

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2018

SESSION OF 2018

202D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 38

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 9:30 a.m., e.d.t.

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. PAM SNYDER, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Please bow your head as we pray for God's blessings.

Heavenly Father, we come together to ask for Your blessings upon this great Commonwealth and its people. We ask that You give us the strength and wisdom to do what is right for the people we represent. Lord, we are all made in Your image and with Your divine love. Let us therefore remember that we are all Your children and that we need to love each other as You love us. Help us to open our hearts and our minds to follow Your example, Lord, to love our neighbor, help those who cannot help themselves, and to forgive those who trespass against us.

Let us continue to seek Your wisdom, guidance, courage, and strength. Give us insight to lead with integrity, that our decisions may reflect what is right and good. We ask all this Lord in Your precious name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, September 25, 2018, will be postponed until printed.

HOUSE RESOLUTION INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1103 By Representatives KIRKLAND, SCHLOSSBERG, VITALI, DAVIS, SOLOMON, YOUNGBLOOD, KINSEY, J. McNEILL, NEILSON and DALEY

A Resolution condemning tobacco companies' practice of targeted advertising in low-income communities.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, September 26, 2018.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2600 By Representatives WHEATLEY, KINSEY, BULLOCK, HILL-EVANS, J. McNEILL, SIMS, NEILSON, DALEY, FRANKEL, SOLOMON, GAINEY, FITZGERALD and MADDEN

An Act amending the act of April 17, 2016 (P.L.84, No.16), known as the Medical Marijuana Act, in preliminary provisions, further providing for title, for short title, for declaration of policy and for definitions; in program, further providing for program established, for confidentiality and public disclosure, for lawful use of medical marijuana and for unlawful use of medical marijuana; in practitioners, further providing for practitioner registration, for practitioner restrictions, for issuance of certification and for duration; in patients, further providing for identification cards, for special conditions, for contents of identification card and for prohibitions; in medical marijuana organizations, further providing for medical marijuana organizations, for permits, for granting of permit, for application and issuance, for fees and other requirements, for issuance, for relocation, for permit renewals, for suspension or revocation, for convictions prohibited and for limitations on permits; in medical marijuana controls, further providing for electronic tracking, for grower/processors, for storage and transportation, for laboratory and for prices; in dispensaries, further providing for dispensing to patients and caregivers and for facility requirements; in tax on medical marijuana, further providing for tax on medical marijuana and for Medical Marijuana Program Fund and providing for tax on recreational cannabis and cannabis products; in administration, further providing for reports by medical marijuana organizations and for report; in Medical Marijuana Advisory Board, further providing for advisory board; in offenses related to medical marijuana, further providing for criminal diversion of medical marijuana by practitioners, for criminal diversion of medical marijuana, for criminal retention of medical marijuana, for criminal diversion of medical marijuana by patient or caregiver, for falsification of identification cards, for adulteration of medical marijuana, for disclosure of information prohibited, for additional penalties and for other restrictions and providing for lawful conduct; in research program, further providing for definitions, for establishment of medical marijuana research program, for medical marijuana research program administration, for approval, for requirements, for restrictions, for regulations and for nonentitlement; in academic clinical research centers and clinical registrants, further providing for legislative findings and declaration of policy, for clinical registrants and for research study; in miscellaneous provisions, further providing for conflict, for financial and employment interests, for insurers, for protections for patients and caregivers, for schools, for day-care centers and for medical marijuana from other states and providing for employers, minors and control of property and for cannabis clean slate; further providing for notice and for applicability; making repeals; and making editorial changes.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, September 26, 2018.

No. 2635 By Representative SCHEMEL

An Act amending Title 44 (Law and Justice) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, establishing the Truth and Restoration Commission and the Truth and Restoration Fund and providing for duties, participation, immunity and barred claims.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, September 26, 2018.

No. 2663 By Representatives KLUNK, GREINER, THOMAS, READSHAW, BARRAR, J. McNEILL, MILLARD, WARD, SAYLOR, WATSON, SIMMONS and D. COSTA

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in driving after imbibing alcohol or utilizing drugs, further providing for accelerated rehabilitative disposition and for drug and alcohol assessments.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, September 26, 2018.

No. 2664 By Representatives BARRAR, BARBIN, BIZZARRO, BOYLE, COMITTA, DeLUCA, DiGIROLAMO, DRISCOLL, FARRY, FLYNN, GILLEN, HEFFLEY, JOZWIAK, J. McNEILL, ROTHMAN, RYAN, SCHLOSSBERG, SCHWEYER, SOLOMON, STEPHENS, TAI and TOEPEL

An Act amending the act of June 2, 1915 (P.L.736, No.338), known as the Workers' Compensation Act, in interpretation and definitions, further providing for the definition of "occupational disease"; and, in liability and compensation, further providing for compensation for post-traumatic stress injury.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, September 26, 2018.

No. 2665 By Representatives CEPHAS, KULIK, BULLOCK, McCLINTON, SOLOMON, DONATUCCI, SCHLOSSBERG, SIMS, KINSEY, FRANKEL, DAVIS, KIRKLAND, J. HARRIS, RABB, MURT, DAWKINS, DAVIDSON, FITZGERALD, TAI, YOUNGBLOOD, DRISCOLL, DALEY, ROEBUCK, KIM and BRADFORD

An Act amending the act of November 22, 1978 (P.L.1166, No.274), referred to as the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency Law, providing for Women and Girls Committee.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, September 26, 2018.

No. 2666 By Representatives BULLOCK, McCLINTON, DONATUCCI, SCHLOSSBERG, SIMS, FRANKEL, DAVIS, KIRKLAND, CEPHAS, THOMAS, J. HARRIS, SOLOMON, RABB, KINSEY, MURT, DAWKINS, DAVIDSON, YOUNGBLOOD, FITZGERALD, DALEY and ROEBUCK

An Act amending Title 61 (Prisons and Parole) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in miscellaneous provisions relating to inmate confinement, providing for phone calls at State correctional institutions.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, September 26, 2018.

No. 2667 By Representatives McCLINTON, BULLOCK, SCHLOSSBERG, SIMS, FRANKEL, DAVIS, CEPHAS, J. HARRIS, SOLOMON, RABB, DAWKINS, DAVIDSON,

DONATUCCI, MURT, TAI, FITZGERALD, DEAN, DALEY and ROEBUCK

An Act amending Title 61 (Prisons and Parole) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in safe community reentry, further providing for Safe Community Reentry Program and for contract for services.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, September 26, 2018.

No. 2668 By Representatives FITZGERALD, CEPHAS, FRANKEL, YOUNGBLOOD, KIM, J. HARRIS, DONATUCCI, McCLINTON, DAVIS, SCHLOSSBERG, KIRKLAND, A. DAVIS, SIMS, RABB, KINSEY, CRUZ, MURT, DAWKINS, TAI, DRISCOLL, BULLOCK, DAVIDSON, DALEY, D. COSTA, ROEBUCK, NEILSON and GILLEN

An Act amending Title 61 (Prisons and Parole) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in miscellaneous provisions relating to inmate confinement, providing for feminine hygiene products.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, September 26, 2018.

No. 2669 By Representatives COMITTA, FRANKEL, TAI, YOUNGBLOOD, KINSEY, THOMAS, HILL-EVANS, SCHLOSSBERG, MADDEN, FITZGERALD and DALEY

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, further providing for carrying loaded weapons other than firearms.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, September 26, 2018.

No. 2671 By Representatives MADDEN, SCHLOSSBERG, KINSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, DEAN, CARROLL, PASHINSKI, KORTZ, STURLA, THOMAS, J. McNEILL, READSHAW, KAVULICH and TAI

An Act amending the act of June 27, 2006 (1st Sp.Sess., P.L.1873, No.1), known as the Taxpayer Relief Act, in senior citizens property tax and rent rebate assistance, further providing for property tax and rent rebate.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, September 26, 2018.

No. 2672 By Representatives MADDEN, SCHLOSSBERG, KINSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, DEAN, CARROLL, PASHINSKI, STURLA, THOMAS, READSHAW and KAVULICH

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

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, September 26, 2018.

No. 2673 By Representatives MADDEN, SCHLOSSBERG, KINSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, DEAN, STURLA, THOMAS, J. McNEILL, READSHAW, KAVULICH, TAI and PASHINSKI

An Act amending Title 58 (Oil and Gas) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in unconventional gas well fee, repealing provisions related to expiration; providing for a natural gas severance tax; establishing the Natural Gas Severance Tax Account; providing for allocation of proceeds; and imposing penalties.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, September 26, 2018.

No. 2674 By Representatives WARNER, CHARLTON, SNYDER, ROTHMAN, HILL-EVANS, WARD, READSHAW, STEPHENS, DOWLING, GROVE, BERNSTINE, WALSH, COOK, DEASY, DRISCOLL, JOZWIAK, ZIMMERMAN and ROEBUCK

An Act amending Title 35 (Health and Safety) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for the use of epinephrine auto-injectors by certain entities and organizations; and conferring powers and imposing duties on the Department of Health.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, September 26, 2018.

No. 2675 By Representatives BERNSTINE, CHRISTIANA, MAHER, MILLARD, RYAN, THOMAS, MUSTIO, WARD, EVERETT, PHILLIPS-HILL, B. MILLER, CORR, KORTZ, QUIGLEY, COOK, MARSHALL, OBERLANDER, IRVIN, MALONEY, BARRAR, TOOHIL, GROVE, KEEFER, WATSON, DAVIS, SACCONI, MACKENZIE, ROTHMAN, A. HARRIS, CONKLIN, KAUFER, FRITZ, HELM, WARNER, KAVULICH, CORBIN, MOUL, ROE, LEWIS, ENGLISH, TALLMAN and REESE

An Act amending Title 65 (Public Officers) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in ethics standards and financial disclosure, further providing for definitions, for restricted activities, for statement of financial interests, for State Ethics Commission, for powers and duties of commission, for investigations by commission and for supplemental provisions.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, September 26, 2018.

No. 2676 By Representatives BERNSTINE, CHRISTIANA, MAHER, MILLARD, RYAN, THOMAS, MUSTIO, WARD, EVERETT, PHILLIPS-HILL, CORR, KORTZ, QUIGLEY, COOK, MARSHALL, OBERLANDER, IRVIN, MALONEY, BARRAR, TOOHIL, GROVE, KEEFER, WATSON, DAVIS, SACCONI, MACKENZIE, ROTHMAN, A. HARRIS, CONKLIN, KAUFER, FRITZ, HELM, WARNER, KAVULICH, CORBIN, MOUL, ROE, LEWIS, ENGLISH and TALLMAN

An Act amending the act of February 22, 1855 (P.L.46, No.50), entitled "An act to incorporate the Farmers' High School of Pennsylvania," further providing for management by board of trustees, for membership, name and power of board of trustees and for meeting, terms and successors of board of trustees.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, September 26, 2018.

No. 2677 By Representatives J. McNEILL, J. HARRIS, KINSEY, SCHLOSSBERG, READSHAW, YOUNGBLOOD, HILL-EVANS, DeLUCA, SCHWEYER, NEILSON, BRADFORD and DALEY

An Act amending Title 51 (Military Affairs) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in educational gratuity program, further providing for eligibility and qualification requirements.

Referred to Committee on VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS, September 26, 2018.

No. 2679 By Representatives BOYLE, KRUEGER-BRANEKY, DAVIS, DEAN, SCHLOSSBERG, THOMAS, SIMS, HILL-EVANS, GALLOWAY, RABB, McCARTER, FRANKEL, DAVIDSON, DALEY, KINSEY, STURLA, BRIGGS, SOLOMON, ROZZI, BULLOCK, TAI and ROEBUCK

An Act amending the act of May 17, 1921 (P.L.682, No.284), known as The Insurance Company Law of 1921, in casualty insurance, providing for prior authorization, copayment, coinsurance and dispensing requirements for contraceptive drugs, devices, products and related medical or counseling services, for coverage for voluntary male sterilization and for drug formularies.

Referred to Committee on INSURANCE, September 26, 2018.

SENATE RESOLUTION FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SR 419, PN 1996

Referred to Committee on RULES, September 26, 2018.

SENATE BILL FOR CONCURRENCE

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

SB 891, PN 1203

Referred to Committee on AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES, September 26, 2018.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The majority whip requests leaves of absence for Representative Carl METZGAR of Somerset for the day.

And the minority whip requests leaves of absence for Representative Ed GAINIEY of Allegheny County for the day, Representative Mike O'BRIEN of Philadelphia County for the day, and Representative Sid KAVULICH of Lackawanna County for the day. Without objection, those will be granted.

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. We will proceed to vote on the master roll.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—194

Barbin	Dush	Kulik	Reed
Barrar	Ellis	Lawrence	Reese
Benninghoff	Emrick	Lewis	Roae
Bernstine	English	Longietti	Roae

Bizzarro	Evans	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bloom	Everett	Madden	Rothman
Boback	Farry	Maher	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Masser	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Freeman	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Fritz	McCarter	Santora
Burns	Galloway	McClinton	Saylor
Caltagirone	Gillen	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Gillespie	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causser	Godshall	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Greiner	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Grove	Miccarelli	Snyder
Comitta	Haggerty	Millard	Solomon
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cook	Hanna	Miller, D.	Staats
Corbin	Harkins	Milne	Stephens
Corr	Harper	Moul	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Mullery	Tai
Costa, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Heffley	Mustio	Taylor
Cruz	Helm	Neilson	Thomas
Culver	Hennessey	Nelson	Tobash
Cutler	Hickernell	Nesbit	Toepel
Daley	Hill	O'Neal	Toohil
Davidson	Irvin	O'Neill	Topper
Davis, A.	James	Oberlander	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Vitali
Dawkins	Kampf	Owlett	Walsh
Day	Kaufer	Pashinski	Ward
Dean	Kauffman	Peifer	Warner
Deasy	Keefer	Petrarca	Warren
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pickett	Watson
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Wentling
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Quigley	Wheatley
Dermody	Kim	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Diamond	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	White
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Rabb	Youngblood
Donatucci	Klunk	Rader	Zimmerman
Dowling	Knowles	Rapp	
Driscoll	Kortz	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Dunbar	Krueger	Readshaw	Speaker

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Gabler	Kavulich	Marsico	O'Brien
Gainey	Mako	Metzgar	

LEAVES ADDED—1

Thomas

The SPEAKER. There are 194 votes on the House floor. We have a quorum. It should be an exciting day.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

SB 1129, PN 2037 (Amended) By Rep. WATSON

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in adoption, further providing for definitions, for hearing, for grounds for involuntary termination and for petition for involuntary termination, providing for notice if identity or whereabouts

of birth parent or putative father unknown, further providing for consents necessary to adoption and repealing provisions relating to consents not naming adopting parents.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILL
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 1346, PN 2167**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

HB 1346, PN 2167

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in burglary and other criminal intrusion, defining the offense of unlawful use of unmanned aircraft; and, in preemptions, prohibiting local regulation of unmanned aircraft.

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

CALENDAR

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2060, PN 3820**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, further providing for persons not to possess, use, manufacture, control, sell or transfer firearms and providing for relinquishment of firearms and firearm licenses by convicted persons and for abandonment of firearms, weapons or ammunition; and, in protection from abuse, further providing for definitions, for commencement of proceedings, for hearings, for relief, for return of relinquished firearms, other weapons and ammunition and additional relief, for relinquishment for consignment sale, lawful transfer or safekeeping and for relinquishment to third party for safekeeping, imposing a penalty and providing for order to seal record from public view.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

Representative Quinn, on the bill.

Ms. QUINN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats. We have a lot of legislation to cover today. Members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Representative Quinn, you may proceed.

Ms. QUINN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the opportunity to stand here on behalf of the victims of domestic violence.

The SPEAKER. Members, please take your seats. We could move expeditiously to the vote. Members, please take your seats. Let us close the doors to the House temporarily. Members, take your seats, please. All members, please take your seats. Members, please take your seats.

Representative Quinn.

Ms. QUINN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, colleagues, for your attention on this very important legislation.

I stand before you to urge a positive vote in favor of HB 2060. I want to share a little bit about myself. I grew up in a household that respected the Second Amendment. My father and brother and uncles and cousins were avid hunters. As a teen, my parents enrolled me in a hunter safety course, so that I, too, could learn to respect and understand the responsibilities that came with gun ownership.

We have heard an awful lot about this bill, but let me outline for you what the basic facts are in HB 2060. The bill only applies to those who are convicted of a crime, convicted of a crime of violence against their partner, their spouse, or their child. The bill only applies to those who have had a final – there is no such thing as permanent PFA (protection from abuse) in Pennsylvania – a final PFA order entered against them by a judge; not temporary, not permanent, final PFA. Each and every defendant is entitled to and will receive due process of the law. In the case of a criminal conviction, a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence, the defendant will receive a trial. In the case of a PFA, a protection-from-abuse order, the defendant will be heard by a judge.

The fact is that guns and domestic violence are a deadly mix. The fact is that this bill does not apply to any responsible gun owner. The fact is, if you do not want to be told by the bench that you need to relinquish your guns, do not commit a crime of domestic violence and do not beat on someone to the point where they fear for their lives go and ask for a PFA. The fact is, the bill will save lives, and the fact is, those lives are worth saving.

The bill is supported by the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Pennsylvania Legal Services, the Fraternal Order of Police, the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association, the Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association, the Pennsylvania Sheriffs' Association, the Pennsylvania State Police, and as you know, the Moms Demand Action. And the bill is neutral in the eyes of the National Rifle Association. Despite claims to the contrary by a third party, the NRA and their attorneys have reviewed this bill and they have declared their neutrality.

For the sake of the 39 people who have been killed since we left here in June, murders, victims of domestic violence, I urge a "yes" vote on this bill, and in doing so, I am fully aware that when this bill is in place, we will tragically still have domestic violence lead to murders. If we all could stop that, I know we would act expeditiously to do that. This is the first step that we can take, and it has been a long journey to get here. I urge an affirmative vote.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tai.

Ms. TAI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I rise in support of HB 2060. Long before I ever considered running for the seat, I came to Harrisburg as a member of Moms Demand Action and lobbied for SB 501, the Senate version of this bill, and I am sorry it has taken so long for us to get here. But I am very happy that we are here, and I agree that this bill closes dangerous loopholes and will greatly decrease the likelihood that victims of domestic violence will be murdered or injured from gun violence.

I am delighted that we are finally being given the opportunity to vote on this most basic, commonsense gun safety measure, and I hope that leadership will also bring to the floor other critical gun safety measures that have been introduced and are supported by the majority of Pennsylvanians.

The SPEAKER. On the bill, please.

Ms. TAI. At the same time, it is incumbent upon me to object to the amendment that was passed by the Appropriations Committee. On June 22 the bill received second consideration. Later that day the Appropriations Committee broke House rules by approving an amendment that had nothing to do with the fiscal aspect of the bill and substantively changed the content and weakened the bill.

Rule 19 of our House rules states that amendments in Appropriations can only consider the fiscal aspects of the bill. I quote, "The Appropriations Committee shall be limited in its consideration...."

The SPEAKER. Please suspend.

Is this a motion?

Ms. TAI. It is just a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there a motion with respect to the bill? If there is, I will entertain this discussion, but this is not on the merits of the bill unless you are opposed to the bill.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Is this a motion?

Mr. DERMODY. It is not a motion, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that she is arguing whether we should support or not this bill, and I think that is an appropriate argument at this time on passage of 2060.

The SPEAKER. Perhaps the leader and the speaker could come up to the rostrum just so I could have a sense as to what the argument is.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. At this time we are just going to temporarily, like 5 minutes, go over the bill for 5 minutes. We will be back to the bill in 5 minutes.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. I am going to do some introductions at this time.

Located in the well of the House, the Chair welcomes guest page J.T. Mullins. J.T., please stand. J.T. is the guest of Representative Tom Mehaffie. Please give him a warm welcome.

In the well of the House, we welcome guest page Joe Szymanski. Joe is a guest of Representative Hickernell. Thanks for being with us, Joe.

To the left of the rostrum, Brett Swineford. Brett, will you please stand. And, Jeff Cole, will you please stand. Jeff is the district manager for Representative Lynda Culver, and Brett Swineford is a constituent. Thanks for being with us today.

In the rear of the House, will Murrey Cohen please stand? Murrey Cohen and his wife, Karen Lecks, and their daughter, Isabel. They are guests of Representative Madeleine Dean. Thank you so much for being with us today. Thank you.

Representative Greiner, please come on up to the rostrum for unanimous consent. Come right up here. And can we bring the team down too. We will bring the team down at this time. The captains, if you could come up to the rostrum with Representative Greiner, and the rest of the team into the well of the House, that would be great. This team won a State championship and that is great. So just the captains come up here and the coaches and administrators, and then the rest of the team in the well of the House.

Members, this team has traveled some distance. Could we please take our seats. We are so honored to have this championship team with us. Please take your seats. We are not going to begin until everybody is in their seats.

In the back, the Sergeants at Arms, can you ask members to please take their seats.

LAMPETER-STRASBURG HIGH SCHOOL SOFTBALL TEAM PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Representative Greiner, you may proceed.

Mr. GREINER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to join my colleagues in recognizing this group of young ladies of the Lampeter-Strasburg High School Softball Team. This great group of athletes claimed the 2018 PIAA Class 5A State Softball Championship, their first ever.

On June 14, the Pioneers were leading the West Allegheny Indians 6 to 2 in the bottom of the seventh inning, when the Indians threatened a comeback. With the bases loaded and just one out, a game-ending double play sealed the victory for the Pioneers.

Already, Mr. Speaker, I was honored to present each member of the L-S softball team with a House citation in recognition of their well-deserved championship, but I am so pleased that they were able to travel to the State Capitol today to receive the well wishes and congratulations of this entire chamber and to receive an honor reserved for our State champions. These athletes have taken the initiative to become more well-rounded individuals by being involved with their team and pushing themselves on the diamond as well as in the classroom.

All of these fine athletes competed to the very best of their abilities. However, as we all know, championship seasons are never solo accomplishments. It takes a unified team effort to lead a team to the championship and bring home the State championship trophy. These players cannot have gotten this far without the dedication of their parents and their coaches. It is certainly not easy to balance all the activities between school, homework, and practices, as well as any other activities, and that is what makes this achievement and your achievement so very special.

On behalf of the State House of Representatives, I extend our heartfelt congratulations to all of you, as well as all of those who assisted the team, upon your stellar season and championship

victory. We commend you for skillfully using your abilities with unflagging dedication in pursuit of academic and athletic excellence, and we offer best wishes for success in all your future endeavors. And I must admit this is a young team and I have already put pressure on the coach and said, "I kind of hope to see you back here next year, hopefully."

So you have earned a great title, and we are all proud of your accomplishments. Keep up the great work, and best wishes as you continue in your education.

I look forward to the upcoming season, as I said, as many of the young ladies are returning.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. They are going to take a quick photo here down front and then we are going to honor some important military members and then we are going to proceed with the legislation.

Thank you. Thank you so much, team. Thank you so much, champions. Great.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. With Representative Harry Readshaw, in my back right, I would ask everybody to please face the back of the chamber if you can, and if we could all stand. Military Service Opportunity Month. We have with us today Lt. Col. Keith Bryant, Commander of the Mid-Atlantic Recruiting Battalion; Lt. Col. Chris Duncan, Commander Harrisburg Recruiting Station; and Mr. Bill Irwin, Public Affairs Officer with the Harrisburg Recruiting Station. We are so appreciative of what each and every one of the young men and women do in the past and in the present who serve us in the military, and we thank you, and we thank you for your recruiting efforts as well. May God bless.

To my good friend, a Marine, Representative Harry Readshaw, "Once a Marine, always a Marine," I am told, thank you for bringing these fine individuals to the chamber.

To the left of the rostrum, we welcome Kinsley Palilla. Please stand, Kinsley. Kinsley was recently crowned 2018 USA National Role Model Princess at a pageant in Orlando, Florida. That was a national event. She is here with her mom and dad, John and Stacy. Please stand. They are the guests of Representative Judy Ward. Great to have you. Thank you so much. We are going to take some photos afterwards. Okay?

In the rear of the House, Representative Harry Lewis has with him a senior citizen group from Thorndale. They are from Caln Privileged Citizens. Please stand, that group with Representative Harry Lewis. Thank you so much. We are so honored that you would take the time to be with us today. Thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2060 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Representative Tai, we are going to go back to HB 2060.

Representative Tai, the floor is yours. Give everybody just a moment to be seated and then you will have attention.

The other members, and perhaps leadership can talk to these folks, but we have Representative Saccone, Representative Madden, Representative Pyle, Representative Dean, and Representative Roe. Those are who I have who have asked to speak, and then, of course, we will proceed to the vote on 2060.

Members, please be seated. Members, please be seated.
Representative Tai, you may proceed.

Ms. TAI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been asked to limit my comments on the merits of the bill and not about the procedural aspects. So I just want to be very, very clear that I am absolutely in support of this bill and intend to vote for it.

Just last week, in Fayette County, a man shot his wife and three others, minutes after the wife dropped domestic violence charges against him, and this is the type of thing that we absolutely need to prevent. So I am very supportive of this bill, and I ask all of my colleagues to vote for it. It is the most basic commonsense legislation we can implement in terms of gun safety. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Saccone.

Mr. SACCONE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to provide some context to this faulty piece of legislation. HB 2060 is purported to be a domestic abuse bill, and I am sure proponents will say anyone opposed to this bill is opposed to helping victims of domestic abuse. Nothing could be further from the truth. Everyone I know wants to help domestic abuse victims, but this bill is merely a gun control bill disguised as protecting domestic abuse victims.

Gun control advocates, I know, they are going to threaten to label any opponents of this as anti-domestic abuse victims. That is what they do to try and intimidate people. But like any other gun control bill that I have ever argued against, this bill solves few, if any, of the problems it purports to solve, while it infringes on the rights of law-abiding citizens.

This bill, as written, has scores of flaws in it, and I am going to attempt to point out just a few of them. The good news is we can fix every one of these flaws. We can fix them. They are not insurmountable, and that is what I am really going to propose after I outline to you some of the flaws today.

First of all, this bill is an unfunded mandate on our law enforcement sheriffs and State Police. Although they do accept weapons now, they are not equipped to accept the number of increase in weapons that they are going to be forced to accept, and the sheriffs that we have talked to do not want this bill. They do not want to build new facilities. They do not want to have to maintain control of these weapons. And by the way, Title 18 and Title 23 require that sheriffs and law enforcement that accept these weapons have to maintain control and maintain the status of those weapons, as of the time that they receive them, and they are responsible to make the person whole if something happens to those weapons while they are in their care. They do not want that kind of responsibility.

A good example is a recent case in Cambria County where a man who had a temporary PFA issued against him had a collection of 306 guns that were taken from him, and the sheriffs spent hours upon hours documenting and cataloging those weapons and thousands of dollars in man-hours expended, and the judge turned around and when the judge heard it, he threw it out. He said, "Return the weapons to him. This is not a legitimate case," and all those hours, man-hours and cataloging and so forth were wasted by the Sheriff's Department and that was a cost, an unfunded mandate, on them.

Second, this bill limits whom a citizen may relinquish his weapons to. It eliminates the ability to give them to a family member or friend. Now, I want to point out that the current law is very strict on this matter. If you are ordered to relinquish your

weapons and you relinquish it to any member, they have to sign a form – I have that form here if anyone cares to see it – and on that form you acknowledge that if you violate the terms of that form, in other words if you give that weapon back, it is a misdemeanor 1. That is 5 years in prison, up to a \$10,000 fine, and you automatically lose the right to have weapons for the rest of your life. A very stiff penalty. We only have one case – I do not even want to call it one, I will call it a half a case – in the last 10 years of anybody ever violating that, that has actually signed that form. It is a very strict penalty. But we are eliminating that. We are not allowing you to relinquish it to friends who will sign that form and keep it in good care. We are going to push it all onto law enforcement who do not want that mandate.

Third, this bill includes "other weapons," which is undefined in the bill. That is a problem. This could include kitchen knives, swords, anything, things in your workshop, sharp objects in your workshop, because believe me, if a person wants to do you harm, even though you have taken his guns, he can go home and get a knife or any other weapon from his tool shop. I have an awl in my workshop that is very, very sharp and can do just as much damage to you as a gun, and three times the number of murders are committed in this State by knives and swords than by rifles. This would include, they would have to confiscate all the knives and implements in your house. And it also includes ammunition, which is not a weapon, they would have to catalog. I have friends who have 20,000 rounds of ammunition in their house. They are going to catalog and store all these things?

It is ridiculous. And believe me, this does not solve the problem, because you know what? Law enforcement does not know how many guns anyone has. They do not know how many guns I have. They may know, may know how many handguns I have, if they look at the sales purchase receipts, but I would submit they do not even know that, but they certainly do not know how many long guns I have. So anybody that is ordered to relinquish their weapons, I can give them 35 long guns and all the handguns and I can still have 10 back at home hidden somewhere. But if I am determined to hurt you, I can use those weapons to hurt you. This bill will not prevent that.

Next, the abandoned property clause is a real problem. It is a constitutional problem. If after a year they cannot make all the efforts to find you or if you have moved away, now the sheriffs can sell your property. No, they cannot. The Constitution does not give the authority to law enforcement to take your property and sell it and make money from it. This needs to be fixed in the bill.

Then there is the 24-hour requirement. It is not adequate for people to comply. PFAs are routinely issued at the end of a day, which makes it more difficult for you to get legal help and other assistance if you really wanted to comply with this order. Originally it was 72 hours. The compromise was 48 hours. Now in this bill it is 24 hours. It is unreasonable.

Next, it creates a problem with PICS (Pennsylvania Instant Check System) and NICS (National Instant Criminal Background Check System). You want the PFAs, temporary PFAs and final PFAs to be included in the PICS and NICS system so that a person cannot go out and buy a weapon, buy a new weapon, even after he has relinquished the old weapons. Both PICS and NICS require what is called unique identifiers to be properly input into the system. Many court orders do not have those unique identifiers on them. Thousands, actually, cannot be put into the system because they do not contain those unique identifiers. SB 501 required those unique identifiers. That is one of the

reasons why it is a superior bill. This bill removed that requirement from the reporting system – another major flaw that we can fix.

Look, this bill, like all gun control bills, concentrates on the instrument and not the person. It tries to prevent the accused from obtaining a weapon but does nothing to control the actual person who may be out of control himself. That is where the focus should be, on the person, not the instrument. There is no other crime out there where the person automatically loses his rights to his weapons. Even assault, even if you go downtown and you get in a bar fight and beat someone up and threaten to do some more, you are not automatically ordered to relinquish all your weapons. There is no other crime where you are automatically ordered to relinquish your weapons.

These are just a few of the myriad of problems with this bill. Again, they can all be fixed. This is not a time for demagoguery and playing on the emotions of people. I know people want us to fix – do something about domestic abuse. This is not it. It is time for thoughtful discussion of real solutions that protect the rights of victims of domestic abuse as well as protecting the rights of law-abiding citizens. This bill is more advocacy than resolution. This bill actually turns gun owners into victims by creating unintentional violations of the law. We should not try to help one victim by creating another. With a nod to a famous conservative I know, I say this: Standing firm in defense of our rights is no vice, and compromise in the defense of our liberty is no virtue.

We are a deliberative body. We need to deliberate on this bill. People say we need to do the right thing, we need to do the right thing. I heard that a lot yesterday. Yes, we do. The right thing is to rework this bill and find that balance that actually protects victims of domestic abuse while protecting the rights of law-abiding citizens.

Now, I have outlined for you many fixable flaws in this bill – many. There are more. It is not too late to fix them. As I have said many times on this floor, there is never a wrong time to do the right thing. We can fix this. I ask you to remove the politics from this process, vote "no," and continue working on an effective solution that actually helps victims of domestic abuse while protecting our individual rights. It is our constitutional responsibility.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Madden.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DUSH. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush—

Mr. DUSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. —for what purpose do you stand?

Mr. DUSH. I rise to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. I am sorry, sir. You cannot interrupt when I have called another speaker. I will call on you and you will be on the list. You will be on the list for a motion, if you want to be on, but right now I have already identified three other speakers. You can be placed after them.

Mr. DUSH. This is a parliamentary issue.

The SPEAKER. Do you have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DUSH. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay. A parliamentary inquiry is in order.

Mr. DUSH. Mr. Speaker, the gentlelady that spoke earlier about the move in Appropriations caused me to do a little research, and I found out that it appears there were substantive changes made to the actual body of the legislation and that was done in Appropriations. And based on the Supreme—

The SPEAKER. Yes, my understanding is it was a unanimous vote in Appropriations on the bill. In addition, it was not raised in Appropriations. It was also not raised on the House floor when it was reported. If you want to make some motion at a later point, after I get to the speakers who are in favor of it, I will address it then with the Parliamentarian. But at this time what I am going to do is I am going to stay in order, and you cannot interrupt. You cannot interrupt. You can get on the list, but you cannot interrupt other people that are supposed to have the opportunity to speak.

Mr. DUSH. I understand, Mr. Speaker, and I would request—

The SPEAKER. I will call on you in order.

Mr. DUSH. —I would request to be on that list; however, this is not—

The SPEAKER. At this time we are going to continue to move forward.

Representative Madden, it is your floor.

Ms. MADDEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of HB 2060. I have received many e-mails and messages in support of this bill, but the one that really touched my heart is the one that I would like to share with all of you and it is from a constituent by the name of Jane, and she writes: "Please tell your colleagues that I can't thank them enough for the attention to HB 2060. My own father used to hold a gun to my mom's head while sitting on the floor on top of her, after he beat her bloody. I'm in tears again. Again, please tell them I can't thank them enough for their work on this bill."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jeff Pyle.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rarity. It is good to see my friend, Madam Quinn from Bucks County, at the rostrum.

HB 2060 seeks to protect the abused, namely, women who have been battered by their spouses, although it does include significant others and whatnot. In its intent it is a noble bill. However, what is contained within the bill is the problem, and as my friend from Allegheny did, I would like to point out a few holes in this bill.

The bill identifies four possible receivers from the governmental end of people who can accept your firearms when you have had the proposed PFA put on you. One of them is your county sheriff. Ask yourself, where are 95 percent of the county sheriffs' headquarters? I am guessing in your courthouse. I thought we were trying to keep guns out of the courthouse. Now, if we are going to include the sheriffs in this equation, I would think we would want to give them arrest powers to be able to go out and serve these notices and seize the guns of somebody who is going to be very agitated at being given 24 hours' notice to relinquish their firearms.

Within that sheriff's office inclusion poses more issues. I know people that own class 2 and class 3 weapons. If the sheriff is not class 2 or class 3 certified, you cannot legally hand over that firearm. You cannot. So what do you do with it then? Well, it says here we can take it to the Pennsylvania State Police, 4400 men in the complement whom, the last I checked, we had turned loose with orders to hunt opioids with extreme prejudice.

No. Now we are going to turn them into a stationary, sedentary force where they have to dedicate manpower to sitting at the desk in case this 24-hour PFA would be put in place.

Let us talk about that, 24 hours to relinquish. I have a great number of people who work out of State on drilling rigs. My neighbor, three doors down, Matt, works in Binghamton, New York. That is 6 1/2 hours from my beloved Ford City. Let us assume his wife goes out and says, "Matt looked at me funny. I need a PFA." Okay. Matt is 6 1/2 hours to Binghamton, 6 1/2 hours back, and then if he is lucky, he catches the sheriff's office while it is open from 9 to 5, in that window, or he may miss the 24-hour stipulation within the bill.

The 24 hours has been a contentious point of this bill for months. Forty-eight hours is much more reasonable, as was in SB 501. The 24 hours, and why I bring it up, as earlier the lady said, these PFAs only apply to people who have already had the full adjudication process run before the judge will issue this. I am real curious about that sequence. How does that work? If you are getting due process, you have got a chance to offer your evidence before judgment is passed on you. This bill proposes we change that order and we take the guns and then give them their day in court. Sorry, Mr. Speaker; not American.

Now, other points have come up. Earlier she said, the lady, the good lady, that if a wife is getting beaten on, yeah, that is an extreme circumstance and I am sure there is even worse, but what is the standard by which a PFA will be issued? I stand 6 foot 3. I have been told by people I am menacing. That was the Speaker a couple years ago. I scare people just with my physical stature. Tall people deal with it. So where is that standard by which my wife can call the cops and go, "You need to come take all of Jeff's guns. He looked at me funny." Serious. What is the standard by which a PFA for this offense will be issued? Does it take "he looked at me funny?" Do I have to beat her? What? That has never been made clear. So we will throw it into that big common denominator. We will leave it to the judges' discretion. Which judges? The magistrates, the common pleas, who? There are just a lot of sentences missing words here.

Now, the gentleman earlier brought up kitchen knives, which any review of any statistics will show you are used in three times more domestic abuse cases than firearms. If you want to get down into the discussion about firearms, I would be glad to have that, but the Speaker has wisely counseled us to stay on subject and that is — I have got a lot of stuff.

Let us talk about this phrase "commonsense gun laws." I do not know that we have ever defined common sense. My common sense, coming from a rural area where we have got to deal with coyotes and rabid raccoons, which I do not imagine they run into in the heart of Philly or Gettysburg or the big-city places, we need our firearms. They are there for a reason. Now, as soon as you all wrap your head around, these are just tools. It cannot act by itself. It has no power of autonomy to create its own actions. As my friend said earlier, let us treat the person, not the object, and if you want to go back into those same "commonsense gun laws" databases, I dare you. Show me the numbers that show a guy who owns guns is going to be violent, because that is who this approaches.

Mr. Speaker, I do happen to have a class 2 license. I do not have a 3, but I am a couple of months away for it. Should my wife choose to go press this route on PFAs, I really do not know how I would comply with the law, because those things are federally issued, not State issued.

I would ask, as was brought up in our caucus yesterday, these problems can be fixed. I think about four amendments address my issues. It does not change the substance of the bill, and I think if this thing is going to enjoy the support of myself or the Second Amendment Caucus' 88 members, we need to fill those missing words in the sentences in.

The offer has been made. All the parties have been together in a huddle. We want to work with you. Let us work on it. Until we hit that point, I would ask the members of the Second Amendment Caucus to vote "no." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dean.

Mrs. DEAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today in support of HB 2060, and I rise to object to some of the rhetoric of my colleague prior to me. You see in the gallery, I want to thank the advocates who have worked so tirelessly on this and other legislation before our House. The advocates like Moms Demand Action, Everytown, Delco United, advocates and victims, and so to you I apologize for the dismissive language that you just heard.

I rise in support of HB 2060—

The SPEAKER. Representative Dean, Representative Dean, please, if you can, do not—

Mrs. DEAN. On the bill.

The SPEAKER. —we have to be careful not to disparage anybody else's remarks. I understand where your perspective is, and you should be advocating for that perspective, but it is just — the good gentleman from Armstrong County has a perspective that he is putting on the floor and you have a perspective. We cannot disparage anybody's perspective, please.

Mrs. DEAN. What we know—

The SPEAKER. Representative Pyle, after the conclusion of her remarks, I will call upon you.

Mrs. DEAN. What we know from the research is that victims of domestic violence often wind up shot, dead, their children traumatized, and so this bill goes at those actions. It certainly does not go at anybody looking at anybody funny. This is due process, this follows law, and what I am excited about is, finally, we are at a historic moment here in Pennsylvania, where we might actually do something to save lives. This bill will save lives. As one of the speakers noted, in the time that we have been absent from this chamber and voting on legislation, 39 people died in this State, were shot and killed, and what research shows is where States that have language like this, which would take the guns away from those only subject to a final PFA, 25 percent reduction in homicide. So 10 of those 39 people would be alive today if we act.

I also rise to say this bill is not perfect, but we must not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. We must not let the perfect be the enemy of saving lives. We have it historically within our grasp today to save lives. Are we ever going to stop all gun violence? No. But can we prevent some, can we save some women, some children, some victims of domestic violence? Sure.

So I congratulate all of us for considering this. I hope we swiftly pass it to the Senate so that we will act today to save lives.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Pyle.

Representative Tallman, I will put you on the list. You are included on the list.

Mr. PYLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your mentioning to the prior speaker but no apology is necessary. We feel completely justified and can substantiate everything we have said, and if the

prior speaker, to me, wants to go ahead with a half-finished bill, that is her prerogative.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush, you are on the list. You are on the list. You are going to have to wait. You are like the third person to be called. Please take your seat. We are going to continue to go in order.

Representative Roe.

Representative Dush, you may approach the rostrum.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

MOTION TO POSTPONE

The SPEAKER. At this time, Representative Dush, you are called upon for your motion.

Representative Dush, please proceed.

Representative Roe, you will be next. Representative Dush has a motion.

Go ahead, Representative Dush, the floor is yours.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Based on the information that the gentelady revealed earlier about what happened in Appropriations with the passage of the amendment which is substantive in nature, and based on a recent Supreme Court ruling and the omnibus 2011 Welfare Code, which was declared unconstitutional because it violated a rule of the House in establishing—

The SPEAKER. Sir, please state your motion first. State the motion, and then we will determine, your arguments underneath it, if they are relevant to that motion. Please state your motion.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move that we postpone the further consideration of this bill until October 9, our very next session day, voting session day.

The SPEAKER. You may state your rationale behind the motion.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, what was revealed earlier about what happened in Appropriations, where there were actually substantive changes to the bill, which is in violation of rule 19, which states that a substantive amendment cannot be made on the fiscal matters of the bill after second consideration.

Again, the Supreme Court has recently ruled on this via the 2011 omnibus Welfare Code—

The SPEAKER. Typically, if you have a U.S. Supreme— Is it a U.S. Supreme Court or a State Supreme Court case in which you cite in support of your motion to postpone?

Mr. DUSH. This was State Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Can you give us the date – I mean, the name of the case?

Mr. DUSH. I do not have that, but I think most of the members here are aware of it, and again, it is still – it is a violation of rule 19. Rule 19 – I am sorry, I ran down here and I have got the rule up there – but it is very plain language that the only thing that the Appropriations Committee, after second consideration, is allowed to consider are the fiscal matters relative to the fiscal note. These were substantive changes—

The SPEAKER. I am not sure the relevance of the actual motion to postpone, but you certainly may do a motion to postpone.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The SPEAKER. The leaders, on the motion to postpone, Representative Reed and Representative Dermody.

Representative Reed.

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

I would oppose the motion to postpone, and although the gentleman from Jefferson County certainly has the right to make a motion to postpone for any reason, I would question the validity of the argument he is making as the rationale for his motion to postpone, and I would cite Mason's Manual, section 676, "Questioning Validity of Committee Reports," section 1, and I will read it for the record: "Neither the right of a committee to consider and report a bill nor the validity of any action reported by a committee may be questioned after the house has begun its consideration of the bill or other matter reported."

In layman's terms, you had your chance to object to the committee's report when the committee issued that report. You do not get to do it randomly sometime in the future. That time has passed, the gentleman's rationale is flawed, and for that reason and many other reasons, members should oppose the motion to postpone HB 2060. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I join with the majority leader in urging all the members to oppose this motion to postpone.

The SPEAKER. Yes. As was indicated to the good Representative from Bucks County and as the leader stated in his remarks, those – and we have had two people now raise it – but the section 676, paragraph 1, is specific to the point of raising any objection. Now, you can make a motion to postpone for any reason, but if there is a remedy to be based upon anything that occurred in Appropriations, the time to have done it has passed. That is not in any way conceding that anything inappropriate occurred in Appropriations. That is a separate issue.

At this time we will take a vote on the motion to postpone.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the motion?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—13

Boback	Kortz	Metcalfe	Rapp
Dush	Markosek	Peifer	Readshaw
Heffley	McGinnis	Pyle	Tallman
Keefe			

NAYS—181

Barbin	Driscoll	Krueger	Roe
Barrar	Dunbar	Kulik	Roebuck
Benninghoff	Ellis	Lawrence	Rothman
Bernstine	Emrick	Lewis	Rozzi
Bizzarro	English	Longietti	Ryan
Bloom	Evans	Mackenzie	Saccone
Boyle	Everett	Madden	Sainato
Bradford	Farry	Maher	Samuelson
Briggs	Fee	Maloney	Sankey
Brown, R.	Fitzgerald	Marshall	Santora
Brown, V.	Flynn	Masser	Saylor

Bullock	Frankel	Matzie	Schemel
Burns	Freeman	McCarter	Schlossberg
Caltagirone	Fritz	McClinton	Schweyer
Carroll	Galloway	McNeill	Simmons
Causar	Gillen	Mehaffie	Sims
Cephas	Gillespie	Mentzer	Snyder
Charlton	Godshall	Miccarelli	Solomon
Christiana	Goodman	Millard	Sonney
Comitta	Greiner	Miller, B.	Staats
Conklin	Grove	Miller, D.	Stephens
Cook	Haggerty	Milne	Sturla
Corbin	Hahn	Moul	Tai
Corr	Hanna	Mullery	Taylor
Costa, D.	Harkins	Murt	Thomas
Costa, P.	Harper	Mustio	Tobash
Cox	Harris, A.	Neilson	Toepel
Cruz	Harris, J.	Nelson	Toohil
Culver	Helm	Nesbit	Topper
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Neal	Vazquez
Daley	Hickernell	O'Neill	Vitali
Davidson	Hill	Oberlander	Walsh
Davis, A.	Irvin	Ortitay	Ward
Davis, T.	James	Owlett	Warner
Dawkins	Jozwiak	Pashinski	Warren
Day	Kampf	Petrarca	Watson
Dean	Kaufer	Pickett	Wentling
Deasy	Kauffman	Quigley	Wheatley
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
DeLozier	Keller, M.K.	Quinn, M.	White
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Rabb	Youngblood
Dermody	Kim	Rader	Zimmerman
Diamond	Kinsey	Ravenstahl	
DiGrolamo	Kirkland	Reed	Turzai,
Donatucci	Klunk	Reese	Speaker
Dowling	Knowles	Roae	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Gabler	Kavulich	Marsico	O'Brien
Gainey	Mako	Metzgar	

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. At this time, Representative Roe, the floor is yours.

Mr. ROE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in support of HB 2060, which will serve as a very important protection for victims of domestic violence. This bill comes at a very difficult time for me and my community. You see, fewer than 4 months ago a resident of my district from West Goshen Township was murdered by her husband with a firearm after decades of physical and emotional abuse from him. I was with her family just a week after the tragedy, and her mother and her sister gave me permission to share her story with you.

Stephanie Burtnett Williams suffered for years at the hands of her husband, Chuck. Chuck battered her. He would strangle her, leaving bruises on her neck. He would drag her around the floors of their house by her long hair. And then on June 1 of this year, he shot her before turning the gun on himself. They leave behind fraternal twins, much like my wife and I have.

Stephanie was in the process of getting a PFA, a protection-from-abuse order, against her husband, but, Mr. Speaker, it is not as easy to get a PFA as you might think. You see, to fill out the PFA form she needed to either print it from a computer or leave the house to get one elsewhere. But when your abuser will not let you leave the house and when the only computer in the house is his, it delays things. When she finally filled out the form, she missed several follow-up phone calls because he was in the house with her every single time the phone rang. She was on the cusp of having that PFA when he finally shot her. But here is the catch, Mr. Speaker: Even if she had been able to answer that phone call, even if she had been able to take her kids and escape, he still would have had 60 days to surrender his firearms under current law, and that is 60 days too many.

Then, Mr. Speaker, only 6 days ago another incident took place in my district. A very troubled individual, who also once had a PFA against him, showed up in West Bradford Township and shot at his wife while she was in her driveway. Thankfully, he missed her, but unfortunately, he did not miss his own parents when he drove to their senior living facility and shot both of them. He then showed up in my district yet again and was found dead there.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here not only as a member of the House of Representatives but also as a former board member of the Domestic Violence Center of Chester County. I would like to tell you that these stories are rare, that they are each just a one-off, that they cannot be helped with legislation. But that is not so. Domestic violence does not discriminate on your ZIP Code (Zone Improvement Plan Code). It does not care how much money you make. It does not discriminate based on your gender or your sexual orientation or your race. Domestic violence is everywhere. Intimate-partner violence is in all parts of this Commonwealth, and the risk of a fatality, when the abuser has access to a firearm, skyrockets. That is why I support HB 2060. It will force abusers issued a PFA to surrender their firearms within the first 24 hours of being issued a protection-from-abuse order.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and I ask them not to let this opportunity pass them by. Nothing guarantees the triumph of evil like refusing to fight it in the first place. Mr. Speaker, I stand with those in the shadows and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on HB 2060. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Conklin.

Let me just give you the list. We have Representative Conklin, Representative Fred Keller, Representative Tony DeLuca; I have Representative Cris Dush still on; Representative Bryan Barbin, Representative Eric Nelson, Representative Dawkins, Representative Stephens, Representative Sturla, Representative Tallman, Representative Dan Miller, Representative Bernstine, and Representative Frankel.

Right now, Representative Conklin.

Mr. CONKLIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to thank the gentlelady from the 143d for bringing this bill forward.

For full disclosure, I want to tell everyone here that, yes, I do carry a permit, I do carry a handgun, I do hunt, I do have weapons at my house. I was raised with them. My son has them; my family has them. But I want to tell a couple stories.

The first story is about Traci Raymond. I can use her name. Traci Raymond is a childhood friend. I grew up in their house, lived in their house. Her brothers and I rode motorcycles together.

We have known each other from the day we were born. Traci lived in a unique neighborhood. Within a two-block area of the neighborhood of which we grew up, there were three women killed in domestic violence cases. But Traci's is quite interesting, not only because I can use her name, but Traci, 2 weeks before she was killed by her husband, we sat with the family for breakfast, with her brothers and her mother and her sister. We knew of no domestic violence going on, but it was. Traci filed a PFA, but the problem is the PFA takes a while to go into effect. When she went to work, her husband followed her there in disguise, pulled his gun out, and murdered her.

I want to tell you another story. This story I cannot use the name, because I do not want to, but I grew up with his father and his mother. They had a son who was in a violent relationship with his girlfriend. The girlfriend put a PFA against him. He took his gun, just recently in the last few months, waited for her to come home, killed her and family members.

Now, why do I bring up both sides? Because for those people that do not understand that when a domestic violence attack happens, it does not just affect the victim who was killed, it affects everybody involved. For those of you who do not think that 24 hours or you think 24 hours is too short, I would like you to meet the father of the young boy that went and murdered his girlfriend and her family. I want you to meet him. I want you to meet him in the lumberyard, where I met him bawling, saying, "Please, why can't you do something? Do something to stop my son. Why can't you, the legislature, do something to stop him?" Because here is the deal, Mr. Speaker: Guns do not kill. Guns never have killed. People kill. And if you listen to the D.A.'s and if you listen to folks, not who are not emotional but who are pragmatic, they will tell you that first 24 hours, that first 24 hours is the most crucial time in a murder, because that is when that individual is estranged. They do not have full control of their senses. That is when they do those crazy things, like go out and murder someone. The first 24 hours is the most important.

For those of you that I know it is nice to talk about what may happen or talk about other weapons, and I understand and I respect your opinions, but I am also asking you to respect those and the emotion and the opinions of those people who have lived through it. Respect the individuals who deal with it every day. Respect the D.A.'s Association, respect the F.O.P. (Fraternal Order of Police), respect the police officers, but most of all, respect the victims. And those victims just are not the women. Those victims just are not the men who were killed in domestic violence. Those victims are the parents and the family of those people that perpetrated that domestic violence. For the rest of their lives they will wonder what they can do, and if you do not believe me, come see me in person. I will give you the names of the family who, to this day, wanted to know if there was one more thing they could have done; if there was something they could have done to get the guns out of the hands of their son, within that 24-hour period, before he did something like this.

I am asking my colleagues – this is not a gun issue. This is not a rights issue. This is simply saving lives. And guess what? The life you save may be the individual or the perpetrator who had 24 hours to cool off and was not able to go in and access that weapon and do that immediately. Please vote "yes" for this bill. Stand up for the victims, stand up for the families, but most of all, stand up for common sense.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Fred Keller.

Mr. F. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Today I have been listening to the debate on HB 2060, and I have heard about people that are going to lose their knives, their tools, all those other things, if they are subject to a final protection-from-abuse order. If you look at the bill, the only thing that would happen that would cause somebody to lose anything other than their firearms, if they are at the final protection-from-abuse order, is if you used those instruments or threatened to use those instruments to inflict harm upon the person or minor children that are filing that protection-from-abuse order. So we are not talking about going through people's houses who have demonstrated that they are violent and taking things.

I did not mention it when I started, but I am in support of HB 2060. I am a life member of the rifle association, I own semiautomatic rifles with 30-round magazines, and I support this bill, because it does not talk about the gun, it talks about the person that possesses the gun on a final protection-from-abuse order.

Everybody is talking about how this affects things. We are talking about current law already in the protection-from-abuse order. We are not talking about what this bill does. Currently if I have a roommate that gets a final PFA from abuse, guess what? The guns are taken. I have no clear path to get my guns back because my roommate did something. This bill provides for that. At the expiration of a PFA, if somebody does not have a clear method for getting their firearms back, this bill provides for that. It is a shame when we have to try and figure out why people perpetrate violence on another person. It should not happen, it is unspeakable, but we are in a society when this happens. And when somebody has demonstrated and has had their case before a judge more than one time, there should be remedies to make sure that that person does not have as easy of a time to inflict violence or harm on another individual.

Now, I look at this and I have had a lot of meetings and discussions with a lot of people, and the thing you have got to think about is we have rights and every right that we have has a responsibility. We need to make sure that we are responsible. We are not talking about going and looking at doing anything from taking guns from people who obey the law and have not demonstrated that they have not handled their responsibility properly. We have an obligation to make sure that when somebody has displayed that – it has been heard multiple times before a judge – that we do something so that they cannot inflict harm easily upon another person. You can talk about the tools and methods that people use, but we already have and many of the arguments we have heard deal with existing law already. This bill actually clears some things up on the side of the person that might be harmed adversely by the current law.

So I would ask my colleagues to please remember that responsible gun owners are not going to be harmed by this bill, not at all. People who love the Second Amendment, who like to go out to the range, who like to hunt, as long as they are responsible with their rights, they will not lose anything. It is just like with the right to vote. When somebody harms society so badly, they lose their right to vote when they are in jail, if they committed a crime to cause them to do that. This is no different. It deals with the actions of the individual when they have displayed that they have not handled the right that they have in a way that is beneficial to society.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask that people support HB 2060.

The SPEAKER. Representative Tony DeLuca.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill, and as an NRA member for over 30 years, with an A rating, I have no problems supporting this piece of legislation because it is not gun control. We keep using the fact that if we do not like a bill, we are going to use it as gun control. That is furthest from the truth.

Thirty years ago when I first came in this House, one of our secretaries who worked for a good friend of ours – a lot of people do not know him – Joe Petrarca, Sr., his father – God rest his soul – had a beautiful girl working for him with a good personality, a great worker, who had a PFA against her husband, and she happened to be in a social club sitting at the bar and some fellow came up to her and they got in a conversation, because she was that type of person, that she, you know, was a good person. Her husband happened to be in there. She did have a PFA. He followed her out and not only shot her three times, once in the head when she was done, but also shot this individual who had just met her that night walking her out to the car, and he was a paraplegic for the rest of his life and did not do anything.

Not too long ago, about 2 weeks ago, with a PFA, a domestic – one of the things that is the most violent thing out of this domestic violence is in the magistrates' courts. The fellow was going to shoot his wife at the district magistrate's court, because his wife had a PFA and she was going – he did not know she was going to withdraw it. He shot five people. Thank God, nobody got killed in that magistrate's office. Now they are talking about maybe putting metal detectors and everything else in the magistrate's office.

Domestic violence, I imagine a lot of us – I get people coming in my office and they are even afraid to go get a PFA because their husbands have threatened them that they will kill them. We all know that. This has nothing to do with taking away people's guns. It is the same way when we had gaming. Everybody says, "a foot in the door, it's a foot in the door." Everything that they said did not happen. It happened to benefit the people of Pennsylvania. We need to benefit the victims up there so they do not have to worry about – and they are still going to have to worry. Let us not kid ourselves. They are still going to have to worry, because that is one of the vicious crimes. If you are going to punch and strangle a woman, you do not care about anything. So let us be truthful: they are still going to worry, but we do not give them the opportunity to shoot them and make it easier for them.

This bill is a good bill. Everyone in this House, whether you are an NRA member or you are not, should support this bill on behalf of the victims who have been brutalized and have been involved with such abuse and that there. So I would ask everybody, whether you are an NRA member – and I am not worried about following through. Maybe by my voting for this I might end up being a C, but that is the right thing to do and I will take my chances. Thank you, and let us vote for this bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Cris Dush, for the second time.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker be willing to rise for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Again, I always remind everybody with respect to interrogation, questions have to be about items that the maker of the question does not know. Also, nobody is required to stand for interrogation. There is no entitlement to interrogation. I know that the good lady has indicated she will so stand, and you may proceed.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for a couple things yesterday on this bill. First of all, the PCCD (Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency) report on how many times the perpetrator has gone and gotten a different weapon and used. Have we received anything back on that?

Ms. QUINN. What we have been told from the Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts is that that information is not available. They are double-checking.

Mr. DUSH. There were a number of other questions that were a part of that. Do you have any procedures yet for dealing with anything that deals with the weapons once they have been confiscated, if something happens to the perpetrator? For example, if the perpetrator happens to die, what happens to the estate on that one year? Do those weapons not go back to the estate?

Ms. QUINN. As discussed in caucus yesterday, there is nothing in this bill that addresses this. However, Mr. Speaker, this is not new practice of weapon relinquishment, so I am sure there is precedent out there as to what happens should the defendant have not identified in his or her will what they wanted to do with those weapons or firearms.

Mr. DUSH. Earlier when you first introduced this bill today, you had said that this applies only to a victim of a crime or those convicted of a crime and then you repeated that only to those convicted of a crime, and then later you said it refers also to a final PFA. Now, are you saying that somebody has reached all the elements of having a conviction before they have their weapons seized from them?

Ms. QUINN. We are talking about two different sides of the law here. Under the misdemeanor crime of domestic violence, that is where the criminal side and the conviction comes into place. The PFA is a judgment that is entered by the judge.

Mr. DUSH. Okay, because initially you had said only convicted of a crime; then you went on.

Ms. QUINN. Would you like me to repeat my opening remarks and I will clarify that?

Mr. DUSH. No. You have clarified it. That is what I wanted to get to.

Let me see. You had said that there were 39 murders since we left in June where people had violated that PFA. At least that is what I understood—

Ms. QUINN. That is not what I said.

Mr. DUSH. How many—

Ms. QUINN. What I said is, there were 39 – on Monday it was reported as 37; today I learned it is 39 – people who died as a result of domestic violence. I would be happy to have my remarks read back to you.

Mr. DUSH. That is fine.

How many of those were by a firearm?

Ms. QUINN. I will have to delineate that, and I will get the answer back. Does it matter? They are dead.

Mr. DUSH. As far as their being dead, that does not matter at all; I am not questioning that. It is just that—

Ms. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I believe what I said delineates the propensity for death when you have domestic violence, and guns and domestic violence, as I said in my opening comments, do not mix well. Thank you.

Mr. DUSH. Okay. I am finished with the interrogation.

Ms. QUINN. Thank you.

Mr. DUSH. I appreciate the gentlelady's—

The SPEAKER. On the bill?

Mr. DUSH. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Mr. DUSH. Under our Constitution, we have items that are called rights, and historically those rights have not been taken from one unless one has been convicted of a crime. And there is a distinct and marked difference between the elements of a conviction for a criminal act and the elements of a protection-from-abuse order. That being said, right now the judges actually have the ability to have weapons confiscated as part of a final protection-from-abuse order. What this does is say now as a part of statute, you do not have to any longer be convicted of something in order to lose those rights, and I have a very hard time with that. I understand the reason the judges have that discretion is because those judges are standing right there with the individual and the couple or whoever it is and get a sense of the potential for violence.

The main flaw that we have under the current law is that we cannot get that individual who has that propensity for violence the help that he needs or she needs before they go into that violent act. Having been in law enforcement, having dealt with domestic relation problems before, the first 4 or 5 hours is generally when that problem is going to happen. And on a military installation where my experience has been, where the individuals have to keep their weapons locked when they are on base in the base armory until they need them, then the guy will go back or the woman will go back – I had a supervisor who actually had been beaten, a male, by his wife, so it is not a male or female issue – but they will go and grab a baseball bat, a hammer, they will use their fists.

Frédéric Bastiat used the comment that all government is forced. We are either compelling somebody to do something or not to do something, but it is external. We have gone so far away from love your God with all your heart and mind, body, and soul and love your neighbor as yourself because we have gotten God out of the conversation, that we are not looking at trying to correct the soul problem that is going on in this State and in this nation. And what we are doing with this piece of legislation and with one exception virtually everybody that has been here has been talking about guns when we know three times more people have been killed with knives and swords and edged weapons than have been killed with long guns. Those are the types of statistics that show that it is not – it is the evil intent in one's heart that dictates the actions, and until we find a way to step in and stop that, we are not going to correct the problem. And every single life matters. But by the same token, you look at what happened and the reason our Constitution says what it does is not only back in those days to be able to help sustain life by the people going out and hunting, but more importantly, because of what was happening in places like Long Island when the British confiscated weapons so that the civilians could not rise up and defend their rights.

Even the gentleman from Centre County, he said about getting that 24 hours to cool off. From experience I can tell you, that is true. That is the biggest thing that will prevent the person from taking action. You will get a bigger bang for the buck by finding a way to get that person the help that he needs or she needs to get the cooling-off period instead of as soon as they get that PFA, they go out with their drinking buddies, yeah, she is this or he is that and getting themselves fired up and then go and take action, because that is generally the way things go. Or they will get on social media and back and forth and get fired up and go and take action.

One of the things that has not been addressed here is our fiscal note is in error. It says there will be zero cost. When you are looking at people, as one Representative said about having hundreds of firearms, where are the State Police going to find additional armory space? That is going to be a fiscal cost. So our fiscal note is in error.

A lot of this bill – the main purpose of this bill is driven by fear, and people who are using this bill to address their fears are not addressing the root causes. In medical terms, they are treating the symptom and not the cause. This bill addresses a symptom rather than a cause, and evil will find a way to accomplish its intent.

What we need to do as a society through our churches, our community organizations, our being friends and neighbors to our neighbors is to be there for them, to reach out and give help, and not encourage like you see on social media, the encouragement of the bashing of the opposite party in order to make people get fired up and take some sort of reprehensible action.

I appreciate the gentlelady's desire to stop the violence. I have seen it firsthand. I want to stop it. Until we start addressing the root of the problem, getting the love of God and the love of our neighbors back into our hearts – on these two hang all the law and the prophets – until we start doing that, we are not going to start taking the corrective action that is truly going to save a significant number of lives.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Bryan Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Would the gentlelady stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. Yes. As indicated earlier, interrogation is not entitled. The good lady has to agree to it. And in addition, it has to be questions about the bill of which the maker of the question does not know.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We made amendments to this bill. Has there been any discussion with the Senate as to whether these amendments are as acceptable to the Senate as the prior SB 501, Senator Killion's bill?

Ms. QUINN. Yes, there have been.

Mr. BARBIN. Okay. And they have agreed that this is an acceptable form for the bill?

Ms. QUINN. They, as in their leadership; I have not spoken with the entire body.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you.

On the bill?

The SPEAKER. You may proceed.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise, as my colleague from Allegheny County and colleagues on the other side, I am a lifetime member and I have an A rating. And I think today the question is not about whether this is gun control. The question is whether the person who has access to guns should be limited if a judge signs an order. Under the bill, one of the amendments to this bill is a provision that allows a consent order which protects the right of the person and the guns that he owns until the disability is lifted. That is better than the current state of the law. This is a bill about people. It is not about guns. And because of that and because the district attorneys, the State Police, the F.O.P. say this is necessary, I will be voting in favor of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Representative Eric Nelson.

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to applaud the maker of this bill in her efforts to reduce domestic violence. I think domestic violence is a threat that can affect all of us. Personally, just a few miles from our farm, we had a multiple-family shooting with a troubled teen using a rifle. I speak on this floor each year on the anniversary of a young woman who was killed in her kitchen as a result of domestic violence. She was killed with a knife. And personally, a good friend of mine's daughter was murdered with a pistol to slow and then with a hammer. So I am a strong supporter of creating the most safe environment we can for people who are impacted by domestic violence.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is in the details of this bill. We do not define what a weapon is. Under this category, this needs to be addressed, and if we cannot address it through additional amendments in this body, then it needs to be addressed moving forward because other weapons can be defined in many different ways. In Franklin School District, where multiple students were stabbed and slashed using a knife, the definition of "weapons" needs to be addressed, Mr. Speaker.

A second concern is that we are removing a judge's ability to apply discretion in this case. And I feel and truly believe that in domestic violence situations a judge's discretion is essential because in our area domestic violence or these types of claims can be used as a weapon in civil disputes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have four daughters, and domestic violence can affect either way, against men and against women. But when I envision one of my daughters being the victim of domestic abuse, I want her to have all the protection and controls there. But if I envision that same daughter as a law enforcement officer and she is being falsely accused by her spouse or mate of domestic violence charges, not having the ability for a judge to decide or apply discretion will cause her to lose her career, Mr. Speaker, and that is fundamentally wrong.

A judge should be given the opportunity to review these facts, and an amendment could be placed in this bill to automatically remove these firearms if it is determined that there is a final PFA order needed. And maybe they need to be apart, but a judge should be allowed to apply discretion for an individual so that their profession is not ended as a result of a false allegation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill needs more time or needs to be fixed as it advances to the Senate because I support protections for domestic violence, but I do not support an absence of a definition of "weapons" and taking the authority from our judges to be able to deal with these situations. We have to trust at the most local level, and this bill takes that authority away, and so for that, at this point in time I will be voting "no" on the bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jason Dawkins.

Mr. DAWKINS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me just start off again thanking the maker for her courage for putting this bill forward. I had a similar piece of legislation and I talked about this in the Judiciary Committee, HB 2097, which essentially did the same thing.

But let me also apologize to all of the women in this chamber because what I have witnessed today was a clear disrespect to the fact that we are not standing up for the protection of women in these very precarious positions, and as a man of this body, I have your back.

And I would be remiss if I did not mention a former colleague of mine when I worked in city council who was violently murdered by her husband last month, and she leaves behind a pair

of twins that will have to be raised without any parents because we did not have any protection measures in place to stand by Linda Rios.

And I find it ironic that we are talking about a judge's discretion and sentencing when we are talking about removing firearms but we were not talking about that for mandatory minimums. So I cannot stand for hypocrisy in this chamber. If we are going to stand for victims, we are going to stand united. This is not a partisan issue. When we are talking about weapons, those who are saying if you remove my weapon and I live in a rural area, I may be attacked by a bear, you should have thought about that before you put your hands on a woman or any child or anyone else. We cannot have this any longer in this Commonwealth. We have to stand up for victims. We have to stop being on the side of those who are perpetrators. We as a body are better than this, and I stand again with the gentlelady who introduced this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Stephens.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of rhetoric and a lot of discussion about this bill going on many, many months. There has unfortunately been a fair amount of misinformation conveyed to my constituents and I know many of the other folks across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by different special interest groups. There has been a lot of discussion about different components of the PFA Act that are not at all implicated by this bill.

I just want to set the record straight and make sure that my constituents are aware this bill does three things, just three, and it only does them following a judicial determination. Instead of allowing someone who is no longer permitted to possess a firearm, instead of allowing that individual to give it to a friend, this provides some other more secure alternatives like the sheriff's department or an attorney or an armory. This requires that instead of 60 days to relinquish a firearm, again, after a judicial determination, you have 24 hours. This also provides that if a judge determines that you should be ordered to not have contact with someone by virtue of a protection-from-abuse petition, you must also relinquish your firearm within 24 hours. That is it – three things, all after judicial determination.

The data is overwhelming that guns and domestic violence are a deadly combination. The data is overwhelming. But if you do not believe me, let us look at the folks who support this bill. These people are on the front lines every day – our law enforcement community, our domestic violence advocacy groups, the District Attorneys Association – they are on the front line dealing with these issues every single day.

Before coming here I spent 10 years as a prosecutor. I was on the front lines dealing with these issues every single day. I saw it firsthand. But you do not have to take my word for it. Look to those who do this for a living. Do not second-guess their expertise. Do not second-guess their guidance. This bill will save lives and we need to pass it today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will be brief. I want to point out to my colleagues that a version of this bill, arguably a stronger version of this bill, passed the State Senate unanimously. This was not controversial and it should not be controversial when we are talking about saving the lives of victims of domestic abuse.

I want to leave you with one thought and it relates to my Jewish faith and a quote from the Talmud, which is an authoritative or rabbinic discussion of Jewish law and Jewish ethics. There is a very famous line from the Talmud that says, "Whoever destroys a single life is considered by Scripture to have destroyed the entire world, and whoever saves a single life is considered by Scripture to have saved the whole world."

We have the opportunity not just to save one life today but dozens, hundreds, thousands over the years by passing this piece of legislation. We should do this. It should be unanimous just like the Senate. Please vote "yes." Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Daryl Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot said from those who oppose HB 2060, the majority of which I would agree with and do not intend on repeating today. But I received a call over the weekend from my sheriff in Butler County to express concerns about this legislation as drafted. And something I had shared with the caucus yesterday was that this legislation from the Senate form had been worked on for a long period of time and there had been a lot of folks giving input from outside the halls here in the Capitol.

From the perspective of many Second Amendment advocates, we believe that with some small changes to this legislation it is something that could find unanimous support or at least supermajority support if not unanimous if we actually had time to work on this. As the gentleman from Armstrong County had said, this legislation is only half finished. I mean, there is really work that could be done so that many here today who are opposing it could actually support it.

And some of the arguments that have been made, I think there has been the wrong message that has been conveyed. There have been a lot of emotional pleas and probably everyone here would sympathize with those emotional stories that have been shared and would share that they really— I mean, to understand the horrific circumstances that some people find themselves in is something that we all can be compassionate about and something that we all can sympathize with and empathize with, but we should not advance legislation and policy just based on somebody's emotional plea.

We need to look at, as the prime sponsor had said earlier when she made her initial presentation, the facts. And I think the fact is, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not doing what a judge cannot already do now for the situation where he thinks that firearms should be relinquished when there are two individuals that have a dispute going and a PFA that is issued, a final order PFA. So right now a judge can order in those situations, during that hearing after they have issued the temporary and they are going to look at doing a final, the judge can already say I want the firearms relinquished, and he has made the determination based on the people that are standing before him. This legislation will mandate that that judge actually, when he issues that final order, this legislation will mandate that the firearms are now removed.

Now, the way that it was being presented by some of the speakers from my understanding what they were saying and from what I heard them say was that the individual that is having their firearms taken away from them, that they have already done something wrong. Somebody had said it was akin to having your voting rights taken away if you had committed certain levels of crime, and that is not the case. The individuals that we are talking about, some of those individuals that would have to relinquish their firearms might be in the situation where accusations have

been made – as we have seen on national television, accusations can be made; it does not mean there is any evidence – accusations made and now, because of this legislation, if the judge says he is going to issue a final order PFA, firearms will be relinquished whether or not the individual the accusation has been made against has done anything wrong or not. An individual might have their rights impacted, might have their rights taken away, might have very expensive property taken away, when they in fact had done nothing wrong at all. And I think that is what is being missed. So for anybody that is tuning in to the debate, for all of those that are standing up sharing these emotional pleas and these emotionalized stories that we can all sympathize with, that we all would feel horrible about knowing anybody that has had these types of violent situations impact their lives or take their lives away, many of the people that will be impacted by this are going to be fellow citizens who will have their rights taken away, that had an accusation made, that may not have done anything wrong at all.

Now, currently they can stand before a judge and the judge can try and make that determination under current law, is this a bogus accusation or is there substance here? Is there enough of a dispute going? Is there enough emotion here that we need to issue the final order? And when I issue the final order, I should have firearms relinquished? But now the judge can say, "Well, we need to keep these two people apart, but I don't think it's going to turn violent to where the firearms should be relinquished." So right now we have allowed a judge to actually decide that. This legislation will mandate it. And ultimately, as I said, the individual would not necessarily have been convicted of any crime or have committed any crime, but there would have been an accusation made, and as a result of the accusation, as a result of going before the judge and the judge saying we need a final order, now the judge's hands will be tied and firearms will be relinquished.

Well, the concern that my sheriff had brought to me over the weekend when he called me this weekend was that he does not have enough space to take on the potential firearms that are going to be brought to him in these situations where the judge's hands are now tied and because he issued, because he gave the final order PFA, that those individuals have to relinquish the firearms. The other concern that the sheriff brought to me was, one, we do not have the storage space, so we are going to have to find more storage space; and then, two, who is going to be liable for any damage that might occur to those firearms? There are some very expensive firearms, and potentially, as somebody said in caucus today, potentially even heirlooms that have been passed down from generation to generation. They have a lot of value. Who is going to pay if there is damage done to those? Well, of course, you know, there will be a suit. When the individual gets their firearms back and if there was no reason they should have been taken away and there is damage that is done, then there will be a lawsuit, and who is going to be on the hook to pay for that? But our taxpayers, who ultimately will be having that suit litigated by attorneys for the county, attorneys hired by the county, and ultimately, whatever settlements occur, our county tax payers will ultimately be on the hook for that, unless, I think, it is the State Police or somebody else that might be taking those in and then potentially a State tax payer.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think there are a lot of concerns about this legislation that still remain. As I said, I think that we could get to a final legislative product where the supermajority, if not unanimously, it could be embraced. But, Mr. Speaker, this vote

today, because it is being ramrodded through in this aggressive manner, discarding, discarding the conversations we had even yesterday in caucus where we had shared these sentiments that we could work to a final resolution, despite that, despite those conversations, this is being ramrodded through, and ultimately, I believe the motivation as it was shared by one of the gentledadies from the other side of the aisle that stood up and said that she is with one of these radical groups pushing for gun control and that this is one step toward that, and that they want additional gun control measures. Now, they do not call them that. They call them gun safety measures, which is nonsense. They are gun-grabbing individuals and they are trying to take away the rights of our citizens who own firearms. This is one step in that direction, and if it was not a step in that direction, then there would be work being done right now so that the majority of us could support this instead of ramrodding through something that everybody here that was in caucuses yesterday knows full well what the objections are and knows full well that we could get to a final resolution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask for opposition to HB 2060. It is not ready for a vote, and once it is voted, it is going to go to the Senate. I do not think it is going to have the same life in the Senate that it has seen here today. We could find a final product that we agree with, we could all be reasonable in this, but those who are not reasonable that just want to advance gun control measures in Pennsylvania that are rejected by the majority of our population, they want to ram this through today.

This is about gun control. I ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. We have two more speakers before the final— Oh, no, I am sorry; somebody just added. So I have Representative Sturla, Representative Dan Miller, Representative Diamond, and then the primary sponsor of the bill.

So we are going to introduce some guests first.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located in the rear of the House, we welcome students and professors from Seton Hill University. Please stand. It is great to have you here today. They are guests of Representative Mike Reese and Representative Eric Nelson out in Westmoreland County. It is great to have you here today. Thanks so much for joining us. We really appreciate it.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2060 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. We tend to go back and forth, so what we are going to do is we are going to take Representative Sturla, who will be followed by Representative Diamond, followed by Representative Miller, and then we will go to the prime sponsor.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I was contacted by a friend of mine who wanted to make sure that I was supportive of HB 2060. She wrote to me and said that one of her daughters was beaten and left for dead last year, in a domestic violence case. "Her assailant used a gun in the commission of the crime. When we got to the hospital, the trauma surgeon told us before we saw her 'that it is a miracle she is alive.'" And we are grateful every day that she still is, but so many others are not. Mr. Speaker, that was one of the messages that I received in support of HB 2060.

I will also tell you that I received a few e-mails opposing HB 2060, and what I found very curious was that the one e-mail that I received, a person gave their name, they even gave their address in my town, only problem is there is no such address like that in my town. And so I started to look at the handful of e-mails that I had gotten in opposition to HB 2060 and clearly half of them were to addresses that Google claims do not exist in the United States. Must be a Russian bot.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the testimony today and I have got to tell you it is just truly amazing. I do not know how my colleagues that are women have been able to tolerate some of the things that have been said today. I am outraged and I cannot imagine that they are not even more so. What we have heard is that we can sympathize with those victims of domestic violence, the majority, the vast majority of which we know are women, if in fact we could actually believe women. That is what we have heard. Whether it is the parallels at the national level right now or whether it is incidents in their own districts, members standing up saying well, you know, those women, they do not always tell the truth, and sometimes if they did not tell the truth, my guns might be taken away. That is what we heard.

Now, these are victims of domestic violence, and what we have been told is those victims, the vast majority of which are women, cannot always be trusted to determine whether in fact they were actually in danger or not because maybe they were not actually in danger, maybe they just kind of misinterpreted the fact that a gun in their face meant that they were in danger.

The interesting thing is what we have heard from some of those people that espouse these ideas are the same people that not too long ago on the floor of this House stood and talked about the Castle Doctrine and defend your ground and the ability for someone to make a snap-decision judgment as to whether or not they felt threatened and could in fact not go to a judge and get a judge to determine whether in fact they were in danger or not but could take someone's life in an instant, mostly because, after all, they were men and they could make those snap judgments.

The SPEAKER. Sir, please, on the bill. The Castle Doctrine is already in law and is not in front of us.

Mr. STURLA. That is true, Mr. Speaker.

But what is before us is whether or not we trust women because that is what this is about. This bill is about whether or not we trust women who feel they are threatened. Now, apparently because the Castle Doctrine is in place, if every one of those women who was a victim of domestic violence decided that on that snap decision they wanted to shoot their perpetrator instead of going to a judge and asking for a protection from abuse, if they wanted to make the decision right then and there themselves to end their abuser's life, we would all be okay with that, but if they decide instead that they do not want to go the violent route, that they want to go and get a PFA and have that perpetrator's guns taken away, well, then all the bets are off, because heaven forbid, we cannot trust them. That, to me, is absurd.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to strengthen this bill in the future, we have all the opportunities later this session, next session, years into it as we go forward. If we want to make sure that there is mandatory counseling for perpetrators of domestic violence, if we want to make sure that they get detained for a cooling-off period, if you want to strengthen the bill, go ahead, let us do that, but let us do it later. For right now let us make sure that — as the

statistics point out, the biggest threat to that person who has domestic violence perpetrated against them is the possession of a weapon by their perpetrator – let us get rid of that weapon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of HB 2060 and urge my colleagues to do so also.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Diamond, sir.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I will ask you to bear with me. Usually when I get up to speak about something, I use a very loud voice. I will probably be a little bit quiet today.

I hesitated for a long time on whether I would speak on this bill because it touches me in ways that I do not believe it touches any other member. I believe the goal of protecting victims from abuse and deadly violence should be at the top of our lists of things to do, and I appreciate all the colleagues who brought stories from constituents in their districts here. But I want to tell you a firsthand story, firsthand story because I am a 30-plus-year survivor of serious domestic violence. I was punched. I was slapped. I was kicked. I was stabbed. I woke up one morning with a loaded gun to my head. I know what it is like to be a victim of domestic violence. Because of the timeframe when that happened to me – this was the mideighties and I was a young man in my early twenties – I did not realize there were resources out there, and you know, quite frankly, this is not something you go and you talk to your colleagues at work about when you are a young up-and-coming male. It just was not acceptable to talk about.

It took me about 20 years to get over that, and I made a lot of bad decisions in my life. I stand before you as a survivor of serious domestic violence, and my heart goes out to every victim of actual domestic violence. It is not something you ever want to live through. Despite that, Mr. Speaker, I must stand in opposition to this bill because I think there is a serious flaw in it and the flaw also has very personal ramifications for me. And the flaw, Mr. Speaker, I do not remember the exact words they used, but the maker of the bill inferred it in her statements and it was echoed by the gentleman from Philadelphia, the assumption that every person who asks for a protection-from-abuse order has actually been abused.

There is a very low threshold of evidence required to get a protection-from-abuse order in Pennsylvania. How do I know? Because some years after I was actually abused, like I told you about before, I was abused again, and by that time I knew about the PFA system. So I went to the courthouse, and at that time there were no – now there is domestic violence advocates who are there to help you – the only person there to help me was the person who worked in the law library. So they asked me to write a statement. And I went into the judge, it was my first interaction ever, first time I had ever met, you know, one of the common pleas judges in our county, and he went over my statement. He asked me to repeat my statement to him from memory. And he issued the PFA, a temporary PFA order. That was all that was needed. I did not need a police report. I did not need a bruise. It was just me standing before the judge.

And there is no higher standard of evidence when you carry through and attempt to get a final PFA order. It may be just the two parties standing in front of the judge, one saying this happened, the other one said this did not. Right now our judges have the discretion, the discretion to determine the terms of a final PFA order. Put yourself in that judge's position. If you have two people standing in front of you, one says something

happened, one says that did not happen, what do you do if there is no other evidence, if there is no other evidence other than that? You err on the side of caution, and you do what the protection-from-abuse order is intended to do, you put time and distance between those two parties. If you want to add any other provisions to that final order, you as a judge have the discretion to do that based on those two people appearing before you and your impressions of those two people as that process unveils.

Now, I can also tell you that all it takes is one person's word to get a PFA, because before I came here, a few years before I came here, and this was so ironic to me based on what I had gone through earlier in my life, I was falsely accused by someone of abusing them. That person filed and successfully got a temporary PFA order against me. Even though that person had called the police to her house and the police made no report, even though there were no marks, bruises, injuries, anything like that, a temporary PFA order was issued. And I was met at my home after work one day by the deputies who showed me the PFA order and came in and then took my firearms. I complied because I knew how the system worked, because I was on the other side of it.

But let us not— And I have seen another colleague who posted this on Facebook, that they were standing with those people who are guilty of abuse. A PFA hearing, a final PFA order does not necessarily include any kind of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. It is a preponderance of the evidence.

As such, the PFA system has a flaw in it. It does have a flaw. If it did not have a flaw, 48.4 percent of these temporary orders would not be either withdrawn or have their plaintiffs not show up for court. I am not saying it is too easy to get a PFA order. We need to have that system in place.

And I could certainly, certainly vote for HB 2060 if the condition was you have a final PFA order accompanied by a conviction of some sort of crime beyond a reasonable doubt. But 2060 does not include that.

You know, the other members of this caucus know more about the gun issue than I do. And if you do not believe, Mr. Speaker, if you do not believe that this system can be abused by people who have not suffered from domestic violence, I ask you to contact divorce lawyers and family court lawyers in your district for a little feedback. The system has been weaponized by some to the great detriment of those actual victims of domestic violence like me who need those resources to keep them safe.

I believe, as others have already stated, that this bill can be fixed. I believe we can get this bill to a place where it meets everyone's objectives, protecting victims and safeguarding our Second Amendment rights. But it is not there yet.

So, Mr. Speaker, a motion?

The SPEAKER. Yes, please state your motion.

Mr. DIAMOND. I am not clear on the required language for this. I would like a motion to move this bill from third consideration to second consideration so further amendments can be added.

The SPEAKER. Okay. There is no motion to move, in consultation with the Parliamentarian, to move the bill from third to second consideration. We are on the final passage vote. You have two motions you would have to make. Please come up. There is no such motion that you are making.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER. Sir, on the record, in consultation with the Parliamentarian, the motion that you are attempting to state is not allowed by the rules.

Mr. DIAMOND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate your indulgence and the Parliamentarian's time on that.

I had remembered we had done that before, but there was a different method of doing that, apparently.

That being said, I really wish to perfect this bill because I could absolutely be behind this bill if it is perfected. But at this time then, Mr. Speaker, I must simply ask my colleagues to vote in opposition to HB 2060. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Dan Miller.

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

I recognize debate has gone on for a while. I appreciate that. I appreciate the comments from everyone. I do appreciate the maker of the bill, Representative Quinn, for her leadership on this issue.

I do feel that there are some things that we may be a bit confused about. I feel that there are some things I just think we all need to have kind of a set understanding about. We have heard today about confusion about standards with PFAs. The implication seems to be that there is none; that for the last X amount of years you walk in and it is crazy time and just by flipping a coin, somebody gets a temporary or final PFA. It is ridiculous. It is reflective, in my opinion, of a large misunderstanding of a very important part of law and the key element in the protection of Pennsylvanians.

There are plenty of standards throughout this issue. One only needs to look in Title 23, Title 18. You will find everything spelled out as to who can get it, what they need to prove, and of course, as referenced by our previous speaker, I appreciate the burden that is necessary to be reached. It is all spelled out. There is nothing new. The PFA system has been here a long time, and overwhelmingly, it gets things right.

There is an implication that seems to be that because we cannot guarantee that every PFA was granted appropriately, then something is massively wrong. It is an interesting bit of logic, one that makes me wonder about those who are sitting in prisons and jails who have taken pleas, who likewise did not perhaps do the crime that was charged. They are there as well. There is no doubt that in our system of justice – civil, criminal, family – we can point to examples of failures in the system to get it 100 percent right. It is the best system that we have, and thus far I have not seen an amendment that would fundamentally change it. If you believe that a preponderance of the evidence is somehow too low, where is the amendment to increase it?

There is a difference between a PFA system and the criminal system. There is a reason why we structured it differently than that. And you know what a lot of it has to do with? Fear. Fear. At the heart of domestic violence and the inability to get justice is fear. Overwhelmingly, the women who go through – and it is largely women – who go through this process with it, if you have ever represented them, if you have ever had a family member go through it or a friend, you know what they are? They are afraid. They are afraid of standing up and saying I am in danger. Overwhelmingly that is the case. They are afraid of what happens when they go home. They are afraid of what happens in between the temporary and the final discussion. They are afraid.

Some have said, well, we did not cure – we do not have a cure. With all respect, if you have a cure for domestic violence, please say it now. I would love to have that cure. But while we search for that cure, I am tired of women, mostly women, getting beaten, getting killed, and being too afraid to stand up. This body is 20 percent women. The reality of it is, there is something wrong in our country largely speaking in the domestic violence arena in relation to males. No easy answer. I do not know. But what is it that is making it overwhelmingly a crime of violence against women, in domestic violence or sexual violence? What is it? And again, I would love to know and I mean that sincerely. It should be something that we should discuss, and while we are trying to discuss that matter, we need to protect more people.

Some people seem to think that the judges seemingly do not know what they are doing on the bench, and again, nobody would stand up here and say that they get it right all the time. Nobody will say that. And again, if you do not like the standard of review that they are doing, change it. In the meantime, the majority of our judges are getting it right. The majority of our judges are doing what we need them to do, which is weigh the evidence. People say, well, hey, it is an accusation. It is evidence. You may not find it to be enough for your standard, but it is evidence that is entered into court. And there is a difference with how evidence is done. We sit there and say, well, listen, we are going to talk about the Second Amendment. Fantastic. There is a whole bunch of our Bill of Rights that relates to evidence. It relates to what we are talking about. That is all coming into play. And again, if you do not like how it gets in, then change the standard, it is not that tough, if you do not think it is doing the job right.

The reality of it is, more people need PFAs than get them. There are more people that need help than seek it. And if you did not know the standard, that is on you. It is clear. Chapter 61 spells it out. You can read it in about 10 minutes of what this discussion has been. Do not come up here saying I do not know what the standard is. Too many people are depending upon you knowing it. Too many people are looking for us to help. This is too important of an issue.

I would agree that sometimes the personal stories are challenging. I would agree. I would also agree I am biased. I am totally biased. I am totally biased. Because of those personal connections, I know the fear personally that my mom had. I know it. I saw it on her face. I listened in between her tears. I hugged her during it. It is real. The fear in domestic violence is real.

The SPEAKER. Thank you. Thank you.

Mr. D. MILLER. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I am sorry. You—

Mr. D. MILLER. Thank you. I am not— Just a moment.

The reality is this, and I appreciate again, some people have said, well, we cannot figure out how to stop them when they use fists. We cannot figure out how to stop them if they use a hammer. We cannot figure out how to stop them when they use any other weapon. Agreed. Something to work on.

But what we can do is this, stop them with their gun with the window of opportunity they have to turn it in. The connection is clear; Representative Stephens laid it out. It is clear as day. It is clear as day about this plague that is impacting largely women in this State and in this country. It is a massive issue for us to do.

The reality of it for us here is that I understand that a bunch of people will balance out a right, and again, I am always open to look for an opportunity here to be sure that due process is

followed. That is something that I do not really think that people have talked too much about but I get it. That is something we should talk about. But the solution to domestic violence cannot just be fingers crossed, say a prayer, and it will work out. It is a disservice to the women who are living it and are looking for us to help.

Mr. Speaker, with that I will close, obviously in support of the bill and looking forward to a unanimous vote for us to stand with women in particular and domestic violence survivors in the State of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. We have two additional speakers, Representative Dawn Keefer and Representative Harry Readshaw. Representative Keefer and then Representative Readshaw.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. KEEFER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion to recommit this bill to committee.

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may state.

Mrs. KEEFER. Just based upon there are many definitions that are missing in this legislation as well as there are a lot of conflicting definitions and there are also a lot of language mistakes, there are numerous language mistakes in the bill, for that reason I ask it to be recommitted back to committee to have it corrected.

The SPEAKER. Okay. Which committee, Representative, do you wish to—

Mrs. KEEFER. Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Okay.

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

The SPEAKER. The leaders, on the motion, please. The leaders, on the motion, please.

The majority leader, Representative Reed.

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

I would ask the members to oppose the motion to recommit HB 2060 to the Judiciary Committee. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, even if this bill is rereferred to a committee, it cannot be amended at this point in committee. This is just a delay tactic. We have an opportunity to protect victims of domestic abuse. We need to vote the bill. Oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER. Representative Saccone, on the motion. Representative Rick Saccone, on the motion.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to recommit. As I said when I first spoke, they have tried to portray this as if you are opposed to it, you are opposed against women and you are opposed to helping domestic abuse victims, and that is just not true—

The SPEAKER. Just on the motion, sir.

Mr. SACCONI. Yes, sir. I am explaining why I am supporting it.

I outlined a number of fixable flaws as the reason I am supporting this. I outlined a number of them, at least 10 of them that will make this bill better. Many of us want to support this bill. We want to work with both sides of the aisle. This is not a one-way street. We are a deliberative body. Let us deliberate and

make the best piece of legislation that we can make. That is what we are supposed to do here. We have that chance to go back and fix this and make it so that we can have a unanimous vote. Put aside the demagoguery and the politics for a moment. Let us do what is right. That is why we are here. So I support this motion. Thank you.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

May I make a point of parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may.

Mr. DERMODY. I would ask, if this bill is rereferred to a committee, can it be amended?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Keefer, on the motion.

Mrs. KEEFER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question regarding that?

The SPEAKER. Yes. Parliamentary inquiry. You may proceed.

Mrs. KEEFER. Yes, please. Why could it not be amended in committee? If recommitted to Rules?

The SPEAKER. It is on third consideration. Excuse me; it is on final passage. The bill has already been amended in committee. The House has no power to amend the bill at this point.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—42

Boback	Heffley	Metcalfe	Rothman
Causar	Hill	Moul	Ryan
Cook	Irvin	Nelson	Saccone
Diamond	James	Ortitay	Sankey
Dowling	Keefer	Peifer	Tallman
Dunbar	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Topper
Dush	Knowles	Rapp	Walsh
Ellis	Kortz	Readshaw	Ward
Godshall	Maloney	Reese	Warner
Grove	Markosek	Roae	Wentling
Hanna	McGinnis		

NAYS—152

Barbin	Dermody	Krueger	Ravenstahl
Barrar	DiGiroloamo	Kulik	Reed
Benninghoff	Donatucci	Lawrence	Roe
Bernstine	Driscoll	Lewis	Roebuck
Bizzarro	Emrick	Longietti	Rozzi
Bloom	English	Mackenzie	Sainato
Boyle	Evans	Madden	Samuelson
Bradford	Everett	Maher	Santora
Briggs	Farry	Marshall	Saylor
Brown, R.	Fee	Masser	Schemel
Brown, V.	Fitzgerald	Matzie	Schlossberg
Bullock	Flynn	McCarter	Schweyer
Burns	Frankel	McClinton	Simmons
Caltagirone	Freeman	McNeill	Sims

Carroll	Fritz	Mehaffie	Snyder
Cephas	Galloway	Mentzer	Solomon
Charlton	Gillen	Miccarelli	Sonney
Christiana	Gillespie	Millard	Staats
Comitta	Goodman	Miller, B.	Stephens
Conklin	Greiner	Miller, D.	Sturla
Corbin	Haggerty	Milne	Tai
Corr	Hahn	Mullery	Taylor
Costa, D.	Harkins	Murt	Thomas
Costa, P.	Harper	Mustio	Tobash
Cox	Harris, A.	Neilson	Toepel
Cruz	Harris, J.	Nesbit	Toohil
Culver	Helm	O'Neal	Vazquez
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Neill	Vitali
Daley	Hickernell	Oberlander	Warren
Davidson	Jozwiak	Owlett	Watson
Davis, A.	Kampf	Pashinski	Wheatley
Davis, T.	Kaufer	Petrarca	Wheeland
Dawkins	Kauffman	Pickett	White
Day	Keller, F.	Quigley	Youngblood
Dean	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Zimmerman
Deasy	Kim	Quinn, M.	
DeLissio	Kinsey	Rabb	Turzai,
Delozier	Kirkland	Rader	Speaker
DeLuca	Klunk		

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Gabler	Kavulich	Marsico	O'Brien
Gainey	Mako	Metzgar	

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

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. Representative Readshaw is our last speaker before the prime sponsor. Representative Readshaw, the floor is yours.

Mr. READSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Yes, you may proceed.

Mr. READSHAW. That inquiry is, if a motion to table to a date and time specific would pass this House, could this bill be amended during that course of time?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. READSHAW. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Quinn. Before you begin Representative Quinn, I just want to see does any other member wish to speak on the bill? And Representative Quinn will be the final speaker. If anybody else wishes to speak, now is the time.

Representative Quinn, you may proceed.

Ms. QUINN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you, colleagues, for the hearty discussion that we have had leading up to this vote.

I especially want to thank the gentleman from Lebanon County who stood before us with the courage to speak about his own personal experience with domestic violence. His brave,

personal words underscored the fact that domestic violence does not discriminate only – it does not discriminate with gender, with economic status, with someone who actually has firearms on their possession. His brave testimony speaks to the fact that when a loved one, a spouse, a partner, a child, when domestic violence is rendered, it is at its heat of a moment, that you do not know what to do, that you could wake up with a gun pointed at your head. Thank you for sharing that. And I am so happy that you have been here to share it, that you were able to survive the fear and avoid the tragedy that so many others have succumbed to.

We have heard a number of issues about this bill, a number of issues that quite frankly are not true, a number of issues that seem to be just delay tactics for something that is long overdue. Let me remind you that when we broke from here and we left having tabled this bill in June, there have been 39 deaths of domestic violence involving firearms, not baseball bats, not hands, not any other weapon, which are all defined in the underlying bill. Someone has got to read a little bit beyond these few pages and see that this is on top of underlying law. But there have been 39 deaths.

I do not know what date you would like this postponed till, but really, the next death in domestic violence with a firearm going to be in your district? Who knows. We are not going to stop all of this. Nothing in this legislation is going to stop the onslaught of domestic violence, but what this legislation will do is take away the guns from a perpetrator who has been either convicted or has a final order PFA against them. And I will tell you that in law to get a final order PFA, you have to show bodily injury or fear of imminent serious bodily injury. Those terms are defined in existing law. This is not a matter of someone looking at you funny or someone being afraid of your size or stature, or you having said the nasty thing; this is all established in law. And as I sat up there and I consulted with the executive director and other lawyers on the Judiciary Committee staff, I asked, "Wow, I was not aware that the PFA law has so many flaws. Could you please tell me how many bills are in your committee now that address this?" Well, based on what we have heard today— Oh, and their answer was none.

Your next session you might be busy working on that, and as you do work on that PFA law, I hope you keep the victims in mind and I hope you uphold the standards that this bill has for those who are being accused. Thank you very much. I appreciate an affirmative vote and a step doing the right thing. Thank you.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. My understanding is Representative THOMAS has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2060 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—131

Barbin	Delozier	Kim	Quinn, M.
Barrar	DeLuca	Kinsey	Rabb
Benninghoff	Dermody	Kirkland	Rader
Bizzarro	DiGirolamo	Klunk	Ravenstahl
Boback	Donatucci	Kortz	Reed
Boyle	Driscoll	Krueger	Roe
Bradford	Emrick	Kulik	Roebuck
Briggs	English	Lawrence	Rozzi
Brown, R.	Evans	Lewis	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Farry	Longietti	Santora
Bullock	Fee	Mackenzie	Saylor
Caltagirone	Fitzgerald	Madden	Schlossberg
Carroll	Flynn	Maher	Schweyer
Cephas	Frankel	Masser	Simmons
Charlton	Freeman	Matzie	Sims
Comitta	Galloway	McCarter	Solomon
Conklin	Gillen	McClinton	Staats
Corbin	Gillespie	McNeill	Stephens
Corr	Goodman	Mehaffie	Sturla
Costa, D.	Greiner	Mentzer	Tai
Costa, P.	Hahn	Miccarelli	Taylor
Cox	Harkins	Millard	Toepel
Cruz	Harper	Miller, B.	Toohil
Culver	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Vazquez
Cutler	Harris, J.	Milne	Vitali
Daley	Helm	Moul	Warren
Davidson	Hennessey	Mullery	Watson
Davis, A.	Hickernell	Murt	Wheatley
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Neilson	White
Dawkins	Kampf	O'Neill	Youngblood
Day	Kaufer	Pashinski	
Dean	Keller, F.	Quigley	Turzai,
Deasy	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Speaker
DeLissio			

NAYS—62

Bernstine	Hanna	Nesbit	Saccone
Bloom	Heffley	O'Neal	Sainato
Burns	Hill	Oberlander	Sankey
Causer	Irvin	Ortitay	Schemel
Christiana	James	Owlett	Snyder
Cook	Kauffman	Peifer	Sonney
Diamond	Keefer	Petrarca	Tallman
Dowling	Keller, M.K.	Pickett	Tobash
Dunbar	Knowles	Pyle	Topper
Dush	Maloney	Rapp	Walsh
Ellis	Markosek	Readshaw	Ward
Everett	Marshall	Reese	Warner
Fritz	McGinnis	Roae	Wentling
Godshall	Metcalfe	Rothman	Wheeland
Grove	Mustio	Ryan	Zimmerman
Haggerty	Nelson		

NOT VOTING—0**EXCUSED—8**

Gabler	Kavulich	Marsico	O'Brien
Gainey	Mako	Metzgar	Thomas

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

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

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR**RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35**

Mr. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 1009, PN 3834**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2018 as "National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month" and September 10, 2018, as "World Suicide Prevention Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MURT called up **HR 1011, PN 3853**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2018 as "National Recovery Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. CRUZ called up **HR 1013, PN 3870**, entitled:

A Resolution observing the month of September 2018 as "Newborn Screening Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. CRUZ called up **HR 1014, PN 3871**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2018 as "Leukodystrophy Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. CRUZ called up **HR 1015, PN 3872**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2018 as "Krabbe Disease Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. CRUZ called up **HR 1016, PN 3873**, entitled:

A Resolution observing September 15 through October 15, 2018, as "Hispanic Heritage Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. CRUZ called up **HR 1017, PN 3874**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week following the second Monday in October as "Indigenous Peoples Week" and the month of October 2018 as "Indigenous Peoples Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. JAMES called up **HR 1028, PN 3921**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of October 2018 as "National Arts and Humanities Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. HEFFLEY called up **HR 1040, PN 3951**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2018 as "Down Syndrome Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MARSHALL called up **HR 1042, PN 3952**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2018 as "Chiropractic Health and Wellness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. DELOZIER called up **HR 1046, PN 3971**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of October 2018 as "Domestic Violence Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. WHEATLEY called up **HR 1047, PN 3972**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2018 as "Hunger Action Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. HAHN called up **HR 1051, PN 3987**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 125th anniversary of the Borough of Wind Gap.

* * *

Mr. SAYLOR called up **HR 1052, PN 3989**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2018 as "Fire Prevention Month" and recognizing the week of October 7 through 13, 2018, as "National Fire Prevention Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. READSHAW called up **HR 1059, PN 3999**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2018 as "Military Service Opportunity Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. WARREN called up **HR 1064, PN 4004**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Spanish influenza pandemic.

* * *

Mr. MATZIE called up **HR 1075, PN 4022**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2018 as "Agent Orange Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MAHER called up **HR 1077, PN 4029**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of October 7 through 13, 2018, as "National Newspaper Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. SAYLOR called up **HR 1078, PN 4030**, entitled:

A Resolution designating October 10, 2018, as "Put the Brakes on Fatalities Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. KINSEY called up **HR 1079, PN 4031**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing September 25, 2018, as the "Day of Remembrance for Murder Victims" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. KINSEY called up **HR 1080, PN 4032**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2018 as "Emergency Preparedness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. KINSEY called up **HR 1081, PN 4033**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of September 16 through 22, 2018, as "Direct Support Professionals Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. QUINN called up **HR 1085, PN 4035**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of September 2018 as "Sepsis Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MALONEY called up **HR 1088, PN 4056**, entitled:

A Resolution designating September 25, 2018, as "Motorsports Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. R. BROWN called up **HR 1089, PN 4057**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the month of September 2018 as "Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. R. BROWN called up **HR 1090, PN 4058**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing September 29, 2018, as "Pick Up the Poconos Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. WHITE called up **HR 1091, PN 4059**, entitled:

A Resolution designating 2018 as "Year of the Woman" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mrs. EVANS called up **HR 1097, PN 4064**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2018 as "Pennsylvania Pharmacists and Pharmacy Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Barbin	Dush	Kulik	Reed
Barrar	Ellis	Lawrence	Reese
Benninghoff	Emrick	Lewis	Roae
Bernstine	English	Longietti	Roe
Bizzarro	Evans	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bloom	Everett	Madden	Rothman
Boback	Farry	Maher	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Masser	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Freeman	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Fritz	McCarter	Santora
Burns	Galloway	McClinton	Saylor
Caltagirone	Gillen	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Gillespie	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Godshall	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Greiner	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Grove	Miccarelli	Snyder
Comitta	Haggerty	Millard	Solomon
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cook	Hanna	Miller, D.	Staats
Corbin	Harkins	Milne	Stephens
Corr	Harper	Moul	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Mullery	Tai
Costa, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Heffley	Mustio	Taylor
Cruz	Helm	Neilson	Tobash
Culver	Hennessey	Nelson	Toepel
Cutler	Hickernell	Nesbit	Toohil
Daley	Hill	O'Neal	Topper
Davidson	Irvin	O'Neill	Vazquez
Davis, A.	James	Oberlander	Vitali
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Walsh
Dawkins	Kampf	Owlett	Ward
Day	Kaufner	Pashinski	Warner
Dean	Kauffman	Peifer	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Petrarca	Watson
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pickett	Wentling
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Wheatley
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Quigley	Wheeland
Dermody	Kim	Quinn, C.	White
Diamond	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Rabb	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Klunk	Rader	
Dowling	Knowles	Rapp	Turzai,
Driscoll	Kortz	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Dunbar	Krueger	Readshaw	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gabler	Kavulich	Marsico	O'Brien
Gainey	Mako	Metzgar	Thomas

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

UNCONTESTED SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. GOODMAN called up **HR 1098, PN 4083**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of October 2018 as "Fire Prevention Month" and recognizing the week of October 7 through 13, 2018, as "National Fire Prevention Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Barbin	Dush	Kulik	Reed
Barrar	Ellis	Lawrence	Reese
Benninghoff	Emrick	Lewis	Roae
Bernstine	English	Longietti	Roe
Bizzarro	Evans	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bloom	Everett	Madden	Rothman
Boback	Farry	Maher	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Masser	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Freeman	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Fritz	McCarter	Santora
Burns	Galloway	McClinton	Saylor
Caltagirone	Gillen	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Gillespie	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Godshall	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Greiner	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Grove	Miccarelli	Snyder
Comitta	Haggerty	Millard	Solomon
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, B.	Sonney
Cook	Hanna	Miller, D.	Staats
Corbin	Harkins	Milne	Stephens
Corr	Harper	Moul	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Mullery	Tai
Costa, P.	Harris, J.	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Heffley	Mustio	Taylor
Cruz	Helm	Neilson	Tobash
Culver	Hennessey	Nelson	Toepel
Cutler	Hickernell	Nesbit	Toohil
Daley	Hill	O'Neal	Topper
Davidson	Irvin	O'Neill	Vazquez
Davis, A.	James	Oberlander	Vitali
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Ortitay	Walsh
Dawkins	Kampf	Owlett	Ward
Day	Kaufner	Pashinski	Warner
Dean	Kauffman	Peifer	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Petrarca	Watson
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pickett	Wentling
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Pyle	Wheatley
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Quigley	Wheeland
Dermody	Kim	Quinn, C.	White
Diamond	Kinsey	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Rabb	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Klunk	Rader	
Dowling	Knowles	Rapp	Turzai,
Driscoll	Kortz	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Dunbar	Krueger	Readshaw	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gabler	Kavulich	Marsico	O'Brien
Gainey	Mako	Metzgar	Thomas

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

**BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEES,
CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED**

HB 2511, PN 3726 By Rep. O'NEILL

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in Treasury Department, further providing for investment of moneys.

FINANCE.

HB 2523, PN 4109 (Amended) By Rep. O'NEILL

An Act amending the act of June 27, 2006 (1st Sp.Sess., P.L.1873, No.1), known as the Taxpayer Relief Act, repealing provisions relating to local tax study commission; and making editorial changes to incorrect references.

FINANCE.

The SPEAKER. We are not taking further votes today. I am going to have some announcements and some unanimous consents, and any member that wishes to speak on a resolution, please come up and let us know that you wish to speak on a resolution. We will do that. We are going to be in session on October 1, Monday. We will not be in session on October 2 and 3, but we will be in session on October 1, Monday.

MOTION PURSUANT TO RULE 15

The SPEAKER. We are going to need a motion because we are going to start that day at 11 a.m., but we are going to be in session on October 1, Monday. We will not be in session on October 2 and 3.

With that, I am going to turn to the leader for a motion.

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

I would make a motion to start voting session on Monday, October 1, at 11 a.m. Thank you.

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

The SPEAKER. And the leader, on the motion.
Mr. DERMODY. I support the motion, Mr. Speaker.
The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Barbin	Dush	Kulik	Reed
Barrar	Ellis	Lawrence	Reese
Benninghoff	Emrick	Lewis	Roae
Bernstine	English	Longietti	Roe
Bizzarro	Evans	Mackenzie	Roebuck
Bloom	Everett	Madden	Rothman
Boback	Farry	Maher	Rozzi
Boyle	Fee	Maloney	Ryan
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Markosek	Saccone
Briggs	Flynn	Marshall	Sainato
Brown, R.	Frankel	Masser	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Freeman	Matzie	Sankey
Bullock	Fritz	McCarter	Santora
Burns	Galloway	McClinton	Saylor
Caltagirone	Gillen	McNeill	Schemel
Carroll	Gillespie	Mehaffie	Schlossberg
Causar	Godshall	Mentzer	Schweyer
Cephas	Goodman	Metcalfe	Simmons
Charlton	Greiner	Miccarelli	Sims
Christiana	Grove	Millard	Snyder
Comitta	Haggerty	Miller, B.	Solomon
Conklin	Hahn	Miller, D.	Sonney
Cook	Hanna	Milne	Staats
Corbin	Harkins	Moul	Stephens
Corr	Harper	Mullery	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harris, A.	Murt	Tai
Costa, P.	Harris, J.	Mustio	Tallman
Cox	Heffley	Neilson	Taylor
Cruz	Helm	Nelson	Tobash
Culver	Hennessey	Nesbit	Toepel
Cutler	Hickernell	O'Neal	Toohil
Daley	Hill	O'Neill	Topper
Davidson	Irvin	Oberlander	Vazquez
Davis, A.	James	Ortitay	Vitali
Davis, T.	Jozwiak	Owlett	Walsh
Dawkins	Kampf	Pashinski	Ward
Day	Kaufner	Peifer	Warner
Dean	Kauffman	Petrarca	Warren
Deasy	Keefer	Pickett	Watson
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pyle	Wentling
DeLozier	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	Wheatley
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
Dermody	Kim	Quinn, M.	White
Diamond	Kinsey	Rabb	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Rader	Zimmerman
Donatucci	Klunk	Rapp	
Dowling	Knowles	Ravenstahl	Turzai,
Driscoll	Kortz	Readshaw	Speaker
Dunbar	Krueger		

NAYS—1

McGinnis

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Gabler	Kavulich	Marsico	O'Brien
Gainey	Mako	Metzgar	Thomas

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

The SPEAKER. We will be starting Monday, October 1, at 11 a.m., at 11 a.m.

I have these individuals that want to be recognized, and then I am going to introduce some guests.

STATEMENT BY MR. CORR

The SPEAKER. Representative Corr, on unanimous consent. We will start with you. Go ahead, Representative Corr.

Mr. CORR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I asked to speak on unanimous consent to offer a couple of comments about HB 2060 that was just passed by the House. I think it represents the best of what we do as legislators. This was a bill that was respectfully debated by people on both sides of the issue. What may have been overlooked, however, is that it not only provides further protection for victims of domestic abuse, this was a bill that was put together over a series of years and I wanted to acknowledge the hard work by the maker of the bill, the Representative from Bucks County, Representative Marguerite Quinn. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Representative will not be returning to the House at the end of this session, and I believe as both Republicans and Democrats we owe her a debt of gratitude for her hard work and I wish to acknowledge that work.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Dan Frankel, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before all of my colleagues head out of here, we are going to have a very brief caucus at 1 o'clock. Please stick around, brief caucus, 1 o'clock. Thank you.

CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Watson, for a committee announcement.

Mrs. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House Children and Youth Committee did meet this morning at 8:45. We did not complete our work as had been advertised, so we will reconvene at the close of this session. In other words, in just a few minutes we will be in room 60, East Wing, right next to the cafeteria, and we will consider HB 2641. So we will meet in the next few minutes. We will be in room 60. This is the House Children and Youth Committee continuing its work to complete it today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Madam Chair.

In just a few minutes, the Children and Youth Committee will meet in room 60, East Wing, right next to the cafeteria, to consider HB 2641.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. EVERETT

The SPEAKER. Representative Everett has a caucus announcement, I believe. Representative Everett has a caucus announcement.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to remind the members of the Susquehanna Caucus that we had a noon meeting in 39 East Wing. If you would like to stop down there and pick up the information that was provided and catch the rest of the meeting, and I think lunch was being provided at that meeting also.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. CAUSER

The SPEAKER. Chairman Marty Causer, for, I believe, a committee announcement. Chairman Marty Causer, for a committee announcement.

Mr. CAUSER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just a notice to the members that the House Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee has scheduled a public hearing for Monday at 1 p.m., and we are going to cancel that meeting and reschedule to a later date. So the public hearing that was scheduled for Monday for the House Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee will be postponed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. KAUFFMAN

The SPEAKER. Representative Rob Kauffman, for a committee announcement.

Mr. KAUFFMAN. Thank you.

I similarly had a hearing scheduled for the House Labor and Industry Committee for 1 p.m. in Dallastown, Pennsylvania, and that committee hearing will now have to be postponed and we will make that announcement at a later date. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

Representative Kerry Benninghoff is recognized on remarks on a resolution. Any other members that wish to speak on a resolution— I know Representative Murt, Representative Kinsey, Representative James. I will be calling on each and every one of you.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. I also just want to briefly introduce to my left, realtors who are in town for State association meetings. If they will please stand, everybody: Quenna Smith of Conemaugh Township in Somerset County; Adam Conrad of Duncansville, Blair County; Bill Lease of Westmont in Cambria County; Della Csehowski of Johnstown in Cambria County; and Julie Sebock from Butler, Butler County. They are the guests of Representatives Reese, Ward, Barbin, and Ellis. Thank you so much for being with us today on the House floor. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MR. BENNINGHOFF

The SPEAKER. We are going to begin with Representative Kerry Benninghoff on his resolution. Any member who wishes to speak on a resolution, you will be recognized.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the members, I just want to take a moment to recognize HR 1009. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this is the resolution honoring September 2018 as "National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month."

I know it is an issue that a lot of people may not want to talk about, but it is something we as a nation need to talk about. Sadly, we lose over 2,000 people a year to suicide, one issue that is preventable in the health-care realm for premature deaths. We can do better with that, and part of that is the awareness and talking about it, trying to reduce the stigma of that and letting people know that life is valuable and worth working towards. In reducing these rates, it also requires a worldwide effort known as the psychological, social services, cultural and environmental risk factors to better address these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time to honor this. More importantly, we want to remember those individuals we lost and honor those family members that struggle with those losses on a day-to-day basis. So therefore, the House of Representatives recognizes September 2018 as "National Suicide Prevention Awareness Month," and I appreciate the members' attention.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MS. HAHN

The SPEAKER. Representative Marcia Hahn, on HR 1051.

Ms. HAHN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you, members, for your vote on HR 1051, which recognizes the 125th anniversary of Wind Gap Borough in Northampton County.

Shepherders settled Wind Gap in 1893 as part of a stage route. The local economy was formed by textile mills, slate industry, and took off when the railroad came to town in 1878. The borough consists of 25 acres with a population of slightly more than 2700 citizens. It is a classic small town feel, but it also is not far from bigger cities and is often referred to as a gateway to the Poconos.

I would like to congratulate Mayor Mitch Molgiski and all of the borough council members for all that they do and on this great occasion. And again, thank you to the members for their affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. MURT

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey and Representative Murt wish to speak on HR 1081.

Representative Murt, please, the floor is yours.

Mr. MURT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, with this resolution we recognize the great work done by direct support professionals. Direct support professionals and support coordinators, Mr. Speaker, are people who help individuals with intellectual disabilities, adults with special needs, if you will, to have real choices, to work, to live and socialize in their communities, to realize their dreams, to transform their lives, and to be included in the everyday lives of

their communities.

These professionals work directly with consumers in residential, day, employment services, and support programs throughout our Commonwealth. They provide skillful and compassionate services and support for seniors, people with developmental disabilities, people with mental illness, and those with chronic medical conditions. Direct support professionals and support coordinators support thousands of individuals across this Commonwealth and inspire us with their ability to work with individuals with disabilities and assist them with securing meaningful jobs, finding appropriate housing arrangements, learning to navigate public transportation systems, and engaging in social activities throughout their own communities. Mr. Speaker, these efforts allow those in need to live with dignity and comfort in our communities and their efforts should be lauded.

Mr. Speaker, one day is not enough to properly thank our direct support professionals for the skillful and unselfish work they do 365 days a year, and to that end, it is for these reasons that I stand with my friend and my colleague, Representative Kinsey, and I am proud to offer this resolution recognizing the important work these professionals provide to our neediest and most vulnerable citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MR. KINSEY

The SPEAKER. Representative Kinsey.

Mr. KINSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend and colleague, Representative Murt, as well as all of my colleagues in support of HR 1081, a resolution designating the week of September 16 through 22 as "Direct Support Professionals Week" in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time to honor these extraordinary, hardworking citizens within our Commonwealth. In my opinion, direct support professionals are not given nearly the amount of respect, praise, or pay they deserve. While many are living well below or close to poverty, their wages often do not reflect the care and services they provide.

DSPs enable individuals with disabilities to live as independently as possible in their communities – to live healthy lives, full of opportunity and freedom. For these direct support professionals, that often means working at the expense of spending time with their loved ones and family at home. For that, I express heartfelt appreciation to these workers and their families for allowing them to spend time with those in need.

Direct support professionals are vital to the daily lives of thousands of individuals and their families across the Commonwealth. One week of recognition is really not enough time to properly thank them for the essential work they provide 365 days a year. I deeply admire what they do, and we should all be grateful for people like them for the dedicated service to those in need.

Mr. Speaker, I just ask that each and every one of my colleagues as they travel back to their respective districts just reach out and say thank you to those individuals, those direct support professionals and their families for the work that they do in creating a better life for all that they work with.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MR. JAMES

The SPEAKER. Representative Lee James, I believe on HR 1028.

Mr. JAMES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am here with Representative Tim Briggs, my cosponsor and co-committee chair of the Arts and Humanities Committee. Tim.

I would just like to make a few comments on HR 1028, recognizing the month of October 2018 as "National Arts and Humanities Month."

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to serve as one of the four cochairmen of this bipartisan, bicameral legislative caucus, and while I have always valued art and the humanities, and I realize not everybody rises to that same level of enthusiasm, the position has helped me realize the economic value of these sectors of our society. As an example, for instance, the resolution notes that the nonprofit arts industry generates \$3.3 billion in total annual economic activity. To put that in perspective, the total budget for Pennsylvania is \$33 billion.

There is something about art that captures part of the human experience and expresses it in a way that no other format can communicate. We see in art the expression of our highest ideals and the warning to avoid our most base instincts. We hope that marking the month of October as "National Arts and Humanities Month" will draw attention to their importance of the value in our economy.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT BY MS. DELOZIER

The SPEAKER. Representative Sheryl DeLozier.

Ms. DELOZIER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to thank my colleagues for their unanimous vote recognizing October as "Domestic Violence Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania, an annual recognition of the issue that we need more education on and more conversation on.

It is a sad but startling fact that 117 people were killed last year in Pennsylvania by someone who was supposed to love them, someone who was supposed to be there for them in good times and bad, and someone whom they should never have had to fear.

The victims were all ages, races, incomes, and education levels. Six victims were 12 years or younger, and nine were over the age of 65. They died in all parts of our State, in 43 separate counties. But each of these victims is more than a statistic. They were mothers, fathers, daughters, sons, and friends. They each were valued parts of our community and someone's family.

With this resolution, I hope that we can further raise public awareness about this issue. Education and awareness are needed the most. Each year I introduce this resolution for just this purpose. The more we talk about it, the more people are aware of it, and the more people know what services are available. During the month of October, a red silhouette, which is part of the Silent Witness Initiative, will stand in the Capitol Rotunda to help bring attention to domestic violence. I urge you to find the time to visit this tribute and consider what you can do to prevent domestic violence.

No one should think that they are alone and feel that they have to face the demons alone. There is help out there for domestic violence victims. There are resources and people willing to help

and be the support a victim needs to stay strong and get the part of their life back that they have lost being a victim.

I am hopeful that this resolution can send a strong message that Pennsylvanians will not tolerate any type of this activity. There is much more to do, and it is up to us to keep pushing and fighting for the victims. We need to be their voice, and as I mentioned, educate every chance we get.

It is imperative that we continue to raise the consciousness and change public perception, bring this issue out from behind closed doors, and make sure no one deserves to be a victim of domestic violence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

STATEMENT BY MS. WHITE

The SPEAKER. Representative Martina White.

Ms. WHITE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thank you to all of my colleagues who supported this important resolution today. We are taking this moment in this year of 2018 to recognize all the accomplishments women have made to Pennsylvania since its founding.

This year is special because it is the 300th anniversary of when Hannah Penn took charge in leading Pennsylvania. In 1718 when her husband, William Penn, passed, she became the sole proprietor of Pennsylvania, leading its people as the first female Governor.

Throughout history women have overcome many challenges with grace and grit. They embraced leadership roles and have given us all a legacy to live up to. Here are a few stories of incredible women in our past that I would like to share with you.

Lydia Darragh was an Irish immigrant who served as a spy for George Washington during the Revolutionary War. British soldiers took over her family's home, and she eavesdropped on their meetings in order to convey information to the Continental Army. Imagine the danger she put herself in to help further the revolution.

Then there was Lucretia Mott, who moved to Philadelphia with her husband in 1811. Mott was an active voice in the abolitionist movement who worked on the Underground Railroad and later founded the Female Anti-Slavery Society as well as Swarthmore College, which she insisted would allow women students.

Mary Johnson Ambler. After the Great Train Wreck of 1856, Ambler walked 2 miles to bring medical supplies to the injured. She even converted her home into a makeshift hospital, and because of her rescue efforts, the train station and later the borough were named after her. Ambler, Pennsylvania, still exists in her memory.

All of these women took the challenges in front of them and helped others. They helped pave the path we walk today. Success comes in many forms. Some are faced with major events like the Revolution; others inspire and nurture the next generation through education or philanthropy.

We are fortunate to have so many amazing women in Pennsylvania today. Almost 2 weeks ago several Representatives and myself brought women together from all over the State so that we could spotlight their contributions to our Commonwealth. I would like to mention two women from my area for their accomplishments.

Sharon Snyder. In 1998 Sharon Snyder lost her first son, Kyle Samuel Snyder, after he bravely battled leukemia for 8 months. Kyle was only 2 years old when he passed. To honor his memory she started raising money for a memorial fund. She then started the Kisses for Kyle Foundation to support and comfort other families whose children are battling cancer. They assisted with everything from mortgage payments to Uber rides to get their children to treatment centers. In 2018 they have helped nearly 1,000 families.

Another incredible woman making a difference in my district is Susan Thompson. Susan graduated from the University of Pennsylvania and immediately began teaching. And after several years in this field, in 2015 Ms. Thompson joined the Philadelphia School District as an instructional leadership coach. In the spring of 2016, Ms. Thompson was appointed the interim principal at George Washington High School in the northeast. She has dramatically improved the student and academic environment there, and I am very happy that she is leading the way for the only public high school in my district. We are lucky to have her.

There are countless stories like this across Pennsylvania. To all the women listening, I thank you for the special contributions that you have made to our communities and to the world that we live in.

To all the mothers, nurses, teachers, first responders, military, and all of the women who are making a difference in Pennsylvania, we thank you. Continue the incredible work you are doing and future generations will remember the impact that you have made today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

The SPEAKER. And remarks have been submitted for the record by Representative Hill-Evans and Representative Kinsey on HR 1079.

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And thanks to my colleagues for their support to HR 1079, which marks September 25, 2018, as the "Day of Remembrance for Murder Victims" in Pennsylvania.

Every day thousands of people become victims of crimes that tear apart families and claim the lives of innocent people whose only mistake was to be in the wrong place at the wrong time – actually, Mr. Speaker, those innocent victims had a right, had every right. In Pennsylvania, over 3,200 people fell victim to murder between 2012 and 2016. Many of these victims lived vibrant lives, surrounded by family and friends and loved ones.

And let us be clear: A murder impacts not only the victim, but those who called the victim a son, father, daughter, mother, brother, sister, husband, wife, partner, friend, or coworker. And I believe the right way to honor the memory of victims who have been killed by violence is by speaking out against violence and supporting the families and friends of each victim, and promoting awareness of the impact of violent crime in all aspects.

May this resolution serve as a reflection for all those whose lives have been impacted by a murder, and to remind them that they are not alone in their struggle.

Thank you.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mrs. EVANS submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to my colleagues and my co-prime sponsor, Rep. Stephen Kinsey, for your support of HR 1080, which recognizes the month of September 2018 as "Emergency Preparedness Month" in Pennsylvania.

My district this summer experienced flooding throughout our area, but I am proud of our emergency crews for responding to those in need; personnel from the Department of Transportation that made the appropriate assessments; and all that heeded the warnings in those affected areas.

Nationally, we observe September as "National Emergency Preparedness Month" to stress the importance of strengthening the security and resiliency of our nation through a number of threats, natural and unnatural, that threaten us. That is why we have the Federal Management Agency and, on the local level, the Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency that both allow Pennsylvanians to obtain the necessary information and resources to aid us all through a disaster and educate us on the best way to be safe.

We urge all to familiarize themselves with these agencies, their emergency plans and tips, and to continue to heed the public warnings and alerts for any affected area. Information is power and being prepared helps to save lives. With that in mind, that is why it is vital that we highlight the importance of emergency preparedness and the resources available to our residents in case of a disaster.

Thank you for making September "Emergency Preparedness Month" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Nearly three in five American adults take a prescription drug, according to the Journal of the American Medical Association. That is one of the major ways pharmacists, especially today, play a vital role in our lives and we should give them recognition for the valuable service they provide to our communities.

I am proud to present this resolution, which designates October 2018 as "Pennsylvania Pharmacists and Pharmacy Month." Our goal is to recognize the many contributions made by pharmacists to the health-care field throughout the Commonwealth.

In Pennsylvania we have 17,665 licensed pharmacists working toward improving medication use by reducing abuse and advancing patient care in all practice settings such as hospitals, community pharmacies, drug stores, and the pharmaceutical industries. Through their extensive training, pharmacists are another line of defense against the opioid epidemic and they work to protect patients by identifying harmful drug interactions. Their knowledge ensures patients will receive the proper care they deserve.

As we recognize pharmacists in Pennsylvania, we must also acknowledge the Pennsylvania Pharmacists Association, a membership group that includes pharmacists, students, technicians, part-time employees, and retirees.

For 140 years this organization has been the leading voice of pharmacy through its promotion of the profession, advocacy, and providing health education throughout our communities in order to enhance our State's overall public health. This month will be a time to thank these professionals for their dedication and commitment to patient care.

I thank you in advance for your support in making October 2018 "Pennsylvania Pharmacists and Pharmacy Month."

The SPEAKER. With that, some housekeeping.

CALENDAR CONTINUED**BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 358**, **PN 376**, entitled:

An Act providing for a volunteer health care practitioner certification; and imposing powers and duties on the Department of Health.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 358 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 358 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 383**, **PN 386**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in ownership of property and legal title and equitable estate, further providing for right to dispose of a decedent's remains.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 383 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 383 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 1098**, **PN 2910**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 31, 1965 (P.L.1257, No.511), known as The Local Tax Enabling Act, in local taxes, further providing for delegation of taxing powers and restrictions thereon; and, in consolidated collection of local income taxes, further providing for declaration and payment of income taxes.

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

BILL TABLED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1098 be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar.

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

BILL REMOVED FROM TABLE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 1098 be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar.

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

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. We have a formal motion from Representative Mehaffie that the House move to adjourn until Monday, October 1, 2018, at 11 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

We will be back on Monday, October 1, 2018, at 11 a.m.

On the question,
Will the House agree to the motion?
Motion was agreed to, and at 12:56 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.