

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2018

SESSION OF 2018

202D OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 42

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

THE SPEAKER (MIKE TURZAI) PRESIDING

PRAYER

HON. BRYAN BARBIN, member of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This prayer is taken from the 18th chapter of Ezekiel, which represents the prophecy of the Holy Spirit.

Will you join me in bowing your heads to the creator of all living things, who has written His character on all of our hearts.

Lord, help us this day to form our thoughts, our words, and our actions in the manner most pleasing to You. Instill Your character, whether it be called ahavah, agape, or brotherly love, in each member here assembled. Blessed be Your justice, mercy, and kindness. Instruct us through Your Word to be good and faithful servants to Your people in this holy land. Help us, Lord, to be firm in right, as You have given us the ability to see righteousness; help us to be merciful, as You have shown us mercy; and help us to resolve to show kindness to those who need our care.

Lord, bless all of the members who are this day battling illness. We pray specifically for Representative Kavulich, that he might make a speedy recovery.

Bless all of our soldiers who provide selfless service to protect this nation. Help us to remember that our Republic cannot stand without the same choice of selflessness by its government and by all citizens.

In this and all things we give You praise. And all of God's people say, 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, October 9, 2018, will be postponed until printed.

HOUSE RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 1134 By Representative J. HARRIS

A Resolution urging the Congress of the United States to pass the language from the Hemp Farming Act of 2018, as contained in the 2018 Farm Bill, removing industrial hemp from the Schedule I Controlled Substance List and legalizing commercial industrial hemp production in the United States, and urging the Department of Agriculture of the Commonwealth to conduct a study of industrial hemp research pilot programs and prepare recommended draft statutory and regulatory language.

Referred to Committee on AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS, October 10, 2018.

No. 1150 By Representatives WHEATLEY, MILLARD, A. DAVIS, KINSEY, YOUNGBLOOD, VAZQUEZ and DRISCOLL

A Resolution reestablishing the select subcommittee on tax modernization and reform to investigate, review and make recommendations concerning the process, rates and methods by which revenue in this Commonwealth is collected and assessed on taxpayers.

Referred to Committee on FINANCE, October 10, 2018.

HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2698 By Representatives D. MILLER, THOMAS, HAGGERTY, DAVIS, HILL-EVANS, DRISCOLL, J. McNEILL, DALEY and ROZZI

An Act amending the act of September 27, 1961 (P.L.1700, No.699), known as the Pharmacy Act, providing for accessible prescription labels.

Referred to Committee on HEALTH, October 10, 2018.

No. 2699 By Representatives D. MILLER, MURT, SIMS, HILL-EVANS, YOUNGBLOOD, FRANKEL, J. McNEILL, DALEY, ROEBUCK and ROZZI

An Act amending the act of November 10, 1999 (P.L.491, No.45), known as the Pennsylvania Construction Code Act, in uniform construction code, providing for changing stations in places of public accommodation.

Referred to Committee on LABOR AND INDUSTRY, October 10, 2018.

No. 2700 By Representatives KIRKLAND, SCHLOSSBERG, KINSEY, HILL-EVANS, SOLOMON, DEAN, CALTAGIRONE, DRISCOLL, DALEY and WARREN

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in firearms and other dangerous articles, providing for identification required for purchase of firearm ammunition.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 10, 2018.

No. 2701 By Representatives RABB, THOMAS, FRANKEL, DEAN, STURLA, HILL-EVANS, DALEY, DeLUCA, ROEBUCK, DONATUCCI and ROZZI

An Act amending Title 58 (Oil and Gas) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in development, further providing for well reporting requirements.

Referred to Committee on ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY, October 10, 2018.

No. 2702 By Representatives RABB, RYAN, YOUNGBLOOD, STURLA, MURT, DEAN, A. DAVIS, J. HARRIS, SIMS and DAVIDSON

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in judicial boards and commissions, further providing for powers and duties and for adoption of guidelines for sentencing.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, October 10, 2018.

No. 2704 By Representatives C. QUINN, BARRAR, SANTORA, MENTZER and YOUNGBLOOD

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, establishing the Digital Protection School Safety Account; and providing for duties of school entities and the department.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, October 10, 2018.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located in the well of the House, we welcome guest page Cameron Smith, who is a senior at Dallastown High School. He is the guest of Representative Phillips-Hill. Please welcome him.

Located to the left of the rostrum, we welcome Kaitlin Kovel. She is the guest of Representative Harry Lewis. Please stand. Thank you so much for joining us today.

Representative Warren, please come on up to the rostrum. Representative Perry Warren; I know he has some guests to introduce today. Thank you, sir.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Dunbar, would you do a committee announcement for us, please, first before we start? We are going to do a committee meeting while we are doing activity on the floor.

Mr. DUNBAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce an Appropriations meeting immediately in the majority caucus room; that is Appropriations meeting in the majority caucus room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Members, there is an Appropriations Committee meeting at this time in the majority caucus room. All members of the Appropriations Committee should be reporting to the majority caucus room. All members of the Appropriations Committee should be headed to a meeting in the majority caucus room.

All members and guests, please take your seats. We have some individuals that have traveled some distance to be with us today. The Sergeants at Arms will close the doors of the House as soon as these guests come in.

Welcome, everybody. Please join us. We are excited to have you. Thank you for coming in.

TEAM ET CETERA PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Representative Warren, the floor is yours, sir. Mr. WARREN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On behalf of also Representative Galloway and Representative Tai, I am pleased to welcome Team et cetera, the State champion Destination Imagination team.

Destination Imagination is the largest creativity competition in the world. Team et cetera features five students from Pennsbury School District and one from the Council Rock School District, and they placed first in its category at the State competition in April. From there it was on to the global competition at the University of Tennessee, where over 1400 teams from 15 countries competed. Team et cetera finished 12th out of 70 teams in the Service Learning category, and 2d on the core portion of the project, musical and the book. Their book, titled "Maggie's Box," is about a girl who discovers that by thinking outside the box, she can do anything, and it is available for sale and proceeds benefit Camfed, the campaign for female education. Their musical presentation tells the story of a grown-up, educated Maggie interviewing for a job, and through confidence, a strong female role model, and a belief that girls should not be limited by preconceived notions of what a girl can and cannot do, she obtains the job and performs outstandingly well, thereby inspiring others to do the same.

The Team et cetera members that are here today are Nick Franchi, Tommy Kraeck, Leah Stoogenke, Maya Stoogenke, and Regan Stump. Teammate Fran Miller was unable to join us today. And also with us in the rear of the House is coach Scott Stoogenke, as well as parents and other family members of this State champion team.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please join me in congratulating the Destination Imagination State champions, Team et cetera.

The SPEAKER. Representative, are there members of the team in the back?

Mr. WARREN. There are not, Mr. Speaker. Just the coach, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Okay. The coach should come up. Please come on up, sir. Just come right up this side. Thank you for joining us.

And congratulations, young folks. We are very, very honored that you would take the time to come here. Keep up the great work.

We are going to take a few photos and we will continue.

We are going to open the doors of the House right now, briefly. We do have very, very special guests. Chairman Ron Marsico is going to come up to the rostrum, up here on our platform, and then we are going to bring the guests down to the well of the House, and I think some are going to come up on the rostrum with Chairman Marsico.

All members, please come to the floor. This is so exciting to have these champions with us. I would ask everybody to please take their seats for these special guests.

SPECIAL OLYMPICS CHAMPIONS PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Chairman Marsico, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Members of the House, what a great day to recognize these special champions. Members, there are 27 counties that these champions are from, so I think I gathered most of the members up here that represent those counties. I appreciate you being here. There are 27 counties, so feel free to come down afterward to take photos with your constituents.

Today it is great to recognize and welcome some exceptional Pennsylvanians, exceptional because of their athletic talents and because of the adversity they have overcome in order to excel in their chosen sports. These men and women before you are members of our Commonwealth's Special Olympics Team. Joining us today are 29 athletes, all of whom brought home at least one medal after taking part in the national competition in Seattle in July.

The basketball team – raise your hand, basketball members – earned a gold medal. They are national gold medal champions, while the soccer team members – raise your hand, soccer members – took home the silver medal. The swimmers did an amazing job also, earning 14 individual medals among 6 of them. Swimmers, raise your hands. Another 16 medals were earned in a variety of athletic events, as well as bowling, golf, and powerlifting. Any golfers here? Powerlifters or bowlers? There we go.

So these members here today, these athletes are joined here today by several of their coaches and family members who have supported them and helped them along the way. I think most of them are in the balcony. Please stand to be recognized.

Please join me, everyone, in congratulating all of our special athletes on their outstanding achievements.

So at this time, recognizing the coaches that are with the athletes and also the CEO (chief executive officer) and president of Special Olympics Pennsylvania, Matt Aaron, if you want to come forward and receive a citation from the House of Representatives.

Matt, congratulations. Great job. Congratulations.

Thank you, members.

The SPEAKER. Chairman Marsico, thank you so much.

We will open the doors of the House.

Olympians, we are so excited that you took the time to come and be with us today, and just congratulations on your great work. Stay there; we are going to have the members come down and take some photos with you, if that is all right, if you do not mind giving us a few more minutes of your time. We would certainly appreciate it.

So the members who represent you are going to join you in a photo. And we may need some people to kneel to get everybody in the photo – maybe the members can do the kneeling – but we are so honored that you would be with us today.

BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

HB 1981, PN 4198

By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act providing for the establishment of first-time home buyer savings accounts for first-time home buyers in this Commonwealth.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2307, PN 4067

By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for victim and witness outreach; and, in post-trial matters, further providing for eligibility for relief and for jurisdiction and proceedings.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2308, PN 4068

By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending Titles 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) and 44 (Law and Justice) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in post-trial matters, further providing for postconviction DNA testing; and, in DNA data and testing, further providing for policy, for definitions, for powers and duties of State Police, for State DNA Data Base, for State DNA Data Bank, for State Police recommendation of additional offenses, for procedural compatibility with FBI and for DNA sample required upon conviction, delinquency adjudication and certain ARD cases, providing for collection from persons accepted from other jurisdictions and further providing for procedures for withdrawal, collection and transmission of DNA samples, for procedures for conduct, disposition and use of DNA analysis, for DNA data base exchange and for expungement..

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2433, PN 3565

By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act designating the future bridge on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 88 over Peters Creek, Finleyville Borough, Washington County, as the John Emerick Memorial Bridge.

APPROPRIATIONS.

HB 2437, PN 4197

By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses), 23 (Domestic Relations) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in assault, further providing for the offense of stalking; in wiretapping and electronic surveillance, further providing for definitions; in child custody, further providing for consideration of criminal conviction; in domestic and sexual violence victim address confidentiality, further providing for penalties; and, in sentencing, further providing for sentences for second and subsequent offenses.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 108, PN 1659

By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in anatomical gifts, further providing for manner of executing anatomical gifts and for Governor Robert P. Casey Memorial Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Trust Fund contributions.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 299, PN 1849 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in nomination of candidates, further providing for number of signers required for nomination petitions of candidates at primaries.

APPROPRIATIONS.

SB 1172, PN 2094 By Rep. DUNBAR

An Act amending the act of October 31, 2006 (P.L.1210, No.133), known as the Price Gouging Act, further providing for definitions, for price gouging prohibited and for investigation.

APPROPRIATIONS.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. On the master roll, the majority whip requests a leave of absence for Mike TOBASH of Schuylkill County for the day. Without objection, that will be granted.

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

MASTER ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. Members, please proceed to vote.

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—193

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillen	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Hanna	Miccarelli	Solomon
Conklin	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Tai
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas

Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Toepel
Daley	Irvin	Nelson	Toohil
Davidson	James	Nesbit	Topper
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vitali
Dawkins	Kaufner	Oberlander	Walsh
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Ward
Deasy	Keefe	Owlett	Warner
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warren
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wentling
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wheatley
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Quigley	White
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Speaker
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

LEAVES ADDED—1

Owlett

LEAVES CANCELED—2

Owlett Tobash

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-three members having voted on the master roll, a quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2307, PN 4067**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for victim and witness outreach; and, in post-trial matters, further providing for eligibility for relief and for jurisdiction and proceedings.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2308, PN 4068**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) and 44 (Law and Justice) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in post-trial matters, further providing for postconviction DNA testing; and, in DNA data and testing, further providing for policy, for definitions, for powers and duties of State Police, for State DNA Data Base, for State DNA Data Bank, for State Police recommendation of additional offenses, for procedural compatibility with FBI and for DNA sample required upon conviction, delinquency adjudication and certain ARD cases, providing for collection from persons accepted from other jurisdictions and further providing for procedures for withdrawal, collection and transmission of DNA samples, for procedures for conduct, disposition and use of DNA analysis, for DNA data base exchange and for expungement..

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—190

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Galloway	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Gillen	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillespie	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Godshall	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Goodman	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Greiner	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Grove	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Haggerty	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Hahn	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hanna	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Harkins	Miccarelli	Solomon
Conklin	Harper	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harris, A.	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, J.	Milne	Stephens
Costa, D.	Heffley	Moul	Sturla
Costa, P.	Helm	Mullery	Tai
Cox	Hennessey	Murt	Tallman
Cruz	Hickernell	Mustio	Taylor
Culver	Hill	Neilson	Thomas
Cutler	Irvin	Nelson	Toepel
Daley	James	Nesbit	Toohil
Davidson	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Topper
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kaufner	Oberlander	Vitali
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Ward
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warner
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Warren
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Watson

Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Quigley	Wheeland
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	Speaker

NAYS-3

Davis, A.	Gainey	Miller, D.
-----------	--------	------------

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

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

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Corbin, we are going to call up your bill, HB 2437, PN 4197. We are going to need a motion to proceed, if you would not mind making that motion or the leader can make that motion. And we cannot vote it until 4:23 because that is when it was amended. We also have SB 1172, PN 2094, which we would not be able to vote until 4:33 p.m.

MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION UNDER RULE 24

The SPEAKER. Majority leader Dave Reed, on the motion. Mr. REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I make a motion to proceed to the immediate consideration of HB 2437 and SB 1172. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much.

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

The SPEAKER. Representative Dermody, on that motion, sir. Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would also urge the members to support the motion to proceed.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-179

Barbin	Dunbar	Knowles	Readshaw
Barrar	Dush	Kortz	Reed
Benninghoff	Ellis	Krueger	Reese
Bernstine	Emrick	Kulik	Roe
Bizzarro	Evans	Lawrence	Roe
Bloom	Farry	Lewis	Roebuck

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

NAYS-14

English	McGinnis	Milne	Samuelson
Gillen	Metzgar	Mullery	Tallman
Matzie	Miller, B.	Rabb	Vitali
McCarter	Miller, D.		

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

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.

BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2437, PN 4197**, entitled:

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses), 23 (Domestic Relations) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in assault, further providing for the offense of stalking; in wiretapping and electronic surveillance, further providing for definitions; in child custody, further providing for consideration of criminal conviction; in domestic and sexual violence victim address confidentiality, further providing for penalties; and, in sentencing, further providing for sentences for second and subsequent offenses.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration on **SB 1172, PN 2094**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of October 31, 2006 (P.L.1210, No.133), known as the Price Gouging Act, further providing for definitions, for price gouging prohibited and for investigation.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillen	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Hanna	Miccarelli	Solomon
Conklin	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Tai
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas

Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Toepel
Daley	Irvin	Nelson	Toohil
Davidson	James	Nesbit	Topper
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vitali
Dawkins	Kaufner	Oberlander	Walsh
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Ward
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Warner
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warren
DeLozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wentling
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wheatley
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Quigley	White
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Speaker
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 108, PN 1659**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 20 (Decedents, Estates and Fiduciaries) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in anatomical gifts, further providing for manner of executing anatomical gifts and for Governor Robert P. Casey Memorial Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Trust Fund contributions.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-193

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roac

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

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

Ordered, That the clerk return the same to the Senate with the information that the House has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 299, PN 1849**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in nomination of candidates, further providing for number of signers required for nomination petitions of candidates at primaries.

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 Vitali, on the bill, sir.
Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. Members, please be seated.

Representative Vitali, I think what we are going to do on this one, because I need to get to Representative Hanna and his farewell remarks, is I am going to go over the bill just briefly. I will definitely call on you to speak. I will definitely do so.

* * *

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2433, PN 3565**, entitled:

An Act designating the future bridge on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 88 over Peters Creek, Finleyville Borough, Washington County, as the John Emerick Memorial Bridge.

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

(Bill analysis was read.)

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

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—193

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longiotti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillen	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causser	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Hanna	Miccarelli	Solomon

Conklin	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Tai
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Toepel
Daley	Irvin	Nelson	Toohil
Davidson	James	Nesbit	Topper
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Vazquez
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vitali
Dawkins	Kaufner	Oberlander	Walsh
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Ward
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Warner
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warren
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wentling
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wheatley
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheeland
DiGirolo	Kirkland	Quigley	White
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Youngblood
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Zimmerman
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	Turzai,
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Speaker
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—8

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	Tobash

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

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

The SPEAKER. Members, at this time I would like everybody to take their seats. Another of our distinguished members is retiring at the end of this session and he will be giving his farewell remarks. So I am asking everybody to please take their seats, and I am asking the Sergeants at Arms to please close the doors of the House. We have family members and guests here. Thank you.

**FAREWELL ADDRESS
BY MR. HANNA**

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Hanna, the House Democratic whip, has served faithfully the people of the 76th Legislative District, which consists of all of Clinton County and parts of Centre County, and he has served with distinction since 1991. Representative Hanna also serves on the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education's Board of Governors, and he and his wife, Susan, reside in Lock Haven and are the proud parents of two sons whom many of us know, Michael Jr. and Kevin.

I am honored to bring up my colleague, somebody with whom we have worked on much legislation and important work on budgets, the minority whip, Mike Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, if I could, I would like to propose a rule change. I would like to have the 5-minute rule apply to farewell speeches from this point forward.

Well, thank you, and everything I have to say can be summed up in two words, and those two words are "thank you." It really has been the honor and privilege of my life to serve the 76th District for the last 28 years. But unfortunately for all of you, it is going to take me more than just those two words to say thank you. I have a lot of people who need to be mentioned in my thank-you.

And first, of course, is my wife, Susan. Susan, if you could stand. Susan, I love you and I thank you for loving me and I thank you for all the sacrifices you have made over the last 37 years. Thank you.

Next are my two sons, Mike and Kevin. Now, you guys know you are the pride and joy of your mother and I, but I am really proud to have you here today. And of course, most of you in the House, you all know my son, Michael, and the record of service that he has had over the years. But my son, Kevin— Mike and Kevin, please stand, if you would, please. A few of you know Kevin. I know Joe knows him well. A few others know Kevin, but I want to introduce him to you as well. Kevin is our businessman. He has run a restaurant and a bar for the last 7 years, and one of the things I can say very proudly is that he has run it profitably for the last 7 years, so he is a good businessman.

Back to my son, Mike; as I said, most of you know him. What some of you may not know and something that his mother and I are very proud of is that Mike is a newlywed, and we are so happy to have Katrina join us. Mike's wife joined us on – she is not able to join us today – but she joined us on September 1, on Labor Day they were married, and we are so very happy for them. So, Mike and Katrina, congratulations.

You know, every step of my life has strongly been influenced by my parents. My mother, Celestine Kelly Hanna, passed about 10 years ago, while my father, Horace Hanna, whom everybody knows as Buck, has advanced dementia. I can tell you that he continues to provide joy to me, to provide joy to me every Sunday during our visits. I have to say thank you to my mom and dad because they are the reason for any successes that I have had in this job. They inspired me, they worked side by side with me, and I have to say thank you to them.

I also have to thank my extended family and my wife's family for all of the sacrifices that they have made to help me during the past three decades. You know, it does take a team effort, and we are so proud of the H-team, as we are known back in the district, and they have always been there. The H-team has always been there for me and they have always delivered for us, so I have to say thank you to the H-team.

No thank-you would be complete without a special thanks to the folks who have worked side by side with me in our offices the last 28 years. A number of them are here today and I am going to call their names out and ask them to stand: Donna Dedert-Clark, Donna; Gayle Jones; Alycia Laureti; Angela Candori; Adam Wagon seller; Andy Surra; Eric Mock; Samantha Lockhart; Lynette Perkins Carter; Cory Smith; Valerie Hubbard; and Mikal Jenkins. Now, they are all here in Harrisburg, but they are not all working for me now. They have worked for me over the years. I want to make that clear. Dermody has given me the smallest whip staff ever, so they are all not currently employed by me, but

I have had the privilege of working with them over the years and I want to thank all of them, and I wish you would give them a round of applause.

One that could not be here that I have to mention is Marjorie Schaffer. Marjorie was my first L.A. (legislative assistant) and she was just a godsend to get me acquainted with what I needed to know to be hopefully effective here.

From my district office we have Tammy Ammerman – Tammy, stand – Janaan Maggs, Mitzi Gallagher, and Kim Cohen. And let me just say this about my district office staff: I would suggest, and I think this is probably with all of our district office staffs, I would suggest that the district office staff band together and say that the job evaluation form should be to require members to go knock on doors in the district, because I can promise you that if you do that – I have been doing it for weeks now and I get the most glowing reports about these folks. I swear to God, people are voting for them, not for me, when they go to the polls. They love these people and I love these people.

I want to say thanks to all of you, all my legislative colleagues. I count you all as friends. And when you have been here as long as I have been here, you do not just have legislative friends, and I am not going to call all of you out, but I just want to tell you that it is not just legislative friends. I have hunting friends. I have fishing friends. I have legislative friends. I have family friends. All of you are— Oh, and my 7 a.m. gym friends. Bernie, I thought you would look up on that. But you develop those friendships in all of the different areas that you get to work with these folks.

There are a few friends that I would like to name and that is because they have been the friends I have had the longest. And on the Republican side, I am looking back to Bod Godshall. Bob and I became good friends when I got here, and it was largely because of my predecessor being a good friend of Bob's, and we have remained friends for 28 years, and, Bob, I am really proud of that. I am happy to have been friends with you. I am happy to have traveled across the State with you. I am happy to have played golf with you, and I appreciate your friendship over the last 28 years. Thank you, Bob.

On the Democratic side, obviously all of you know that my best friend, of course, is Frank Dermody. And I want to tell you that he has been my closest friend. We were elected together 28 years ago and he has been one of my closest friends for all of that time, and I can tell you that it is because the one thing that I really feel strongest about is that I can completely trust Frank, and I think that that— Well, all of you know that trust is the basis of all friendship, but that trust has enabled us, I think, as a leadership team to work together cohesively, and he has that trust, I think, with the entire leadership team that I am so proud to serve with. So, Frank, I want to thank you for all that you do.

I want to thank the deputy whips, the deputy whips and our regional caucus chairs. I kind of amended the form, I guess, for the whip's office. It was very effective to have deputy whips in the past, but what we found is our regional caucus chairs had really good rapport with a lot of their members, so what we did is we kind of expanded it in our office to include the deputy whips and the regional caucus chairs as we worked on counting votes. And I want to thank both the deputy whips and the regional caucus chairs, because without you, we would not have been able to run the whip's office during the past 8 years, and I appreciate all that you did.

So let me just say thank you and let me leave you with this: One of the things that I hope all of us do is when we get to where we are going, turn around and help someone else get there too. So thank you very much. I appreciate it.

REMARKS BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Without a doubt, Mike Hanna is one of the most effective leaders in this chamber, and it is really through a very quiet and humble grace. And I know how much respect you have in your caucus and across the entire chamber, by the way, Mike. You are always very precise, very thorough, very prepared with any budget or legislative negotiations and I know how well you represent the folks in your caucus that have elected you whip. You have a really wonderful family. We have gotten to know them over the years. And I know back in Lock Haven, you are certainly a hometown guy, because any time I have been there, everybody knows the Hanna family and certainly references Mike Hanna.

God bless. Thank you for the service to the Commonwealth and to the people of your district, the 76th Legislative District, and, everybody, one more applause for Mike Hanna, the minority whip.

(Commemorative gavel was presented.)

The SPEAKER. I am going to open the doors briefly because I am going to have a second set of remarks, farewell remarks from one of our longstanding legislators. It is important that everybody be on the floor, so I am going to ask all members to please come out and take your seats.

FAREWELL ADDRESS BY MR. MAHER

The SPEAKER. At this time I am calling up one of my close friends – friends before either of us were elected to this body. He is just an outstanding individual and I think one of the single best orators ever to be on the House floor, and he has often served as the Speaker pro tem and has been a chair of the Environmental Resources and Energy Committee.

John Maher has been a member of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives since 1997, representing the 40th District, which covers part of Allegheny County and part of Washington County. John is exceptionally bright, sharp, and quite a good wit. Sometimes you do not even know, you do not even recognize the wit until a couple minutes later. You are there, like, "I think that might have been directed at me." But I will say this – this is a very serious time – I do want to say one personal thing about John. My dad was a middle school teacher and coach in Upper St. Clair, where John is from; my wife is also from there. John represents and has always represented that district, that community in the 40th District, and they had a group of my dad's former basketball players who got together for a reunion for the middle school team – they had won a championship – and John took the time to actually go to that event, and it meant a lot.

We are going to miss him, and, John Maher, the floor is yours.

Mr. MAHER. It is an interesting thing for me to be here in this spot for this purpose. I have had the honor and privilege to serve as pro tem with three different Speakers, and, Mike, thank you for your generous remarks. I will tell you, the day Mike Turzai

was sworn in, I let everybody know – and I mean everybody know – that that was the happiest day I had had since I began serving in the legislature. So thank you, Mike.

Now, I have heard a lot of these bon voyage remarks, valedictory remarks, salutary remarks over the years, and I have not yet heard anybody been ruled out of order, but that may be coming. Now, Clancy. Clancy Myer has the institutional knowledge that is unbelievable. He is pretty darn amazing, and he is frequently correct.

Most of you I think know that I really never use prepared remarks, and I will have maybe a few words scratched on a piece of paper or nothing at all, and so I feel a little bit out of my depth here because I have a bunch of notes. So forgive me if I glance down because I am just not used to speaking from such things. I remember when I was here, I do not know, 6 months or a year, and as most freshmen, I did not say much to begin with, but the time I got up, and I do not even remember what the issue was, I carried on for quite a time – Cris Dush would have been proud – and Cuppy Shugars, our chief page here, came back to me afterwards and said, "The stenographers are having trouble keeping up. We would like a copy of your remarks." And I said to her, "So would I."

Now, these particular valedictory things, I know I threatened yesterday to give you all a piece of my mind, and I have been trying to do that for 21 years, and if I have not gotten it done before today, I am certainly not going to succeed now, so I am not going to give you a piece of my mind. I am going to just offer some reflections and maybe remonstrances, and mostly thanksgiving. And I really do apologize because this may go on a little while because there is— And I did try to boil it down.

But I remember back, and maybe Frank and Mr. Hanna can remember particularly what it was, but there was some debate going on, and this was before we had the computers and so all the bills would come out from the Xerox machine, and there was some bill with like a 700-page amendment. I mean literally, I think it was 700 pages that were being delivered to each desk, and the paper was hot. I mean, talk about hot off the press. Maybe this was one of your bills, Mr. Markosek. I think maybe it was Transportation. And this was when we did not have the limits on what hours we were in session, so we had this bill and we are going to debate it right then. There is no caucusing, there is no reading, we are just rolling. So I got those 700 pages and I go to the microphone – they used to call it the Maher microphone; not so much anymore. I do not get up too often – and I did everybody a favor. I said, "This is going to take a while, so those of you who are interested in having dinner, you might want to head on out now, and I will give you like a 10-minute warning when I am getting close to being done," and sure enough, the whole place cleared out. Everybody went to dinner. Oh my; I am sorry. You see, I am rambling, and that is because I have notes.

I am an accidental legislator; many of you know that. My life was perfect – and I mean just perfect – and my successor died in the midst of his term, so the ordinary jockey for position had not happened and people in the community were encouraging different people to think about running. And I really had no interest in running for office ever at any level, but I was getting these calls and outreach, and some of them were from Democrats, and some of them were from Republicans, and I told them both the same thing: "No way, and I'm not in your party." I was never in a political party until the day I became a candidate for office. But one day – I do not know if you remember Catherine Baker Knoll or if you remember Barbara Hafer. I knew both of them,

and they did not care much for each other – I went out to my mailbox, and in my mailbox I had a letter from each of them with a contribution for this guy who was not even running for office, both encouraging me. And if the preeminent Republican and the preeminent Democrat women of the State both thought I should run, I thought maybe I should think about it.

But to give you an idea of how apolitical I had been, Governor Ridge nominated my dad for the State Supreme Court, and my dad made some remarks that he believed public corruption was really one of the most serious crimes because there are so many victims and they do not even know it. And Senator – I will not name his name – a particular Senator took umbrage to this and blocked him from being confirmed. But when I heard he was nominated, I called my dad and I said, "Dad, what party are you in?" I had no idea. And he said to me, "Why do you need to know?" Because the family, we always talked about issues and subjects, but we never talked about politics. My mom, during the era of segregation, forever in Alabama, with the Democrat Governor, George Wallace, we moved to Alabama and my mom said about going out to enroll the voters who had been blocked from voting. And so the people that came to our dinner table were from all political persuasions, and mind you – I do not mean to be partisan here – but mind you, it was mostly Republicans who were pushing to get folks enrolled to vote who had been blocked until then.

Now the weird thing happened: my mom wound up clerking for Judge Genevieve Blatt, and Genevieve Blatt was the first woman ever elected statewide in Pennsylvania to any office, and she was her law clerk. My mom went to law school in her forties, and when she graduated, she was probably 10 years younger than when she started. So she clerked for Judge Blatt. Now, when I was first elected – I was a special election – it was 9/9/97, and today is 10/10, and guess what? – yeah, I am a number head guy – it is exactly 7700 days in between.

The day I was sworn in, I went up to my office, which you can imagine was the least desirable of all offices in the complex, and I go and I look out the window and I had a sense of *déjà vu*. I felt like I had been there before, and when my mom and dad showed up, my mom said, "Do you know where you are?" I said, "Well, I'm in my office," and she goes, "No, no." It had been her office when she clerked for Genevieve Blatt. Yeah, weird, right?

Here is another thing that is weird, and I do not see him over here, because I would like him to nod and confirm if he were. I was so apolitical when I first ran for office, I thought, who do I know that knows anything about politics and fundraising? So I called that person and asked him to be my campaign treasurer. That person was Dan Frankel. It is true. And Dan goes, "That would be awkward. I am looking to run as a Democrat."

I have a lot of happy memories here and I am just going to mention a few. One, which is a lesson of perseverance, is a bill that before I could get it out of committee had 212 cosponsors. Now, you might ask yourself, how could it have 212 cosponsors? Well, if somebody signs onto a bill and passes away, they are still on the bill. If somebody signs onto the bill and has the misfortune of going to the Senate, they are still on the bill. And as their replacements would arrive, I would go after their replacements too. So as somebody once observed, that year we had a number of members who went to heaven and we had some who went to hell, but it needed 202 cosponsors before I could get it out of committee.

At that time, there was a lot of civility back in those days, and I particularly want to thank somebody who has been gone a long time from here, Ralph Kaiser, who was my neighbor in Bethel Park, and Harry Readshaw, who neighbored just across the border, and we actually would work together for the common good. We would aim to find solutions, and so many of us did this. It was not peculiar to just a small handful of people. It was the way we went about things, and that standard of civility is something we should aspire to more so and perhaps be more successful than we have been recently. I have had the pleasure to work with giants like Tom Ridge and Mark Schweiker, and even Ed Rendell. He was a giant.

Now, my office on the second floor of the Ryan Building was exactly opposite his office. And back in those days, a bill could be posted one night to be considered the next day, and I had a little amendment factory operating in my office. The light would be on until 10 p.m., 11 p.m. Steve Crawford and Ed Rendell paid me the highest compliment one evening when they ran into me in a restaurant. They said, "We're so happy to see you," and I thought they were actually happy to see me. And I said, "Well, that's lovely," and they are like, "This means you're not in your office doing the amendments." And they explained that they would actually stand there and look and try to figure out what I was up to. Now, they did not know, and Mike Peifer would like to remember this, that was actually the evening before my amendments to the land conveyance for the Pike County Courthouse. Now, most of you will not remember that as being a particularly significant bill, but the reason it was significant is, there was a one-sentence amendment that stopped the transfer of the turnpike to corporate interests; a one-sentence amendment. And about a half an hour before we went on the floor, the Governor's Office called me and they said, "We've looked at your amendment and we don't think it's necessary for the conveyance of the Pike County Courthouse," and I said, "You know, I think you're correct." It had really nothing to do with it. But it was germane, it was in order, and it killed it. You guys remember that; that was good legislating.

Now, but even though I ran the little amendment factory, you cannot do it by yourself, and in that case, as in so many other cases, I do want to send out my highest regards to Barbara Lane in the Legislative Reference Bureau. Barbara Lane absolutely, positively must have handled 1,000 amendments for me over the years, and on that particular caper – at the risk of getting somebody in trouble – I will say that Susan Boyle was the only other person on the planet, other than me and Barbara Lane, who knew what was going to happen. We had fun being legislators. I had fun, anyway.

I will tell you something about the rest of the story. You know that famous New Year's Eve of 2006 where the call went out and Josh Shapiro went and recruited Mr. O'Brien? Some of you know, but most of you do not. Earlier that evening I had dinner with Bill DeWeese, and Bill DeWeese had a proposition for me, that I would be Speaker if only – and he did not put it this way – but if only I would betray all my colleagues in the caucus and hand over control. And I made a serious mistake because I said no. No was the right answer, but I said it quickly. If I had only said, "Let me get back to you in the morning," history might have been different. Years later both Mr. DeWeese and Mr. Perzel both said to me, you know, if anybody ever said to them, "We will make you Speaker if," it would not have mattered how that sentence finished, but it did to me, and I never have regretted that decision.

Now, on to the thanksgiving part. Just about everybody who has ever worked with me in the House is here today. There are not many. I have had the good fortune of great people with long continuity, and I would like to mention each of them. First is Dawn Gob. Dawn Gob worked with me for 15 years in the district office. She has this joy that she carries with her everywhere, and no matter what the circumstance is, she could always make me laugh. She kept me sane. She has been retired 6 years and surprised me by coming up for today. Thank you, Dawn. You should stand up and wave; all right.

Someone who is not with us today is Karen Trueblood. Karen Trueblood was the other person who worked with me in the district office in the early years, and after 9/11, she was a U.S. Navy captain in the Reserves and had just been assigned to be the commander of the Marine battalion and then 9/11 happened. And I think, but I am not certain, that she is the first woman in American history to lead a Marine battalion into battle during the invasion of Iraq. And suddenly, handicap placards were not quite as interesting anymore, and she went on to serve our country in the Pentagon for many, many years and has recently retired, but it was a joy.

And Sandy Tolliver worked with us for a brief time while Karen was deployed, knowing it would probably be a brief time, and she is a fine person as well.

But Mary Geiger – wave, Mary, or something – Mary Geiger here in the Capitol. She could be the CEO (chief executive officer) of just about any firm. There is no doubt. And as much as possible, she kept me pointed in the right direction.

Shelly Weaver – give a wave, Shelly – Shelly has this particular gift. People can call angry, angry. They talk to Shelly, they wind up saying, "Well, thank you so very much." People love Shelly, and I love you too, Shelly.

Mary Linn Theis. Mary Linn works in my district office and works in the Capitol office. She does both. And for those of you who are not aware, it is 222 miles between them. She has been a godsend, and really, these last 6 years, I could not have done it without you.

Nancy Makowski. Nancy has a magic wand, that there are these intransigent problems that constituents can run into and somehow or another Nancy solves things even when I go, "Yeah, there's not going to be a happy answer on this," and she will solve it. And to give you an idea of how much wisdom she has, when I first asked her to come work with me, she said no. Pretty smart.

You may remember back in 2012 I ran statewide for Auditor General, and another illustration of civility in politics, Gene DePasquale won that race. He was another member of this House. And that entire year we both ran for the office. We did not run against each other. And I remember one time we were both in at the Philadelphia Inquirer Editorial Board and they were interviewing us simultaneously, and I thought they were being a bit unfair with Gene, and I actually jumped in. I said, "Excuse me. I think you're out of bounds there," and the Inquirer people were like, "What? What just happened?" But we, Gene and I, I think we set out to set a standard for good behavior in a campaign. We succeeded in that. I came a bit short for the other. But in honor of that, we have reassembled the entire campaign organization and it is here today. Mr. Hart, would you stand up, please? Mr. Hart was the entire campaign. Yeah. Of course, it is just Pennsylvania; it is not like it is a big area.

The other guest I have today is someone who has served— We have so many people in local government – municipalities, school districts – and they do a lot of hard work and a lot of it is thankless. And in Bethel Park – it is an interesting community; it is really a microcosm of Pennsylvania – there are a lot of Republicans, a lot of Democrats, and a bunch of unaffiliated voters. And for years Bethel Park was always cats and dogs, cats and dogs. Sound like anyplace else you might know of, perhaps? And then Tim Moury came along and Bethel Park now is a model for how people should be able to sit down, have adult conversations, make decisions, and move forward. It does not matter if you are Republican. It does not matter if you are Democrat. What matters is, what is the best answer? And Tim Moury – got to wave or something, Tim; he will not – is one of my personal political heroes because he has done it and set a standard and he has done it for a long time, and I am honored that you took the trouble to drive all the way over for today.

And I know I have been going on, and I promise you I only have eight pages more.

One of the great moments in my life was when I was appointed chairman of the Agriculture Committee, which is really one of those "only in government" situations. I had not been on a farm since a hayride in the 10th grade. I knew nothing. But I was very fortunate to have an executive director, Kerry Golden, who knows everything and has known everything for a quarter century. And I had the good fortune to have as the majority chair Representative Hanna, who was kind and gentle and civil and we actually worked things out and sorted things out and solved problems. It was wonderful. Now, in the recent years, I have been chairman of the Environmental Resources and Energy Committee, and Leda Lipton Lacomba has the distinction that on the very first day that she was on the State payroll, a bill she had authored was enacted into law her first day. It does not happen. She is that good. She is that smart. I will confess to you, I have been a bit frustrated on the ERE front, and I will spare you those frustrations.

There is one name I have not mentioned yet whom I need to mention. It is a person who knew how to make the trains run on time and sort things out with the Senate on behalf of all of us, and that is Karen Coates. Now, I could get really steamed at Karen on certain occasions and for certain decisions, but I have to tell you, I admire, admire her ability and her skill. And she, of all the legislative directors – and there have been many who are very, very good; I am not diminishing any of them – but in my book, she is the best.

It has been an honor and a privilege to be among you. It is true that people at home may not realize what you do, and that those of you who travel from out of town, when you are here, you are away from home, but when you are not here, you are not often at home either because you have events. And even when you are in the grocery store, there are people lining up because they are happy to see you, because there is something they want to mention to you. And the things they mention to you sometimes are particularly relevant and very helpful, and other times – well, I will give you an example.

A week or so ago I picked up the phone and it was a rather irate caller who said to me, "You better not vote against Kavanaugh." So I tried to explain that that question probably was not going to come before us, and he goes, "You're just dodging

it. You're just dodging it. Come on." So finally I said to him, "All right. I'm going to make you an oath: I will not vote against Kavanaugh," and he goes, "Thank you." That is the end of the conversation. And I think how odd it is that when you can promise somebody that you will not do anything on something which is entirely irrelevant to what we do, they can go away as a happy constituent. It is a weird world.

I am blessed. I know it. I wish for you that you be well and that you do good. Thank you.

REMARKS BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. As many of you know, John is a certified public accountant, and long before coming to – well, I do not mean to say long – but before coming to the legislature, he had an outstanding and successful CPA, certified public accountant firm, Maher Duessel, that many of us in the Pittsburgh region and beyond, but certainly in the Pittsburgh business community, just admired John's work and the work of his team. And he brought that level of expertise to the legislature. No one that I have had the honor of working with has been able, really, to sit through numbers and understand what was really going on with the numbers beyond John's expertise. Both John— I know your dad was dean of the Dickinson Law School, correct? And was your mom a judge?

Mr. MAHER. Attorney.

The SPEAKER. She was an attorney. And so oftentimes I would always think of John, I thought he would make – his knowledge of the law. He never formally went to law school, but I have to tell you, John, you were one of the best litigators I have ever gotten to meet here in the State House. And your staff is just outstanding, and how you have represented the people back in Allegheny and Washington Counties, in your district, those folks will long remember.

I do have to say one other person who I know wanted you to run – was he State Senator at the time, Mike Fisher? Now Third Circuit judge and Attorney General. He was Attorney General when you first ran. And I know Mike was one of the folks that always wanted you to run, too, and a great friend of yours.

Hey, thank you, everybody. John, God bless.

(Commemorative gavel was presented.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Mike Tobash is on the House floor and should be placed back on the master roll.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Representative Clint OWLETT has requested to be placed on leave. Without objection, that will be granted.

SHAWNE LOUISE VANCE PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. Members, we are going to be honoring one of our employees, a State House employee who has so ably served the constituents of our Commonwealth, and I invite Representative Warren Kampf at this time to recognize Shawne Vance for her service of 31 years to the House Republican

Caucus, to the General Assembly, and to the constituents of Pennsylvania. And, Shawne, if you would please stand, and please come up here and join us on the rostrum, if you do not mind.

Representative Kampf, I am going to turn it over to you. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KAMPF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Colleagues, we are here to present a citation to Shawne. This is signed by myself and Mark Keller and Michael Corr. Mark represents the district where Shawne lived, and then Michael and I had the benefit of her service before she retired this summer.

But as the Speaker said, Shawne served the citizens of the Commonwealth in the House and in the Republican Caucus for 31 years. She served 12 years with Chairman John Payne, who is in the back. John if you might wave to us. She also served for 13 years with Representative James Merry. And in addition to that, she was in the Republican Communications Department, the Republican Research Department, and she also served Representative Gib Armstrong.

She is joined here today by some special family members. Mr. Speaker, if I may recognize them?

The SPEAKER. Yes, please do, sir.

Mr. KAMPF. Thank you.

Her husband, Jake Vance. Jake, if you would stand, please. There is a theme to this. Jake is a veteran of the United States Marine Corps. Thank you for your service. Shawne's mother, Dee Ross; Dee. And Shawne and Jake are now living in West Virginia so they can be near Shawne's mother. And in the back we have several guests for Shawne: her nephew, Cole Murphy. Cole, would you stand, please. He is a junior at Buckhannon-Upshur High School. Shawne's daughter, S. Sgt. Ashley Unger; Ashley. And Shawne's son-in-law, Sfc. Jason Unger. They are both in the Pennsylvania National Guard. Thank you for your service. Shawne's daughter, Katelyn Hooker; Katelyn. Katelyn is the deputy emergency management coordinator of Silver Spring Township. And her husband, Randy Hooker. Randy, would you please stand. And Randy is a supervisor at Asurion at Teleplan.

Just a couple of quick things about Shawne in addition to her service here. She is an EMT (emergency medical technician) firefighter and has been for 19 years, and is an EMSVO (emergency medical service vehicle operator) instructor. As she was working here, she was on call from 5 p.m. when she went home until 5 the next morning during that 19 years, so that was awesome work around the clock. And if you ever get any e-mails from Shawne – the first one I got was kind of a shock to me – right at the bottom with her signature line it says: "When there's a fire and you run out, I run in." She is the first female to receive a lifetime membership with the Liverpool Volunteer Fire Company, and she is currently working at Community Care of West Virginia at CareXpress and Pediatrics in Buckhannon, West Virginia. She and Jake enjoy kayaking, hiking, and target shooting. She is the one that taught me what the symbol 2A – I do not know if anybody is aware of that, but 2A has a symbol. I hear Mr. Keller laughing in the back there, what that meant.

And just a couple of quick personal reflections. I have a problem where I stack these papers that come into our offices on my desk and they grow and they grow and they grow, and I do not want to throw any of them away. Shawne was the first one to fix that. She puts them into virtual files so they disappear. They are still stacked and need attention, but they are in virtual files. So thank you for that. She always did great work for me and was

unflappable, no matter what anyone would say to her on the phone or in person. And, Shawne, I do want to add that you know my dad died in March. That was a very difficult time, those 6 months of his treatment, and you always knew how to deal with me and talk to me and make light conversation and also talk about the seriousness of it.

So on behalf of Mark and myself and Michael and everyone – including Chairman Payne; I know he would echo these comments – thank you so much for your service to this State.

The SPEAKER. Shawne, thank you for your loyalty and dedication to the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and to the citizens of Pennsylvania. All of the members with whom you have served speak so highly of you and your outstanding work. Please know that we are very appreciative and hope that you enjoy your retirement years with your loyal husband, Jake. I know that you have got a lot of good years ahead of you. And we want to also thank your mom, Delores, for being here. It is really great to have her here upon this day where we honor you. Thank you very, very much, and all the best.

Shawne has some additional guests here that I think it is important that we recognize. Katelyn – please raise your hand – her daughter, and her husband, Randy. Thank you so much, Katelyn and Randy, for being here. Please give them round of applause. And Shawne and Jake's other daughter, Ashley, with her husband, Jason; Ashley and Jason, daughter and son-in-law. Ashley and Jason are both with the United States Army serving our country. God bless. Thank you so much. Thank you. And behind is her nephew, Cole. That is Cole right there. Great to have you here. And then, of course, Jake is on the far end, her husband, and we are so honored. And her mom, Delores, is right beside her.

Boy, it is so great that you all could be here today. We are just so honored that everybody is here. Thank you.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 299 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Members, at this time we are going to return to SB 299.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Representative Greg Vitali had asked to be recognized on this, and we are going to go back to that point.

Representative Vitali.

Members, please take your seats. We are on SB 299.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in opposition to SB 299, and the most basic reason I oppose it is it violates a principle of fundamental fairness. All candidates in our electoral system should be on equal footing. We should all be playing on a level playing field. We in the House, when we run, our 2-year term runs its course. We have to stand for election and we are situated in a point exactly equal to any of our challengers, Democratic or Republican, general election or primary. Our voters have elected us for a 2-year term. We all start fresh. We all are on equal footing. The same also should apply to district justices. They are elected to a 6-year term, and when that term runs its course, when they have served the time the voters have appointed to them, they stand on equal footing with all challengers in their community who also wish to run for the office of district justice. They should not have an unfair advantage.

One provision of this bill that many of you may not be aware of – and I have confirmed this with lobbyists and the district justice lobbying this bill, James Kelley – not only if this bill passes would it allow a district justice to be on the ballot of his own party without filing a nominating petition, it would also allow him to cross-file without filing a nominating petition. So if this bill becomes law, an incumbent district justice could get on both sides of the ballot without filing a single nominating petition. That is particularly unfair to challengers, because getting on the ballot of the opposing party is particularly difficult and more difficult than getting on the ballot of your own party by gathering signatures.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this bill argue that this bill is needed to protect district justices, saying that if they were forced to go to their streets, there would be the danger of meeting someone they had ruled against unfavorably and harm would befall them. Well, I have taken some time to look into this issue. I have carefully asked those lobbying the bill, I have asked the so-called experts, I have asked our research staff, and I cannot find one single example of a district justice in Pennsylvania who was physically injured while gathering nominating petitions in his district from someone he ruled against – not one single example. And do you know how many doors the collective district justice candidates must have knocked on and gathered signatures for over the years? All those district justices, all those elections, and not one single, solitary example of a district justice being injured while he was gathering nominating petitions.

Now, the proponents of this bill say, "Well, our studies show that 30 percent of district justices have encountered some sort of hostility," and so forth. Well, ask yourself: How many of you have encountered some sort of hostility while gathering nominating petitions? I certainly have. That is not, that is not a valid reason.

Mr. Speaker, I think when we are analyzing whether district justices would really be in danger gathering signatures, let us apply our real-life common sense to this. When I gather nominating petitions, and maybe you do the same, what is the first thing you do? Well, what I do is walk up and down my street, Lawson Avenue. I can get 20 signatures on my own street; certainly no danger on your own street, right? Next night, next street up, Penfield Avenue. No danger there. Next night, Larchmont, and so forth. Mr. Speaker, really; are you telling me that there really is danger in your own neighborhood? Really, in your own precinct, do you really expect us to believe that? Mr. Speaker, the reality of it is that if the district justice needs 100 signatures, can he not find 5 committee people to gather 20 signatures apiece? Really? Really?

Mr. Speaker, another argument made for this bill is, well, it is politics. If we go to the doors and ask for something, they might come before us and think they should get something in return. Well, guess what? This is an electoral process. You are asking for the vote of these people every single election. And do you know what? You are subjecting your candidate to that same ask. So the fact that this somehow dirties you in politics or you would certainly be beholden to those people, I do not think that argument holds water.

Mr. Speaker, no one likes to gather signatures; certainly, I do not. You have to do it in cold weather. You have to do it after work when you are tired. You can go for 10, 20, 30 minutes without getting a signature sometimes. I have gathered 450 signatures this spring myself. I know no one likes to do it and

I understand why they do not want to do it. But you know what? There is a fundamental fairness here. Both sides should be on equal footing. Mr. Speaker, I know there is political pressure here. We all have district justices, many of whom are on the same political team. We may ourselves find ourselves before them, you know, so there is that political pressure, why we want to keep the judges happy. We always want to keep happy people in our life who can help or hurt us – judges, police officers, and so forth – but that is not a reason to vote for a bill that would make our system less fair.

You know, I am particularly disappointed that our judges are asking for this, because the one quality we look for in judges, the most important quality is this sense of fair play, treating both sides equal. You think of that iconic figure of Lady Justice with the blindfold holding the scales. Mr. Speaker, they ought to understand that this is making this system unfair. They are asking to be treated at a higher plateau than their competitors.

This is bad policy, this is unfair, and I ask for a "no" vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you very much.

Representative Rick Saccone, and then Representative Roae.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Sir, hold on just one second, for just a moment.

We have Representative Saccone, then we will go to Representative McCarter, then Representative Roae, then Representative Dom Costa, then Representative Santora, and then Representative Mehaffie.

So, Representative Saccone, you are first. Please proceed.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to oppose SB 299 and echo the comments of my good colleague from Delaware County. I ask you all to even set aside for a minute that you only have to get 100 signatures every 6 years. Set that aside. Set aside that when we get our signatures, it is mostly the same people we get to sign. We go back to the same pool of people. Set that aside for a minute. So it should not be too hard for them to get 100 of the same people that they got 6 years before. Set aside that you rarely get your own signatures. I mean, the first year I was elected was Snowmageddon, and my wife, Yong, and I actually went out and got our own signatures. We got 600-some signatures ourselves, trampling through the snow, knocking on doors, people saying, "Wow, you guys are crazy. What are you doing out here? The roads aren't plowed, sidewalks aren't cleared." But we got 600-some ourselves. But since then we have 50 to 100 people going out and carrying petitions and helping us get signatures. Geez, if you have got 50 people and they each got 2 signatures, you would be in. Come on. It is pathetic to think that you cannot get 100 signatures every 6 years.

But set that aside. Set that aside for a minute, because the most important reason why you should vote "no" on this bill is that it is unconstitutional. Article I, section 5, requires free and fair elections. Remember, everybody in this room swore an oath to defend that Constitution. I hope you take that seriously: defend that Constitution. And that takes precedence over friendships, because I have heard many people say, "Oh, well, I've got friends that are district justices. All the district justices I have I consider friends." This is not against district justices. This is about the Constitution, and that takes precedence over friendships and deals or things that you cut with those people. The Constitution trumps all of that, I hope, in your mind and in your heart and in your soul.

Clearly, this is not providing free and fair elections. This is amplifying what we already call the incumbent advantage. You know, there is a clear advantage to being an incumbent. As a political scientist, we know that; as an elected official, you know that. There is an advantage to being an incumbent. This amplifies that advantage by tilting the scales in favor of the incumbent. It is subverting the election process. If you are thinking as a fair-minded person who reads our Constitution, you have to realize that this is subverting the election process in favor of incumbents.

So I ask my colleagues to think. Open up that Constitution. Think about that oath you swore. Put aside personal friendships. Stand on principle today – it is important that you do – and vote "no" on SB 299.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative McCarter.

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

No one in this room is a stranger to the grueling necessity of knocking on doors, soliciting political support. We have all had to go through it every 2 years, for those of us in this chamber. But for judges, that is a different scenario. It can be dangerous, in contrast to what some people have suggested.

How, you ask? Consider this scenario – a true story. A magisterial district judge and his wife were circulating petitions when the judge noticed that his wife had been in a home for about 15 minutes without emerging, and he grew concerned. He went to the house and was let in by an elderly woman, and inside, an elderly man was yelling and screaming at the judge's wife about a landlord-tenant dispute on which the judge had ruled the previous year. The elderly man was so enraged he was shaking.

Here is another story, also true. A magisterial district judge approached two people burning some material outside a home. As the judge approached, she introduced herself and explained that she was there to collect signatures. One of the men looked at the judge and asked, "Do you remember me?" The judge replied that she did not. He told her that she had ruled against him in a civil case. As he placed the metal poker into the fire, the man then snarled at the judge, "Get the heck out of here," only he did not use those words exactly. I will not repeat them.

Mr. Speaker, this is a pressing matter of safety. It will not wait. A recent study by the Special Court Judges Association of Pennsylvania revealed that a significant percentage – nearly 37 percent – of district court judges in the Commonwealth have reported being on the receiving end of hostile, frightening behavior while campaigning to retain their seats, and 10 percent of those judges reported experiencing actual physical harm. Judges have reported homeowners siccing their dogs on them. They have reported homeowners wielding guns or shovels.

And, Mr. Speaker, examples of violence in our district courts in general seem to be increasing. Only a few days ago one of the district judges in my district, facing a case dealing with domestic violence, the individual broke from the hands of the two police officers who were guarding him, picked up a table, threw it, and scared the judge, the staff, and the others in the courtroom to the point that they had to run out of the building, and the individual defendant was finally subdued by five police officers who had to use a taser. And, Mr. Speaker, I think all of us have heard of the September shooting on the doorstep of a district court in Masontown, Pennsylvania, that resulted in four people being shot by the individual, who was then fatally wounded by a responding police officer. The gunman was facing charges of strangulation, aggravated assault, terroristic threats, and simple assault. He was

also under a protection-from-abuse order. Who knows, judges may even make next year's list of the most dangerous professions, but do we really want to wait before we act in this situation?

Mr. Speaker, there is a distinct difference between a sitting judge going door to door and legislators or candidates for judge to collect signatures for petitions. That difference is that none of those people, including ourselves, has ever sentenced someone to jail or issued a PFA order. When a judge unknowingly or unwittingly knocks on the door of a disgruntled defendant, one who believes the judge treated him unfairly by ordering incarceration, setting monetary bail, or issuing a protective order, that judge is literally taking his or her life in his or her hands. Mr. Speaker, that is unacceptable in this day and age. It is not safe. We should not have to wait for one judge to be fatally wounded before we act.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 50 years Pennsylvania has required incumbents running for magisterial district judge to demonstrate a modicum of support by filing nominating petitions containing just 100 signatures, and the prior speakers are right, it does not take a lot of work to do that, and if in fact you want others to circulate your petitions, you could accomplish that. But many of the judges that I know are ones that want to go out on their own and get their own signatures if they have to do this, but in the increasing difficulties of today, that modicum of support has become a problem. Anyone can get those signatures, as I say. The responsibility of everyone in this room, though, is to keep our magisterial district judges safe, and that is a much weightier and more persistent need.

I urge my colleagues to do as the good legislators of Michigan have done before us and endorse the sensible approach put forth in this bill. They have had this for several years. No constitutional issues have ever been raised about it.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit, however, I do want to tell one more story, and that is the story of, again, judges who have faced this situation, and one in which I hope we do not end up with a situation where we have to come back to this issue and see that a judge has lost his or her life because of our unwillingness to act. I ask for your support for this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. Representative Clint Owlett is back on the House floor and should be placed back on the master roll.

CONSIDERATION OF SB 299 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. Members, we have four more speakers. Representative Roae, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. ROAE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, SB 299 is a seriously flawed piece of legislation that we should vote against. The argument that is made is that district judges are the only ones that have to do petitions – other judges do not – and it is a safety hazard. Mr. Speaker, there are very, very many reasons why that is a very flawed argument. If you think about it, how are other judges reelected? When you look at a Supreme Court justice when their term is almost up, they do not run in a primary. They run in a retention election; yes or no? Should this Supreme Court justice have another 10-year

term, yes or no? Same thing with Commonwealth Court, same thing with Superior Court, same thing with the court of common pleas. They have retention elections. District judges do not have retention elections. They run in the primary, then they run in the general election – just like legislators, just like the Governor, just like school board members, and just like most other elected offices. The purpose of petitions, Mr. Speaker, is to get your name on a primary ballot, so anybody that wants to be in the primary needs to do petitions. Other levels of judges do not run in primaries, and that is why they do not do petitions. So the whole argument that it is unfair that district judges have to do petitions is a flawed argument, because when you do petitions, you are saying, "I want my name on the primary ballot." So if you want your name on the primary ballot, you have to do petitions. That is how it works.

Another argument that makes this a seriously flawed piece of legislation is that somehow district judges face a lot of serious risk when they are out doing their petitions, but, Mr. Speaker, so does everyone else. If you think about it, district attorneys would still have to do petitions under this legislation. The county sheriff would still have to do petitions. The clerk of courts would still have to do petitions. If safety is an issue, we should be saying that nobody has to do petitions, not just the district judges.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring up another issue, too, and that is on what is fair in an election. Normally when you have a fair election, all of the candidates have to do the same thing, and under SB 299, it basically says that if you are the incumbent, you do not have to do as many things as if you are the challenger, and that does not seem right, Mr. Speaker. When you think about it, when any other office is up for reelection and they are going to be in a primary, all the candidates have to do the same thing. It does not matter if you are the incumbent or the challenger, you all have to fill out the same paperwork, the same ethics form, the same number of petitions, the candidate affidavit – all the things you have to do to run for office and have your name on the primary ballot. Everybody has to do the same thing. Under this legislation, it basically says that if you are running against an incumbent district judge, you have to do more things than the incumbent has to do. That seems to be a violation of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker. Article I, section 5, does call for free and fair elections. In our system, Mr. Speaker, we cannot say one candidate has to do this, this, and this, and the other candidate only has to do this and that.

CONSTITUTIONAL POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROAE. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation, if we pass it, would be a violation of the Pennsylvania Constitution. so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a motion.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir. You may.

Mr. ROAE. I would like to make a motion that SB 299 is unconstitutional, as it violates Article I, section 5, of the Pennsylvania Constitution.

The SPEAKER. In consultation with the Parliamentarian, we will be having a motion on constitutionality. The gentleman, Representative Brad Roae, raises the point of order that SB 299, PN 1849, is unconstitutional. The Speaker, under rule 4, has submitted the question affecting the constitutionality of the bill to the House for decision.

On the question,
Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Representative Roae, I know you already covered much of the basis of your motion. Do you want to add anything more to that?

Mr. ROAE. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Article I, section 5, deals with free and fair elections, and it is unconstitutional in a fair election if there are two candidates and one candidate has to do more things to have their name on the ballot than the other candidate; therefore, SB 299 is unconstitutional.

The SPEAKER. Okay. Anybody can speak on constitutionality, but you are restricted to one time. Representative Bryan Barbin, on constitutionality.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The section provided by the maker of this motion, states it as Article I, section 5, "Elections shall be free and equal...." The problem with his argument is that if his argument applies in this case, then it is unconstitutional to have retention. It is also unconstitutional to have a retention in common pleas, in Superior Court, in Commonwealth Court, and in the Supreme Court. The argument does not hold water. What this argument really says is, in my mind, this is not free and equal; therefore, I can make a motion for unconstitutionality. The same thing could be said about the fact that we have unlimited campaign contributions. The same thing could be said that Ohio has early voting and we do not. The same thing could be said that other States have absentee ballots with no reason. The bottom line is, we make those rules.

This rule is made, the retention rule is made because once those people are elected, they are not supposed to be involved with politics anymore. This bill does not say that you have a leg up in an election. All this bill says is, if you are a sitting district judge, you get to have your name on the ballot. If the Democratic Party does not like that and puts up their own candidate and he beats you, you are out of luck. If the Republican Party puts up their own candidate and he beats you, you are out of luck. All this says is for a sitting district judge, we are going to try to minimize politics. We are going to try to say that you went out and got the signatures before you were elected. No, you do not get to have retention like common pleas judges or Superior Court judges or Supreme Court judges, but we are at least not going to make you walk into a district, somebody's house who might have it out against you and you might not even know it because they were the uncle of the person you put in jail. We are in the middle of an opioid epidemic. It does not make sense to make district judges walk into those houses. If they are going to get beaten by the parties, either party or by an independent, they are still on the ballot.

This bill is constitutional. It makes sense right now, particularly in light of the opioid epidemic. It is clearly constitutional as much as retention is constitutional, and I urge everyone to make a "no" vote on constitutionality.

The SPEAKER. Members, just in terms of your remarks on constitutionality, I just want to, for Representative Barbin, you may want to just get back up.

Those voting "aye" will vote to declare the bill to be constitutional. So when we vote it, if you are arguing for it to be constitutional, you are saying "aye." If you are voting to declare the bill to be unconstitutional, you will be voting "no."

So Representative Roae is arguing that the bill is unconstitutional so he is asking you for a "no" vote. My understanding is Representative Barbin is saying you should say it is constitutional, so he is asking for an "aye" vote. So if you think it is unconstitutional, you will be voting "no," as suggested by the maker of the motion. If you think it is constitutional, you will be voting "aye."

Representative Saccone, on constitutionality.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. And then Representative Dush will be next.

Mr. SACCONI. As I spoke previously, and I want to disagree with my good colleague there, there is a clear advantage. It is not a fair process. It is providing a clear advantage to the incumbent. You can argue that it is different from a retention. You can make that argument. I will not go into that here, but there is a differentiation there.

And to the argument that you have to be totally isolated from politics; well, that is a false argument. By definition, you are an elected official. There is some politics involved in the process and the purpose is to make this fair. The Constitution demands that we make it fair.

And the safety argument, again, it is facetious, because – it is specious I mean, because you can always have surrogates. It is only 100 signatures. You can have surrogates go out and get them. If you cannot find 100 people in your district that you have not put in jail or you are not willing to go up and talk to – in other words, you do not go to the grocery store, you do not go to the post office, you do not go anywhere because you might run into someone you put in jail? It is a ridiculous argument. You should be able to go out or have surrogates go out and find 100 people that will write on your petition for you.

So this bill is unconstitutional. I support the amendment. Please vote with Representative Roae.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Dush, I think, is our last speaker on constitutionality. Okay. And then Representative Samuelson. I would have never guessed that we would get this much debate on this bill, but, Representative Dush, on constitutionality, sir.

Mr. DUSH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the member's motion. Article I, section 5, specifically states that "Elections shall be free and equal...." There is an inequality here in the way that we are setting this up. A previous speaker mentioned about the retention elections. Those retention elections are covered under Article IV, section 13, of the Constitution. If we are going to make this change for the district courts, we should be doing it at the constitutional level rather than as a piece of legislation. So for that reason I think if we are going to have such a bill offering this type of, basically, a retention-type election, then we should be addressing that as a matter of the constitutional, through a constitutional resolution rather than a bill.

For that reason I rise in support of Representative Roae and a negative vote on constitutionality.

The SPEAKER. Representative Samuelson, on constitutionality.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of Representative Roae's motion that this bill is unconstitutional. Representative Roae is citing Article I, section 5. It is a one-sentence part of our Constitution. The first clause says, "Elections shall be free and equal....," and if we start

setting up different standards for different candidates based on whether or not they are an incumbent, where does that end?

If you take a look at the bill in chief, look at page 2, line 3. This bill is amending the Election Code, and if you look at page 2, line 3, this is amending subsection 32. That means there are 31 other elections that are cited in the Election Code ahead of this. What if we started saying that we need different standards for if you are an incumbent U.S. Senator or a challenger U.S. Senator? What if we said we needed different standards for an incumbent city council person or a challenger city council person? What if you turned to law enforcement. What if you said, if you are the district attorney, you should have one standard if you are the incumbent, but if you are a challenger for district attorney, you need a different standard. What if – you could go down the list – Governor of Pennsylvania, Attorney General of Pennsylvania, President of the United States? My goodness, if we start saying that we need different standards for different candidates based on whether or not you are an incumbent, where does that stop? That is a slippery slope.

It is clear in the Constitution that elections should be free and equal. Let us keep our elections equal. Let us vote that this bill is unconstitutional.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. So those voting "aye" – only one time, sir, I am sorry – those voting "aye" will be voting to declare the bill to be constitutional.

I am sorry; go ahead. Did I miss somebody? I apologize.

Representative Freeman, yes. I apologize. I did not see you, sir. On the issue of constitutionality.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be very brief.

I think the arguments have been well covered by those who have outlined why this is unconstitutional. The key point here is one of uniformity. Both in Article I, section 5, as cited by the gentleman, Mr. Roae, and also in Article VII, section 6, it requires all elections to be uniform. If we put before our laws in Pennsylvania that there can be two different standards on how to get on the ballot, and one candidate has to observe those standards and the other does not, that is not uniform. That is the crux of the argument of why this is unconstitutional.

If the argument for this legislation is that our magistrate candidates or incumbents are at risk, then let us lower the number of signatures required to get on the ballot, maybe make it 10 so they only have to encounter a handful of people to get on the ballot. But to have a dual standard violates the uniformity aspect of our elections, and therefore, this is unconstitutional. I urge a vote of unconstitutionality.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

So, members, if you are voting that it is unconstitutional, you are going to be voting "no." If you – where Representative Roae is; he made the motion and he says that he is challenging the constitutionality of the bill – if you think that it is unconstitutional you will be voting "no." If you believe that it is constitutional, you will be voting "aye."

On the question recurring,

Will the House sustain the constitutionality of the bill?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—120

Barbin	Dermody	Krueger	Rabb
Barrar	DiGirolamo	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Bernstine	Donatucci	Lawrence	Readshaw
Bizzarro	Dowling	Longietti	Reed
Bloom	Driscoll	Madden	Reese
Boback	Farry	Markosek	Roe
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Marsico	Rothman
Briggs	Frankel	Masser	Rozzi
Brown, V.	Fritz	Matzje	Sainato
Bullock	Gainey	McCartner	Sankey
Burns	Galloway	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	Mehaffie	Sims
Carroll	Goodman	Metcalfe	Snyder
Cephas	Grove	Metzgar	Solomon
Christiana	Haggerty	Miccarelli	Staats
Comitta	Hahn	Milne	Stephens
Conklin	Hanna	Mullery	Sturla
Corbin	Harkins	Neilson	Tai
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Nelson	Taylor
Costa, P.	Heffley	Nesbit	Tobash
Cruz	Hennessey	O'Neal	Toohil
Culver	Hill	O'Neill	Topper
Daley	Irvin	Ortitay	Vazquez
Davis, A.	James	Owlett	Walsh
Davis, T.	Kampf	Pashinski	Ward
Dawkins	Kauffman	Petrarca	Warner
Deasy	Keller, W.	Pickett	Warren
DeLissio	Kirkland	Quigley	Wheatley
Delozier	Klunk	Quinn, C.	Wheeland
DeLuca	Kortz	Quinn, M.	Youngblood

NAYS—74

Benninghoff	Freeman	Mako	Ryan
Boyle	Gillen	Maloney	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gillespie	Marshall	Samuelson
Causar	Greiner	McGinnis	Schemel
Charlton	Harper	McNeill	Schlossberg
Cook	Harris, A.	Mentzer	Schweyer
Cox	Helm	Millard	Simmons
Cutler	Hickernell	Miller, B.	Sonney
Davidson	Jozwiak	Miller, D.	Tallman
Day	Kaufer	Moul	Thomas
Diamond	Keefer	Murt	Toepel
Dunbar	Keller, F.	Mustio	Vitali
Dush	Keller, M.K.	Oberlander	Watson
Ellis	Kim	Peifer	Wentling
Emrick	Kinsey	Pyle	White
English	Knowles	Rader	Zimmerman
Evans	Lewis	Rapp	
Fee	Mackenzie	Roae	Turzai,
Flynn	Maher	Roebuck	Speaker

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the constitutionality of the bill was sustained.

On the question recurring,
Shall the bill pass finally?

The SPEAKER. Representative Dom Costa, on the bill.

He will be followed by Representative Diamond and then followed by Representative Davidson. Those are our remaining speakers.

Representative Dom Costa.

Representative Roae, do you want to be on the bill?

Mr. ROAE. Mr. Speaker, do I still have the floor? I mean, I made a motion about constitutionality.

The SPEAKER. Yes. That is fine. Yes, absolutely. If you want to continue to speak, please feel free to do so.

Mr. ROAE. Okay. I am almost concluded.

But just in final words, I just want to say that I want to ask the members to just really think about something. If this legislation said that the incumbent does not have to pay the filing fee to have their name on the ballot but the challenger has to pay the filing fee to have their name on the ballot, most of us would think that is unfair. If this legislation said the incumbent does not have to complete a statement of financial interest but the challenger does, most of us would think that is not fair. If this legislation said the incumbent does not have to fill out a candidate affidavit form but the challenger does, most of us would think this is unfair. What this legislation does, it says the incumbent does not have to do petitions but the challenger does have to do petitions. Mr. Speaker, that is not fair, and I would urge a "no" vote on the legislation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

Representative Dom Costa.

Mr. D. COSTA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to try to hit this at a different perspective. I am standing here in support of SB 299, and I will tell you why: it is a safety issue for these district judges. As legislators, I am hearing that we are saying that if it is fair for us, it is fair for them. Our jobs are different, dramatically different. In this time, in this age of craziness out there, people think nothing of using deadly force or bodily injury to get their points across. And these magistrates do not just hear criminal offenses. They hear civil offenses. They hear domestic violence. Just last week or the week before we passed a domestic violence bill here. These same district judges will have to rule to take people's weapons away, to take them away from their home, and we are going to send them into somebody's property, that property being their castle, and they believe their castle is their domain. It is different when you are approached on the street. You are on neutral ground. You have rights that you do not have on someone else's property. We are sending them into a danger zone.

Over my years as a police officer, which were 28 as most of you know, I have seen many cases where district judges were threatened. My own cousin was a district judge and was threatened through me, and the person threatening my cousin through me knew that I was a police officer; not a bright move, but knew that I was a police officer.

So please, look at this in a different perspective. It is not about politics. It is not about, "Oh, it's fair if we do it, they have to do it." They are in a different set. They need our protection. There is no reason to risk someone's life or their bodily safety over 100 signatures. So please, support this bill. It is good. Our district judges need it and it has worked in other places.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. Members, there are other speakers that are adding on at this time. Representative Pyle is now on the list. We are going to go over the bill. We will come back to the speakers. We are going to proceed to some other work that we have to get done.

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. READSHAW called up **HR 1062, PN 4002**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of October 21 through 27, 2018, as "Respiratory Care Week" in Pennsylvania and commending respiratory therapists for their outstanding contributions to health care.

* * *

Mr. READSHAW called up **HR 1063, PN 4003**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the week of October 21 through 27, 2018, as "National Massage Therapy Awareness Week" in Pennsylvania to honor the more than 7,900 licensed massage therapists in this Commonwealth.

* * *

Mr. F. KELLER called up **HR 1096, PN 4063**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of October 15 through 19, 2018, as "CARES Recognition Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. MATZIE called up **HR 1128, PN 4170**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of October 14 through 20, 2018, as "Credit Union Week" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Mr. BENNINGHOFF called up **HR 1132, PN 4174**, entitled:

A Resolution designating November 2, 2018, as "Veterans, Record Your Discharge Day" in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Ms. BOBACK called up **HR 1141, PN 4183**, entitled:

A Resolution designating October 15 through 19, 2018, as "Small Business Development Center Week" in Pennsylvania to celebrate the collective impact and success of small business development centers across the nation and in our local communities.

* * *

Ms. BOBACK called up **HR 1142, PN 4184**, entitled:

A Resolution designating October 19, 2018, as "Lock 'Em Up Day in PA."

* * *

Mr. PASHINSKI called up **HR 1144, PN 4185**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing the hard work and dedication of the first responders, members of local law enforcement, emergency management agencies, utility workers and township and county officials who responded to the large-scale emergency situation that took place in Wilkes-Barre on June 13, 2018, as a result of a category EF2 tornado.

* * *

Ms. CULVER called up **HR 1146, PN 4187**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the month of November 2018 as "Veteran Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania in conjunction with the annual "Veterans Day" observance on November 11, 2018.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

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. DiGIROLAMO called up **HR 1151, PN 4199**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing October 10, 2018, as "World Mental Health Day" in Pennsylvania to highlight the importance of mental health globally and the contributions and value of mental health.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillen	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Hanna	Miccarelli	Solomon
Conklin	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Tai
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Tobash
Daley	Irvin	Nelson	Toepel
Davidson	James	Nesbit	Toohil
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Topper
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kaufman	Oberlander	Vitali
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Ward
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warner
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Warren

DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Watson
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Quigley	Wheeland
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

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

CALENDAR

BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 1078, PN 1560**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 65 (Public Officers) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in open meetings, further providing for executive sessions.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 888, PN 1998**, entitled:

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

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **SB 945, PN 1718**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in registration of vehicles, further providing for contributions to Veterans' Trust Fund.

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

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 270, PN 949**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of August 26, 1971 (P.L.351, No.91), known as the State Lottery Law, in pharmaceutical assistance for the elderly, further providing for definitions, providing for medication synchronization, further providing for the Pharmaceutical Assistance Contract for the Elderly Needs Enhancement Tier and for board, providing for medication therapy management and further providing for coordination of benefits.

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

Mr. **FARRY** offered the following amendment No. **A10067**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 11, by striking out "and" where it occurs the second time and inserting a comma

Amend Bill, page 1, line 12, by inserting after "management" and further providing for coordination of benefits

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 17 and 18, by striking out "a definition" and inserting definitions

Amend Bill, page 2, by inserting between lines 6 and 7 "LEP" or "late enrollment penalty." The amount added to the Part D plan premium of either:

(1) an individual who did not obtain creditable prescription drug coverage as defined under 42 CFR § 423.56 (relating to procedures to determine and document creditable status of prescription drug coverage) when the individual was first eligible for Part D; or

(2) an individual who had a break in creditable prescription drug coverage of at least 63 consecutive days and that is considered a part of the plan premium.

* * *

"Maintenance medication." A medication prescribed for a chronic, long-term condition and taken on a regular, recurring basis.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 15, by striking out "rate" and inserting fees

Amend Bill, page 2, line 16, by striking out "rate" and inserting fee

Amend Bill, page 2, line 22, by inserting after "synchronization." The program may not use payment structures incorporating prorated dispensing fees.

(b) Full payment.—Dispensing fees for a partial supply or refilled prescription shall be paid in full for each maintenance medication dispensed, regardless of any prorated copay for the beneficiary or fee paid for alignment services.

(c) Partial supply.—The program may not deny coverage for the dispensing of a maintenance medication that is dispensed by a network pharmacy on the basis that the dispensing is for a partial supply if the prescriber or pharmacist determines the fill or refill is in the best interest of the patient and the patient requests or agrees to a partial supply for the purpose of medication synchronization.

(d) Annual limitation.—The fill or refill under this section shall be limited to three times a year for each maintenance medication for a covered individual. For each clinically necessary synchronization thereafter, approval may be required at the discretion of the program.

Amend Bill, page 2, line 23, by striking out "(b)" and inserting (e)

Amend Bill, page 2, line 23, by striking out "The" and inserting Subject to section 520(c.1), the

Amend Bill, page 2, line 26, by striking out the period after "synchronization" and inserting

utilizing the submission clarification and message codes as adopted by the National Council for Prescription Drug Programs or alternative codes provided by the program.

(f) Exemption.—This section does not apply to prescription drugs

that are either:

(1) unit-of-use packaging for which medication synchronization is not possible; or

(2) controlled substances classified in Schedule II under section 4(2) of the act of April 14, 1972 (P.L.233, No.64), known as The Controlled Substance, Drug, Device and Cosmetic Act.

Amend Bill, page 3, line 3, by striking out "\$31,000" and inserting

\$27,500

Amend Bill, page 3, line 5, by striking out "\$41,000" and inserting

\$35,500

Amend Bill, page 5, line 5, by inserting a bracket before the comma after "copayment"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 5, by inserting after "copayment,"] or

Amend Bill, page 5, line 5, by inserting a bracket before "or"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 6, by inserting a bracket after "pharmacists"

Amend Bill, page 5, lines 16 and 17, by striking out "the department proposals for"

Amend Bill, page 6, line 1, by striking out "one year" and inserting

six months

Amend Bill, page 6, by inserting between lines 2 and 3

Section 5. Section 534 of the act is amended by adding a subsection to read:

Section 534. Coordination of benefits.

* * *

(c.1) Authorization.—The department may pay the LEP of Part D enrollees in excess of the regional benchmark premium.

* * *

Amend Bill, page 6, line 3, by striking out "5" and inserting 6

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

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

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In brief, this amendment was the amendment that was derived through rather substantial negotiations with the various stakeholders, including the administration, and I ask for an affirmative vote on the amendment, sir.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

* * *

The House proceeded to second consideration of SB 748, PN 2021, entitled:

An Act providing for public safety facilities.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. **WHEELAND** offered the following amendment
No. **A09569**:

Amend Bill, page 4, line 3, by inserting after "closure."
Notice of the hearing shall be given in a newspaper of
general circulation in the county at least 15 days prior to the date
of the hearing.

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

The **SPEAKER**. On the amendment, Representative Jeff
Wheeland.

Mr. **WHEELAND**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment is just basically a fix, and it is for public
notification 15 days prior to the public meeting, and I would ask
my colleagues for an affirmative vote. Thank you.

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

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

Driscoll	Kulik	Rader	
Dunbar	Lawrence	Rapp	Turzai,
Dush	Lewis	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Ellis			

NAYS—2

Evans	Harper
-------	--------

NOT VOTING—1

Schweyer

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

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

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

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

BILLS ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in
Senate amendments to **HB 783, PN 4136**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania
Consolidated Statutes, in certificate of title and security interests, further
providing for transfer of ownership of vehicles used for human
habitation.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The **SPEAKER**. The prime sponsor of the bill, Representative
Nesbit, is here. Representative Nesbit, please give us a summary
of the original bill and the Senate amendments, and you may
make any comments thereupon.

Mr. **NESBIT**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 783 passed the House 188 to 0 in October of 2017. If you
remember, this legislation exempted manufactured homes not
previously titled in PA from the tax certification requirement
when titling in the Commonwealth. HB 783 was amended by the
Senate to require the transferrer to obtain tax status certification
from the tax claim bureau showing county, municipal, and school
district real estate taxes that were due on a mobile home or a
manufactured home, including any delinquent taxes turned over
to a third party for collection. Current law only requires county
real estate taxes be certified, and this legislation ensures new
owners are not left with the previous owner's municipal or school
taxes.

I would request an affirmative vote. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**. Thank you, sir.

The good gentleman urged a "yes" vote, and so moved by the
gentleman, Representative Nesbit, that the House concur in the
amendments inserted by the Senate.

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1386, PN 4070**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in certification of teachers, providing for instructional certificate grade spans and age levels and duties of department.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. Representative Phillips-Hill is the prime sponsor of the bill. Representative Phillips-Hill, will you please give us a summary of the underlying bill, the Senate amendments, and any remarks you have with respect to concurrence.

Mrs. HILL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 1386 was amended by the Senate and the amendment removed the changes to nonspecial education certification. Instead, PDE (Pennsylvania Department of Education) will now be required to notify teacher preparation programs, all individuals enrolled in these programs, and all individuals holding an early childhood certificate that they can obtain an existing add-on certification to teach grades 5 and 6. PDE will also be required to issue an annual report on the number of certifications issued by type and field.

Finally, the amended legislation directs the Joint State Government Commission to analyze and issue a report about the appropriateness of fields of certification, the creation or elimination of certifications and endorsements, and national trends regarding grade spans and age limitations. This bill as amended is supported by various education organizations, including PSBA (Pennsylvania School Boards Association) and PSEA (Pennsylvania State Education Association), and there is no known opposition.

These changes are the result of extensive collaboration with the Senate and education stakeholders, and was passed by the Senate unanimously. I respectfully ask that you concur with the Senate's changes by casting an affirmative vote on HB 1386.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentlelady, Representative Phillips-Hill, that the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate.

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longiotti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone
Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato

Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillen	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Hanna	Miccarelli	Solomon
Conklin	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Tai
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Tobash
Daley	Irvin	Nelson	Toepel
Davidson	James	Nesbit	Toohil
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Topper
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kaufman	Oberlander	Vitali
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Ward
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warner
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Warren
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Watson
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Quigley	Wheeland
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1414, PN 4134**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions, further providing for definitions; and, in other required equipment, further providing for visual and audible signals on emergency vehicles and for visual signals on authorized vehicles and providing for flashing or revolving yellow and white lights and for solid waste collection vehicles.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon the prime sponsor of the bill, Representative Barrar, for a summary of the bill and the Senate amendments, and any remarks on the bill with respect to concurrence.

Mr. BARRAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This legislation deals with the lighting on different vehicles, from tow trucks to trash trucks and a lot of emergency vehicles, and this legislation helps to straighten out a lot of it. Over the years there have been disputes between different organizations of who can have what lights. This legislation will straighten that out. And I would like to thank our Transportation chairman for his help in getting this done.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

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

Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai,
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	Speaker

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 1499, PN 3688**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in creation, alteration and termination of condominiums, further providing for contents of declaration and all condominiums; in management of the condominium, further providing for powers of unit owners' association, for executive board members and officers and for conveyance or encumbrance of common elements; in protection of purchasers, further providing for release of liens and for warranty against structural defects; in creation, alteration and termination of cooperatives, further providing for contents of declaration; in management of cooperatives, further providing for powers of association, for executive board members and officers and for conveyance or encumbrance of cooperative; in protection of cooperative interest purchasers, further providing for release of liens and for implied warranty against structural defects; in general provisions relating to planned communities, further providing for definitions; in creation, alteration and termination of planned communities, further providing for construction and validity of declaration and bylaws and for contents of declaration and all planned communities; in management of planned community, further providing for power of unit owners' association, for executive board members and officers and for conveyance or encumbrance of common facilities; and, in protection of purchasers, further providing for release of liens and for warranty against structural defects.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes Representative Mark Keller, the prime sponsor of the bill, to summarize the bill, the Senate amendments, and for any remarks with respect to the concurrence vote. Representative Keller.

Mr. M. KELLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what this does is an updated provision of Title 68. And what the Senate did as far as amendments is added a provision to bring DEP (Department of Environmental Protection) guidelines regarding maintenance and operation of storm water management facilities and communities into statute by clarifying an association's responsibility following termination of a declarant's control, and it also adjusts the timeframe of the association's right to pursue action under a declarant's warranty against structural deficits to the 6 years after

the warranty begins or 2 years after the unit owner elects a board, whichever occurs first.

I would encourage an affirmative vote. Thank you.

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS-194

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

NAYS-0

NOT VOTING-0

EXCUSED-7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to **HB 2297, PN 4054**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of February 15, 2018 (P.L.22, No.9), entitled "An act designating a portion of State Route 2005 in Saxonburg Borough, Butler County, as the Chief Gregory B. Adams Way; designating a bridge on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 271 over US Route 22, Jackson Township, Cambria County, as the Trooper Gary Fisher Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 53 over US Route 22, Cresson Township, Cambria County, as the Corporal Robert J. Sherwood, Jr., Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on Segment 80 of State Route 2015, along Overbridge Street and over Railroad Street, Lilly Borough, Cambria County, as the Paul E. Sweeney Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on that portion of Avenue A over the Allegheny River, Coudersport Borough, Potter County, as the Commander Philip F. "Jet" Palmatier, Jr., Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on that portion of Sunnyside Road over the Oswayo Creek, Shinglehouse Borough, Potter County, as the PVT Malon Stanley Memorial Bridge; designating a portion of State Route 1001 in Greene Township, Franklin County, as the Lance Corporal Michael L. Freeman, Jr., Memorial Highway; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 533 over Muddy Run, Southampton Township, Franklin County, as the Private First Class Dana Edward Diehl Memorial Bridge; and designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 1004 over the Conococheague Creek, Greene Township, Franklin County, as the Private Charles W. "Bill" Roher Memorial Bridge," further providing for Lance Corporal Michael L. Freeman, Jr., Memorial Highway; and providing for Cpl. Carl F. Hynek III Memorial Highway.

On the question,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls on the prime sponsor, Representative John Taylor, to provide us a summary of the underlying bill, any Senate amendments, and any comments on a concurrence vote.

Representative Taylor.
Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill just merely is a technical correction to two different road-naming bills that we had to get over to the Senate. They corrected one even further. It was unanimously supported over there, and I ask for your vote in concurrence.

On the question recurring,
Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roe
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roebuck
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Rothman
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rozzi
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Ryan
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Saccone
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	

Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillen	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causer	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Hanna	Miccarelli	Solomon
Conklin	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Tai
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Tobash
Daley	Irvin	Nelson	Toepel
Davidson	James	Nesbit	Toohil
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Topper
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kaufner	Oberlander	Vitali
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Ward
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warner
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Warren
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Watson
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheatley
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Quigley	Wheeland
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai, Speaker
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

**BILLS ON CONCURRENCE
IN SENATE AMENDMENTS
TO HOUSE AMENDMENTS**

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to **SB 180, PN 2048**, 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; in health care, further providing for example; and, in anatomical gifts, further providing for definitions, providing for scope, further providing for persons who may execute anatomical gift, for persons who may become donees and purposes for which anatomical gifts may be made, for manner of executing anatomical gifts, for rights and duties at death, for requests for anatomical gifts, for use of driver's

license or identification card to indicate organ or tissue donation, for The Governor Robert P. Casey Memorial Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Trust Fund contributions, for The Governor Robert P. Casey Memorial Organ and Tissue Donation Awareness Trust Fund, for confidentiality requirement and for prohibited activities, providing for promotion of organ and tissue donation, establishing the Donate Life PA Registry, providing for facilitation of anatomical gift from decedent whose death is under investigation, for notification by coroners and medical examiners to district attorneys, for discretionary notification by coroner or medical examiner, for collaboration among departments and organ procurement organizations, for information relative to organ and tissue donation, for requirements for physician and nurse training relative to organ and tissue donation and recovery, for Department of Transportation, for Department of Corrections, for study of organ procurement organizations and for relation to Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, repealing provisions relating to corneal transplants and providing for vascularized composite allografts.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. Moved by the gentleman, Representative Bryan Cutler, that the House concur in the amendments.

The Chair recognizes Representative Cutler for a brief description of the bill as it presently stands, given the amendments by the Senate and the earlier amendments by the House. Sir, you may proceed.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, by way of a brief reminder for the members, this is an issue that was before us previously regarding organ donation. It was an issue that we debated for some time.

The main change was actually a change that we had also proposed in another corollary bill, which I am sure we will be discussing later. But specifically, on October 1, 2018, the Senate amended SB 180 in its Rules Committee. The amendment increased the voluntarily contribution made by citizens from \$1 to \$3 with respect to the driver's license renewals and renewals of vehicle registration. The amendment also corrects drafting errors and makes changes and further clarifications for provisions relating to physicians and transplant surgeons, and adds technical language that was requested by PennDOT.

Members might remember that the same increase from \$1 to \$3 was carried by the minority chairman of the Judiciary Committee on another bill related to organ donation, and that same amendment and same language had previously passed unanimously. I want to thank the gentleman for his work on that and would encourage support of the underlying bill because of that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Joseph Petrarca, on the concurrence vote, sir.

Mr. PETRARCA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill is a restatement or update of the Pennsylvania – and has been called the Pennsylvania Donate Life bill. This legislation will update our anatomical gifts act in Pennsylvania. The original legislation sought to create a framework for education, and also dealt with who can and the methods of organ donation, and also to update our law relative to best practices.

Our organ donor legislation was passed in 1994, and it was certainly model legislation nationally and internationally. Pennsylvania was a leader in organ donation. Since that time, some of our numbers in Pennsylvania have slipped, and in fact, we are one of only two or three States that have not passed some form of a uniform anatomical gifts act.

This legislation has been worked on for a number of years. I have worked on it for 4 or 5 years. It is truly, at this point, a compromise piece of legislation. This legislation certainly will help those on our organ donation list. That list, unfortunately, has grown to over 8,000 in recent years.

Again, I want to thank all of the advocates from donor families, recipient families who have worked on this for so long, many of which are not with us anymore. I would also like to thank our organ procurement organizations and the State Organ Donation Advisory Committee, of which I have had the privilege of serving on since its inception in 1995.

So I ask for an affirmative vote on this legislation, and again, let us give people the gift of life moving forward. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Representative Kerry Benninghoff, on the concurrence vote.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to thank all the members for the time and endurance that you have put in on this proposal. Mr. Speaker, I realize that I was part of that, or probably the cause of some of that delay, but I would be remiss to not thank both chairmen, Representative Marsico and Representative Petrarca. I thought Representative Ward said it yesterday: I think for the most that we are able to agree more than we disagree on things. And though we had some varying viewpoints on this particular piece of proposal and/or some other ones that came along the lines, I commend Representative Petrarca for humoring some of my thoughts and some of the things we needed to do even when he may have disagreed, and that is what this chamber is about. Representative Marsico gave us the opportunity to make some changes.

But most of all, Pennsylvania has been leading the country in organ donations, and we would like to continue to do that, at the same time respecting individual family's wishes and individuals' wishes, whether it is advance directives, living wills, or whatever else. And so this compromise, which I thought it was a great example of what we want to do not only as a chamber, but with our sister chamber and for those people on the outside. It is a time when we can disagree vehemently on things and work together, discuss things, and get other people's opinions that make a final product. We do not pass legislation in its entirety as it is generally first time proposed, but with good dialogue, the willingness to be understanding and listen to others, sometimes we learn a little bit, grow a little bit, and we can change legislation to make a better product.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss to not acknowledge my friend, Garth Everett. I know this is important to him and his family; our staff, both in the Judiciary Committee and my own, because they have spent countless hours on this proposal and we are honored to stand before it, and I would like to see our chamber vote unanimously to pass SB 180, the organ procurement proposal, that will bring us up to date. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and to all the members for your time.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to House amendments were concurred in.
 Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

* * *

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to House amendments to **SB 764, PN 2049**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 22, 1983 (P.L.306, No.84), known as the Board of Vehicles Act, providing for preliminary provisions, further providing for short title, for definitions, for State Board of Vehicle Manufacturers, Dealers and Salespersons, for powers and duties of board, for license to engage in business, for biennial renewal, for enforcement, for protest hearing decision within 120 days unless waived by the parties, for reimbursement for all parts and service required by the manufacturer or distributor and reimbursement audits, for vehicle recalls, for damage disclosure, for mediation and arbitration, for unlawful acts by manufacturers or distributors, for area of responsibility, for termination of franchises, for industry reorganization, for succession to franchise ownership, for manufacturer right of first refusal, for manufacturer or distributor repurchase of inventory and equipment, for reimbursement of rental costs for dealer facility, for grounds for disciplinary proceedings, for administrative liability of employer, copartnership, association or corporation, for reinstatement, for application for license, for refusal of license, for change of salesperson's license to indicate new employer, for termination of employment or business, for exemption from licensure and registration, for limitations on establishing or relocating dealers, for licensing cost, for penalties, for civil actions for violations, for fees, for disposition of fees and fines, for vehicle shows, off-premise sales and exhibitions, for recreational vehicle shows, recreational vehicle off-premise sales, recreational vehicle exhibitions and recreational vehicle rallies and for off-premise sales, shows, exhibitions or rallies on Sundays; providing for recreational vehicles and for miscellaneous provisions; further providing for savings provision, for repeals, expiration of terms of board members and for existing rules and regulations.

On the question,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls upon Representative Mark Mustio, who moves that the House concur in these amendments.

Mr. MUSTIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Senate added a technical amendment in their Rules Committee to SB 764 recognizing the Board of Vehicles Act into new chapters, and the amendment simply adds the provisions of Act 59 of 2018, which was HB 1898, to the reorganized structure of the underlying statute. HB 1898, the vehicle recall provisions, was passed and signed into law on June 28, 2018.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments to House amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—194

Barbin	Emrick	Lewis	Readshaw
Barrar	English	Longietti	Reed
Benninghoff	Evans	Mackenzie	Reese
Bernstine	Farry	Madden	Roae
Bizzarro	Fee	Maher	Roe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Mako	Roebuck
Boback	Flynn	Maloney	Rothman
Boyle	Frankel	Markosek	Rozzi
Bradford	Freeman	Marshall	Ryan
Briggs	Fritz	Marsico	Saccone

Brown, R.	Gainey	Masser	Sainato
Brown, V.	Galloway	Matzie	Samuelson
Bullock	Gillen	McCarter	Sankey
Burns	Gillespie	McClinton	Santora
Caltagirone	Godshall	McGinnis	Schemel
Carroll	Goodman	McNeill	Schlossberg
Causar	Greiner	Mehaffie	Schweyer
Cephas	Grove	Mentzer	Simmons
Charlton	Haggerty	Metcalfe	Sims
Christiana	Hahn	Metzgar	Snyder
Comitta	Hanna	Miccarelli	Solomon
Conklin	Harkins	Millard	Sonney
Cook	Harper	Miller, B.	Staats
Corbin	Harris, A.	Miller, D.	Stephens
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Milne	Sturla
Costa, P.	Heffley	Moul	Tai
Cox	Helm	Mullery	Tallman
Cruz	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
Cutler	Hill	Neilson	Tobash
Daley	Irvin	Nelson	Toepel
Davidson	James	Nesbit	Toohil
Davis, A.	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Topper
Davis, T.	Kampf	O'Neill	Vazquez
Dawkins	Kaufner	Oberlander	Vitali
Day	Kauffman	Ortitay	Walsh
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Ward
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warner
DeLozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Warren
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Watson
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Wentling
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Wheatley
DiGrolamo	Kirkland	Quigley	Wheeland
Donatucci	Klunk	Quinn, C.	White
Dowling	Knowles	Quinn, M.	Youngblood
Driscoll	Kortz	Rabb	Zimmerman
Dunbar	Krueger	Rader	
Dush	Kulik	Rapp	Turzai, Speaker
Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

The majority required by the Constitution having voted in the affirmative, the question was determined in the affirmative and the amendments to House amendments were concurred in.

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Schweyer, for what purpose do you rise?

Mr. SCHWEYER. To correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SCHWEYER. Thank you, sir.

On amendment 9569 to SB 748, I was not recorded. I would like to be recorded in the affirmative, sir.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

BILLS SIGNED BY SPEAKER

Bills numbered and entitled as follows having been prepared for presentation to the Governor, and the same being correct, the titles were publicly read as follows:

HB 783, PN 4136

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in certificate of title and security interests, further providing for transfer of ownership of vehicles used for human habitation.

HB 1386, PN 4070

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in certification of teachers, providing for instructional certificate grade spans and age levels and duties of department.

HB 1414, PN 4134

An Act amending Title 75 (Vehicles) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in general provisions, further providing for definitions; and, in other required equipment, further providing for visual and audible signals on emergency vehicles and for visual signals on authorized vehicles and providing for flashing or revolving yellow and white lights and for solid waste collection vehicles.

HB 1499, PN 3688

An Act amending Title 68 (Real and Personal Property) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in creation, alteration and termination of condominiums, further providing for contents of declaration and all condominiums; in management of the condominium, further providing for powers of unit owners' association, for executive board members and officers and for conveyance or encumbrance of common elements; in protection of purchasers, further providing for release of liens and for warranty against structural defects; in creation, alteration and termination of cooperatives, further providing for contents of declaration; in management of cooperatives, further providing for powers of association, for executive board members and officers and for conveyance or encumbrance of cooperative; in protection of cooperative interest purchasers, further providing for release of liens and for implied warranty against structural defects; in general provisions relating to planned communities, further providing for definitions; in creation, alteration and termination of planned communities, further providing for construction and validity of declaration and bylaws and for contents of declaration and all planned communities; in management of planned community, further providing for power of unit owners' association, for executive board members and officers and for conveyance or encumbrance of common facilities; and, in protection of purchasers, further providing for release of liens and for warranty against structural defects.

HB 2297, PN 4054

An Act amending the act of February 15, 2018 (P.L.22, No.9), entitled "An act designating a portion of State Route 2005 in Saxonburg Borough, Butler County, as the Chief Gregory B. Adams Way; designating a bridge on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 271 over US Route 22, Jackson Township, Cambria County, as the Trooper Gary Fisher Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on that portion of Pennsylvania Route 53 over US Route 22, Cresson Township, Cambria County, as the Corporal Robert J. Sherwood, Jr., Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on Segment 80 of State Route 2015, along Overbridge Street and over Railroad Street, Lilly Borough, Cambria County, as the Paul E. Sweeney Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge

on that portion of Avenue A over the Allegheny River, Coudersport Borough, Potter County, as the Commander Philip F. "Jet" Palmatier, Jr., Memorial Bridge; designating a bridge on that portion of Sunnyside Road over the Oswayo Creek, Shinglehouse Borough, Potter County, as the PVT Malon Stanley Memorial Bridge; designating a portion of State Route 1001 in Greene Township, Franklin County, as the Lance Corporal Michael L. Freeman, Jr., Memorial Highway; designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 533 over Muddy Run, Southampton Township, Franklin County, as the Private First Class Dana Edward Diehl Memorial Bridge; and designating a bridge on that portion of State Route 1004 over the Conococheague Creek, Greene Township, Franklin County, as the Private Charles W. "Bill" Roher Memorial Bridge," further providing for Lance Corporal Michael L. Freeman, Jr., Memorial Highway; and providing for Cpl. Carl F. Hynek III Memorial Highway.

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

STATEMENT BY MR. PYLE

The SPEAKER. Representative Jeff Pyle is recognized on unanimous consent.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this body deals with such a wide variety of things on a daily basis, and today is no different. However, occasionally, to get a better view of things, it is good to take a step back for a wider perspective. Earlier this week, very quietly and unassumingly, the Nobel Committee handed out its prizes for medicine, which were awarded to an American doctor, a Dr. Allison, and a Japanese doctor, a Dr. Honjo. Seven years ago these gentlemen pioneered treatment for cancer with a brand-new field nobody had ever heard of before: immunotherapy. Their invention, Yervoy, was the first widely used immuno drug in saving many, many thousands of lives. They are the men who invented the stuff that is saving me. I just wanted to recognize them.

Down. Down. No. I really hope that round of applause is for Drs. Allison and Honjo.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, Representative Pyle.

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 2638, PN 4047**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of December 8, 2004 (P.L.1801, No.238), known as the Transit Revitalization Investment District Act, in general provisions, further providing for declaration of policy and for definitions; and adding provisions relating to military installation remediation.

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

The SPEAKER. HB 2638, PN 4047? Okay. I think it is known as the Transit Revitalization Investment District.

There are two amendments to it. They are filed by Representative Maher.

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

Mr. MAHER offered the following amendment No. **A09489**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 21, by striking out the period after "remediation" and inserting
and water, sewer and storm water systems remediation projects; and establishing the Remediation Fund.

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 21 and 22, by striking out "at military installations to address PFAS contamination, and there is a need"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 23, by striking out "the"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 23, by inserting after "water"

, sewer and storm water

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 23 and 24, by striking out "on military installations and surrounding parcels"

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 8 through 18, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 22 and 23, by striking out "military installation"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 1, by striking out the period after "installation" and inserting

or water, sewer and storm water pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Environmental Protection.

Amend Bill, page 6, by inserting between lines 3 and 4

"Remediation project." Any of the following:

(1) The cost of remediation relating to pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Environmental Protection.

(2) The transportation infrastructure and economic development costs within a qualified municipality to encourage redevelopment of the qualified former military installation.

(3) The cost of remediation relating to water, sewer and storm water projects.

* * *

Amend Bill, page 6, line 9, by striking out "MILITARY INSTALLATION"

Amend Bill, page 6, line 9, by inserting after "REMEDIATION"
PROGRAM

Amend Bill, page 6, line 10, by striking out "Military installation remediation" and inserting

Remediation

Amend Bill, page 6, by inserting between lines 21 and 22

(iv) Parcels having water, sewer and storm water pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Environmental Protection.

Amend Bill, page 11, lines 27 and 28, by striking out "MILITARY INSTALLATION"

Amend Bill, page 12, line 1, by inserting after "installation"

and qualified municipality having water, sewer and storm water pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Environmental Protection

Amend Bill, page 12, line 9, by striking out "military installation"

Amend Bill, page 12, line 13, by striking out "military installation"

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

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. Representative Maher withdraws that amendment.

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

Mr. MAHER offered the following amendment No. **A09594**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 21, by striking out the period after "remediation" and inserting
and water, sewer and storm water systems remediation projects; and establishing the Remediation Fund.

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 21 and 22, by striking out "at military installations to address PFAS contamination, and there is a need"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 23, by striking out "the"

Amend Bill, page 3, line 23, by inserting after "water"

, sewer and storm water

Amend Bill, page 3, lines 23 and 24, by striking out "on military installations and surrounding parcels"

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 8 through 18, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 4, lines 22 and 23, by striking out "military installation"

Amend Bill, page 5, line 1, by striking out the period after "installation" and inserting

or water, sewer or storm water pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency or the Department of Environmental Protection.

Amend Bill, page 6, by inserting between lines 3 and 4

"Remediation project." Any of the following:

(1) The cost of remediation relating to pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency or the Department of Environmental Protection.

(2) The transportation infrastructure and economic development costs within a qualified municipality to encourage redevelopment.

(3) The cost of remediation relating to water, sewer or storm water projects.

* * *

Amend Bill, page 6, line 9, by striking out "MILITARY INSTALLATION"

Amend Bill, page 6, line 9, by inserting after "REMEDIATION"
PROGRAM

Amend Bill, page 6, line 10, by striking out "Military installation remediation" and inserting
Remediation

Amend Bill, page 6, by inserting between lines 21 and 22

(iv) Parcels having water, sewer or storm water pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency or the Department of Environmental Protection.

Amend Bill, page 11, lines 27 and 28, by striking out "MILITARY INSTALLATION"

Amend Bill, page 12, line 1, by inserting after "installation"
and qualified municipality having water, sewer or storm water pollution identified by the United States Environmental Protection Agency or the Department of Environmental Protection

Amend Bill, page 12, line 9, by striking out "military installation"

Amend Bill, page 12, line 13, by striking out "military installation"

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. On the question, the Chair recognizes Representative Maher.

Mr. MAHER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The underlying bill seeks to provide a remedy for a pollution condition in one particular place in the Commonwealth. Without regard to whether or not that is the right approach, I do think it makes perfect sense that if that is the road we plan to travel to address environmental remediation, that that same road be available to all sources of pollution and contamination of the waters of the Commonwealth. Across this State, in virtually every

district, there are issues. The nature of those issues varies quite a bit spot to spot across the State, but most of us have issues with polluted water, and if this is the road that we are going to travel to address it, then I think the road should be open to all communities in our State.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Stephens, on the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate and applaud my colleague's interest in addressing statewide environmental issues. This bill was tailored to address a very unique and discrete problem that is occurring in Montgomery and Bucks Counties, and specifically, the uniqueness of this is defined by the polluter and the location of the pollution. The Federal government contaminated our public drinking water. The Federal government contaminated our public drinking water. The military installation on which all that activity occurred was scheduled to be closed in 2005. That land sits vacant and unproductive today because of those environmental issues. I submit that that is a pretty unique situation that does not exist around the Commonwealth.

Adopting this amendment would waste taxpayer dollars in a couple of different ways. And it is not to say that this amendment might be, that my colleague might be onto something and that this amendment or this approach could be adapted to be replicated in other areas of the State where there might be other contaminants or other polluters, but here are some of the problems with taking this approach, which was tailored very narrowly in trying to apply it broadly across the Commonwealth. Polluters should be the ones paying to clean up their pollution – I think we can all agree with that – not the Commonwealth's taxpayers. The first resort ought to be, whoever polluted the drinking water should have to pay to clean up the drinking water. What is unique in this situation in Montgomery and Bucks Counties is that the polluter was the Federal government, so we do not have an ability to hold them accountable. DEP does not have the ability to do that. So if we were to adopt this amendment, we would allow polluters to be let off the hook and otherwise have these State tax dollars address the issues they should frankly be dealing with.

Another issue and another problem where this could cause some waste of taxpayer resources is, we know that this land is in an economically viable area. With the exception of this land, the rest of the land around it is developed and producing revenue for this Commonwealth, producing jobs for our residents. But this land is not. There very well may be other places around the Commonwealth that are similarly situated, and if their environmental issues were addressed and remediated could be put back to productive use. But there may also be some places where that is not possible for other reasons, and to take this approach would divert State tax dollars to invest in locations that might not otherwise be able to be viable regardless of the remediation.

But lastly, Mr. Speaker, there is a drafting error in this amendment, which I think will probably cause most of my colleagues significant concern. You see, this underlying bill creates an authority which is partially comprised of local residents in the areas of contamination, but the amendment does not change the composition of the authority. So any authority created in, say, Pittsburgh would by definition have an appointee of the Hatboro-Horsham School Board sitting on it. They would also have an appointee of the Horsham Land Redevelopment Authority sitting on it. I am sure that the members of this body

do not want members from my local community making decisions about the environmental remediation necessary in their communities or the economic development that is appropriate in their communities.

And so, Mr. Speaker, while I do again I want to compliment and applaud the gentleman for his efforts, because I do think that this program could be adapted and replicated for other areas of the State that have environmental issues that are preventing land from being productive, this amendment does not get us there.

So every journey begins with a single step. I would ask the members to oppose this amendment. Let us let this bill go through and then we can begin the work of crafting the appropriate changes necessary to utilize this approach on a broader application around the Commonwealth to get land that is currently not productive for us and our citizens and put it back on the productive tax rolls.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Vitali, and then it will be Representative Carroll and Representative Maher. So Representative Vitali, Representative Carroll, Representative Maher. And then, Representative Stephens, you will be able to go again.

Representative Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just wanted to bring to the attention of the members the opposition of the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue to the Maher amendment. I am just going to read from an e-mail sent by Andrew Moser, the legislative director of the Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Revenue: "We are opposed to the Maher amendments due to the negative fiscal impact to the General Fund. In addition, countless municipalities with water, sewer or storm water pollution could create special tax zones. The administration is opposed to the Maher amendments and not opposing the underlying bill."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Carroll.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the amendment of the gentleman from Allegheny County. I think the thing for us to consider as we contemplate this vote is that if the language of this bill is so good for these communities of Montgomery County, then those same benefits should be enjoyed by every community across this State. And so while I applaud the gentleman's efforts to take care and address the concerns of his community, I think he is shortsighted with respect to the application of this fix, and I think that the gentleman from Allegheny County's application of a fix in a broad sense across 67 counties that affects every single person in this chamber is the right way to go. And I think the smart thing for us to do today is to embrace the amendment, support it, and let us have the application of this bill apply to all citizens.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative John Maher, on the amendment for the second time. And then will be followed by Representative Stephens.

Representative Maher.

Mr. MAHER. The existence of PFOAs (perfluorooctanoic acid) is not limited to the one site in Montgomery County. PFOAs are any place, at least any place where firefighters have used foam – say that three times fast – any place where firefighters used foam are going have PFOAs; any place where there has been

a military base, any place where there has been a missile silo there are going to be PFOAs left behind by the Federal government.

Again, I think the Department of Revenue may have a point in opposing my amendment, because I am not sure the underlying model is a good one, but if we are going to use that model, I think the gentleman, Chairman Carroll, is entirely correct. Let us make this model available across the State. And in the event that the bill needs a bit of tweaking, we know the Senate is always happy to provide the commas and apostrophes and so forth.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Stephens, on the amendment.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Look, again, we can draft a bill, and I am happy to sit down and work on it, and the good chairman of the Environmental Committee I am sure could move it pretty quickly to do exactly that: provide a mechanism for a statewide application for this. Unfortunately, this bill is not it.

And again, I will just say one last time, for all of you who would like this program in your district, first of all, thank you. I guess they say imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. But remember, you would have an appointee of the Hatboro-Horsham School District and the Horsham Land Redevelopment Authority making decisions about the economic development in your community. I am not quite sure mechanically how that travel arrangement will work from Hatboro-Horsham on a routine basis across the Commonwealth for every polluted site that there is, but nonetheless, I do not think that that is the approach we want to take. I think we need to tailor a bill specifically for statewide application, and I would urge you to oppose this amendment and let us get moving on with drafting something that could work statewide.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—149

Barbin	Dowling	Kirkland	Quinn, C.
Barrar	Driscoll	Klunk	Quinn, M.
Bernstine	Dunbar	Kortz	Rabb
Bizzarro	Dush	Krueger	Rapp
Bloom	Emrick	Kulik	Ravenstahl
Boback	English	Lawrence	Readshaw
Boyle	Evans	Longietti	Reese
Bradford	Fee	Madden	Roae
Briggs	Fitzgerald	Maher	Roebuck
Brown, R.	Flynn	Mako	Rothman
Brown, V.	Frankel	Maloney	Rozzi
Bullock	Freeman	Markosek	Ryan
Burns	Fritz	Matzie	Saccione
Caltagirone	Gainey	McCarter	Sainato
Carroll	Galloway	McClinton	Samuelson
Causer	Gillen	McNeill	Sankey
Charlton	Gillespie	Mehaffie	Santora
Christiana	Goodman	Mentzer	Schemel
Comitta	Greiner	Metcalfe	Schlossberg
Conklin	Grove	Metzgar	Schweyer
Cook	Haggerty	Miccarelli	Sims
Corbin	Hahn	Millard	Snyder
Costa, D.	Hanna	Miller, B.	Sonney
Costa, P.	Harkins	Miller, D.	Sturla
Cox	Harris, J.	Moul	Tai
Cruz	Heffley	Mullery	Tallman

Culver	Hickernell	Mustio	Thomas
Daley	Hill	Neilson	Topper
Davidson	Irvin	Nelson	Vazquez
Davis, A.	James	Nesbit	Walsh
Dawkins	Kauffman	Ortitay	Ward
Deasy	Keefer	Owlett	Warner
DeLissio	Keller, F.	Pashinski	Warren
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Peifer	Wentling
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca	Wheatley
Dermody	Kim	Pickett	Youngblood
Diamond	Kinsey	Pyle	Zimmerman
Donatucci			

NAYS—45

Benninghoff	Hennessey	Murt	Taylor
Cephas	Jozwiak	O'Neal	Tobash
Cutler	Kampf	O'Neill	Toepel
Davis, T.	Kaufner	Oberlander	Toohil
Day	Knowles	Quigley	Vitali
DiGirolo	Lewis	Rader	Watson
Ellis	Mackenzie	Reed	Wheeland
Farry	Marshall	Roe	White
Godshall	Marsico	Simmons	
Harper	Masser	Solomon	Turzai,
Harris, A.	McGinnis	Staats	Speaker
Helm	Milne	Stephens	

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

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

On the question,

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

Bill as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The bill as amended will be reprinted.

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B CONTINUED

CONSIDERATION OF SB 299 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. We are going to return to SB 299. We left off with four speakers.

Representative Diamond. Waives off.

Representative Davidson, on SB 299.

Mrs. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It has been said that district magistrates, district judges are the best possible jobs in politics. It is said to be on par with the Lieutenant Governor position.

Ballot access is a really important issue in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. There is a system, and the Constitution provides for fair elections.

We are often accused in the legislature of passing legislation that provides for and secures incumbent protection. When we look at incumbent protection for the district magistrate, what could be more protective than not demanding or not requiring district magistrates to get petitions signed. Petition signatures are

at the fundamental base of what is required to seek elected office. We make these requirements for a number of law enforcement professionals.

We can say that the legislature's job is different than the district magistrate because we do not put people in jail. But on the contrary, some of our legislation is very pro-criminal justice slanted, so we in fact, with our laws, do put people in jail. But when you look at tax collectors, when you look at constables, the district attorney, the sheriff's office, these are all law enforcement-protected individuals that need to and are required to collect signatures, Mr. Speaker. If we apply this rule fairly, none of those offices would have to collect signatures, but we are not applying this law fairly in this bill, SB 299.

Courts matter, Mr. Speaker, and when the Framers of the Constitution first created district magistrates, they made it so it would be unique to Pennsylvania and that you were not required to be an attorney. Why did the Framers determine that you were not required to be an attorney to be a district magistrate? The answer to that question is very simple. The Framers decided, and their debate will let you know, that they wanted the district magistrate to be responsive to the community; not set above the community, to be from the community – that is why the districts are small – and that they would be subject to the will of the community.

We are all in danger when you seek elected office; that goes with the job. But district magistrates are no more in danger by collecting signatures than any one of us and any other law enforcement official. It is a false argument. It is incumbent protection, pure and simple, and it makes the playing field completely unlevel.

District judges are only required to collect 100 signatures. Most of us have teams; district magistrates can have teams to collect those signatures if they really feel as though they are in peril. But I heard one speaker say that the district magistrates like to collect the signatures themselves. Well, you cannot have it both ways. If the district magistrate wants to collect the signatures himself or herself, then there are very likely, I am sure, 100 people in that district for which they have a relationship and with whom they feel safe. This is not about safety. This is about incumbent protection, and it is wrong and it is inconsistent with what the Framers intended for the office of district magistrate.

It is very interesting that I am standing here in agreement with my friend from Crawford County and my friend and colleague from Delaware County, but this argument crosses party lines. It is an issue of fairness.

And outside of Philadelphia where district magistrates are the first line of defense for people, courts matter. Do we really want district magistrates that no longer have to really be responsive to 100 people in their district as a magistrate?

Mr. Speaker, this bill is bad public policy. It is unfair, it is counterreform, and it makes our criminal justice system more unfair to the people that need it the most.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Representative Jeff Pyle.

Mr. PYLE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, earlier we heard from a number of members pointing out the constitutional weaknesses of this bill, and I do not think we should just breeze right over those. As the previous speaker said, magistrates are from smaller districts so they are more in touch with the people who live there. In my district it is common; we will not elect lawyers for magistrate. We want

somebody who is just from us; to use a phrase, of the people, by the people, and for the people. Within our Constitution, Article IV and Article I are two separate clauses that directly address SB 299. I know we voted on constitutionality or unconstitutionality. I voted "no"; that vote did not prevail. Nonetheless, the point remains: I feel upon the first challenge to this that it will be thrown out because it clearly violates Article IV.

I would ask for a "no" vote on SB 299. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Our last speaker on the bill is Representative Frank Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, thank you so much.

I have just a few comments that I would like to address on this issue. I have a concern about the bill, but from an entirely different perspective than I think others might have.

First of all, I am having a great deal of difficulty buying the safety argument, in all candor. I have the dubious distinction of being the recipient of a death threat since I have been in office. In my time in the Marine Corps I saw that as well, so it is kind of an interesting experience.

But I think the problem I have and why this bill is something that I think we need to take seriously is, in 2004, Sue Helm, Russ Diamond, and myself all ran for Congress. Sue and I ran against each other on the Republican ticket, and since we are both in the House of Representatives, it must mean that we both lost that election. But the difference was that Russ needed 2.4 times the number of signatures to get on the ballot as an Independent than we did. If we are going to talk about reform, let us talk about reform. And this bill, in my mind, starts a process in which that starts to happen.

In 2010 I ran for office a second time and I wanted to run as an Independent and I would have needed 2500 signatures to my opponent's 1,000. I ran instead on the Republican ticket, and I am here, so that means I lost that one as well, but by a much smaller margin.

Independent voters; I hear about the constitutionality, then let us talk about the constitutionality when an Independent cannot vote in a primary election in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Sir, it has to be on the bill. No disrespect, but this is not on the bill.

Mr. RYAN. Thanks, Mr. Speaker.

But I mention this merely that we talk about constitutionality and we talk about the bill. This bill, in my mind, and I am going to encourage a "yes" vote because it will start to unwind the unfairness in the systems that we have that we believe are fair and providing equal access. Now is the time to start taking a serious and hard look at election reform, and I encourage a "yes" vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—128

Barbin	Donatucci	Klunk	Quigley
Barrar	Dowling	Kortz	Quinn, C.
Bernstine	Driscoll	Krueger	Quinn, M.
Bizzarro	Dunbar	Kulik	Rabb
Bloom	Ellis	Lawrence	Ravenstahl
Boback	Farry	Longietti	Readshaw
Bradford	Fitzgerald	Madden	Reed
Briggs	Flynn	Markosek	Reese
Brown, V.	Frankel	Marsico	Roe
Bullock	Fritz	Masser	Rothman
Burns	Gainey	Matzie	Rozzi
Caltagirone	Galloway	McCarter	Ryan
Carroll	Gillespie	Mehaffie	Sainato
Cephas	Godshall	Metcalf	Sankey
Charlton	Goodman	Metzgar	Santora
Christiana	Grove	Miccarelli	Sims
Comitta	Haggerty	Miller, D.	Snyder
Conklin	Hanna	Milne	Solomon
Corbin	Harkins	Moul	Staats
Costa, D.	Harris, J.	Mullery	Stephens
Costa, P.	Heffley	Mustio	Tai
Cruz	Helm	Neilson	Taylor
Culver	Hennessey	Nelson	Toobash
Daley	Hill	Nesbit	Toohil
Davis, A.	Irvin	O'Neal	Topper
Davis, T.	James	O'Neill	Walsh
Deasy	Kampf	Oberlander	Ward
DeLissio	Kauffman	Ortitay	Warner
Delozier	Keller, M.K.	Owlett	Warren
DeLuca	Keller, W.	Pashinski	Wheatley
Dermody	Kinsey	Petrarca	Wheeland
DiGirolamo	Kirkland	Pickett	White

NAYS—65

Benninghoff	Gillen	McClinton	Schweyer
Boyle	Greiner	McGinnis	Simmons
Brown, R.	Harper	McNeill	Sonney
Causar	Harris, A.	Mentzer	Sturla
Cook	Hickernell	Millard	Tallman
Cox	Jozwiak	Miller, B.	Thomas
Cutler	Kaufner	Murt	Toepel
Davidson	Keefer	Peifer	Vazquez
Dawkins	Keller, F.	Pyle	Vitali
Day	Kim	Rader	Watson
Diamond	Knowles	Rapp	Wentling
Dush	Lewis	Roae	Youngblood
Emrick	Mackenzie	Roebuck	Zimmerman
English	Maher	Saccone	
Evans	Mako	Samuelson	Turzai,
Fee	Maloney	Schemel	Speaker
Freeman	Marshall	Schlossberg	

NOT VOTING—1

Hahn

EXCUSED—7

Corr	Everett	Kavulich	Saylor
Dean	Gabler	O'Brien	

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

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

The SPEAKER. There are no further votes today, but we will be having caucus.

VOTE CORRECTION

The SPEAKER. Representative Marcia Hahn, for what purpose do you rise?

Ms. HAHN. My button malfunctioned and I wanted to be voted in the affirmative on that last vote.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Chairman Marsico, for a committee announcement.

Mr. MARSICO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Judiciary Committee at the break will meet in 205 Ryan to consider SB 10. At the break, SB 10. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you.

The Judiciary Committee will meet at the break in 205 Ryan.

VETERANS AFFAIRS AND EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative Barry Jozwiak.

Mr. JOZWIAK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee will hold a voting meeting immediately in G-50 Irvis to consider HR 1112 and HB 2696 and any other business that may come before the committee. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Thank you, sir.

The Veterans Affairs and Emergency Preparedness Committee will meet immediately in G-50 Irvis.

HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Representative DiGirolamo, for a committee announcement.

Mr. DIGIROLAMO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be an immediate meeting of the Human Services Committee at the break in room 60, East Wing, to vote on SB 31. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Human Services Committee will meet immediately at the break in room 60, East Wing.

We have two members that wish to speak on the uncontested House calendar, Representative Benninghoff and Representative Pashinski. I will be calling on them shortly.

Any other committee announcements?

Committee announcement? Oh, yeah, yeah. Please. Come on. Do you want me to introduce the guest? Okay.

GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to call upon Representative Barrar on unanimous consent.

Mr. BARRAR. Hey, everyone, I would like to welcome to the House here my little brother, Tim Barrar, who is with the Attorney General's Office, and also he is a retired 30-year police

officer. Tim is over here in the Speaker's seating. Stand up, Tim. He is shy like me.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. You bet. Thank you, sir.

Any other committee announcements?

Representative Benninghoff has waived off.

Representative Marcy Toepel, please, for a caucus announcement.

REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Toepel, thank you.

Mrs. TOEPEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Republicans will caucus at 1:30. We would be holding a second caucus at 3 o'clock. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Okay. So Republicans are caucusing at 1:30 and then there will be a second caucus at 3 o'clock.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. Representative Frankel, for a caucus announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Mr. Speaker, Democrats will caucus at 2:30. Democrats will caucus at 2:30. Thank you.

STATEMENT BY MR. PASHINSKI

The SPEAKER. Representative Pashinski, you want to speak on HR 1144, sir?

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

And I thank all my fellow legislators for supporting HR 1144 to honor the first responders who aided Wilkes-Barre Township in our moment of need.

In the late evening of June 13 of this year in the midst of severe thunderstorms, a tornado alert was issued for Wilkes-Barre and the surrounding communities. As I traveled from Harrisburg to Wilkes-Barre and I was on top of the mountains, I saw the ominous clouds; quite frankly, larger and more ominous than I have ever seen. I arrived at my house at approximately 9:15, turned on the TV, and began to go through my mail, when all of a sudden, the TV went out and the lights flickered. A mere 2 miles away, an EF2 tornado, with winds between 111 miles per hour and 130 miles per hour touched down around the intersection of Highland Park Boulevard and Mundy Street. It moved southeast about three-quarters of a mile toward the Arena Hub before it finally dissipated, but the damage was severe and had already been done.

Thanks to the good Lord, no one died, and amazingly, only six people suffered minor injuries, but the structural damage was extensive. Initial reports put the cost of the damage at over \$18 million, with 23 businesses not only damaged but 8 of those businesses were condemned.

Immediately following the tornado, first responders swarmed to the scene. Local law enforcement, emergency management personnel, fire and EMS (emergency medical services) workers, utility workers, and township and county officials acted quickly to secure the area and evacuate other individuals. We had leaking propane tanks that possessed a serious threat, but they were quickly neutralized by the utility workers who put their lives on the line to prevent further disaster. Thanks to these individuals,

their due diligence, their expertise, and their rapid response, there were no further injuries and no further damage. These brave men and women ran into the disaster in total darkness not knowing what they would find, but they know their job is to put their own safety and security on the line to protect others, and for that we owe them a debt of gratitude. We cannot forget, we cannot take for granted their courage and expertise for protecting the public.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that the Wyoming Valley is the valley with a heart. History has demonstrated this time and time again, and this disaster that struck Wilkes-Barre Township showed once again this to be true. We had more than 17 municipalities responding and assisting. We had multiple businesses and individuals dropping off food and drinks for the first responders and utility workers in the days after the tornado, so much that we actually had to ask them stop. We had so much and did not want it to waste, and ended up sharing it with our food kitchen.

But most of all, we were all so appreciative of the bravery, the heart, and the dedication of our first responders and our utility workers from our valley. I am eternally grateful for their sacrifice and I would be honored to present this citation to them in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you once again, and I certainly thank all my fellow legislators for joining me in honoring these valiant individuals. Thank you once again, Mr. Speaker.

BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 270;
HB 2638;
SB 748;
SB 888;
SB 945; and
SB 1078.

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 2557 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.

CALENDAR CONTINUED

BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 641, PN 1712**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 53 (Municipalities Generally) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in assessments of persons and property, providing for senior property tax freeze.

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 641 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 641 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 SPEAKER. The House will be at ease. We have some reports coming back from the committees which we are going to read. There will be no further votes, but we are going to be taking reports from the committees, so we are going to stand at ease at this time.

The House will come to order.

BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

SB 10, PN 2096 (Amended) By Rep. MARSICO

An act amending Title 29 (Federal Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for immigration preemption and cooperation.

JUDICIARY.

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. Representative Steve Samuelson moves that the House be adjourned until Thursday, October 11, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to, and at 1:28 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.