terms of defending a woman's right to make the decisions about her reproductive healthcare. Mr. President, I have a daughter; I stand here today on behalf of allowing her the opportunity to preserve that right. And I know, as a Senate Democratic Caucus--I will say to the folks who are watching: we know that this thing is wired to get done over in the House and will likely end up on the ballot--we as a Senate Democratic Caucus stand arm in arm, shoulder to shoulder, and we will continue to fight to ensure that women in this Commonwealth get to make those choices about what is right for them and their bodies.

Thank you, Mr. President. I ask for a "no" vote on this Senate Resolution.

(The following prepared remarks were made part of the record at the request of the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator COSTA:)

Mr. President, I would first like to recognize and thank all of the speakers from our Caucus before me who so eloquently and passionately described how dangerous this bill before us is, and rightfully so.

What we are doing here today is egregious. The Constitution is meant to protect the liberties and rights of Pennsylvanians, not to be used as a tool to enshrine prohibiting rights. We are elected to legislate, to craft bills, work through a negotiation process, vet them in committees, bring them to floor, and if they are successful, through the next Chamber and then deliver them to the Governor. The governor is elected statewide to have a final say on the issues that impact citizens statewide. Our constituents are entrusting us with the responsibility to write bills and to vote on them.

We have heard the argument on this very abortion issue that it is only meant to ensure that the legislature has say over this matter in terms of the law. If that is the truth--and this really does not have anything to do with boldly restricting the right of bodily autonomy--it should be done through the regular legislative process.

Not that I condone--nor will ever agree--the substance of the issue, but at least it would not be a blatant attempt at skirting the democratic process. But this new fad of legislating by constitutional amendment dramatically reshapes Pennsylvania's State government. It subverts the authority of the Governor. It allows one party to rule overall. We have a multi-branch, two-party government here that is simply being ignored.

And that has been going on for some time, but their latest strategy of avoiding the veto pen is uniquely un-democratic. They are using it for issues that do not have bipartisan support, and in some cases do not even have complete support of their party. There are certainly occasions when we could consider editing our Constitution, but this is not something to be taken lightly or done politically. Unfortunately, that is what we are seeing.

The United States Constitution has been amended only 27 times in more than 200 years. Republicans in the General Assembly are on track to attempt 27 amendments this Session. I want to be clear, I will--and the Senate Democrats will--always fight to protect a woman's right to choose and her own healthcare decisions.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, obviously, through the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations meeting last night and today, there is a lot, a lot, of emotion and strong feelings when it comes to abortion. When you say the word "abortion," it is like a firecracker goes off somewhere. But this amendment does not ban abortion. I just want to be clear about that. And I know that folks are afraid that is what is going to happen, but this amendment does nothing to change the current law. All it does is say that the legislature and the governor, as opposed to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, will determine the laws on abortion in our Commonwealth. It is power back to the legislature and away from the court. Again, a constitutional amendment and letting our citizens vote--you know, you do not know how this is going to go. It could go either way. This is not a: we are going to try to put it on the ballot and it is a slam dunk, it is going to happen; it may not happen. This is just us giving the people of Pennsylvania the ability to put their voice into what our laws in Pennsylvania are. So, I do appreciate everyone's comments, and I know how strongly people feel on both sides of the aisle. We will see how this all turns out, and I ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I request a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Regan, and a legislative leave for Senator Baker.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Costa.

Senator COSTA. Mr. President, I request a legislative leave for Senator Fontana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Kim Ward requests a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Regan, and a legislative leave for Senator Baker.

Senator Costa requests a legislative leave for Senator Fontana. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

And the question recurring, Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The yeas and nays were required by Senator K. WARD and were as follows, viz:

YEA-28

Argall	DiSanto	Mastriano	Stefano
Aument	Dush	Mensch	Tomlinson
Bartolotta	Gebhard	Phillips-Hill	Vogel
Boscola	Gordner	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Brooks	Hutchinson	Regan	Ward, Kim
Browne	Langerholc	Robinson	Yaw
Corman	Martin	Scavello	Yudichak

NAY-22

Baker	Dillon	Kearney	Schwank
Brewster	Flynn	Laughlin	Street
Cappelletti	Fontana	Muth	Tartaglione

Collett	Haywood	Santarsiero	Williams, Anthony H.
Comitta	Hughes	Saval	Williams, Lindsey
Costa	Kane		

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Regan has returned, and his temporary Capitol leave is cancelled.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

PREFERRED APPROPRIATION BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SB 1100 (Pr. No. 1852) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

On the question, Will the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 1100?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 1100.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh, Senator Browne.

Senator BROWNE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the important provisions in Senate Bill No. 1100, as amended by our colleagues in the House. Mr. President, when we look back through the looking glass at where we all were at that start of the worst pandemic in our country's history 2 years ago, no one could have envisioned that now, not only would we be through the worst of that health crisis, but that we would be in the positive financial position we are today. Part of the reason for our overwhelmingly positive current position is the financially

responsible work that the General Assembly has produced the past 2 years in budgeting through the pandemic and recovery by limiting spending growth, managing billions of dollars of Federal relief support--which I acknowledge our Federal colleagues for working with us on--and still providing necessary resources for critical programs and services. The other truly more compelling part is the resolve our citizens have shown, consistent with their legendary fortitude of past generations throughout our Commonwealth's history, in taking on the challenges of the pandemic and mustering up the strength and will to not only survive the health and safety challenges forced on us by COVID-19, but also the resolve to forge ahead with their businesses and their investments in the Commonwealth despite the challenging times. Honoring the dedication and determination of our fellow citizens, this spending plan is about investing and setting the stage for a bright future for our great Commonwealth.

In our planning process for this year's 2022-23 budget, there were several compelling commitments we had made to frame a responsible spending plan for the benefit of our citizens. The first commitment made with this budget is the continued investment in our Commonwealth's most important asset, our young pre-school and school-age children. While there may be legitimate concerns that the funding for education in this year's budget includes appropriations above any previous levels that we have supported, the agreed-to education spending increases were made with the expectations that they will promote greater equity in education for our most challenged school districts in relation to their local revenue capacity and therefore lead to the proficiency of all our students at all levels of education. The accepted understanding that students reaching those proficiencies are necessary for the future economic wellbeing of Pennsylvania.

The budget includes historic increases of \$850 million in K through 12 education, which includes a \$525 million increase for basic education funding to be distributed through the Basic Education Funding Formula, which was approved by a consensus by a very diverse component of this General Assembly; \$225 million for a new Level Up supplement, to provide additional support for the 100 school districts with the lowest local revenue capacity. It is important to note that the Level Up supplement is structured as a creditable companion to both the Basic and Special Education Base Funding Formulas because it utilizes the factors contained in these formulas which were developed through years, years of due diligence by both the Basic and Special Education Funding Commissions; \$100 million increase for special education funding distributed through the newly updated Special Education Funding Formula.

The budget also includes \$200 million of additional funding to be directed to the School Safety and Security Fund, with \$100 million through the Ready to Learn Block Grant program to address school-based mental health concerns of our students; \$100 million through the new General Fund appropriation for school safety and security to address physical safety and security in our schools.

Additional education funding increases in the budget include \$60 million to increase our funding to Pre-K Counts, Pennsylvania's signature pre-kindergarten education program; a \$19 million increase for Head Start Supplemental Assistance; a \$6.1 million increase for career and technical education; \$125 million increase in the amount of tax credits available for scholarships under the

Education Improvement Tax Credit program; \$11 million increase in the Commonwealth's support of public libraries, the most significant increase in these most important community resources in many fiscal years.

The second commitment in this budget acknowledges the importance our business and job creators play to the future of Pennsylvania. This budget helps reverse course from Pennsylvania's business tax structure being an impediment to anyone who wanted to invest, conduct business, and create new employment in Pennsylvania, to a tax structure that lays the groundwork for the future to encourage and incentivize rather than discourage investment in Pennsylvania. The critical changes to the State's tax structure included in this budget starts with the plan for a phased reduction of the Corporate Net Income tax rate. Under this fiscal plan, the rate drops to 8.99 percent from 9.99 percent in the first year and will phase down to 4.99 by 2031. This budget also provides additional changes to help businesses including modernizing expense deductions for small business; allowing small business owners more flexibility and tax planning opportunities in their real estate holdings; and providing historic new incentives for small businesses to grow and invest in our State. Annual tax deductions for capital investment by small business will increase by \$25,000 per year to over \$1 million per year under this budget. And this budget creates a Pennsylvania Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit to help working families pay for necessary services and to avoid the potential of a so-called childcare cliff when they lose access to benefits due to incremental and inflationary increases in their income.

With these changes, Pennsylvania's business and individual tax structure will clearly sit as the most cost effective and competitive amongst northeastern States and place Pennsylvania in the class of one of the most competitive and cost-effective States in our entire nation. When considering tax structure, our State will be able to compete for all new business investment and relocation opportunities, and Pennsylvania will no longer be passed over, but in the competition for all new growth and employment. Pennsylvania, Mr. President, in short, with the most impactful improvements to our tax structure in more than a generation, will be open for business. Additional investments in Pennsylvania's economic growth include a \$2.5 million increase to the Ben Franklin Technology Partners, for a total of \$17 million; a \$2.35 million appropriation to support entrepreneurial growth in Pennsylvania and the Invent Penn State initiative; and a new \$5 million appropriation for bilingual, community-based workforce development in Central Pennsylvania's third class cities.

The final commitment with this budget is to ensure that the Commonwealth is on a stable financial footing moving forward. First, that will be accomplished with additional funding being transferred to our State's Rainy Day Fund. Prior to the Fiscal Year 2021-22, which made the first large transfer of budget surplus to the Rainy Day Fund, Pennsylvania was poorly positioned to anticipate any inevitable future slowdown in our economy. However, building off of last year's transfer, this year's State budget transfer of \$2.1 billion to the Rainy Day Fund brings the balance of our Rainy Day Fund to nearly \$5 billion, representing an 11 percent reserve balance and brings Pennsylvania more in line with median reserve balances of other States. This is extremely important, Mr. President, when it comes to our debt rating with rating agencies and will make expenses related to servicing our

debt more competitive and less expensive. Second, this budget brings more stability by expediting payment cycles for managed care organizations and putting those payments on a more timely payment plan. These payments include two payment cycles in Medical Assistance capitation program at \$1.1 billion and one payment cycle in the Community HealthChoices program for long-term care services at \$400 million.

Finally, Mr. President, this budget takes the prudent step of repaying the outstanding loan to the Workers' Compensation Security Fund, which is approximately \$350 million. In addition to the three major commitments that were made and accomplished in the 2022-23 spending plan is the allocation of the remaining \$2.2 billion in Federal American Rescue Plan funding, which we had received in partnership with our Federal colleagues. Our original expectations were that the remaining Federal resources would be needed to offset revenue loss from the economic results of the pandemic. However, thanks to the significantly strong economic performance in the Commonwealth, this Federal funding was no longer eligible for revenue replacement and must be allocated to other COVID-19-related impacts. Accordingly, our fiscal actions include allocating the remaining \$2.2 billion toward various priorities that serve to meet the commitments in this budget to investing and strengthening important programs and infrastructure sectors as a down payment in the future of Pennsylvania. Priorities include \$250 million for long-term living programs; \$20 million for supplemental payments to personal care homes; \$320 million for water and sewer projects; \$100 million for State parks and outdoor recreation programs; \$200 million transfer to the Clean Streams Fund; \$125 million for the new Whole Home Repair Program to provide investment in the important infrastructure of housing stock in our urban areas; \$125 million for the State System of Higher Education; \$150 million for the Property Tax/Rent Rebate Program to double the rebate that is available to senior citizens under that program; and \$100 million for more affordable housing construction.

The new responsible investments made in this budget, an increase of 2.9 percent over the 2021-22 fiscal cycle, when supplemental spending and Federal stimulus spending are included, maintains our commitment to long-term fiscal stewardship which, when combined with the significant deposit to our Rainy Day Fund and the recalibration of our human services payment cycles, allow the Commonwealth to close the Federal stimulus funding period at the end of 2024 with a forecasted positive financial position. This will allow Pennsylvania to sustain and promote the longest sustained period of fiscal balance in more than a generation. The longest sustained period of fiscal balance in more than a generation.

Mr. President, as we reflect on the collective experiences of the General Assembly in serving the Pennsylvania citizenry over the past 2 years with a focus on a spending plan which sets a solid foundation for our future, we can anticipate a time in our looking glass where future generations will study and observe Pennsylvania and our nation during the COVID-19 pandemic. They will observe and learn about the many tragedies and severe loss of life in the maelstrom of a global panning deadly virus. But they will also observe and learn about the heroes made and the many triumphs of thousands of Pennsylvanians in the spirit of the many gratefully departed generations past, who stood up to defy the

demons and carry a torch of courage, triumph, and success for themselves and their families.

It is upon this platform, Mr. President, to honor those who we serve who will always face the challenges before them, those of the ferial day and those of historic magnitude alike, with an eye to a promising future, for which we advance the investments and the financial position we are closing on today. It is upon this platform, Mr. President, that I ask for the Members of the Senate to cast an affirmative vote on Senate Bill No. 1100. And before I close, Mr. President, I wanted to acknowledge my cochair, Senator Hughes, all the Democratic Members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, all the Republican Members of the Committee on Appropriations. This is an example of the collective, cooperative, collaborative action that our constituents want from us. Mr. President, this is governing. Mr. President, this is progress, and I wanted to acknowledge my Senate Committee on Appropriations team, led by our executive director, John Guyer. No one, Mr. President, no one works harder than this team to serve the constituents, and the people, and the citizens of Pennsylvania. They are a credit to Pennsylvania, and they deserve our acknowledgement.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Saval.

Senator SAVAL. Mr. President, in December of last year, my team organized a policy hearing on preserving Pennsylvania's homes, stabilizing our communities, and lowering residents' utility bills. Aimen Lipscomb, a Philadelphia renter, offered her experience as her testimony. For years, Ms. Lipscomb has lived in an apartment with inadequate heating and a partially collapsed ceiling. The temperature in her bedroom follows the temperatures outside, and every winter when the temperature in her bedroom begins to dip down in the 40s, Ms. Lipscomb closes the door and sleeps on her couch instead. Ms. Lipscomb said, and I will quote, I always get asked, why do you not just leave or why do you not go back home, and that is the tricky part. Between the sky-high rental rates and, unfortunately, losing my job in the midst of a pandemic, I felt trapped, and I still do. I badly wanted to return home to my family home, but that option was ruled out because our home is also in need of repairs from damages dating back to Hurricane Sandy. We have leaks in our roof that have led to mold and poor indoor air quality. Like myself, my mother sought out assistance in funding for home repairs, but with limited to no access or knowledge of available resources, she hit roadblocks, leaving her health and well-being in jeopardy. My family then had to make the difficult decision to temporarily relocate Mom and pull whatever funds we could in an effort to remedy our situation and restore our home. It is still very much a work in progress, and it is also a terrible feeling to be uncomfortable in your own home, but it is even worse to witness your elderly parents experiencing similar circumstances.

Mr. President, fellow Members of the Senate, I rise today not only to speak on behalf of those who are struggling, quite literally, to keep a roof over their heads, but to prevent the water that is coming in through the holes from drowning them. Every person has a right to a home that is safe, a home that is healthy. But hundreds of thousands of households across our Commonwealth are currently denied this right simply because they do not have the access to resources they need to fix their homes. Pennsylvania

has some of the oldest housing stock in the country. Results from a survey released this past May show that 1 in 4 Pennsylvania voters lives in a home that needs a critical repair; 1 in 4. One in 3 Pennsylvania voters described their utility bills as unaffordable, and if confronted with the need to make a critical repair to their home, nearly half of Pennsylvania voters said they would struggle to afford it. Housing and security transcends all geographic bounds and political bounds. Urban, suburban, and rural counties alike have suffered for decades from disinvestment from their government at all levels. And that is why I am so proud to say that the inclusion of the Whole-Home Repairs Program in this year's budget begins to change that.

The Whole-Home Repairs Program is a housing security initiative, an energy initiative, an anti-bligh initiative, a jobs initiative, and a community safety initiative. Dozens of stakeholders were involved in drafting and editing and finalizing the program logistics. At a time of incredible hardship for people across the Commonwealth, we are seizing a historic opportunity to move the needle on our housing crisis permanently. And our actions here have national implications. Across our country, the inability to make repairs to one's home has become an intractable problem. The United States needs a model for how to preserve its aging housing stock and to create new jobs. By creating the Whole-Home Repairs Program, we are positioning Pennsylvania to step into its role as the leader. We can be a national model in fixing aging housing stock and creating new jobs.

To the hundreds of Pennsylvanians who called your representatives to ask them to support this bill, who signed on in support of Whole-Home Repairs and shared your experiences for why this program matters, thank you. Your support and your trust breathes life into this. To the 58 organizations that became our partners in raising the alarm on the state of Pennsylvania's housing and who demanded that your State invest in your neighbors, invest in you, thank you. I feel certain that I would not be here on the floor of the Senate speaking about making the Whole-Home Repairs Program a reality if it were not for your tireless advocacy. To the Leaders in both Caucuses, to the chairs of the Committee on Appropriations, to all my colleagues who join me in cosponsoring the Whole-Home Repairs, who share this vision of every one of our constituents being safe in their homes, safe in their communities, thank you. Every one of us in this Chamber has taken a different path to get here, but the common kernel in our journeys is that we saw the needs of our neighbors go unmet, their calls for support unheard. And today I am proud to say that we have heard those calls, and we have a plan to meet these needs by preserving housing across the Commonwealth; stabilizing our communities; preventing blight and abandonment and displacement; building a workforce to keep our State at the forefront of the industries of the future; and protecting the place that is most dear to all of us, which is home.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Hughes.

Senator HUGHES. Mr. President, first, before I get into any of the details, I am obliged to say thank you. Thank you to Governor Wolf, who has led us through this process, and I am going to return to his name in a moment. Thank you to my friend and colleague, Pat Browne, who I can call Pat, I think we got it like that, Pat, alright? Senator Pat Browne, the chair of the Committee

on Appropriations, who dogged this process out all the way to the very end, trying to find spaces where we could come together, trying to find common ground, and we have been successful in that. Thank you, Pat, thank you very much. Thank you, probably most importantly, to the people who make Pat Browne and I look good, like we know what we are talking about. On our side, I will start with Mark Mekilo, our executive director, and the entire Committee on Appropriations team. I will say, Senator Browne, I will challenge you on that assertion about who is the best. I think our crew is the best, okay? And Mark and his team have done an incredible job managing through a pandemic, let us not forget that. Managing this process of governing this huge State with all of its intricacies, governing a divided government, governing and managing and working through all of the interests that have been provided, and, in fact, all of the resources that have come our way. Thank you, President Biden and Vice President Harris. Thank you, Mark and the team and, of course, Pat, on your side, John Guyer and his team. Thank you to our colleagues for stepping up--and what I will go out on a limb and say: this will probably be an overwhelming vote in support of this budget document--for coming together in an environment where tensions were tight, emotions were high, frustrations were great, but, in the end, we have a document in front of us that advances the ball in a very dramatic way. Senator Browne, my colleague, my friend, used the word progress, and I think we have to utilize that word progress with a capital P. This is some very significant progress in some areas that clearly needed some significant attention. These are not perfect documents. Budgets built on compromise are not perfect documents. They are documents that are the product of compromise. So, there is nothing perfect about this, but there are certainly some very significant items in this budget bill that we must pay attention to.

I will go back to probably the number one issue that demanded that this State must pay attention to, and that is the issue of the funding of our schools, our basic education system. When we add the numbers up, we can see all the lines added up: \$1.1 billion increase in education funding. It is the largest ever. And let me be clear about this, it is not just the largest ever by a dollar on top of what was done before, or \$1 million on top of what was done before, or \$10 million on top of what was done before. We are nearly tripling our 1-year commitment to basic education when we count up \$1.1 billion. We are all committed to our kids, some rightfully so, maybe more than others, but we have to take a moment in this time to thank Governor Wolf for staying the course in the negotiation process and making sure that we never lost sight of the need to make a historic investment in our basic education system. Our children all across Pennsylvania will see the results of this investment very soon in the schools; our teachers, our educators, and all those involved in this process of educating our children and providing an environment for them to thrive, to thrive, will see the results of this very soon. So, thank you. Thank you. Thank you for this historic threefold commitment to basic education, not just the largest by a little bit, the largest by a long shot. Our children for generations to come will benefit from this, but that is not just the only place.

We are experiencing, Mr. President, an issue of violence and crime all across Pennsylvania, not just in our urban centers that traditionally have been the focus of where crime has gotten the attention, but even in the most rural communities across

Pennsylvania, we see an uptick in violence and crime. In this budget, there are over \$300 million of new money going to address the issues of violence and crime. Portions of that will go into law enforcement. Our police and local law enforcement individuals need additional support so they can modernize their equipment so they can have the investments necessary to address this increase in violence, which, as I said, is happening in every county across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, from the farthest rural communities to the urban centers. The ability to prosecute gun violence will be supported in this budget. The ability to provide investments in our neighborhood-based organizations so that they can provide the real help that real people have been asking for, for generations--13 months ago, Mr. President, there were no dollars spent on that kind of violence intervention program. Now, over \$105 million dollars will go into that space. That is significant, that is significant, and that is worthy of support.

To respond to the crisis of inflation and the pressures that exist on all families in Pennsylvania, we push this budget process to try to make sure that we are responding, and there are results here. The Property Tax/Rent Rebate Program--450,000 people in Pennsylvania will get a check that they were not anticipating when we started this process. The Child Tax Credit program--this is the first time that we have entered into this space for child tax credits--220,000 people will get a tax credit in their State taxes when they file next year. First time ever, our Child Tax Credit program. For our students going to college, Mr. President, this budget provides the largest increase in the State grant program in the history of the State grant program through PHEAA, responding to their realities, responding to their concerns.

My good friend and colleague just spoke, Senator Saval, just spoke about housing. And he spoke about a program that began at his inception, the Whole Home [Repair] Program, and worked all the way to fruition, and that is significant, but that is not the only thing that we are doing in housing. We are dealing with providing support for the cost that those who are building housing--moderate and low-income housing, building housing--but their prices have skyrocketed. They need help from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We are stepping into the breach and providing them help so those projects can be completed, and we can get more affordable housing units on the street and available for folks to reside in. We are doing a program that adds an extra \$100 million into the housing new-unit construction space. So, understand this, Mr. President, understand this, 13 months ago the State of Pennsylvania spent \$55 million on housing. Now we are upwards of close to \$450 million in the housing space; from \$55 million--13 months later-- to \$450 million.

In our environment we are providing \$320 million; long-term living facilities, \$250 million; the nursing and student loan forgiveness program, Mr. President, an additional \$35 million. To our State-owned system, our State-owned colleges--I still call them 14, there are still 14 of them, I do not care how you restructure it, there are still 14 of them--our State-owned systems are getting what they asked for, \$225 million to keep them strong and take them to the next level, to push them to the next level. The mental health system--at least adult mental health--is at least getting \$100 million in this space, in this budget. And we all know the crisis that exists in our mental health system, not just with adults, but also for our children, new investments happening in that space. Mr. President, we could go on and on and on. The

childcare staff support program is getting \$90 million. We could go on and on, Mr. President, about the kinds of financial investments that we are making in this budget. The LIHEAP program is getting \$25 million dollars, something, Mr. President, I intend to remind you on. You and I worked together a long time ago on State support for LIHEAP.

So, there is plenty in this budget document that we can look to in terms of investments in the people of Pennsylvania, plenty, from the different programs that I have mentioned here, the different programs that my colleague, Senator Browne, Chairman Browne, mentioned earlier, to some that are not being mentioned but are supported in dramatic ways. This represents the best of us when we work together, and we have the resources available. It is not a perfect document. It is not a perfect plan. There are some things about this that folks may have to hold their nose on, they may not like. But, on balance with new resources in housing, new resources for the education of our children, new resources to deal with the inflation pressures, new resources to deal with the security of our communities and investing in young people, new resources to provide a way, a hope, opportunity, to individuals who for far too long have been left out and not thought of, this is an investment worthy of a vote. And I encourage all Members on all sides to take this product that our staffs worked so hard to pull together--trying to bring all of our varied thinking together from all across this Commonwealth, worked so hard to pull together--this document deserves our support, and I encourage an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, Pennsylvania's 2022-23 budget has presented the Commonwealth with the opportunity to position Pennsylvania for success by investing in our families and communities while also setting up our State's economy for success. Higher than expected revenues coupled with the American Rescue Plan Act funds has created an unprecedented financial position for the Commonwealth that will functionally balance our State budget for the first time since the late 1990s; make investments in Pennsylvanians in the form of school safety, mental health, education, educational choice programs, nursing homes, and long-term care providers; as well as prioritize job creation and business growth, including a phased-in reduction of the corporate net income tax from 9.99 to 4.99 percent by 2031. Doing that puts Pennsylvania, with our great colleges and universities; strong, trained workforce; top-notch research and technology centers; some of the best hospitals in the country; and our immense natural resources, it puts us at the top of the list for businesses to want to expand and move into.

A particular area of interest in this budget for me is our advancements in childcare, with the addition of a childcare tax credit and increasing the childcare eligibility limits for Pennsylvania's working families, for those making 235 percent of the Federal poverty income limit to 330 percent of the Federal poverty income limit. For Pennsylvanians struggling to make ends meet, we are providing relief in housing funds for residents who own or rent property. Additional reprieve will also be extended for the vulnerable and low-income residents through the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, and the property tax income housing energy assistance. In total, this budget is \$45.2

billion. It represents a 2.9 percent increase over the previous year with no broad-based tax increases and provides respite for Pennsylvanians as we manage the current economic headwinds of inflation and higher energy and food prices. It is a people's budget that not only provides economic investments in relief, but also addresses some of Pennsylvanians' concerns. We have heard a lot when we are out with our folks and meeting people. We heard a lot for the need for free and fair elections in our State. Therefore, election integrity is keystone to this year's budget package. As such, third-party funding--dark money--will no longer be allowed in our election process in our Commonwealth. Instead, we established a grant program that provides funds to counties to conduct elections in a safe and secure manner with timely ballot counting.

This is a significant budget and a step in the right direction for Pennsylvania. To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in the House and the Governor, we agreed on many issues, but also had to work through many issues to get to a place of "yes." We all made compromises. None of us got everything we wanted, but we all came to a good compromise that will be good for the people who we represent. Our bipartisan efforts landed us on a budget that places the Commonwealth on a forward trajectory that is good for our citizens and our State. I want to thank some folks and thank all of you and all of us who, you know, we were working together for weeks now on getting this done. I want to thank some people for their tireless efforts. I want to, first of all, thank Senator Browne. You know, Senator Browne, you have worked so hard on this, on our side of the aisle, we appreciate it. I have a sneaking suspicion that you slept here some nights, and we will be sending you an invoice. That is probably true. I also want to thank John Guyer, from Senator Browne's office. He is the one walking around with toothpicks to keep his eyes open. You will know him when you see him. You know, Senator Browne had a big team here that was here a lot, and these folks have not been home in weeks to really do anything but sleep. I have had some people in my office say we have not seen our kids. It is because they show up here--on both sides of the aisle--they show up here at 7 in the morning, and they are still here at midnight. I am getting texts at midnight, like, I am sleeping, what are you doing? So, I would like to thank some of the folks in Senator Browne's office: Tom Horan, Billy Joraskie, Bill Witmer, Russ Miller, Stacey Connors, Vicki Wilken, Tom Diehl, and Kristi Houtz. Thank you all so much for your tireless efforts to get this done. I also would like to take a second here to thank Anna Fitzsimmons. I do not know where she is. She might be taking a nap because she has not been home, either. And in my own office, I think our team is just terrific, and I have Rob Ritson, Scott Sikorski, Adam Pankake, Mike Gerdes, Greg Mahon, and Chris Donahue. I want to thank you guys, because without you I could have never, ever been able to find a place to land here. So, I do not have all the names from the Democrat's side of the aisle, but I know you work just as hard, and the same thing goes for the Governor's office. So, we are glad to close this out on a good, positive note and do something that will really help the people of Pennsylvania. Thank you.

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The yeas and nays were required by Senator K. WARD and were as follows, viz:

YEA-47

Argall	Costa	Laughlin	Stefano
Aument	Dillon	Martin	Street
Baker	Dush	Mastriano	Tartaglione
Bartolotta	Flynn	Mensch	Tomlinson
Boscola	Fontana	Muth	Vogel
Brewster	Gebhard	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Brooks	Gordner	Regan	Ward, Kim
Browne	Haywood	Robinson	Williams, Anthony H.
Cappelletti	Hughes	Santarsiero	Williams, Lindsey
Collett	Kane	Saval	Yaw
Comitta	Kearney	Scavello	Yudichak
Corman	Langerholc	Schwank	

NAY-3

DiSanto	Hutchinson	Phillips-Hill
---------	------------	---------------

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SECRETARY

The SECRETARY. Permission has been granted for the Committee on Appropriations to meet today off the floor to consider House Bill No. 2709.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I request a recess of the Senate for the purpose of a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the purpose of an off-the-floor meeting of the Committee on Appropriations to be held here on the Senate floor, without objection, the Senate stands in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of recess having expired, the Senate will come to order.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

Senator BROWNE, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill:

HB 2709 (Pr. No. 3309) (Rereported)

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

**SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR No. 2**

BILL AMENDED

HB 2709 (Pr. No. 3309) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

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

PITTMAN AMENDMENT A5428 AGREED TO

Senator PITTMAN offered the following amendment No. A5428:

Amend Bill, page 2, line 7, by striking out "lessor" and inserting:

lessee

Amend Bill, page 2, line 9, by striking out "lessor" and inserting:

lessee

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Senator Pittman.

Senator PITTMAN. Mr. President, I just wanted to inform the Members that this amendment is technical in nature, and I believe it is agreed to.

And the question recurring,
Will the Senate agree to the amendment?

It was agreed to.

Without objection, the bill, as amended, was passed over in its order at the request of Senator AUMENT.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SB 1171 (Pr. No. 1848) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

On the question,
Will the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 1171?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Senator Aument.

Senator AUMENT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 1171.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Senator AUMENT and were as follows, viz:

YEA-32

Argall	DiSanto	Martin	Schwank
Aument	Dush	Mastriano	Stefano
Baker	Gebhard	Mensch	Tomlinson
Bartolotta	Gordner	Phillips-Hill	Vogel
Boscola	Haywood	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Brooks	Hutchinson	Regan	Ward, Kim
Browne	Langerholc	Robinson	Yaw
Corman	Laughlin	Scavello	Yudichak

NAY-18

Brewster	Dillon	Kearney	Street
Cappelletti	Flynn	Muth	Tartaglione
Collett	Fontana	Santarsiero	Williams, Anthony H.
Comitta	Hughes	Saval	Williams, Lindsey
Costa	Kane		

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I request a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Regan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny, Senator Costa.

Senator COSTA. No leaves, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Kim Ward requests a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Regan. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS

SB 1222 (Pr. No. 1853) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

On the question,
Will the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 1222?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate Bill No. 1222.

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

The yeas and nays were required by Senator K. WARD and were as follows, viz:

YEA-29

Argall	Dush	Mastriano	Stefano
Aument	Gebhard	Mensch	Tomlinson
Baker	Gordner	Phillips-Hill	Vogel
Bartolotta	Hutchinson	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Brooks	Langerholc	Regan	Ward, Kim
Browne	Laughlin	Robinson	Yaw
Corman	Martin	Scavello	Yudichak
DiSanto			

NAY-21

Boscola	Dillon	Kane	Schwank
Brewster	Flynn	Kearney	Street
Cappelletti	Fontana	Muth	Tartaglione
Collett	Haywood	Santarsiero	Williams, Anthony H.
Comitta	Hughes	Saval	Williams, Lindsey
Costa			

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I request a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Laughlin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Anthony Williams.

Senator A.H. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I request a legislative leave for Senator Flynn.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Kim Ward requests a temporary Capitol leave for Senator Laughlin.

Senator Anthony Williams requests a legislative leave for Senator Flynn.

Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR No. 3

MOTION NOTWITHSTANDING SENATE RULE 12

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, as a special order of business, I call up Senate Supplemental Calendar No. 3 and move that the Senate proceed to consider House Bill No. 2709, notwithstanding the provisions of Senate Rule 12(p)(2)(ii).

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

A voice vote having been taken, the question was determined in the affirmative.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION
AND FINAL PASSAGE

HB 2709 (Pr. No. 3378) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

Considered the third time and agreed to,
And the amendments made thereto having been printed as required by the Constitution,

On the question,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Senator Saval.

Senator SAVAL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to House Bill No. 2709. Just briefly, House Bill No. 2709 treats the issue of renting to own, for example, in the purchase of basic household goods--currently Pennsylvania law requires rent-to-own stores to affix a price tag, often referred to as a hang tag, to each item in the store detailing the cost of the rent-to-own product. This, as you may understand intuitively, is a very useful way to ensure that the total cost of the product is not hidden in the fine print of a product. So, it is a pro-consumer mode of ensuring that people understand how much they are paying for when they do rent to own. Now, what this legislation would do is it would allow that rent-to-own company to disclose this price tag electronically, and the experience of consumers in electronic disclosure agreements is that they may not actually see the full cost of what they are buying. So, this may have an effect of inducing consumers into kind of predatory forms of buying in rent-to-own agreements. So, I think for that reason this is a concerning bill, and for that reason I will be voting "no" and urge a "no" vote on House Bill No. 2709.
Thank you, Mr. President.

And the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The yeas and nays were taken agreeably to the provisions of the Constitution and were as follows, viz:

YEA-35

Argall	Dillon	Martin	Schwank
Aument	DiSanto	Mastriano	Stefano
Baker	Dush	Mensch	Tomlinson
Bartolotta	Fontana	Phillips-Hill	Vogel

Boscola	Gebhard	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Brooks	Gordner	Regan	Ward, Kim
Browne	Hutchinson	Robinson	Yaw
Collett	Langerholc	Santarsiero	Yudichak
Corman	Laughlin	Scavello	

NAY-15

Brewster	Flynn	Kearney	Tartaglione
Cappelletti	Haywood	Muth	Williams, Anthony H.
Comitta	Hughes	Saval	Williams, Lindsey
Costa	Kane	Street	

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate return said bill to the House of Representatives with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendments in which concurrence of the House is requested.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR RESUMED

THIRD CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 1, HB 118, SB 129, SB 137, SB 145, HB 324, SB 358, SB 589 and SB 775 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

BILL OVER IN ORDER AND LAID ON THE TABLE

SB 871 (Pr. No. 1079) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in child protective services, further providing for definitions, for mandatory reporting and postmortem investigation of deaths, for establishment of Statewide database, for access to information in Statewide database, for information in Statewide database, for disposition and expunction of unfounded reports and general protective services reports, for disposition of founded and indicated reports, for expunction of information of perpetrator who was under 18 years of age when child abuse was committed and for release of information in confidential reports, providing for exchange of information for placement, further providing for amendment or expunction of information, for investigating performance of county agency, for employees having contact with children and adoptive and foster parents, for audits by Attorney General, for reports to Governor and General Assembly, for penalties, for services for prevention, investigation and treatment of child abuse, for reports to department and coroner, for investigation of reports, for voluntary or court-ordered services and findings of child abuse and for evidence in court proceedings; and making editorial changes.

Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9, the bill was laid on the table.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 956 and SB 993 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

BILL OVER IN ORDER AND LAID ON THE TABLE

HB 996 (Pr. No. 1617) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act providing for access to long-term care facilities for members of the clergy, for additional safety requirements for residents, for suspension of access for members of the clergy and for personal protective equipment for members of the clergy.

Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9, the bill was laid on the table.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 1135, SB 1203, HB 1660 and HB 2426 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

SECOND CONSIDERATION CALENDAR

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 140, SB 152, SB 167, HB 223 and HB 397 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION AND REREFERRED

SB 485 (Pr. No. 1811) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 10, 1975 (P.L.383, No.110), known as the Physical Therapy Practice Act, further providing for definitions, for training and license required and exceptions, for qualifications for license, examinations, failure of examinations, licensure without examination, issuing of license, foreign applicants for licensure, temporary license and perjury and for physical therapist assistant, education and examination, scope of duties and certification.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, To be printed on the Calendar for third consideration.

Upon motion of Senator K. WARD, and agreed to by voice vote, the bill just considered was rereferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SB 692 (Pr. No. 771) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act providing for erosion and sediment control requirements.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, To be printed on the Calendar for third consideration.

Upon motion of Senator K. WARD, and agreed to by voice vote, the bill just considered was rereferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILL OVER IN ORDER

SB 749 -- Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

BILL OVER IN ORDER AND LAID ON THE TABLE

HB 803 (Pr. No. 3240) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in National Guard Youth Challenge Program, further providing for definitions and for administration, establishing the Keystone State Challenge Academy Account and further providing for report and for audit required.

Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9, the bill was laid on the table.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 895, SB 965, HB 1103, SB 1130, SB 1160, SB 1161, HB 1186, SB 1249 and SB 1281 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION
AND REREFERRED

SB 1282 (Pr. No. 1742) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 19, 1995 (P.L.33, No.3), known as the Economic Development Agency, Fiduciary and Lender Environmental Liability Protection Act, further providing for definitions.

Considered the second time and agreed to,

Ordered, To be printed on the Calendar for third consideration.

Upon motion of Senator K. WARD, and agreed to by voice vote, the bill just considered was rereferred to the Committee on Appropriations.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

SB 1286 and HB 1500 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

BILL OVER IN ORDER AND LAID ON THE TABLE

HB 2148 (Pr. No. 2586) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

Without objection, the bill was passed over in its order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9, the bill was laid on the table.

BILLS OVER IN ORDER

HB 2265 and HB 2485 -- Without objection, the bills were passed over in their order at the request of Senator K. WARD.

LEGISLATIVE LEAVES CANCELLED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator Regan and Senator Laughlin have returned, and their temporary Capitol leaves are cancelled.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I request a recess of the Senate for the purpose of a meeting of the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the purpose of an off-the-floor meeting of the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations to be held immediately, without objection, the Senate stands in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of recess having expired, the Senate will come to order.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

Senator K. WARD, from the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations, reported the following bill:

HB 1421 (Pr. No. 3379) (Amended) (Rereported) (*Concurrence*)

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

of Human Services, for Department of Revenue, for Pennsylvania Infrastructure Investment Authority, for Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, for Pennsylvania Public Television Network Commission, for Pennsylvania Securities Commission and for State Tax Equalization Board, providing for State-related universities and further providing for surcharges and for Multimodal Transportation Fund; providing for 2022-2023 budget implementation and for 2022-2023 restrictions on appropriations for funds and accounts; abrogating regulations; and making related repeals.

**COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE GOVERNOR
REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE ON RULES
AND EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS**

Senator AUMENT, from the Committee on Rules and Executive Nominations, reported the following nominations made by His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, which were read by the Clerk as follows:

CONTROLLER, ALLEGHENY COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Corey O'Connor, 1108 Goodman Street, Pittsburgh 15218, Allegheny County, Forty-third Senatorial District, for appointment as Controller, in and for the County of Allegheny, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice Chelsa Wagner, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, ALLEGHENY COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Andrew Szefi, Esquire, 347 Parker Drive, Pittsburgh 15216, Allegheny County, Thirty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Allegheny County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jeffrey Manning, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, BERKS COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Jill Koestel, Esquire, 255 Pennwyn Place, Reading 19607, Berks County, Eleventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Berks County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Timothy Rowley, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, BLAIR COUNTY

June 15, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Ilissa Zimmerman, Esquire, 1282 Dry Run Road, Duncansville 16635, Blair County, Thirtieth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Blair County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Daniel Milliron, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, CHESTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Nicole Forzato, Esquire, 1542 Sugartown Road, Paoli 19301, Chester County, Twenty-sixth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Chester County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jacqueline Cody, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, CHESTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Louis Mincarelli, Esquire, 140 Randolph Drive, Downingtown 19335, Chester County, Forty-fourth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Chester County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Katherine Platt, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
COLUMBIA COUNTY AND MONTOUR COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Richard Knecht, Esquire, 10 Amber Lane, Berwick 18603, Columbia County, Twenty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Columbia County and Montour County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Thomas James, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, LANCASTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Shawn Long, Esquire, 475 Snavely Mill Road, Lititz 17543, Lancaster County, Thirty-sixth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Lancaster County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Howard Knisely, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, LANCASTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Karen Mansfield, Esquire, 665 North Pier Drive, Lancaster 17603, Lancaster County, Thirteenth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Lancaster County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Donald Totaro, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, LYCOMING COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, William Carlucci, Esquire, 1330 Mansel Avenue, Williamsport 17701, Lycoming County, Twenty-third Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Lycoming County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Joy Reynolds McCoy, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 14, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Kenneth Joel, Esquire, 2116 Chestnut Street, Unit 2408, Philadelphia 19103, Philadelphia County, First Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Shelley Robins New, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Brian McLaughlin, Esquire, 3699 Morrrell Avenue, Unit A, Philadelphia 19114, Philadelphia County, Fifth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Diane Thompson, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, John Padova, Esquire, 1901 Walnut Street, Apt. 2E, Philadelphia 19103, Philadelphia County, First Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Frederica Massiah-Jackson, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Tamika Washington, Esquire, 8264 Temple Road, Philadelphia 19150, Philadelphia County, Fourth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jeffrey Minchart, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Brian Marriott, 48 Karen Road, Holland 18966, Bucks County, Sixth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Bucks, Magisterial District 07-2-01, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable William Benz, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Elizabeth Gallard, 210 Sykes Lane, Wallingford 19086, Delaware County, Ninth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Delaware, Magisterial District 32-1-28, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Deborah Krull, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 14, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Jeffrey Wood, 22 Milford Road, Newport 17074, Perry County, Fifteenth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the Counties of Juniata and Perry, Magisterial District 41-3-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Michael Schechterly, removed.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, John Caffese, 123 Stillwater Drive, Pocono Summit 18346, Monroe County, Fortieth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Monroe, Magisterial District 43-4-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Richard Claypool, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Andrew Serina, 530 McIntosh Lane, Andreas 18211, Schuylkill County, Twenty-ninth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Schuylkill, Magisterial District 21-3-03, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable James Ferrier, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Bo Trawitz, 317 Wagenseller Street, Middleburg 17842, Snyder County, Twenty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the Counties of Snyder and Union, Magisterial District 17-3-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Lori Hackenberg, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Phillippe Melograne, 201 Trinity Drive, McMurray 15317, Washington County, Thirty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Washington, Magisterial District 27-3-01, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jesse Pettit, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Adrian Boxley, 342 East Jackson Street, York 17403, York County, Twenty-eighth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of York, Magisterial District 19-1-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Ronald Haskell, Jr., resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

NOMINATIONS LAID ON THE TABLE

Senator AUMENT. Mr. President, I move that the nominations just read by the Clerk be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be laid on the table.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion was made by Senator AUMENT,
That the Senate do now resolve itself into Executive Session for the purpose of considering nominations made by the Governor.

Which was agreed to by voice vote.

NOMINATIONS TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Senator AUMENT. Mr. President, I call from the table certain nominations and ask for their consideration.
The Clerk read the nominations as follows:

CONTROLLER, ALLEGHENY COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Corey O'Connor, 1108 Goodman Street, Pittsburgh 15218, Allegheny County, Forty-third Senatorial District, for appointment as Controller, in and for the County of Allegheny, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice Chelsa Wagner, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Brian Marriott, 48 Karen Road, Holland 18966, Bucks County, Sixth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Bucks, Magisterial District 07-2-01, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable William Benz, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Elizabeth Gallard, 210 Sykes Lane, Wallingford 19086, Delaware County, Ninth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Delaware, Magisterial District 32-1-28, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Deborah Krull, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 14, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Jeffrey Wood, 22 Milford Road, Newport 17074, Perry County, Fifteenth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the Counties of Juniata and Perry,

Magisterial District 41-3-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Michael Schechter, removed.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, John Caffese, 123 Stillwater Drive, Pocono Summit 18346, Monroe County, Fortieth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Monroe, Magisterial District 43-4-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Richard Claypool, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Andrew Serina, 530 McIntosh Lane, Andreas 18211, Schuylkill County, Twenty-ninth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of Schuylkill, Magisterial District 21-3-03, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable James Ferrier, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Bo Trawitz, 317 Wagenseller Street, Middleburg 17842, Snyder County, Twenty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the Counties of Snyder and Union, Magisterial District 17-3-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Lori Hackenberg, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Phillippe Melograne, 201 Trinity Drive, McMurray 15317, Washington County, Thirty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the

County of Washington, Magisterial District 27-3-01, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jesse Pettit, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

MAGISTERIAL DISTRICT JUDGE

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Adrian Boxley, 342 East Jackson Street, York 17403, York County, Twenty-eighth Senatorial District, for appointment as Magisterial District Judge, in and for the County of York, Magisterial District 19-1-04, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Ronald Haskell, Jr., resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

On the question,
Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations?

The yeas and nays were required by Senator AUMENT and were as follows, viz:

YEA-50

Argall	Dillon	Laughlin	Schwank
Aument	DiSanto	Martin	Stefano
Baker	Dush	Mastriano	Street
Bartolotta	Flynn	Mensch	Tartaglione
Boscola	Fontana	Muth	Tomlinson
Brewster	Gebhard	Phillips-Hill	Vogel
Brooks	Gordner	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Browne	Haywood	Regan	Ward, Kim
Cappelletti	Hughes	Robinson	Williams, Anthony H.
Collett	Hutchinson	Santarsiero	Williams, Lindsey
Comitta	Kane	Saval	Yaw
Corman	Kearney	Scavello	Yudichak
Costa	Langerhole		

NAY-0

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Governor be informed accordingly.

NOMINATIONS TAKEN FROM THE TABLE

Senator AUMENT. Mr. President, I call from the table certain nominations and ask for their consideration.

The Clerk read the nominations as follows:

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, ALLEGHENY COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Andrew Szefi, Esquire, 347 Parker Drive, Pittsburgh 15216, Allegheny County, Thirty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Allegheny

County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jeffrey Manning, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, BERKS COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Jill Koestel, Esquire, 255 Pennwyn Place, Reading 19607, Berks County, Eleventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Berks County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Timothy Rowley, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, BLAIR COUNTY

June 15, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Ilissa Zimmerman, Esquire, 1282 Dry Run Road, Duncansville 16635, Blair County, Thirtieth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Blair County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Daniel Milliron, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, CHESTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Nicole Forzato, Esquire, 1542 Sugartown Road, Paoli 19301, Chester County, Twenty-sixth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Chester County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jacqueline Cody, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, CHESTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Louis Mincarelli, Esquire, 140 Randolph Drive, Downingtown 19335, Chester County, Forty-fourth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas,

Chester County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Katherine Platt, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
COLUMBIA COUNTY AND MONTOUR COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Richard Knecht, Esquire, 10 Amber Lane, Berwick 18603, Columbia County, Twenty-seventh Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Columbia County and Montour County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Thomas James, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, LANCASTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Shawn Long, Esquire, 475 Snavely Mill Road, Lititz 17543, Lancaster County, Thirty-sixth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Lancaster County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Howard Knisely, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, LANCASTER COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Karen Mansfield, Esquire, 665 North Pier Drive, Lancaster 17603, Lancaster County, Thirteenth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Lancaster County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Donald Totaro, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, LYCOMING COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, William Carlucci, Esquire, 1330 Mansel Avenue, Williamsport 17701, Lycoming County, Twenty-third Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas,

Lycoming County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Joy Reynolds McCoy, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 14, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Kenneth Joel, Esquire, 2116 Chestnut Street, Unit 2408, Philadelphia 19103, Philadelphia County, First Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Shelley Robins New, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Brian McLaughlin, Esquire, 3699 Morrell Avenue, Unit A, Philadelphia 19114, Philadelphia County, Fifth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Diane Thompson, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, John Padova, Esquire, 1901 Walnut Street, Apt. 2E, Philadelphia 19103, Philadelphia County, First Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Frederica Massiah-Jackson, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

JUDGE, COURT OF COMMON PLEAS,
PHILADELPHIA COUNTY

June 13, 2022

To the Honorable, the Senate
of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

In conformity with law, I have the honor hereby to nominate for the advice and consent of the Senate, Tamika Washington, Esquire, 8264

Temple Road, Philadelphia 19150, Philadelphia County, Fourth Senatorial District, for appointment as Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, to serve until the first Monday of January 2024, vice the Honorable Jeffrey Minehart, resigned.

TOM WOLF
Governor

On the question,
Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations?

The yeas and nays were required by Senator AUMENT and were as follows, viz:

YEA-49

Argall	Dillon	Langerholc	Schwank
Aument	DiSanto	Laughlin	Stefano
Baker	Dush	Martin	Street
Bartolotta	Flynn	Mastriano	Tartaglione
Boscola	Fontana	Mensch	Tomlinson
Brewster	Gebhard	Phillips-Hill	Vogel
Brooks	Gordner	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Browne	Haywood	Regan	Ward, Kim
Cappelletti	Hughes	Robinson	Williams, Anthony H.
Collett	Hutchinson	Santarsiero	Williams, Lindsey
Comitta	Kane	Saval	Yaw
Corman	Kearney	Scavello	Yudichak
Costa			

NAY-1

Muth

A constitutional two-thirds majority of the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Governor be informed accordingly.

EXECUTIVE SESSION RISES

Senator AUMENT. Mr. President, I move that the Executive Session do now rise.

The motion was agreed to by voice vote.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SECRETARY

The following announcements were read by the Secretary of the Senate:

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA
COMMITTEE MEETINGS

MONDAY, JULY 18, 2022

11:00 A.M.	STATE GOVERNMENT (public hearing on Act 347 of 1974, Governor and Lieutenant Governor Disability Procedure Law)	Hrg. Room 1 North Office (LIVE STREAMED)
------------	---	---

TUESDAY, JULY 19, 2022

2:00 P.M.	GAME AND FISHERIES (public hearing on the Fishery of Lake Erie and its economic impact on the region)	H.O. Hirt Aud. Blasco Mem. Library, Erie
-----------	---	--

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2022

10:30 A.M.	URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING and VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (joint public hearing on efforts to address veterans homelessness)	Veterans Place 945 Wash. Blvd. Pittsburgh
------------	--	---

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2022

10:00 A.M.	AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS (S) and AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS (H) (joint informational meeting regarding Enhancing Meat Processing Opportunities in Pennsylvania)	Russell Larson Agricultural Research Ctr. 2710 W. Pine Grove Rd. PA Furnace
11:00 A.M.	LOCAL GOVERNMENT (public hearing to consider Senate Bill No. 898)	Hrg. Room 1 North Office

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2022

1:00 P.M.	TRANSPORTATION (public hearing on Act 84 and improving Pennsylvania's major bridges)	Southwestern PA Commission Two Chatham Ctr. 112 Wash. Place Suite 500 Pittsburgh
-----------	--	---

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2022

9:30 A.M.	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY (to consider a Disapproval Letter to IRRC regarding the Environmental Quality Board's manganese final-regulation; Regulation #7-553: Water Quality Standard for Manganese and Implementation)	Room 461 Main Capitol
-----------	--	--------------------------

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2022

1:30 P.M.	AGING AND YOUTH (public hearing on House Bill No. 1155)	Hrg. Room 1 North Office
-----------	---	-----------------------------

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2022

10:00 A.M.	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY (informational meeting to discuss carbon capture utilization and storage technology and the collaborative efforts to advance a clean energy hub in the PA, Ohio and WV region)	Room 8E-B East Wing (LIVE STREAMED)
------------	---	--

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2022

10:00 A.M.	FINANCE (to consider Senate Bills No. 1315 and 1320; and House Bills No. 1059, 1377, 2057, 2277 and 2667)	Room 8E-B East Wing (LIVE STREAMED)
10:30 A.M.	EDUCATION (to consider Senate Bill No. 139; and House Bill No. 1813)	Room 8E-B East Wing (LIVE STREAMED)
10:30 A.M.	STATE GOVERNMENT (to consider Senate Bills No. 492 and 1292; and House Bills No. 121, 1281, 1738 and 2524)	Room 8E-A East Wing (LIVE STREAMED)
11:00 A.M.	HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES (public hearing on the tick crisis in Pennsylvania)	Room 8E-A East Wing (LIVE STREAMED)

11:30 A.M.	JUDICIARY (to consider Senate Bills No. 1317, 1321 and 1333; and House Bills No. 103, 185, 875, 1393, 1929 and 2527)	Room 8E-B East Wing (LIVE STREAMED)
12:30 P.M.	CONSUMER PROTECTION AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE (to consider House Bills No. 19 and 1161)	Room 461 Main Capitol
12:30 P.M.	VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS (to consider Senate Bill No. 244; and House Bills No. 2086, 2361 and 2586)	Room 8E-A East Wing (LIVE STREAMED)
Off the Floor	BANKING AND INSURANCE (to consider Senate Bills No. 1225 and 1330; and House Bill No. 2499)	Rules Cmte. Conf. Room

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2022

10:00 A.M.	LABOR AND INDUSTRY (to consider Senate Bill No. 1319; and House Bill No. 2079)	Room 461 Main Capitol
10:30 A.M.	AGING AND YOUTH (to consider House Bill No. 1155)	Room 461 Main Capitol

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Philadelphia, Senator Tartaglione.

Senator TARTAGLIONE. Mr. President, I rise because today marks 5,843 days since this Commonwealth's legislature last passed an increase in Pennsylvania's minimum wage. And, Mr. President, on a day when we passed a budget that includes a historic investment in Pennsylvanians via education, housing security, and public safety, we are also missing the opportunity to make historic investments in our workers as well.

Mr. President, 150 days ago, Governor Wolf addressed the General Assembly and laid out his priorities for this budget year. Many of our Governor's goals were included in this budget, and it can largely be seen as a win for all Pennsylvanians. But one way we missed the Governor's calls and the calls of the vast majority of Pennsylvanians is failing to pass Senate Bill No. 12 and increase the minimum wage as a part of the budget. Mr. President, we are cutting the corporate net income tax, which will fall from nearly 10 percent to under 5 percent. We are making it more attractive for employers to enter Pennsylvania and hire Pennsylvanians. But, while we are making huge slashes in corporate tax burdens here in Pennsylvania, we fail to address the second part of the Governor's plan, a policy that is popular with two thirds of Pennsylvanians. Instead of addressing and correcting our poverty-level wages here in Pennsylvania and having employers shift that saved tax burden to their employees, we are allowing them to pocket the difference. Mr. President, I know, and everyone in this Chamber knows, that Pennsylvania's poverty-level minimum wage is a moral failure. That is why Governor Wolf and the Democrats of this Chamber have been fighting to enact substantive, needed minimum wage reform that would put Pennsylvania and Pennsylvanians on a path for \$15 an hour. We have the opportunity to pass it now. Senate Bill No. 12 is sitting in committee right now. Mr. President, let us bring it to a vote on the floor, and I am confident it will pass.

Thank you, Mr. President.

**SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR No. 1**

MOTION NOTWITHSTANDING SENATE RULE 12

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the provisions of Senate Rule 12(m)(2), I move that the Senate proceed to consider House Bill No. 1421, contained on Supplemental Calendar No. 1.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

A voice vote having been taken, the question was determined in the affirmative.

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

**SENATE CONCURS IN HOUSE AMENDMENTS
TO SENATE AMENDMENTS AS AMENDED**

HB 1421 (Pr. No. 3379) -- The Senate proceeded to consideration of the bill, entitled:

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

appropriations for funds and accounts; abrogating regulations; and making related repeals.

On the question,

Will the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate amendments to House Bill No. 1421, as further amended by the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Westmoreland, Senator Kim Ward.

Senator K. WARD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now concur in the amendments made by the House to Senate amendments to House Bill No. 1421, as further amended by the Senate.

On the question,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Montgomery, Senator Muth.

Senator MUTH. Mr. President, I rise today to announce some gratitude for a provision that is within our Fiscal Code language in Senate Bill No. 1286, a piece of legislation that I introduced along with Senator Stefano that passed unanimously out of the Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness. The bill actually increases the minimum daily pay for our Special Duty and State Active Duty pay rate for members of our National Guard from the current rate of \$100 per day to \$180 per day. This piece of legislation was a priority for the Department of Military and Veterans Affairs and the Pennsylvania National Guard Associations. So, I am thrilled to be able to get this across the finish line. Even though it was not the bill that we had, it is in the Fiscal Code and our National Guard members who are in the starting ranks will have a higher daily pay rate than they did before. They had not had a pay increase since 2016, and the \$100 day minimum prior to being changed was about \$8 per hour based on a 12-hour shift. Again, I just want to say that our National Guard members--we always knew they were critical, but during the COVID-19 pandemic we saw how valuable they really are to our communities; from helping with food banks, coming into our nursing homes to help with care for our loved ones when staffing shortages occurred, and also when COVID-19 took over a lot of our long-term care facilities. This is a small measure, but an important one, and a way to thank them for their service to our Commonwealth. And I appreciate that this was accepted into the Fiscal Code. I ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

And the question recurring,

Will the Senate agree to the motion?

The yeas and nays were required by Senator K. WARD and were as follows, viz:

YEA-49

Argall	Dillon	Laughlin	Schwank
Aument	Dush	Martin	Stefano
Baker	Flynn	Mastriano	Street
Bartolotta	Fontana	Mensch	Tartaglione
Boscola	Gebhard	Muth	Tomlinson
Brewster	Gordner	Phillips-Hill	Vogel

Brooks	Haywood	Pittman	Ward, Judy
Browne	Hughes	Regan	Ward, Kim
Cappelletti	Hutchinson	Robinson	Williams, Anthony H.
Collett	Kane	Santarsiero	Williams, Lindsey
Comitta	Kearney	Saval	Yaw
Corman	Langerholc	Scavello	Yudichak
Costa			

NAY-1

DiSanto

A constitutional majority of all the Senators having voted "aye," the question was determined in the affirmative.

Ordered, That the Secretary of the Senate inform the House of Representatives accordingly.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS
HOUSE MESSAGES

HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL

The Clerk of the House of Representatives informed the Senate that the House has concurred in amendments made by the Senate to House amendments to **SB 982**.

HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE BILLS

The Clerk of the House of Representatives informed the Senate that the House has concurred in amendments made by the Senate to **HB 2702** and **HB 2709**.

BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Senator Jacob D. Corman III) in the presence of the Senate signed the following bills:

SB 982, SB 1100, SB 1171, SB 1222, HB 1642, HB 2702 and HB 2709.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. For the information of the Members, we will have no more votes, but the desk will stay open. We are going to go at ease until we receive bills back from the House for the Presiding Officer to sign.

The Senate will be at ease.
(The Senate was at ease.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNOR

SENATE BILL RETURNED WITHOUT APPROVAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following veto communication in writing from His Excellency, the Governor of the Commonwealth, advising that the following Senate Bill had been returned without approval:

SB 573, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in district election officers, further

providing for appointment of watchers; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for canvassing of official absentee ballots and mail-in ballots; and, in penalties, further providing for refusal to permit overseers, watchers, attorneys or candidates to act, for prohibiting duress and intimidation of voters and interference with the free exercises of the elective franchise and for hindering or delaying performance of duty.

The Clerk read the veto message as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
Office of the Governor
Harrisburg

July 8, 2022

TO THE HONORABLE SENATE OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Pursuant to Article IV, Section 15 of the Pennsylvania Constitution, I am returning herewith, without my approval, Senate Bill 573, Printer's Number 1712.

This legislation does nothing to increase access to voting. Instead, this bill undermines the integrity of our election process and encourages voter intimidation.

This bill would permit any registered voter to be a poll watcher in any election district throughout the Commonwealth. Current law only permits a person to serve as a poll watcher in the county where the person is registered to vote. This requirement is important because poll watchers who live in the county are generally familiar with the voting district in which they are serving.

This bill makes it possible for bad faith partisan operatives to target a specific neighborhood or group of voters in an attempt to challenge the eligibility of voters, make poll workers' jobs more difficult, and disrupt the counting of ballots. This will only serve to slow down the election process and restrict access to the ballot box.

Our elections work best when members of the community work together to ensure that everyone's voice is heard. I urge the Republican-controlled General Assembly to focus their efforts on election reform measures that ensure that voters can freely and safely exercise their right to vote.

For the reasons set forth above, I must withhold my signature from Senate Bill 573, Printer's Number 1712.

Sincerely,

TOM WOLF
Governor

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill and veto message will be laid on the table.

HOUSE MESSAGES

**HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL**

The Clerk of the House of Representatives informed the Senate that the House has concurred in amendments made by the Senate to House amendments to **SB 106**.

**HOUSE CONCURS IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE BILL**

The Clerk of the House of Representatives informed the Senate that the House has concurred in amendments made by the Senate to **HB 1421**.

BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Senator Jacob D. Corman III) in the presence of the Senate signed the following bills:

SB 106 and HB 1421.

RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Senator Aument.

Senator AUMENT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate do now recess until Monday, September 19, 2022, at 1 p.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time, unless sooner recalled by the President pro tempore.

The motion was agreed to by voice vote.

The Senate recessed at 10:12 p.m., Eastern Daylight Saving Time.