

# COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

## LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

MONDAY, JUNE 20, 2011

SESSION OF 2011

195TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 47

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 1 p.m., e.d.t.

**THE SPEAKER (SAMUEL H. SMITH)  
PRESIDING**

#### PRAYER

The SPEAKER. This afternoon the prayer will be offered by Pastor Tony Sundermeier, First Presbyterian Church, Allentown, PA.

PASTOR TONY SUNDERMEIER, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Gracious God, we give You thanks for bringing this Assembly back to session. As this House convenes to do their important work on behalf of the great citizens of our Commonwealth, I would ask and we would ask that all business, all discussion would be conducted under the direction of Your divine wisdom and leading. Bless Speaker Smith in his leadership role and bless each and every member of this chamber as they voice the concerns and hopes of their constituents. We pray that each and every member would be reminded of what got them into this room in the first place. Call to mind that passion and promise that first captured their hearts and catapulted them into public life and service. We thank You for this service, we thank You for this great State, and we thank You for hearing this prayer. 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 Friday, June 17, 2011, will be postponed until printed.

#### JOURNAL APPROVED

The SPEAKER. However, the following Journal is in print and, without objection, will be approved: Monday, April 11, 2011.

### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 1676** By Representatives BOYD, AUMENT, BEAR, CUTLER, DENLINGER, EVANKOVICH, EVERETT, GROVE, HICKERNELL, HUTCHINSON, KILLION, MOUL, PETRI, ROSS, SAYLOR, TALLMAN and LAWRENCE

An Act amending Title 71 (State Government) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in retirement for State employees and officers, further providing for definitions, for mandatory and optional membership, for credited State service, for retention and reinstatement of service credits, for creditable nonstate service, for eligibility for actuarial increase factor, for classes of service, for election to become a Class A-4 member, for eligibility for annuities, for eligibility for vesting, for eligibility for refunds and for regular member contributions for current service; providing for cash balance voluntary contributions; further providing for waiver of regular member contributions and Social Security integration member contributions, for pickup contributions, for member contributions for the purchase of credit for previous State service or to become a full coverage member, for contributions for the purchase of credit for creditable nonstate service, for contributions by the Commonwealth and other employers, for appropriations and assessments by the Commonwealth, for return of total accumulated deductions, for maximum single life annuity, for disability annuities, for member's options, for payment of accumulated deductions resulting from Class A-3 and Class A-4 service, for termination of annuities, for death benefits, for payment of benefits, for administrative duties of the board, for duties of the board to advise and report to heads of departments and members, for duties of the board regarding applications and elections of members, for installment payments of accumulated deductions, for duties of heads of departments, for rights and duties of State employees and members, for State Employees' Retirement Fund, for members' savings account, for State accumulation account, for annuity reserve account, for State Police benefit account and for enforcement officers' benefit account; and providing for cash balance savings account.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT, June 17, 2011.

**No. 1677** By Representatives BOYD, AUMENT, BEAR, CUTLER, DENLINGER, EVANKOVICH, EVERETT, GROVE, HICKERNELL, HUTCHINSON, KILLION, MOUL, PETRI, ROSS, SAYLOR, TALLMAN and LAWRENCE

An Act amending Title 24 (Education) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in retirement for school employees, further providing for definitions, for construction of part, for mandatory and optional membership, for eligibility points for retention and reinstatement of service credits, for creditable nonschool service, for classes of service, for eligibility for annuities, for eligibility for vesting, for eligibility for death benefits, for regular member contributions for current service, for member contributions for creditable school service, for return of accumulated deductions, for maximum single life annuity, for disability annuities, for member's options, for termination of annuities, for death benefits, for payment of benefits and for administrative duties of board; providing for long-term disability group

insurance program; and further providing for duties of employers, for rights and duties of school employees and members, for members' savings account, for State accumulation account and for payments to school entities by Commonwealth.

Referred to Committee on STATE GOVERNMENT,  
June 17, 2011.

**No. 1700** By Representatives QUINN, ADOLPH, BRENNAN, BURNS, CALTAGIRONE, D. COSTA, P. COSTA, CREIGHTON, DALEY, DAVIS, DEASY, DeLUCA, DePASQUALE, FLECK, GALLOWAY, HACKETT, HARPER, W. KELLER, KILLION, MARSHALL, MURT, O'NEILL, PEIFER, PETRI, RAVENSTAHL, READSHAW, REICHLEY, ROSS, SCAVELLO, TOBASH, TRUITT, WATSON, M. O'BRIEN, GERBER, HORNAMAN and R. BROWN

An Act establishing a well impact fee; providing for distribution of fees; establishing the Local Government Shale Impact Mitigation Fund, the Environmental Shale Impact Mitigation Fund and the Road and Bridge Shale Impact Mitigation Account; and providing for the powers and duties of the Department of Revenue.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT,  
June 17, 2011.

### REAL PROPERTY DISPOSITION PLAN PLACED ON CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Speaker submits for the record the 2011 Real Property Disposition Plan. The plan shall be placed on tomorrow's legislative calendar.

### LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker turns to leaves of absence and recognizes the majority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. PERRY, from York County for the week. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

The Chair recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. CURRY, from Montgomery County for the day, and the lady, Ms. WAGNER, from Allegheny County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

### MASTER ROLL CALL

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. DEASY, from Allegheny County for the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

### MASTER ROLL CALL CONTINUED

The following roll call was recorded:

#### PRESENT—199

Adolph	Emrick	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Evankovich	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Evans, D.	Kotik	Readshaw
Barbin	Evans, J.	Krieger	Reed
Barrar	Everett	Kula	Reese
Bear	Fabrizio	Lawrence	Reichley
Benninghoff	Farry	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Fleck	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Frankel	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Freeman	Major	Ross
Boyd	Gabler	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Galloway	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Geist	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	George	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	Gerber	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gingrich	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Goodman	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Miller	Sonney
Causer	Hackett	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hahn	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Haluska	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Hanna	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Harhai	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harkins	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harris	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Heffley	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Helm	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Dailey	Hess	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Hickernell	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hornaman	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hutchinson	Pashinski	Vitali
DeLissio	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLozier	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLuca	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	White
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	
Donatucci	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S.,
Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn	Speaker
Ellis			

#### ADDITIONS—0

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—4

Curry	Deasy	Perry	Wagner
-------	-------	-------	--------

#### LEAVES ADDED—4

Gerber	Kirkland	McGeehan	O'Brien, D.
--------	----------	----------	-------------

#### LEAVES CANCELED—1

Curry
-------

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

### GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. I would like to recognize a couple of guests that are with us today. Located to the left of the Speaker is Sally Ku. She is a legislative drafting attorney with the Legislative Counseling Office in Seoul, South Korea. She is visiting Pennsylvania for a few days to observe the attorneys in our Legislative Reference Bureau. Welcome to the hall of the House. Welcome to Pennsylvania. I might ask you to come back and report what you learn up there.

Also located to the left of the rostrum, the Speaker welcomes Andrew Turzai, the son of Majority Leader Mike Turzai. Andrew, where did you get to? Over here, okay. Wave. Welcome to the hall of the House, Andrew.

Also from Representative Turzai's office we welcome, to the left of the Chair, a group of interns. Kayla McMurphy is a 2011 graduate of Pine-Richland High School and will be attending Ohio State University in the fall. Jake Chavara is a 2011 graduate of Pine-Richland High School and will be attending George Mason University in the fall. Richard Gayler is a 2011 graduate of North Allegheny Senior High School and will be attending Yale University in the fall. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also to the left of the Speaker, we would like to welcome Eric Hunter. Eric is the Pennsylvania AAA Boys Pole Vault Champion, having captured the gold medal at the PIAA State Championship Track and Field Event at Shippensburg University on May 28. Eric also holds the Northampton High School record for pole vault, tying the alltime regional record of 15 feet 5 inches at the Lehigh Valley Conference Championships on May 11, 2011. Eric is here today with his family, who are seated at the rear of the House. With those family members is Eric's grandfather, Bill Zaun, a retired magisterial district judge. They are here as guests of Representative Harhart. Will all of our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House, and congratulations.

In the rear of the House, we have a couple of guests, who are guests of Representative Matt Smith and Representative Nick Kotik: Denise Fitzgerald, who is the manager of Scott Township, Allegheny County; and Patricia Caruso, who is the council president of Scott Township. Will those two guests please rise, over here to the right. Welcome to the hall of the House, ladies.

Up in the gallery, the Speaker would like to welcome a group of students from the Junior Pennsylvania Lake Erie Watershed Association. Among the group are Peter Bohrer, Jasmine Pena, Korissa Kasper, Allyson Vorse, Chad Greenlee, Stephen McFarland, Lauren Pierson, Claire Wolford, and Molly Giewont. They are accompanied by teacher Cindy Murray and Sister Pat Lupo from Earth Action. They are guests of Representative Hornaman and the Northwest Caucus. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also up in the gallery, the Speaker would like to welcome Boy Scout Troop 338 with their scoutmaster, P.J. Palko. The Scouts spent the past weekend walking trails in Gettysburg. They are visiting the State Capitol as a requirement of an Eagle Scout Citizenship Merit Badge. They are the guests of Representative Readshaw. Welcome to the hall of the House, Scouts.

We have a number of guest pages with us this afternoon. If the pages could just stand whenever I say your name. Obviously located in the well of the House, guest page Noelle Kownurko. Noelle's mother, Laura Rayburn, and grandmother, Ruth Kownurko, are sitting to the left of the Speaker. They are the guests of Representative Petri. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also as a guest page, Helana – sorry, I need a little pronunciation cue on this one - Helana Lippay and Claire Lippay. The girls' mother, Anne MacHaffie, works as a legislative assistant in Representative Curry's district office. Welcome to the hall of the House, girls.

We also welcome guest page Arron Rustici, a student at Pocono Mountain West Junior High School. He is the president of the student government and recipient of the first Joshua Miller Award for the Most Outstanding Trooper Cadet. Arron is here with his stepfather, Jeff Batzle, and mother, Kelly Rustici-Batzle. They are located in the gallery. Welcome. They are guests of Representative Scavello. Welcome to the hall of the House, and welcome to the gallery.

Last but not least is Nathaniel Litts, who is serving as a guest page today. He is a student at Notre Dame Elementary and plays soccer and baseball. He also enjoys studying history and traveling. His parents, John and Diane Litts, and grandparents, Sally and Michael Mickosavich, are seated in the gallery. They are the guests of Representative Scavello and Representative Rosemary Brown.

Welcome to the pages and to the families.

### BILL REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

**SB 612, PN 1386** (Amended)

By Rep. CLYMER

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, in professional employees, further providing for causes for suspension and for persons to be suspended.

EDUCATION.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. GERBER, from Montgomery County for the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

## UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

## RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mrs. R. BROWN called up **HR 206, PN 1515**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of July 24 through July 30, 2011, as "ADA Week" in Pennsylvania.

\* \* \*

Mr. AUMENT called up **HR 258, PN 1696**, entitled:

A Resolution designating September 25, 2011, as "Gold Star Mother's Day" in Pennsylvania.

\* \* \*

Mr. EVERETT called up **HR 282, PN 1822**, entitled:

A Resolution recognizing July 2011 as "Take a Swing Against Breast Cancer Month" in Pennsylvania.

\* \* \*

Mr. REED called up **HR 305, PN 1948**, entitled:

A Resolution designating August 2011 as "Native American Awareness Month" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolutions?

The following roll call was recorded:

## YEAS—198

Adolph	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barbin	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Barrar	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bear	Everett	Lawrence	Reichley
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Frankel	Major	Ross
Boyd	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gingrich	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Goodman	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Miller	Sonney
Causar	Hackett	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hahn	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Haluska	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Hanna	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Harhai	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harkins	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Mustio	Taylor

Creighton	Harris	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Heffley	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Helm	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Hess	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Hickernell	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hornaman	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hutchinson	Pashinski	Vitali
DeLissio	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLozier	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLuca	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	White
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	
Donatucci	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S., Speaker
Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn	

## NAYS—0

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—5

Curry	Gerber	Perry	Wagner
Deasy			

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

## FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. For the purpose of making an announcement, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Benninghoff.

Mr. BENNINGHOFF. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The House Finance Committee will be meeting directly upon the break in the Appropriations chairman's conference room.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The Finance Committee will meet in the Appropriations chairman's conference room at the break.

## HEALTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Baker, seeking recognition to make an announcement?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. BAKER. There will be a Health Committee meeting immediately at the break. A Health Committee meeting in room G-50 upon the break.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

There will be a Health Committee meeting in room G-50 at the break.

## RULES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader for the purpose of making an announcement.

Mr. TURZAI. There will be an immediate Rules Committee meeting in the Appropriations Committee conference room.

There will be an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the Appropriations Committee conference room. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. We need to clarify something here. We have two meetings called immediately in the conference room, so we just need to— The Finance Committee meeting will commence when the Rules Committee meeting is over. Rules immediately in the majority Appropriations conference room, and Finance will commence momentarily.

### APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority Appropriations chairman for the purpose of calling a meeting, which hopefully, will not be immediately in his own conference room.

Mr. ADOLPH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call a House Appropriations Committee meeting at 1:30 in the majority caucus room. House Appropriations Committee at 1:30 in the majority caucus room. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. There will be an Appropriations Committee meeting in the majority caucus room at 1:30.

### REPUBLICAN CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The lady, Ms. Major, from Susquehanna County for a caucus announcement.

Ms. MAJOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to announce a Republican caucus at 1:45. I would ask our Republican members to please report to our caucus room at 1:45. We would be prepared to come back on the floor at 3:30.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady.

### DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Frankel, for the purpose of a caucus announcement.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a Democratic caucus at 1:45. Democratic caucus at 1:45; back on the floor at 3:30. Thank you.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER. Seeing no further announcements, this House stands in recess until 3:30, unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

### AFTER RECESS

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

### BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE

#### SB 358, PN 348

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, further providing for suits and property.

#### APPROPRIATIONS.

#### SB 360, PN 350

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P.L.932, No.317), known as The Third Class City Code, further providing for sales of personal property.

#### APPROPRIATIONS.

#### SB 450, PN 433

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act amending Title 30 (Fish) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for terms of members of the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission.

#### APPROPRIATIONS.

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

#### SB 326, PN 1387 (Amended)

By Rep. BAKER

An Act amending the act of June 29, 1953 (P.L.304, No.66), known as the Vital Statistics Law of 1953, providing for certificate of birth resulting in stillbirth.

#### HEALTH.

#### SB 828, PN 846

By Rep. CREIGHTON

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, further providing for township manager.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

#### SB 829, PN 847

By Rep. CREIGHTON

An Act amending the act of May 1, 1933 (P.L.103, No.69), known as The Second Class Township Code, further providing for township manager.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

#### SB 830, PN 848

By Rep. CREIGHTON

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P.L.932, No.317), known as The Third Class City Code, providing for the office and powers and duties of a city administrator or manager.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

#### SB 831, PN 849

By Rep. CREIGHTON

An Act amending the act of February 1, 1966 (1965 P.L.1656, No.581), known as The Borough Code, further providing for the office of borough manager and for powers and duties of a borough manager.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

**SB 832, PN 850**

By Rep. CREIGHTON

An Act amending the act of May 24, 1956 (1955, P.L.1674, No.566), entitled "An act authorizing council of any incorporated town to create the office of town manager, and prescribe his powers and duties," further providing for the office of town manager and for powers and duties of a town manager.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

**SB 907, PN 1243**

By Rep. BENNINGHOFF

An Act amending the act of April 9, 1929 (P.L.343, No.176), known as The Fiscal Code, in special funds, reviving and further providing for investments.

## FINANCE.

**SB 1062, PN 1325**

By Rep. ADOLPH

An Act making appropriations from the restricted revenue accounts within the State Gaming Fund and from the State Gaming Fund to the Pennsylvania Gaming Control Board, the Department of Revenue, the Pennsylvania State Police and the Attorney General for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2011, to June 30, 2012, and for the payment of bills incurred and remaining unpaid at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 2011.

## APPROPRIATIONS.

### HOUSE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

**No. 1694** By Representatives STURLA, BRENNAN, CALTAGIRONE, DAVIS, FREEMAN, GEIST, HARHAI, HARKINS, JOSEPHS, KILLION, KULA, MULLERY, MYERS, M. O'BRIEN, PASHINSKI, READSHAW, VULAKOVICH and DALEY

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for Commonwealth portion of fines, etc.

Referred to Committee on JUDICIARY, June 20, 2011.

**No. 1695** By Representatives PAYTON, K. BOYLE, FABRIZIO, JOHNSON, JOSEPHS, STURLA and WATERS

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, providing for in-State tuition for undocumented individuals.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 20, 2011.

**No. 1696** By Representatives SACCONI, WHITE, NEUMAN, TURZAI, EVANKOVICH, MUSTIO, EMRICK, MURT, DUNBAR, GERGELY, D. COSTA, REESE, ELLIS, GABLER, MATZIE, HORNAMAN, SIMMONS, TOOHIL, BLOOM, MALONEY, CUTLER, CHRISTIANA, GOODMAN and SWANGER

An Act providing for a temporary moratorium of court-ordered countywide reassessments and for reforms based upon study.

Referred to Committee on LOCAL GOVERNMENT, June 20, 2011.

**No. 1697** By Representatives KILLION, FABRIZIO, FARRY, FREEMAN, GEIST, GINGRICH, O'NEILL, PICKETT, READSHAW, ROEBUCK, SANTARSIERO and WAGNER

An Act amending the act of March 10, 1949 (P.L.30, No.14), known as the Public School Code of 1949, further providing for program of continuing professional education.

Referred to Committee on EDUCATION, June 20, 2011.

**No. 1698** By Representatives HEFFLEY and GEIST

A Supplement to the act of December 8, 1982 (P.L.848, No.235), known as the Highway-Railroad and Highway Bridge Capital Budget Act for 1982-1983, itemizing additional State and local bridge projects.

Referred to Committee on TRANSPORTATION, June 20, 2011.

## CALENDAR

### RESOLUTIONS PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. M. SMITH called up **HR 82, PN 746**, entitled:

A Resolution honoring the 125th anniversary of Bethel Park.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—198

Adolph	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barbin	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Barrar	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bear	Everett	Lawrence	Reichley
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Frankel	Major	Ross
Boyd	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gingrich	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Goodman	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Miller	Sonney
Causar	Hackett	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hahn	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Haluska	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Hanna	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Harhai	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harkins	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harris	Myers	Thomas

Cruz	Heffley	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Helm	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Hess	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Hickernell	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hornaman	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hutchinson	Pashinski	Vitali
DeLissio	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLozier	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLuca	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	White
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	
Donatucci	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S.,
Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Curry	Gerber	Perry	Wagner
Deasy			

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

\* \* \*

Mr. M. SMITH called up **HR 232, PN 1589**, entitled:

A Resolution congratulating Scott Township in Allegheny County on its 150th anniversary.

On the question,  
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—198

Adolph	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barbin	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Barrar	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bear	Everett	Lawrence	Reichley
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Frankel	Major	Ross
Boyd	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gingrich	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Goodman	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Miller	Sonney

Causar	Hackett	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hahn	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Haluska	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Hanna	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Harhai	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harkins	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harris	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Heffley	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Helm	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Daley	Hess	O'Neill	Truitt
Davidson	Hickernell	Oberlander	Turzai
Davis	Hornaman	Parker	Vereb
Day	Hutchinson	Pashinski	Vitali
DeLissio	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLozier	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLuca	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
Denlinger	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
DePasquale	Kavulich	Petri	White
Dermody	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
DeWeese	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Keller, W.	Pyle	
Donatucci	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S.,
Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn	Speaker

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Curry	Gerber	Perry	Wagner
Deasy			

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

## GUEST INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker would like to introduce a couple of guests that are with us. To the left of the Speaker, we would welcome Cory O'Connor and Bob Jablonowski. Cory is the son of the late mayor of Pittsburgh, Bob O'Connor, and he is visiting today as a guest of Representative Frankel. Welcome to the hall. Please rise and be recognized. Welcome to the hall of the House.

## BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 720, PN 1816**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of April 6, 1937 (P.L.200, No.51), known as the Pawnbrokers License Act, further providing for definitions, for identity of pledger and for pawn ticket; providing for hold orders and related procedures; and further providing for sale of pledge and for penalties.

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 1264, PN 1387**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for expert testimony in certain criminal proceedings.

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 1054, PN 1855**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of May 23, 1945 (P.L.913, No.367), known as the Engineer, Land Surveyor and Geologist Registration Law, further providing for continuing professional competency requirements.

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

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the presence of the gentleman, Mr. Curry, from Montgomery County on the floor of the House. His name will be added back to the master roll call.

### SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR B

### BILLS ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 450, PN 433**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 30 (Fish) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, providing for terms of members of the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission.

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—197

Adolph	Ellis	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Aument	Emrick	Kotik	Readshaw
Baker	Evankovich	Krieger	Reed
Barbin	Evans, D.	Kula	Reese
Barrar	Evans, J.	Lawrence	Reichley

Bear	Everett	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Fabrizio	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Farry	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Fleck	Major	Ross
Boyd	Frankel	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Freeman	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Gabler	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Galloway	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	Geist	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	George	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gergely	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gibbons	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillen	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gillespie	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Godshall	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Goodman	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grell	Miller	Sonney
Causer	Grove	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hackett	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Hahn	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Haluska	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Hanna	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harhai	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harhart	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harkins	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harper	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Harris	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Heffley	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Curry	Helm	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Neill	Truitt
Daley	Hess	Oberlander	Turzai
Davidson	Hickernell	Parker	Vereb
Davis	Hornaman	Pashinski	Vitali
Day	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Josephs	Payton	Waters
Delozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kavulich	Petri	White
DePasquale	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DeWeese	Keller, W.	Pyle	
DiGirolamo	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S.,
Donatucci	Kirkland	Quinn	Speaker
Dunbar	Knowles	Rapp	

#### NAYS—2

Benninghoff      Hutchinson

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—4

Deasy      Gerber      Perry      Wagner

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 House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 358, PN 348**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 24, 1931 (P.L.1206, No.331), known as The First Class Township Code, further providing for suits and property.



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—199

Adolph	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barbin	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Barrar	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bear	Everett	Lawrence	Reichley
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Frankel	Major	Ross
Boyd	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gingrich	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Goodman	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Miller	Sonney
Causer	Hackett	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hahn	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Haluska	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Hanna	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Harhai	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harkins	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harris	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Heffley	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Helm	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Curry	Hennessey	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Cutler	Hess	O'Neill	Truitt
Daley	Hickernell	Oberlander	Turzai
Davidson	Hornaman	Parker	Vereb
Davis	Hutchinson	Pashinski	Vitali
Day	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kavulich	Petri	White
DePasquale	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DeWeese	Keller, W.	Pyle	
DiGirolamo	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S.,
Donatucci	Kirkland	Quinn	Speaker
Dunbar			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—4

Deasy                      Gerber                      Perry                      Wagner

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 House proceeded to third consideration of **SB 360, PN 350**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 23, 1931 (P.L.932, No.317), known as The Third Class City Code, further providing for sales of personal property.

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—199

Adolph	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barbin	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Barrar	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bear	Everett	Lawrence	Reichley
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Frankel	Major	Ross
Boyd	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gingrich	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Goodman	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Miller	Sonney
Causer	Hackett	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hahn	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Haluska	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Hanna	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Harhai	Mundy	Sturla

Costa, D.	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harkins	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harris	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Heffley	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Helm	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Curry	Hennessey	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Cutler	Hess	O'Neill	Truitt
Daley	Hickernell	Oberlander	Turzai
Davidson	Hornaman	Parker	Vereb
Davis	Hutchinson	Pashinski	Vitali
Day	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kavulich	Petri	White
DePasquale	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DeWeese	Keller, W.	Pyle	
DiGirolamo	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S.,
Donatucci	Kirkland	Quinn	Speaker
Dunbar			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—4

Deasy	Gerber	Perry	Wagner
-------	--------	-------	--------

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.

**BILLS REREPORTED FROM COMMITTEE****HB 338, PN 293**

By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for definitions, for immunity from liability, for complaint files and for amendment or expunction of information.

RULES.

**HB 1544, PN 2106**

By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending the act of June 29, 1953 (P.L.304, No.66), known as the Vital Statistics Law of 1953, providing for certificates of death without cause of death listed.

RULES.

**HB 1618, PN 2088**

By Rep. TURZAI

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the offense of assault of law enforcement officer.

RULES.

**CALENDAR CONTINUED****RESOLUTION**

Ms. HELM called up **HR 177, PN 1392**, entitled:

A Resolution requesting the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to study county human services program mandate relief.

On the question,

Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—199

Adolph	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Aument	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Baker	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barbin	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Barrar	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Bear	Everett	Lawrence	Reichley
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roae
Bishop	Farry	Maher	Rock
Bloom	Fleck	Mahoney	Roebuck
Boback	Frankel	Major	Ross
Boyd	Freeman	Maloney	Sabatina
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Mann	Saccone
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Markosek	Sainato
Bradford	Geist	Marshall	Samuelson
Brennan	George	Marsico	Santarsiero
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Santoni
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Saylor
Brown, R.	Gillen	McGeehan	Scavello
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metcalfe	Schroder
Brownlee	Gingrich	Metzgar	Shapiro
Burns	Godshall	Miccarelli	Simmons
Buxton	Goodman	Micozzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	Grell	Millard	Smith, M.
Carroll	Grove	Miller	Sonney
Causar	Hackett	Milne	Staback
Christiana	Hahn	Mirabito	Stephens
Clymer	Haluska	Moul	Stern
Cohen	Hanna	Mullery	Stevenson
Conklin	Harhai	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Harhart	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harkins	Murt	Tallman
Cox	Harper	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harris	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Heffley	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Helm	O'Brien, D.	Toepel
Curry	Hennessey	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Cutler	Hess	O'Neill	Truitt
Daley	Hickernell	Oberlander	Turzai
Davidson	Hornaman	Parker	Vereb
Davis	Hutchinson	Pashinski	Vitali
Day	Johnson	Payne	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Josephs	Payton	Waters
DeLozier	Kampf	Peifer	Watson
DeLuca	Kauffman	Petrarca	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kavulich	Petri	White
DePasquale	Keller, F.	Pickett	Williams
Dermody	Keller, M.K.	Preston	Youngblood
DeWeese	Keller, W.	Pyle	
DiGirolamo	Killion	Quigley	Smith, S.,
Donatucci	Kirkland	Quinn	Speaker
Dunbar			

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—4

Deasy                      Gerber                      Perry                      Wagner

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

The SPEAKER. If we could have the members' attention.

**STATEMENT BY MS. HELM****REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the lady, Ms. Helm, rise?

Ms. HELM. Unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The lady is recognized under unanimous consent.

Ms. HELM. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to thank everyone for their positive vote on HR 177, and I have notes to submit for the record.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady.

Ms. HELM submitted the following remarks for the Legislative Journal:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask my colleagues to vote in support of HR 177, which would direct the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to conduct a study of county human services programs and make recommendations for mandate relief.

Mr. Speaker, the 67 counties throughout the Commonwealth provide a wide array of vital human services to vulnerable residents. Many of these services are required through State and Federal mandates and include voter registration assistance, school monitoring in certain truancy and dependency cases, and nursing home reporting as required by the Department of Health, the Department of Aging, the Pennsylvania State Police, and the Area Agency on Aging.

With the state of the current economy, there are serious revenue shortfalls to support programs funded by local, State, and Federal governments. With limited funding for unfunded and underfunded costs of Federal- and State-required human services functions, counties face serious cutbacks, disruptions to vital services, and the potential of increasing property taxes, which homeowners cannot afford.

Mr. Speaker, in order to meet their obligations, counties need greater flexibility in administering human service programs and support services. To increase efficiency and reduce costs, it is imperative to review the mandates placed on counties, highlight burdensome processes, identify overly prescriptive administrative requirements, determine the costs of meeting these requirements, and identify potential cost savings of consolidating State auditing functions and standardizing reports.

Mr. Speaker, HR 177 would ask the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee to review the rules and regulations that counties are subject to in order to receive funding for a wide range of human services. This would include the utility of the Child Welfare Needs-Based Plan and budget reporting costs in determining county funding level, development of consolidated State auditing functions, compliance reporting form standardization, burdensome processes that may interfere with service delivery or increase costs, and overly prescriptive human services administrative requirements or those that evolved without a statutory or regulatory basis.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an affirmative vote on HR 177. Thank you.

**BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 797, PN 966**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 2, 1915 (P.L.736, No.338), known as the Workers' Compensation Act, further defining "occupational disease"; and providing for cancer in the occupation of firefighter.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. GRELL offered the following amendment No. **A02489**:

Amend Bill, page 4, line 7, by inserting after "(f)"

The following apply:

(1)

Amend Bill, page 5, by inserting between lines 4 and 5

(2) If a firefighter suffers from cancer and is to be granted compensation under this section, the Commonwealth shall be considered the employer for the purposes of this section and shall be liable for payment of the firefighter's claim.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

**AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN**

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman indicating he has withdrawn the amendment? The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

**SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR A****BILLS ON SECOND CONSIDERATION**

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 338, PN 293**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 23 (Domestic Relations) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for definitions, for immunity from liability, for complaint files and for amendment or expunction of information.

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 1618, PN 2088**, entitled:

An Act amending Title 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing for the offense of assault of law enforcement officer.

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

### STATEMENT BY MR. DeLUCA

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. DeLuca, seeking recognition for the purpose of making an announcement?

Mr. DeLUCA. Yes, Mr. Speaker; under unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. DeLUCA. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, Saturday night a young lady from my district, from Representative Markosek's district, and from Representative Dermody's district was crowned Miss Pennsylvania, and I think that is really a tribute to this young lady, Juliann Sheldon, who resides in Plum Township.

This young lady is a special person. She really is an excellent student. She is a beautiful lady, if anybody watched the Miss America Pageant on Saturday night, and we are certainly honored to have her represent us here in Pennsylvania. So I just wanted to congratulate her personally, whoever is looking out there, and hopefully, we can get her here when we come back for session after the summer.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

### CALENDAR CONTINUED

### BILL ON SECOND CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to second consideration of **HB 934, PN 1805**, entitled:

An Act amending the act of June 3, 1937 (P.L.1333, No.320), known as the Pennsylvania Election Code, in preliminary provisions, defining "proof of identification"; in the Secretary of the Commonwealth, providing for requirements relating to voter identification; and, in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges.

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

Mr. **VITALI** offered the following amendment No. **A02059**:

Amend Bill, page 1, line 12, by striking out "in the Secretary of the Commonwealth,"

Amend Bill, page 1, lines 14 and 15, by striking out all of line 14 and "elections," in line 15

Amend Bill, page 1, line 18, by inserting after "challenges"  
; and providing for election spending limitations

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 16 and 17  
Section 3.1. The act is amended by adding a section to read:

Section 1627.1. Election Spending Limitations.—

(a) No individual or political action committee shall make contributions to a candidate for a Statewide office which exceed:

(1) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for a general election.

(2) Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) for a primary election.

(b) For purposes of this section, a political action committee shall have the same meaning as given to it in section 1621(d).

Amend Bill, page 9, line 17, by inserting after "AMENDMENT"  
or addition

Amend Bill, page 9, line 17, by striking out "SECTION 1210"  
and inserting  
sections 1210 and 1627.1

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

The SPEAKER. If the House could come to order and just hold the conversations down a little bit.

### AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Vitali.

Mr. VITALI. I have two amendments, and I am going to withdraw this one and go with another one.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Vitali, withdraws amendment A02059.

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

Mr. **PASHINSKI** offered the following amendment No. **A02064**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by striking out "A SUBSECTION"  
and inserting

subsections

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 6 and 7

\* \* \*

(a.5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in lieu of the requirements of subsection (a), an elector who does not possess proof of identification shall be permitted to cast a provisional ballot if the elector mails a photocopy of proof of identification, postmarked no later than the day following the election and provides a notarized affidavit prescribed by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, swearing or affirming that the elector appeared at the election district and voted a provisional ballot. The county board of elections shall supply each election district with a sufficient supply of affidavit forms and envelopes that are preaddressed to the county board of elections for this purpose.

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

The SPEAKER. On the amendment, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Pashinski.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would prefer to offer amendment A2128 immediately, please, rather than A2064.

The SPEAKER. Are you withdrawing A02064?

Mr. PASHINSKI. I would be willing to do that, sir, as long as I could speak on A2128 immediately, sir.

The SPEAKER. We will recognize you on that following amendment shortly as we work our way through the list.

Mr. PASHINSKI. One minute, Mr. Speaker. I beg your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. One moment, please.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, after due consideration, I will speak on the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order on the amendment.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, there have been times where countless people go to vote and do not have their proper identification. This particular provision would allow for a person to write, to sign a provisional ballot. The following day the individual would present a notarized affidavit to the proper officials to prove the identification was indeed correct. Countless times this has occurred, sir, and I would appreciate a "yes" vote on this.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On the question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Butler, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose amendment 2064. Something similar, a similar amendment, was considered by the State Government Committee of which we did not adopt the amendment. The author is back today to take another shot at it, but we drafted this legislation specifically to follow along the same parallel lines as the Indiana legislation has progressed to require voter ID, a photo ID by voters, which has been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, and we want to keep our legislation in line with what has been tested through the Supreme Court to ensure that it withstands any potential challenges down the road. So I would object to amendment 2064.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

The lady waives off.

Will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Pashinski, for the second time.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that a similar amendment was proposed by myself during the State Government meeting, and after due consideration with members on both sides of the aisle, I was encouraged to reoffer this with the provision that we would notarize the affidavit. During the conversation with the State Government Committee, members of the other side of the aisle said that it made sense to do what I was suggesting, and by notarizing it, it would guarantee the complete authority of the individual relative to their identification. For this reason, I have repropounded this with that added provision.

Based upon the conversations that I have had with members on the other side of the aisle, I would ask that they reconsider it and please support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to ask for a negative vote on the Pashinski amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the majority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. Denny O'BRIEN, from Philadelphia for the remainder of the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

## CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

### YEAS—88

Barbin	DeLissio	Kavulich	Petrarca
Bishop	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Preston
Boyle, B.	DePasquale	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Boyle, K.	Dermody	Kortz	Readshaw
Bradford	DeWeese	Kotik	Roebuck
Brennan	Donatucci	Kula	Sabatina
Briggs	Evans, D.	Longietti	Sainato
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Mahoney	Samuelson
Brownlee	Frankel	Mann	Santarsiero
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Santoni
Buxton	Galloway	Matzie	Shapiro
Caltagirone	George	McGeehan	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gergely	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Cohen	Gibbons	Mullery	Staback
Conklin	Goodman	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Haluska	Murphy	Thomas
Costa, P.	Hanna	Myers	Vitali
Cruz	Harhai	Neuman	Waters
Curry	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Wheatley
Daley	Hornaman	Parker	White
Davidson	Johnson	Pashinski	Williams
Davis	Josephs	Payton	Youngblood

### NAYS—110

Adolph	Farry	Lawrence	Reese
Aument	Fleck	Maher	Reichley
Baker	Gabler	Major	Roae
Barrar	Geist	Maloney	Rock
Bear	Gillen	Marshall	Ross
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Gingrich	Masser	Saylor
Boback	Godshall	Metcalfe	Scavello
Boyd	Grell	Metzgar	Schroder
Brooks	Grove	Miccarelli	Simmons
Brown, R.	Hackett	Micozzie	Sonney
Causer	Hahn	Millard	Stephens
Christiana	Harhart	Miller	Stern
Clymer	Harper	Milne	Stevenson
Cox	Harris	Moul	Swanger
Creighton	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Culver	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Neill	Tobash
Day	Hess	Oberlander	Toepel
Delozier	Hickernell	Payne	Toohil
Denlinger	Hutchinson	Peifer	Truitt
DiGirolamo	Kampf	Petri	Turzai
Dunbar	Kauffman	Pickett	Vereb
Ellis	Keller, F.	Pyle	Vulakovich
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	Watson
Evankovich	Killion	Quinn	
Evans, J.	Knowles	Rapp	Smith, S.,
Everett	Krieger	Reed	Speaker

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—5

Deasy  
Gerber

O'Brien, D.

Perry

Wagner

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

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

Mr. **PASHINSKI** offered the following amendment  
No. **A02067**:

Amend Bill, page 3, by inserting between lines 14 and 15

(d) The Secretary of Transportation shall establish a mobile unit to take photographs of people with disabilities who need assistance in obtaining photographs of themselves for proof of identification under this act.

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

## AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Pashinski.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

After the results of the last amendment, considering the due course of conversations that I had with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that encouraged me to put that provision in, I am going to withdraw this particular amendment, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you.

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

Mr. **BRIGGS** offered the following amendment  
No. **A02102**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 17, by striking out "is" and inserting  
are

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by striking out "A SUBSECTION"  
and inserting  
subsections

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 7 and 8

(a.5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an elector, other than an elector who appears to vote in that election district for the first time, who does not possess proof of identification satisfies the requirements of subsection (a) by, on a form prescribed by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, writing the elector's residential address and date of birth, printing the elector's name and signing an affidavit that the elector is the elector whose name appears in the district register. The county board of elections shall supply each election district with a sufficient supply of such forms.

\* \* \*

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Briggs.

Mr. BRIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am introducing amendment 2102 to fix a problem that I believe may occur. The first time a voter would participate on an election day, they would have to provide a photo license. But on any further voting occasion they would have, if they were not to have their photo ID, they could simply fill out an affidavit with their date of birth and signature and address, and that would suffice, which would alleviate a return trip to the county board of elections within 6 days to present their photo ID.

I ask the members for their support for amendment 2102.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to amendment 2102.

Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that an individual's name and date of birth is within the public record of the voter registration information that is available to anybody to glean from those records, and then to show up to vote, have memorized that date of birth and that name, be able to write that down, sign that affidavit, and after having voted leave, because they did not prove that they were who they actually claim to be, and disappear into the masses, to not be held accountable for even effectuating that affidavit.

So this certainly would undermine the intent of the legislation to require that voters actually prove that they are there to vote, as they say they are, in person, and I would ask for a negative vote on A2102.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to ask for a positive vote, an affirmative vote for this amendment from the good gentleman from Montgomery County.

First of all, this kind of voter fraud does not happen, but hypothetically, let us say it does. Let us say somebody goes to all the trouble of meeting with someone, memorizing a birth date and a name and this not-so-secret middle initial or whatever it is, and there is a fraud perpetuated; unlikely, as likely as getting – less likely than getting struck by lightning, less likely, but let us say it happens. There are severe penalties for this kind of behavior. That is why people do not do it. That is why people do not engage in this kind of behavior. That is why these kinds of requirements are nothing but a barrier.

The good gentleman from Montgomery County is trying to make it a little bit simpler for seniors and American citizens who deserve the right to vote to cast their right to vote, and those of you who care about citizens voting will be voting with the gentleman from Montgomery County, as I will be.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, may I interrogate the maker of the bill?

The SPEAKER. The maker of the bill or the maker of the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. I understand the amendment, but I need some clarification from the maker of the bill.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is willing to stand for interrogation, you may interrogate the maker of the bill on the amendment, but just so we stay on the subject of the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted some clarification before I went to the amendment. The amendment is a good amendment. The amendment almost is unnecessary, and it is only necessary because we have this bill in front of us.

Mr. Speaker, I recall it was not that long ago that the General Assembly passed a bill which imposed serious, serious, serious penalties against judges of election, majority inspectors, and people who sit at the polling place on election day. And for any of those people of the board to permit this kind of conduct or for this kind of conduct to be dealt with, one provision that the Governor put his signature on would send a judge of elections to the penitentiary for 7 years for dealing with certain violations.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to interrogate the maker of the bill because this is unnecessary. As the former speaker said, we do not have any facts to give rise to—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

You may, assuming he is willing to stand for interrogation, you may interrogate the maker of the bill as long as the questions are relative to the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I am laying the foundation for him.

Support the Briggs amendment so I can get to the maker of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Again, Mr. Speaker, I believe this amendment is unnecessary to this bill. This amendment was already discussed and defeated in committee and should be voted down again today for its unnecessary burden on what I believe will be researched by the counties after they get this kind of information. It will put a financial burden on the counties. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—88

Barbin	DeLissio	Kavulich	Petrarca
Bishop	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Preston
Boyle, B.	DePasquale	Kirkland	Ravenstahl
Boyle, K.	Dermoddy	Kortz	Readshaw
Bradford	DeWeese	Kotik	Roebuck
Brennan	Donatucci	Kula	Sabatina
Briggs	Evans, D.	Longietti	Sainato

Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Mahoney	Samuelson
Brownlee	Frankel	Mann	Santarsiero
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Santoni
Buxton	Galloway	Matzie	Shapiro
Caltagirone	George	McGeehan	Smith, K.
Carroll	Gergely	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Cohen	Gibbons	Mullery	Staback
Conklin	Goodman	Mundy	Sturla
Costa, D.	Haluska	Murphy	Thomas
Costa, P.	Hanna	Myers	Vitali
Cruz	Harhai	Neuman	Waters
Curry	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Wheatley
Daley	Hornaman	Parker	White
Davidson	Johnson	Pashinski	Williams
Davis	Josephs	Payton	Youngblood

#### NAYS—110

Adolph	Farry	Lawrence	Reese
Aument	Fleck	Maher	Reichley
Baker	Gabler	Major	Roae
Barrar	Geist	Maloney	Rock
Bear	Gillen	Marshall	Ross
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Gingrich	Masser	Saylor
Boback	Godshall	Metcalfe	Scavello
Boyd	Grell	Metzgar	Schroder
Brooks	Grove	Miccarelli	Simmons
Brown, R.	Hackett	Micozzie	Sonney
Causer	Hahn	Millard	Stephens
Christiana	Harhart	Miller	Stern
Clymer	Harper	Milne	Stevenson
Cox	Harris	Moul	Swanger
Creighton	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Culver	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Neill	Tobash
Day	Hess	Oberlander	Toepel
Delozier	Hickernell	Payne	Toohil
Denlinger	Hutchinson	Peifer	Truitt
DiGirolamo	Kampf	Petri	Turzai
Dunbar	Kauffman	Pickett	Vereb
Ellis	Keller, F.	Pyle	Vulakovich
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	Watson
Evankovich	Killion	Quinn	
Evans, J.	Knowles	Rapp	Smith, S.,
Everett	Krieger	Reed	Speaker

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—5

Deasy	O'Brien, D.	Perry	Wagner
Gerber			

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

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the bill on second consideration?

Mr. DePASQUALE offered the following amendment  
No. A02104:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 17, by striking out "is" and inserting  
are  
Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by striking out "A SUBSECTION"  
and inserting  
subsections  
Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 7 and 8  
(a.5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an

elector, other than an elector who appears to vote in that election district for the first time, who does not possess proof of identification satisfies the requirements of subsection (a) by signing, on a form prescribed by the Secretary of the Commonwealth, an affidavit swearing or affirming that the person is the person identified in the district register.

\* \* \*

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

#### AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The SPEAKER. We will go over that amendment temporarily. Excuse me?

The gentleman indicates he has withdrawn the amendment. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

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

Mr. **SAMUELSON** offered the following amendment No. **A02106**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 17, by striking out "is" and inserting  
are

Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by striking out "A SUBSECTION"  
and inserting  
subsections

Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 7 and 8

(a.5) An elector, other than an elector who appears to vote in that election district for the first time, who is over sixty-two (62) years of age is exempt from the provisions of subsection (a).

\* \* \*

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Samuelson.

Mr. **SAMUELSON**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment would exempt senior citizens from the provisions of this bill. Many senior citizens do not have a photo ID. Sometimes in our district offices we process paperwork for senior citizens who no longer drive and would be giving up their driver's licenses. So without driver's licenses, sometimes the senior citizen does not have a photo ID. Sometimes they sign up; sometimes they do not.

We should not be placing additional roadblocks in the way of our seniors that would restrict their right to vote. This is the United States of America. Our senior citizens are very proud of their record of voting. Many of our senior citizens have voted for 50 straight elections and are in the Voter Hall of Fame in Pennsylvania.

This bill unnecessarily puts restrictions. Now, the prime sponsor of the bill might say, well, the senior citizen could sign up for a photo ID. Well, that requires an extra trip to PENNDOT, getting out documents, extra hassle to get a photo ID for the precious right to vote, the American right to vote. The prime sponsor might say, well, our seniors can fill out a provisional ballot, but if you look at the fine print of his bill, if you look at the fine print of the gentleman from Butler's bill, if you cast a provisional ballot, you have to then drive to the

county courthouse within the next 6 days to fill out an affidavit to make sure that your vote that you cast 6 days ago still counts. That is an extra roadblock, an extra step, an extra hassle that we would be putting on our senior citizens to guarantee their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, the system we have now where you register to vote and then you go to the polls and you vote, that has worked well for decades for our senior citizens, and we should not be impairing their right to vote by requiring extra trips to PENNDOT, extra trips to the county courthouse. Remember, many of our senior citizens do not drive; many of our senior citizens have mobility issues; some of our senior citizens are in nursing homes, and I do not think the House majority wants to be on record requiring our senior citizens to jump through hoops to exercise their right to vote, to exercise their precious American right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on amendment 2106, which would exempt individuals over the age of 62 from the provisions of this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. **METCALFE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to amendment 2106.

The argument that the gentleman is making is a very worn out argument from his side of this issue, and it has been proven in State after State that has photo ID for voting that this in fact is not the case. This is not what occurs, what he is decrying will occur.

It was even noted by the seventh circuit as it reviewed Indiana's voter ID law that the petitioners were unable to introduce evidence of, quote, "...a single, individual Indiana resident who will be unable to vote as a result of..." the voter ID law "...or who will have his or her right to vote unduly burdened by its requirements." In fact, it was discovered that the one woman who was named as a plaintiff in the case was registered to vote in both Indiana and Florida, where she owns a home and claimed a homestead exemption, which required an individual to assert residency. She had a Florida driver's license and then she attempted to use it to vote in Indiana in November of 2006, but the poll workers would not accept it. So the law worked just fine in Indiana. I believe the law will work just fine in Pennsylvania.

And I think it is an insult to the Greatest Generation, that has had a book even titled after them, who have served our nation and in our history to defend freedom for America. To insinuate that because they have reached a more seasoned time in their life that they will not be able to secure an ID and meet the same requirements that every other citizen meets, I think it is an insult to that generation. And from the seniors that I have talked to, they want to ensure that they have their right to cast their legally cast vote and that it is not taken away by a fraudulently cast vote or somebody registering under a fictitious name and voting and casting out their legitimately cast vote. This legislation is to ensure that every individual that is a law-abiding citizen that casts their vote secures that right to have their vote counted, Mr. Speaker.

I oppose amendment 2106. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House adopt the amendment?



On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Cambria County, Mr. Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this amendment. I find it very ironic today that the gentleman from Butler, who is so strong in supporting the rights of the Constitution, would rise today to eliminate the right of the senior citizens to vote.

I would mention one of the provisions of the Constitution which specifically involves his legislation. The Constitution, as we all know, is a limitation on what the government can do. Section 5 of our Constitution titled "Elections" states very clearly, "Elections shall be free and equal; and no power, civil or military, shall at any time interfere to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage." This bill, for whatever its stated purpose is, whether it is stated to eliminate some fraud that does not occur; there are no convictions to back up this legislation, but this bill that he stated will absolutely interfere with the senior citizens' right to vote.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The question before the House is the amendment, not the whole bill.

Mr. BARBIN. Your honor, without this amendment—

The SPEAKER. Whoa, whoa, whoa; do not mix me with the judges here.

Mr. BARBIN. I would say you are very honorable, sir.

But I would also say that this legislation is very misplaced, and without this amendment, Mr. Speaker, the rights of citizens, senior citizens like my grandfather, who is 105 years old; he no longer has his ID, but he has voted in every election since he was 18. That will be changed, and there is no right in this chamber, as long as this constitutional provision is in our Constitution, that we should set forth and create a limitation on the free right to suffrage.

And I ask that all members of this Assembly vote for this amendment to at least make sure that senior citizens are not burdened because of this unwise legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Somerset, Mr. Metzgar.

Mr. METZGAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Will the maker of the amendment please rise for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will stand for interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. Metzgar, may proceed.

Mr. METZGAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am just a little bit confused on the application of this particular law.

I understand in Pennsylvania if you are buying cigarettes or alcohol, we play it safe, if you will. If we think the person is under 18 or under 21, with regard to the respective product which that person is reporting, we play it safe. We say, if you look like you might be, we are going to card you. So my question to you is, where is the line? Is it play it safe on the upper side of 62 or the lower side of 62?

Mr. SAMUELSON. The amendment would exempt people who are age 62 or older, on their 62d birthday or later, and the birth date is included as part of their voter registration. When you sign up to vote, when you register to vote, you list your birthday. That is in part of the voter registration records.

Mr. METZGAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Well, if I do not card them, how do I know who they are then?

Mr. SAMUELSON. The birthday. When you and I signed up to vote, we put our birth date. Those records are available to the counties and the voter election officials.

Mr. METZGAR. I am sorry; perhaps I am confusing you, but how would I know who they are if I do not have their ID? So then I will not be able to determine when their birthday is, so how would I know if they are 62 or not?

Mr. SAMUELSON. The birth date that the voter put down when they signed up to vote is part of the poll record, part of the documents, the information that those individuals at the polling place have, and I think this is an important point. What the gentleman is trying to get at is exactly what I was talking about earlier. We should not be putting extra hoops for these senior citizens to vote. That is a precious right to vote. They have already given their birth date, sometimes decades ago when they signed up to vote in the first place. This bill would say, age 62 and older, you do not have to go by the provisions of this new bill.

And an interesting point, if somebody signs up for an absentee ballot, under the gentleman from Butler's bill, there is no photo ID requirement. So this kind of sets up a two-tiered system of voting. If you sign up by voter absentee ballot, no photo ID required. If you go to the polling place, this bill, the majority seeks to put hoops, hurdles in the way of those senior citizens who are trying to vote.

Mr. METZGAR. On the bill, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order on the amendment.

Mr. METZGAR. Mr. Speaker, I think that we can all see from the answers that were given by the maker of the amendment that this particular amendment cannot be applied. We have no idea who the people are. That is why we are identifying them and we would like to see their identification. However, this particular amendment asks that we only identify those who appear to be less than 62 years of age but does not decide how we are supposed to determine whether they are 62 years of age other than apparently the elector, as listed in this particular amendment, is supposed to be psychic, and obviously, be able to read the lines on someone's hands.

So I am not sure how this works, but I sincerely appreciate my colleague from Cambria County bringing up an excellent point with regard to this particular amendment, and that is that the free and equal provision of the Constitution says that everyone should be treated equally by definition. So by putting this amendment into place, it would actually make the bill unconstitutional, because it would treat people unequally when they go to the polls. So by definition, this amendment is unconstitutional or will make the bill unconstitutional, as the case may be.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Kortz.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of amendment A2106, and I commend the maker of the amendment for doing the right thing with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot believe that we are standing here today talking about disenfranchising the seniors from voting in this State. That is exactly what the majority is proposing here. If you vote against this amendment, you are saying that it is okay to vote against seniors. The reality of the situation is, and we all have this, as you know, in our districts, some seniors, they have their driver's license taken away because they are no longer capable of driving, whether it is eyesight or whatever it may be, and they have to relinquish their driver's license. I go through this all the time trying to get some of our seniors identification because they need it for others things and it becomes a problem at times, especially if mobility is an issue.

So I would ask everybody today, please vote for this, because we are asking our seniors – we are actually putting a roadblock, Mr. Speaker, in front of the seniors to go and vote, and that is absolutely the wrong thing to do here. Again, if you vote against this, you are disenfranchising seniors. You are saying, seniors, we are going to put an extra roadblock in front of you.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask everybody today to please stand up and do the right thing here for our seniors and vote "yes" for this amendment, because it is the right thing to do. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from York, Mr. Saylor.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing that everybody keeps talking about their district offices, and if they were in contact with their district offices, they would realize that the Social Security Administration requires photo ID. Whether you file at 62 years of age, early, or whether you file at 65, or for some people it is 66 and so many months, you are required to bring a photo ID in to show for Social Security. You must maintain that if there is ever a claim that comes up. Today, no matter where you go, you need photo ID to use credit cards, to write a check, whatever it is.

To stand up and say on this House floor that we are disenfranchising senior citizens is a slap in the face to those seniors who know better. It is absolutely wrong, because every day in my district offices, as it is in everybody else's here, seniors are filing for PACE rebates – or PACE (Pharmaceutical Assistance Contract for the Elderly program) applications, property tax rent rebates and the department requires photo ID. Now, to sit here today and say that is not true is just wrong. Nobody here is disenfranchising senior citizens. If you do not know what is going on in your district office, that is up to you, but I am telling you that the staffs know, your district staff, if they are helping fill out PACE or a property tax rent rebate, your district staff knows it requires photo ID when you are filing those applications.

This is about making sure the right people, the right people are getting their opportunity to vote. My seniors have challenged me at the polls when I am in there voting: Why have we not passed the ID requirement?

And it is time for this State to make sure that legitimate people who are voting are not having their vote canceled out by those who are not legitimate. This is not anything about disenfranchising any voter let alone senior citizens. The senior citizens, I would argue, are the most responsible voters we have in this State, because they will vote when there is 3 feet of snow on the ground where other people, a lot of times, will use the

excuse it is good weather or it is bad weather not to vote. Our seniors are better than we give them credit for, and I think we are doing a disservice to them by sitting here and saying they are not smart enough to follow this law.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask for a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Dermody, on the amendment.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the slap in the face here is to senior citizens who are having their constitutional right to vote taken away by this bill.

All this amendment does is give our senior citizens the ability to vote in the precinct they voted at for years. When they walk in the room, they walk in the door, they know everybody in the room, yet we are proposing if they do not have a driver's license or an ID, we are going to send them down to the county courthouse.

There is one reason this bill is here today, it is to suppress turnout; it is to keep registered voters exercising their constitutional right to vote from having that right honored. This amendment protects our senior citizens and it protects their right to vote. That is what we are supposed to be about doing here in this House, not taking away people's rights but making sure those rights are protected and preserved. Vote for the Samuelson amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Cohen.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise in support of the Samuelson amendment.

Nobody here is saying that every single senior citizen in the State of Pennsylvania is going to be denied the right to vote as a result of this legislation; that is not what is going to happen. But here and there throughout the State, probably in every polling place, some senior citizens are not going to be able to vote because they lack the ID.

As I get older and my family gets older and some of my friends get older, I have spent more and more time in the world of senior citizens. My mother will be 94, and she lives in the senior citizens apartment house in Representative Josephs' district. I have spent a fair amount of time in that house, and I have learned that the aging process affects some people very severely and some people are almost totally unaffected by it. But for those who are affected severely by the aging process, this bill takes away their right to vote, and the Samuelson amendment restores the right to vote for those people who are affected by the aging process. For many people, opening an envelope or paying a bill is a very difficult thing to do. This does not mean they did not do heroic things earlier in their lifetimes. It means that the effects of aging are severe for some people at some time in their life.

The Samuelson amendment says that those people, just like others, shall fully be able to vote in Pennsylvania elections. This is a wise amendment. It goes to the heart of this bill. The vast majority of people who will be disenfranchised under this bill, as now written, are senior citizens. Mr. Samuelson restores their vote. I strongly urge support of this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Frankel.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is very telling that in discussing this amendment, the majority whip talked about the right people, because this is what this bill is about at the end of the day: making sure the right people are able to vote and not the right people do not have the opportunity to vote. It is about voter suppression.

Seniors, particularly low-income seniors, seniors who do not have their adult children around, are not going to be able to get to the polls as easily. They are not going to be able to go downtown to the State office building and get that birth certificate, bring it back, and apply for a voter photo ID.

I have an 83-year-old neighbor who has limited mobility, who does not drive, has not driven for years, and his passport has expired. This is an obstacle for that person to get to the polls, and it is all about not getting that person to the poll because it is not useful to those on the other side of the aisle. It does not meet their political goals, and that is exactly what this piece of legislation is about, and it is what the Samuelson amendment is trying to at least mitigate with respect to our senior citizens. Voter suppression, that is what this bill is about.

This amendment does at least something with one class of people that these folks over here on the other side of the aisle are trying to suppress and prevent from voting. This will at least allow some of the people you are trying to suppress, keep from voting at the polls, senior citizens, our Greatest Generation – yes, and they are smart and they have sacrificed and they do not deserve this. They at least deserve the consideration of the Samuelson amendment.

Everybody in this hall, everybody on both sides of the aisle should support this amendment and respect our senior citizens to make sure they have the opportunity to vote. Otherwise, you are taking away that right. You are suppressing the vote, and this is purely political. Vote "yes."

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Vanessa Brown.

Ms. V. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with this House that I stand and rise in support of amendment 2106. I stand in support of this amendment because I am a caregiver of two senior citizens. I have a 90-year-old and a 98-year-old, and I would like to talk about my 90-year-old who is in a nursing home. I am charged to take care of him like I am all of the seniors of this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and in that responsibility that I have, I must remember that he served this country as an Air Force veteran, and at 90 years old he has been forced to give up his driver's license. That happened 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, could you calm the House down, please? I would appreciate it.

The SPEAKER. They are not too bad, relatively speaking, but the Speaker would ask the members to keep the conversations down.

Ms. V. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for indulging the gentledady from Philadelphia.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is very serious to me, and if the members could just indulge me, because I am talking about my family; I am talking about the lives of people who served this country; I am talking about seniors who have paid a dear price to be able to have a privilege, and that privilege is to vote.

In this country there are people who have paid double to be able to vote; they have paid double the price to vote, and for us to put restrictions on seniors who are 62 and over and not support this amendment is wrong. It is wrong because it is very difficult to get those IDs.

And I would like to set the record straight about needing ID for PACE and for the property tax rent rebate. Those members are eligible at age 60. I have someone who is 90 coming into my office. They qualified 30 years ago for their property tax rent rebate with their ID. Since then they never need to do another application with their ID again because they are on the record. So life has changed drastically for some of these individuals within the last 30 years.

And, yes, it is a burden to have that ID. Yes, there are several thousands, hundreds of thousands of seniors out there who to this day if you ask them to go into their home and hold up their ID, would not have a clue. There are some that do not have the mental capacity to even figure it out. This is a burden on their caregivers. I am a caregiver of both of these 90- and 98-year-olds. Neither one of them, when I took over their care in the last 3 years, had an ID, and it has been a tremendous feat to overcome, one of which I have not overcome as of today, and I am a State Representative. You would think I would be able to do better than that, and I have not. He still does not have it, and he is 98 in a nursing home. This is not right, Mr. Speaker. And I hope the members of this House think about just not only the few people who can succeed and get it – there are some seniors, yes, that can – but there are many who cannot, and we have to act for those who cannot today.

And I think it is courageous what the Representative has done to put up this amendment, 2106, to stand for our senior citizens who, again, have paid a dear price and some of them have paid double and triple. They have walked and marched for their right to vote, and they deserve at this time in their lives— Those same people were on the line; they were in front of the dogs; they were in front of the fire hydrants to fight for their right to vote, and how dare we suppress their vote today, how dare we do that.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I rise in support of this amendment, and I would like to thank this House for their generosity in letting me speak and also to you. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Northampton County, Mr. Freeman.

Mr. FREEMAN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of amendment A02106, the Samuelson amendment.

This amendment gets at a very serious flaw in this legislation, and that is one of the biggest groups that we should be concerned about in terms of allowing them to have access to the ballot box, our senior citizens.

As has been mentioned on this floor before on both sides of the aisle, this Greatest Generation gave us a lot. They made America the great country that it is today, and yet if this

legislation in chief is to become law, it will most definitely disqualify many of them from gaining access to the ballot box that they have used, in some cases, for 50 or more years.

It has been said by the gentleman from York that this generation that will be affected are the ones who come out and vote the most, and that is very true. But if you put in front of them an obstacle such is entailed in this legislation in chief, you are going to diminish the number of senior citizens who will be able to access the ballot box because they will not have voter identification that meets the standard in this legislation. The senior population has a greater likelihood of not having a driver's license or other photo IDs that will meet the standard in this bill.

The gentleman from Northampton County's amendment makes a great deal of sense, because as long as they are 62 or older, they would not have to show identification. Under interrogation, the gentleman from Northampton County was asked, well, how will they prove that they are the person they are, that they are 62 or older? Two very clear facts that should be in our thoughts today as we debate this issue. First, as he pointed out, the voter registration office has that information. It can be made available at the polling place as to the actual age of the person seeking to cast a ballot.

But second, we forget one very important detail about the way in which elections are conducted currently in Pennsylvania. You currently have to show a voter ID if you are voting for the first time, but if you have voted in that precinct before, then it is understood that you will be recognizable by the people who conduct the ballot box in that precinct. Keep in mind, the folks who work on the inside of our polling places typically are the same group of people who have worked that precinct for years. They know the voters coming into that precinct. They have exchanged pleasantries with them on election day; they exchange information about how their families are doing. They know them. Mrs. Jones, who has voted in the same precinct for 50-some years, will be readily identifiable to the people taking down the information as they sign in to vote. It is absurd that we want to pass into law a statute which will say, even though this lady has voted for 50 straight years, that the people inside the polling place know for a fact who she is, that she will not be allowed to vote because she does not have a voter ID with her photograph on it. That is voter suppression if we allow that to become the standard by which we judge who can vote and who cannot vote in this Commonwealth. That is a pure and simple fact.

The Samuelson amendment seeks to address some of the worst aspects of this legislation by at least allowing our senior citizens who do not have such voter ID to be able to not have to show it since they are known by the people on the inside of the polling place taking down that information and because they have reached an age where they probably do not have a photo ID. That is a commonsense amendment.

If you do not want senior citizens to vote, vote against this amendment. If you do want senior citizens to have access to the ballot as they have earned by their years as American citizens working to make this place a better country, then vote for the Samuelson amendment. It is a commonsense amendment. It takes into consideration the fact that those working the polling place inside know their voters, particularly those who have been voting in the same precinct for 50-some years. Let us add a little bit of common sense to this debate and vote "yes" on the Samuelson amendment.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. McGEEHAN, from Philadelphia County for the remainder of the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

## CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Samuelson amendment.

What the Samuelson amendment attempts to do is to try and restore some constitutional rights to voters that would otherwise be taken away in this bill. I have heard people argue that, well, you know, you have to produce an ID in order to go buy alcohol. Nowhere in the Constitution do I see it is protected that I have a right under the Constitution to buy alcohol. It says, you know, if you want to buy cigarettes, you have got to produce an ID, but I do not see that anywhere in the Constitution. It says, if I want to write a check, I have to produce a photo ID, but it does not say that anywhere in the Constitution. What it does say in the Constitution is that I have a right to vote and that that should be free and unencumbered. And so this bill, which would spend \$10 million of taxpayer money trying to get them to jump through all sorts of hoops, takes away that right, and what the Samuelson amendment does is attempts to restore some of that.

Let me tell you why it is so important that we at least get the Samuelson amendment. For senior citizens, in particular, and for those of you who do not live in urban districts, let me tell you the majority of them walk to their polling places. So it is not like, well, if they are operating a vehicle, they need to have their driver's license with them anyway; they walk, and they walk to the grocery store and they walk to the dry cleaners and they walk to go vote. And when they walk out of their house, the first thing on their mind is not, do I have my photo ID with me? And so they are going to go out to vote like they have for the last 100 years walking to a polling place. Some of these people have voted for 50 or 60 years, and they are going to walk eight blocks and they are going to walk into the polling place and say, "Hello," to the person that is there that they know, and that person is going to say, "Where's your photo ID, Joe?" And they are going to go, "What do you mean where's my photo ID? I didn't think I needed one. I have voted here for 50 years." And the person at the polling place is going to say, "No, Joe; I'm sorry. You can't vote today. You've got to walk back home eight blocks and then you've got to walk back here eight more blocks after you found your photo ID, if you have one, if you want to vote."

But worse yet, a lot of those seniors, as we have heard, are going to have a hard time acquiring one of those, and the examples that have been given are you need to go down to the State office in your town, you need to do those kind of things. A lot of these people were not born in the State of Pennsylvania. So it is not just as simple as walking into their county courthouse and getting a copy of their birth certificate. Not

everyone still lives in the same town they were born in. Imagine if you were born in Hawaii, for example, especially before 1959. It was not even a State.

### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TURZAI. Mr. Speaker, point of order.

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

Mr. TURZAI. Sir, first of all, it is well beyond the pale of what the underlying amendment is, and in addition, it is designed to, really, incite, and inappropriate for a civil discussion. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman and will encourage the gentleman to keep his remarks confined to the substance of the amendment.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, that senior citizen that was born in Hawaii in 1958 would be adversely affected by this legislation if it were not for the Samuelson amendment. A lot of voters in my district were born in Puerto Rico. They are United States citizens. Try and get your birth certificate from Puerto Rico from 70 years ago; I dare you. Those people are disenfranchised without the Samuelson amendment.

And this notion that how is anybody going to know you are a senior citizen after voting in the same place for 10 or 20 or 30 years? Apparently, there are people that believe that I could walk into a voting place and say, "Hi, my name is Harriet Johnson," and the person behind the polling booth will go, "Oh; hi, Harriet. How are you doing?" And then I could sign Harriet's name, even though I have never signed it before in my life, looking at it upside down, and I could match it exactly. Those are the requirements that you have to go through now. Somebody knows you; you have to match their age and appearance. Those things are all in place right now, which is why we do not have voter fraud in the State of Pennsylvania.

And this Samuelson amendment is an attempt to try and ease the burden of trying to jump through another set of hoops in order to exercise these people's constitutional rights – not their corporate right to buy cigarettes, not their capitalist right to go buy liquor; their constitutional right to vote. And if you vote against the Samuelson amendment, you can count on it, you are taking away someone's constitutional right to vote. And if you do not believe it after, if this bill gets passed and gets put into law, we can start trotting these people in here and proving it to you after the fact, even though you cannot trot people in here who have committed voter fraud. So go ahead, take away their constitutional rights – but not on our watch.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Turzai.

Mr. TURZAI. Thank you.

*Baker v. Carr*, a seminal constitutional law case; one person, one vote. This particular underlying bill is designed to ensure the constitutional right of one person, one vote, and to prevent the manipulation such that an individual can cast more than a singular vote – no more, no less.

My parents are passed away, but I can assure you that like any of your parents or those of you who may yourself be over 62, they would have wanted to know that when they cast a vote, their singular vote, immigrants to this country, that it was a

one-person, one-vote standard and that their vote was not diluted by somebody who was able to utilize fraudulent ways such that they could cast more than one vote.

Photo indication, which we use in many areas, is not designed in any way to stifle anybody's constitutional right to vote. In fact, we want to encourage every citizen of this country to be able to vote and to exercise their constitutional prerogative, but we want to make sure that the principle enunciated in our United States Constitution and in *Baker v. Carr* – one person, one vote – that it is upheld.

Our Pennsylvania Constitution also says that "Elections shall be free and equal; and no power, civil or military, shall at any time interfere to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage." Now, please understand, somebody that cannot get an ID is able under this underlying legislation to get free ID, and that includes senior citizens. Also please understand that in current law and under the amendment by this good gentleman, that first-time voters over 62 have to show an ID.

The fact of the matter is, if you are disabled or you are bedridden, whether that is a senior citizen or whether it is somebody else, you can vote by absentee ballot, you are entitled to vote by absentee ballot. You do not need to get to the polling place and you do not need to show voter ID when you vote by absentee ballot.

Finally, if you are able to vote and get to the polling place, it is clearly a presumption that you can get a free ID. If you cannot, you may vote by absentee ballot, which has its own safeguards, if you are disabled or bedridden, and that certainly includes any senior citizen.

Every single senior citizen in this State should absolutely vote, and they do. My parents never missed an election, and they would have been glad to have shown ID as long as they knew that every single person had one person, one vote, so that we had free and equal and fair elections as demanded by our State Constitution and demanded by our Federal Constitution.

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. TURZAI. This is a sleight-of-hand amendment—

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DERMODY. We let it go on and on, but I believe we have strayed from the substance of the amendment, and I would ask that we be instructed to follow the amendment, please.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman for that comment and would remind the minority leader that we generally do let the two floor leaders drift a little farther from the subject than the other debaters but thanks the gentleman.

The gentleman, Mr. Turzai, is in order.

Mr. TURZAI. And I thank the minority leader.

The point being is that this is not an exception that is needed. The fact of the matter is, we are trying to protect all voters and the sanctity of their vote and that no exception is needed, and that this exception actually will do more harm than good to protecting the constitutional right of one person, one vote. Please vote "no."

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to respond first to two things that have been said. First of all, the gentleman from Butler insinuated, he said, actually, that we were insulting older voters by assuming that they were

not smart enough to do this. Well, let me tell the gentleman from Butler and anybody else who is thinking of voting against this amendment, the senior citizens were here; they were here. They were here at a press conference, they were here at a hearing, and they themselves said, this is too burdensome for us.

And let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I would not go back to my district and tell anybody over 62 that now you have to have voter ID. I would not do that, and I admire your courage, Mr. Speaker, over there, because you are going to have to do that now, and I sure as heck would not want to.

The second thing I want to stay is, we keep on talking here, or the ladies and gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, about photo IDs for getting alcohol, for buying cigarettes, for getting a check cashed. Mr. Speaker, no American ever died for the right to buy a drink, no American ever died for the right to cash a check, no American ever died for the right to smoke cigarettes. Americans have died for the right to vote, and a lot of them are senior citizens whose husbands and sons and wives and daughters and mothers and fathers died for the right to vote. So you go tell them they cannot vote now without an ID. I am not going to do that.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. Thomas.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited that we have a young man sitting up front listening to this conversation. He probably could not get a better education than the one that he is getting this afternoon, and I want him to understand just really what is at stake.

And, Mr. Speaker, in reference to amendment 2106, I ask every resident, every resident of this great State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I want you to call, write, e-mail, do whatever you need to do to get in contact with the Honorable Samuelson, State Representative Samuelson, and I want you to say to Mr. Samuelson, thank you, sir, for amendment 2106; thank you. And here is why you need to thank Representative Samuelson, because, Mr. Speaker, number one, we are only having this conversation because of this implication that there is fraud in the electoral process and therefore we need to have voter ID in order to remove all remnants of fraud. Mr. Speaker, Representative Samuelson is saying, I do not think that residents of Pennsylvania who are 62 years and over are participating in voter fraud and therefore they should be exempted, exempted from this egregious legislative prescription. So, Mr. Speaker, thank you, sir, for saying to people 62 years and over, you are not committing voter fraud and therefore you should be exempted.

Secondly, I ask good residents of Pennsylvania to e-mail, write, talk, send a little bird with a note and say to the Honorable Samuelson, thank you that you have filed—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

I have said this several times over the course of this session that it is improper for members to reference members by their names.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I try to indulge and caution, so I will again caution the gentleman that it is improper to reference members by their name. It is either their district, their home county, or

some other euphemism. Please refrain from using the individuals' names.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What district do you represent, Representative? What county do you represent?

The SPEAKER. Northampton County.

Mr. THOMAS. Northampton County. Residents of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that are 62 years and over, e-mail, write, call, stop him on the street, the Representative from Northampton County, and say to him, thank you, thank you for filing amendment 2106 which exempts people who are 62 years and over from participating in this madness implication that they are involved in voter fraud.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget, the last time I checked there are a whole bunch of folks in here that are 62 years and over that work hard every day, all day, working here and then taking care of their family. Many of them, along with others, know that the United States of America by and through the Patriot Act will be implementing the REAL ID law in another year or so. So, Mr. Speaker, in another year or so, under the REAL ID law, this alleged voter ID requirement in this crazy bill will become moot, unnecessary, and in direct conflict with the Federal REAL ID law, which will be the only identification that is permissible to entering Federal buildings or permitting participation in Federal activities like voting.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are getting ready to spend \$10 million to come up with a voter ID that is going to be in direct conflict with Federal law in another year or so. We want to thank this gentleman from Northampton County for thinking about the people of Pennsylvania that are 62 years and over and exempting them, cutting them out. I wish he could include me in this so I would not have to participate in this madness. The gentleman is trying to ask me my age. I will talk to you when I sit down.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, we have got to vote "yes" on amendment 2106 because, number one, we believe that if you are 62 years and over living in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and have voted, you do not need this additional hurdle in order to participate. And, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman from Northampton County believes – and I know; I support him – that people 62 years and over are not creating any voter fraud in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I have not heard of one case where 62 years and over participated in voter fraud; I have not seen that, but the legs upon which the amendment exists in response to the bill sits on this implication that there is voter fraud out there and therefore we need to do something.

Mr. Speaker, 62 and over, they are not perpetuating that kind of madness, and if you are 62 years and over in Pennsylvania, e-mail, call, stop, walk, run, jump, thank the gentleman from Northampton County for amendment 2106.

Thank you, sir. Vote "yes" on amendment 2106.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Cutler.

Mr. CUTLER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This afternoon we have heard a lot of references to rights, both constitutional and statutory. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, the State always puts reasonable safeguards in place to exercise any rights.

Mr. Speaker, we heard earlier that no American has ever died for the right to purchase cigarettes, to buy a drink, cash a check, travel, or even use a credit card, but, Mr. Speaker, it is true that Americans have died for the Second Amendment. Mr. Speaker, this State has requirements on the Second Amendment for me to exercise my constitutional right of self-protection. Mr. Speaker, the truth is, when I chose to exercise that right, I had to go to the courthouse; I had to pay for my background check; I had to get my photo taken. I had to pay for that myself. I had two trips, two trips, Mr. Speaker, to the courthouse, and yet there was no discussion of subverting my rights under the Second Amendment. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that is a constitutional right guaranteed by the Constitution and upheld by the United States Supreme Court, and yet the Commonwealth has put reasonable safeguards in place to ensure that that right is exercised responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I have joined the gentleman from Northampton on some votes where it was only he and I and a few of our very few friends, half a dozen of us, I might say, but this one time I must disagree with his proposal in this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is, as drafted, it violates the equal part of our elections that was so eloquently quoted earlier, Mr. Speaker. Our elections are supposed to be fair and equal. Mr. Speaker, the bill as drafted is applied evenly, but if we start carving out exceptions, I think we need to at least be intellectually honest and say at that point we are treating different subsets of society differently. Mr. Speaker, that is not constitutional. That is why I believe this amendment should be opposed.

Mr. Speaker, as the Commonwealth, we put reasonable safeguards in place, and I recognize the opposition will say that exercising the Second Amendment right has an impact on the citizens around us, has an impact on the safety and well-being of our community. Mr. Speaker, I would offer that legally casting a vote does the very same thing. As the majority leader pointed out in *Baker v. Carr*: one person, one vote. Mr. Speaker, if we lose the integrity of the voting system and the people do not believe it, they will soon question the results, and, Mr. Speaker, when they question the results, we have far greater problems on our hands.

We must, we must verify the integrity of the system. I believe that the gentleman's proposal that he has offered and contained in this bill adequately and fairly puts the same requirements in place for everyone. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I regretfully will oppose the proposed amendment and urge the bill to be moved under the original intent by the original maker. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Clinton County, Mr. Hanna.

Mr. HANNA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just to clarify one thing for the gentleman from Lancaster: I have exercised my right to bear arms my entire life, and I did not have to go to the courthouse at all to protect that right to bear arms. I think he is mixing up the constitutional right to bear arms with the right to carry a concealed weapon.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of amendment A02106. Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill claims to be about keeping people from voting twice. In reality, the effect of this bill is to

keep people from voting at all. It is not about voter fraud. The maker of the bill cannot point to any voter fraud, and he certainly cannot point to any fraud by senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the members to read the amendment. It is simply four lines long: "An elector, other than an elector who appears to vote in that election district for the first time, who is over sixty-two...years of age is exempt from the provisions of subsection (a)." It could not be more simple. It is simply protecting senior citizens who voted in the same district from having to carry that ID. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple amendment. It is an amendment that I support, and I would ask all of us to support it.

Some of the statistics that argue in favor of the Samuelson amendment include studies that show as many as 18 percent of Americans over age 65 who do not have a photo ID – 18 percent. That equates to approximately 340,000 senior citizens in Pennsylvania. Think about that, Mr. Speaker, 340,000 senior citizens in Pennsylvania that do not have a photo ID. These are the people you will be disenfranchising if you do not support the Samuelson amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the common ID for a senior citizen to have is his AARP card or her Medicare card or their Social Security card. None of those IDs has a photo. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we protect our senior citizens and that we support the Samuelson amendment and vote against the bill, but vote for the Samuelson amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Bishop.

Ms. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support amendment 2106 for these reasons. Number one, if we do not support 2106, we will turn back the hands of time for voting at a time when people were not allowed to vote at all. I want to say that the largest, most dedicated, sincere group of people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania when it comes to voting are the senior citizens, and the largest amount of people from Philadelphia who turn out to vote are the senior citizens. Unless we have amendment 2106, these people will be denied the opportunity to vote, because these are people who do not have the kind of identity that we are requiring that they have, but they know how to go to the polls and vote. Some of them go in wheelchairs and some of them I have seen on walkers, but they make it to the polls to vote.

And the one thing we do not seem to understand, they are known at those polls. They have voted there all of their lives. So they are not strangers voting there. All of the people who keep the records know who they are. They are on the records. Everybody greets them by their first name whenever they walk in, and if a stranger walks in, they know. So I do not know where all of the voter fraud is coming from. It is certainly not coming from those who are keeping watch over the polls when people go out to vote in Philadelphia.

So I think what we are doing, again, is we are discriminating against the largest voting group of people by requiring – and let us call a spade a spade, what we are really doing is trying to avoid the heaviest turnout of people that we have. And I am going to say to this House: You are voting against your mothers, you are voting against your fathers, against your neighbors,

against your grandmothers – everyone who does not have the identification, the papers, that you are requiring, you will have to answer to them when you run again. Believe you me, they remember to vote, and they will be there to vote against you someday, somehow when they find out what you have done to them.

So I am saying, 2106 makes it possible for all of those people to go, all the senior citizens to go to the polls and vote without all of the red tape that we are now placing upon them. All of the difficulties that some of them would have to go through to get what is necessary to vote here are unnecessary. So please support amendment 2106 so that we can move on to the business of voting against the bill when it comes up. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Kortz, for the second time.

Mr. KORTZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do rise for the second time to support this amendment, and I cannot help but ponder this conversation and I cannot believe we are actually going through this, sir, to be quite honest with you, because we truly are disenfranchising the seniors with this. And I would hope that common sense would prevail tonight when we take this vote.

I would also suggest that, you know, our seniors are our Greatest Generation. We all know that. And this generation, many of them went to war for us and many of them are passed on now, okay? But they did stand up and defeat countries that wanted to absolutely destroy us, and our veterans do that same thing today. And when you look over the history of the United States, sir, over 43 million people rose to the occasion to defend this country, and over 1 million of them paid the ultimate sacrifice. And part of that sacrifice and what they defended was our way of life, our Constitution and our right to vote, and I cannot believe that today we are going to try to put some obstacles in front of them to that and suppress the right to vote. I guess I am just in shock that we are having this conversation.

I understand where the gentleman from Butler is coming from, but, I mean, this amendment to help the seniors to vote and for us to do this to them is not only in my opinion disenfranchisement but also a form of disrespect. So I would ask everybody to really think about this, put some common sense into the vote, and let us vote "yes" for the Samuelson amendment. Thank you, sir.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Butler, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just before the prime sponsor of the amendment speaks, I wanted to reiterate my opposition to amendment 2106. The objective of this legislation, which the amendment would severely alter, requiring that those over 62 would not have to present the photo ID, it would really cut to the heart, as one of the speakers from the other side of the aisle had said, it would cut to the heart of this legislation, and that is to ensure that we stop fraud.

Mr. Speaker, in 2008 the Philadelphia deputy city commissioner, Fred Voigt, reported that ACORN (Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now) had submitted

approximately 8,000 fraudulent voter registration forms – 8,000 fraudulent registration forms submitted in 2008, Mr. Speaker. Of those, 1500 involved apparent criminality and were referred to the D.A. for investigation. Thousands—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend; the gentleman will suspend.

## POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the lady, Ms. Josephs, rise?

Ms. JOSEPHS. The subject matter of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is voting on election day. It is not voter registration. The Speaker is talking about voter registration. Not germane.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the lady and would suggest that some of the debate, as I have listened to it, questioned whether or not the prime sponsor of the bill could bring in witnesses that would testify to voter fraud, and given the give-and-take of this debate, I think he is somewhat responding to the previous debate. And I will monitor it, but I do not think he is too far off what some of the other debate said.

For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Thomas, rise?

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you for your wise counsel, but there is a difference between voter registration and voter participation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order. If you want to challenge a ruling of the Chair, which I really have not made a ruling in the formal sense. I appreciate the comments. I will monitor the gentleman's debate closely.

The general rule, for the information of the members is, once a subject is open, it kind of is open for both. So at this point in time, I am not sure that he has changed the debate away from the amendment, but we will urge the member to stay on the subject of the amendment.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I mentioned the fraudulent voter registrations is exactly what allows fraudulent votes to be cast. The report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform from September 2005, which was a bipartisan commission – you would think by today's debate that this issue does not have bipartisan support, but it does. The Carter-Baker Commission that actually went through and studied this – it actually came out in support of photo ID for voting – had said that "Invalid voter files, which contain ineligible, duplicate, fictional, or deceased voters, are an invitation to fraud." So when you submit 8,000 voter registrations that are fraudulent, you are opening up potentially 8,000 opportunities for fictional individuals to be voting, especially when they are not showing photo ID.

And if you look at the voter registrations, if you look at voter turnout, the average age of the average voter is up there in years, that are some of our more seasoned citizens, and some of the individuals that would be perpetrating fraud may very well be over 62 years of age. So this legislation that is being proposed to this bill, the amendment, 2106, would really cut out the heart of the opportunity that we have before us, which is to ensure that when someone casts a vote in Pennsylvania, and they are a law-abiding citizen going about exercising their civic responsibility, their constitutional right to cast a vote, that that right is being ensured, that that right is being protected, that we are ensuring that the election process has integrity, that we are



not going to allow groups like ACORN to submit 8,000 registration forms that can be used in that manner, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of comments about disenfranchising voters, and I think we have a lot of studies that are out there from other States that have enacted this already. The findings of a 2008 American University Center for Democracy and Election Management survey of three States that required photo ID discredited this argument totally, and it found that 99 percent of the voters in the three States possessed the proper ID. And in Indiana, the State that had the most stringent photo ID law, only .3 percent of the voters did not have the necessary ID, and this was out of testimony that we had received from testifiers at our committee that that information was delivered.

Mr. Speaker, I think the report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform, the Jimmy Carter-James Baker Commission, had said it best when they said, "The electoral system cannot inspire public confidence if no safeguards exist to deter or detect fraud or to confirm the identity of voters. Photo IDs currently are needed to board a plane, enter federal buildings, and cash a check. Voting is equally important."

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. METCALFE. And, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Lancaster—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

You might be drifting off onto the bill and not focused on the subject of the specific amendment before us. We would appreciate if you would stay on the amendment.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment to allow individuals that are above 62 years of age to not be required to show photo ID, the gentleman from Lancaster had spelled it out perfectly clear. If you are above 62 years of age, to exercise your constitutional right to bear arms in the form of a carry permit, you have to have photo ID. So we already require that for that. And it has been found by the courts to be constitutional, but we would require it to do so for voting also, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for the members' opposition and "no" vote to amendment 2106.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree with the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Northampton, Mr. Samuelson, for the second time.

Mr. SAMUELSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to encourage a "yes" vote on amendment 2106. I have heard a lot of things said in this debate this afternoon. The prime sponsor of the bill said that this amendment, which would exempt senior citizens from the requirements of showing a photo ID at the polls every single time they vote for the rest of their lives, he said exempting the senior citizens was an insult to the Greatest Generation. I think passing this bill without this amendment, that would be the insult to the Greatest Generation.

Many comments were made; I know folks say that, well, even though this bill requires an extra trip to PENNDOT to get the photo ID or an extra trip to the county courthouse to validate your vote 6 days after you have actually cast your vote, well, cannot seniors get those shared rides? You know, the county has a program. It is supported by State funding. Well, guess what? Look in the budget. Governor Corbett is cutting the amount of

funding for State shared rides by \$2 1/2 million. Are we saying there are less people who could avail themselves of that opportunity?

A couple of the speakers talked about fraudulent cases. Well, the State Government Committee heard testimony – there was just a recent statement there were 8,000 cases. Well, in testimony before the State Government Committee of this House of Representatives, the number that were prosecuted and convicted was actually four – four cases over a 10-year period. So is the majority party in this House, is the Republican Party saying that because there were four cases over the last 10 years, you are going to make every senior citizen in Pennsylvania a suspect, a suspect of voter fraud, and make them jump through hoops to exercise their precious American right to vote? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

One of our speakers talked about, the gentleman from York said that you need a photo ID to fill out your property tax and rent rebate application. Well, actually, on the property tax and rent rebate application, you need a photo ID the first time to prove that you are 65 years old. When you sign up for that rebate the next year and the next year and the next year, the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue knows that if you were 65 years old one year, the following year you are still going to be at least 65. So guess what? The Pennsylvania Department of Revenue does not require a photo ID for the second, the third, the fourth time you fill out your property tax and rent rebate.

Yes, you need a photo ID the first time you sign up for the PACE card, but you do not need to show a photo ID every single time you go to the pharmacy. This bill would require you show a photo ID every single time you vote, and it would take away people's right to vote.

The gentleman from Butler earlier in this debate said, in the Indiana example, there is not a single case of someone in Indiana who did not have a photo ID or could not get a photo ID. Well, guess what? The minority whip of Pennsylvania said there are statistics that show 18 percent of senior citizens do not have a photo ID; you and I can do the math, and that equates to about 340,000 people.

In testimony, in discussion before our own State Government Committee, I think it was the chairperson from Butler who said, it is only 4 percent of the State that does not have a photo ID. Well, guess what? Four percent of all the people who cast ballots in the Governor's race just last year, that is over 160,000 people, by the gentleman's own admission – 160,000 people. That is not a small number. That is a significant number that would need to go get a photo ID, maybe at PENNDOT, maybe by filling out an affidavit down at the courthouse – extra steps, extra barriers, barricades to the right to vote.

The gentleman from Lancaster brought up the concealed weapons permit that he obtained at the Lancaster Courthouse. I hate to break the news to him, but that weapons permit is issued by a county, and under the gentleman from Butler's bill, county-issued photo IDs are not an acceptable form of photo ID for the right to vote. The bill specifically says you need a State-issued photo ID or a Federal-issued photo ID. So that concealed weapons permit from any of our 67 counties would not count to show your identity for the right to vote.

During this debate I have heard people compare the right to vote, some of my Republican colleagues have compared the right to vote to using a credit card, or buying liquor at the State

liquor store, or buying cigarettes. Well, the right to vote is a very precious right in this country, guaranteed by our Constitution. In fact, when the Constitution guarantees the right to vote and expands the right to vote, it uses very strong language. Just listen to the language of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution, when people of color got the right to vote in 1870: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." Strong words: "shall not be denied or abridged."

Similar language was used two generations later when women got the right to vote. In fact, we had a resolution on this House floor honoring the 90th anniversary of women's suffrage just last year: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex" – the Nineteenth Amendment, which passed in 1920.

Well, what if a person is 65 years old, a woman, a person of color, and they go to vote. In fact, let me not talk about a hypothetical person; let me talk about an individual that was honored on this House floor just last year – the late great Dorothy Height, who passed away last year at the age of 98 and was honored by HR 771, which passed in September. She was active in the civil rights movement throughout her life. She was active in the World Youth Conference at the side of Eleanor Roosevelt. She was on stage when Martin Luther King gave his speech, his "I Have a Dream" speech in 1963, and she was 98 years old. If she had gone to the polling place without a photo ID, her right to vote, based on her color, was protected by the Fifteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Her right to vote, based on her sex, was protected by the Nineteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. But if this bill passes without this amendment, her right to vote could have been denied because she forgot her photo ID. Just imagine, a precious right to vote shall not be abridged or denied, by the language of our Constitution, and yet this bill without this amendment puts additional hurdles.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there are senior citizens who do not have photo ID right now, and we should not be asking them at the polling place, do you have your photo ID? Do you have your papers? There are people who do not have their photo ID who might live in a nursing home who would lose the right to vote if they had to jump through the hoops this bill puts forward. There are people who do not have a passport who might lose the right to vote. There are people who do not drive anymore, people who cannot take that extra trip to PENNDOT, people who cannot take that extra trip to the county courthouse. Their right to vote should not be denied or abridged, just like our Constitution says, just like our Constitution says to this day. Because a senior citizen does not have a photo ID, we shall not, we should not deny or abridge their right to vote.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, which would exempt people over the age of 62 from this legislation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—87

Barbin	DeLissio	Kavulich	Preston
Bishop	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Boyle, B.	DePasquale	Kirkland	Readshaw
Boyle, K.	Dermody	Kortz	Roebuck
Bradford	DeWeese	Kotik	Sabatina
Brennan	Donatucci	Kula	Sainato
Briggs	Evans, D.	Longietti	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Mahoney	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Frankel	Mann	Santoni
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Shapiro
Buxton	Galloway	Matzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	George	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Carroll	Gergely	Mullery	Staback
Cohen	Gibbons	Mundy	Sturla
Conklin	Goodman	Murphy	Thomas
Costa, D.	Haluska	Myers	Vitali
Costa, P.	Hanna	Neuman	Waters
Cruz	Harhai	O'Brien, M.	Wheatley
Curry	Harkins	Parker	White
Daley	Hornaman	Pashinski	Williams
Davidson	Johnson	Payton	Youngblood
Davis	Josephs	Petrarca	

#### NAYS—110

Adolph	Farry	Lawrence	Reese
Aument	Fleck	Maher	Reichley
Baker	Gabler	Major	Roae
Barrar	Geist	Maloney	Rock
Bear	Gillen	Marshall	Ross
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Gingrich	Masser	Saylor
Boback	Godshall	Metcalfe	Scavello
Boyd	Grell	Metzgar	Schroder
Brooks	Grove	Miccarelli	Simmons
Brown, R.	Hackett	Micozzie	Sonney
Causar	Hahn	Millard	Stephens
Christiana	Harhart	Miller	Stern
Clymer	Harper	Milne	Stevenson
Cox	Harris	Moul	Swanger
Creighton	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Culver	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Neill	Tobash
Day	Hess	Oberlander	Toepel
Delozier	Hickernell	Payne	Toohil
Denlinger	Hutchinson	Peifer	Truitt
DiGirolamo	Kampf	Petri	Turzai
Dunbar	Kauffman	Pickett	Vereb
Ellis	Keller, F.	Pyle	Vulakovich
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	Watson
Evankovich	Killion	Quinn	
Evans, J.	Knowles	Rapp	Smith, S.,
Everett	Krieger	Reed	Speaker

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—6

Deasy	McGeehan	Perry	Wagner
Gerber	O'Brien, D.		

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

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

Mr. **DeWEESE** offered the following amendment  
No. **A02108**:

Amend Bill, page 3, line 17, by striking out "is" and inserting  
are  
Amend Bill, page 3, line 18, by striking out "A SUBSECTION"  
and inserting  
subsections  
Amend Bill, page 9, by inserting between lines 7 and 8  
(a.5) An elector, other than an elector who appears to vote in that  
election district for the first time, who is a veteran of any of the  
following services shall be exempt from the provisions of subsection  
(a):  
(1) Active and reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air  
Force, Marine Corps or Coast Guard of the United States.  
(2) The National Guard and the Pennsylvania National Guard.  
(3) The United States Merchant Marine.  
The elector shall establish the elector's status under this subsection by  
signing an affidavit, on a form prescribed by the Secretary of the  
Commonwealth, swearing or affirming that the elector is a veteran of  
one of the enumerated services. The county board of elections shall  
supply each election district with a sufficient supply of such forms.

\* \* \*

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

The **SPEAKER**. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the  
gentleman, Mr. DeWeese.

Mr. DeWEESE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment simply augments the effort of the honorable  
gentleman from Butler. Notwithstanding the fact that I have a  
visceral detestation for this legislative initiative, adumbrated by  
many of the reasons just enunciated, there is no doubt, there is  
no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this measure will abridge, to use the  
words of the man from Northampton, and more poignantly, the  
words of our constitutional forebearers. If the honorable  
gentleman does not get this amendment of mine, as he did not  
get the one that preceded me, this melancholy proposal will  
keep on going down the proverbial road, and the count, the  
mathematics of the ensuing weeks and months and years, will  
reveal that this debate, this debate which indicated that fewer  
senior citizens would vote and that fewer Pennsylvanians would  
vote, will indeed come true.

Now, as the amendment process moves forward, it was my  
decision to engage my honorable colleague, a veteran of the  
United States Army, as a veteran of the United States Marines.  
And as I look up and see other veterans in this room and the  
honorable service of Colonel Perry and a variety of others,  
I boiled down my focus to the proverbial nub. And the nub of  
this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to allow veterans to walk into  
their polling place devoid of all of the extravagant hoops, as the  
gentleman from Northampton said, and vote.

If you are in Franklin Township east, and I know that area  
well. It is terra incognita. I should know it well; I have been  
whipped there many times. It is where I vote. Those people  
know everybody that walks into that old township shed, and  
they know who was in the Army and the Navy and the U.S.  
Marines, and they know who was in the Air Force, the Coast  
Guard, and the Merchant Marines. So, honorable Speaker, what

this amendment would do is to at least partially, at least a  
modicum of sanitizing to this insanity that we are going through  
today. The gentleman's bill will limit the number of men and  
women who vote in our State by tens and tens of thousands as  
the years roll forward. This would at least protect those  
audacious souls who either went in harm's way or donned the  
uniform of the United States Armed Forces.

I would ask for an affirmative vote, and I would ask the  
United States Army veteran to my immediate left to embrace  
me and to not allow all of the Republicans in this room to once  
again vote en masse in a way that seems to me inexplicable.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is, will the House agree to the  
amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from  
Butler, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I always appreciate the gentleman from Greene  
County's passion, especially his passion for veterans that we  
both share. And in the beginning of his comments, I almost  
thought if his amendment was agreed to or if I could actually  
convince him it was not needed, then he might actually support  
the legislation, and then he torpedoed those thoughts toward the  
end of his comments, that he does not seem to support the  
legislation even if we would accept such an amendment.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose amendment 2108 by the  
gentleman from Greene County. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran,  
when I first left the United States Army and was ETS'd  
(expiration, term of service) out and was put on Inactive  
Reserve, I had received what our staff had referenced here,  
which was where it says a person who is discharged from the  
military, not retired, is issued a pink-colored photo ID which  
lists them as "Active Duty Reserve." So I had one of those cards  
for a short time, and if need be, if I would have voted and voted  
in a State that required it, I could have used that ID, as a  
veteran. Also, other veterans, actually our active service  
military men and women, they have a picture ID as well that  
they can use, because it would be a Federal ID and accepted  
under this legislation that is attempted to be amended here  
through the gentleman's amendment. Military retirees also get a  
photo ID so that they can exercise it and use their base  
privileges for PX (post exchange) and commissary, for those  
retirement benefits. So those active duty individuals who have  
put the years in and retired from the military have a photo  
ID issued to them by the Federal government that would be  
acceptable.

The veterans that would not have a photo ID from the  
Federal government are in the status that I am currently in,  
which is having served my active duty time, also my Inactive  
Reserve time, and now not having an ID any longer because  
I am totally discharged from the U.S. Army. And those  
individuals that would show up at the poll, unlike in the  
gentleman from Greene County's precinct where it seems like  
everyone knows everyone, I think across the State I think many  
are questioning, if they are viewing this debate, how is it that  
the judge of elections, how do they know when an individual  
shows up that they are a veteran other than somebody telling  
them they are a veteran? And if they are just going based on  
their telling them that they are a veteran, then would that not  
lead to the same type of fraud possibly being perpetrated that  
we are trying to prevent with the underlying legislation,  
Mr. Speaker?

So, Mr. Speaker, this amendment is flawed. We do, in my bill, in 934 we do accept IDs for veterans if they are retired military or if they are on Inactive Reserve, or if they are current Active Reserve or active military, they have a photo ID. So other individuals that are veterans would have to go through the same steps that every other citizen has to, and as a veteran, I think I should have to. And I believe that the majority of my fellow veterans that are out there that have served our nation to defend our freedom believe that they should do the same to protect the right of every law-abiding citizen who casts a legitimate vote, to ensure that vote is counted and not cast out by a fraudulently cast vote, to ensure that our electoral system has integrity, Mr. Speaker.

We have to defeat amendment 2108. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the first place, there is really no fraud. We did some research. We looked at 20 million votes cast over the last six election cycles. There were four people who were prosecuted and convicted. We wrote the district attorney and the Justice Department, the district attorney of Allegheny County, because there were allegations made at the hearing to which the gentleman from Butler just referred. And let me say, the people who came to the hearing, for the most part, although they had organizations attached to their names, told us they were speaking for themselves alone. Of course their organizations have a reputation to uphold. They are not going to allege fraud when it does not exist, because it does not exist.

Let me just say, there is no American who died or is serving in the Middle East now for the right to do any of the kinds of things that have been compared to the right to vote, except possibly the right to bear arms, which does seem to be a constitutional right; I accept that, because that is what the Supreme Court said.

I, again—

The SPEAKER. Will the lady suspend.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Saccone, seek to raise a point of order?

Mr. SACCONE. Yes, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, please.

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

Mr. SACCONE. Mr. Speaker, this is not on the amendment about dealing with veterans. This is back on the issue of voter fraud, and I think it is far afield from the amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The Speaker would simply ask members to stay focused on the amendment, which deals with exemption for military personnel.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The lady may proceed.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am going to support this amendment, because I am not going to go home and say to some person who came back to this country without a leg, without an arm, without lung capacity, perhaps without the eyesight that he or she left with, I am not going to say to that veteran, you have got to show something before you can vote.

I certainly hope some of the ladies and gentlemen on the other side understand that their veterans are not going to care for this very much either. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lehigh County, Mr. Day.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the amendment stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of my questions is about why you selected to write your amendment the way you did, and I want to ask the question as follows: The underlying bill either protects voters and the system, or I believe many people on your side of the aisle believe that it does not protect the system and I think many people on our side believe that it protects the integrity of the system. So I think that is what it comes down to, and my question is, does your amendment only choose to protect one class of Pennsylvanians?

Mr. DeWEESE. Mr. Speaker, when my honorable colleague from Butler and his battalion decided to treat those people that vote by absentee differently than the rest of the body politic, and the gentleman from Lancaster, the young barrister, said a little while ago that everything had to be equal or it would not be constitutional – I would dispute that, although I would obviously say that the gentleman's education is superlative in the law – but if you are going to take care of absentee ballot folks one way and everybody else another way, and you have all agreed to it, at least your side of the aisle has agreed to it, then what I am saying to you is, this amendment is designed for veterans, many of whom, from the Vietnam era and now, because those boys and young women coming home from Afghanistan and Iraq right now have a higher number of unemployed than their peers in the national demographic. Some of these folks have had it pretty rough, and if they come in to vote, and they are not a retired person – the gentleman from Butler has made it clear that if you have that retired ID or that active ID, then you are okay – but the masses, 80 percent, 85 percent, I do not know what the percent would be but it would be overwhelming, are just like the gentleman from Butler and myself – 3 years active, 3 years Inactive Reserve, were in and out of the system. That is the way it has been for generations. Those people that came back from Vietnam, as well as the people coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan, in our Pennsylvania Guard, in our Reserves, and in our active forces, once they are out for a year or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5, if they were to go in and vote and they sign an affidavit that they are a veteran, and Mrs. Bafuffna behind the little cardboard table at the Franklin Township Grange said, "Oh, I remember when

Charlie went off to the Army" – you folks, God bless you, are coming up with a national answer to the Republican platform. This is ridiculous. This whole dialogue is ridiculous. Four cases out of 20 million votes cast—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

I believe you were responding to a specific question. You maybe went on beyond the answer.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your answer to my question, and I appreciate what you said about the absentee voter process, which is a completely different way to vote than walking into our local voter poll.

I would echo what the Speaker of the House just mentioned. I am attempting to engage in dialogue with another member who holds equally esteemed our veterans, and I would appreciate if you would try to stay focused for my behalf on the question, because then we could have a better—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman—

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question, if he chooses.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Do you seek to further interrogate?

Mr. DAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker, my next question is about your understanding of the absentee process. Is it separate and distinct in the way that it verifies each voter that is casting a vote?

Mr. DeWEESE. Well, the absentee process, to the best of my knowledge, has nothing to do with my amendment.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, you brought that up as—

Mr. DeWEESE. And you admonished me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman— Both gentlemen will suspend.

Mr. DeWEESE. My friend.

The SPEAKER. Did you say that in a wholesome and manly way?

The gentleman from Lehigh is recognized under interrogation. The gentleman, Mr. DeWeese, from Greene County is standing for interrogation. The Speaker would encourage the questions to be direct and the answers to be equally direct.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On that answer that you gave to the first question, I believe it was separate and distinct classes. I am glad you raised that point. I am glad we had a chance to make that point here today.

Mr. Speaker, would you believe that the underlying bill protects veterans or does not protect veterans?

Mr. DeWEESE. I would respond to the gentleman from the Lehigh Valley with the answer that it does not protect them to the degree that many of us on our side of the aisle would wish. We are, with this amendment, focusing on men and women who have donned the uniform of the United States Armed Forces and who may have been out of the service for a year or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 and did not have their ID with them. They could sign an affidavit. We are just trying to make it easier for veterans to vote.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the class of voters between the ages of 18 and 25, do you not believe they should be protected as well?

Mr. DeWEESE. Of course, and we will try to introduce amendments that will protect them also.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on the amendment, please?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order on the amendment.

Mr. DAY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I outlined at the beginning of my first question in interrogation that I believe there is just a difference in opinion of protecting the individual voter and protecting the voting process. The most important thing is if we are going to have a system that we all can believe in, that we have a system that we verify that the people that are voting actually are supposed to be voting, and I believe that the underlying bill does that equitably and that this amendment, therefore, takes out veterans and, in my opinion, does not protect veterans, and let me illustrate this way.

When I go into a bank that I have an account with money in the bank, I walk over to the teller, and the teller says, "Could I have your identification?" And the first thing I say is, I say thank you, because there is a little thing that happens, and as a matter of fact, it happens mostly to our seniors, called identity theft. So this underlying bill that this amendment would weaken, in my opinion, this underlying bill would protect that without this amendment. So when I say thank you to the teller, the teller says to me, why do you say thank you? Most people expect me to know who they are and like they are the king of the area and just give access to all their money to whoever would walk in and say that they are me.

I look at this underlying bill the same exact way. I look at this underlying bill that there is voter fraud many times; there are many different ways to commit voter fraud – create people who are not there, but also you can take people's identity and vote on their behalf. You can vote with them not even ever showing up at the polls, by committing fraud that way.

Mr. Speaker, to me, the underlying bill protects me, a voter, protects people in my district, and it protects seniors and veterans. Therefore, I am going to ask for a "no" vote on the amendment to keep the underlying bill as it is and wonder out loud that after we bring up an amendment on seniors and veterans, what is next? The only thing I can think about would be puppies. So I do not know how we could protect them with an amendment that way, but I urge all my colleagues to vote against this amendment. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Westmoreland County, Mr. Krieger.

Mr. KRIEGER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish I could speak as eloquently as the gentleman from Greene County, and I do honor his service. I think I have actually had perhaps the chance to remind him I am a Navy veteran, and that the Marine Corps is a part of the Department of the Navy.

The SPEAKER. Do not encourage him too much.

Mr. KRIEGER. He has always had a pretty good rejoinder to that comment. But I would say this: There is not a veteran that I know, not a veteran I have served with, that has fought, that has served to obtain special rights. If they believe in anything, they believe in equal protection under the law, that we all should be treated equally. What this amendment does is to make some people treated other than equally; in this case, veterans.

I think it is exactly the opposite of what they fought for. I do not think there is a veteran that I know that would not be happy to show an ID to establish the integrity of the system, and that is exactly what we are talking about. We want to make sure that the system is such that we can trust its results. Many of our constituents do not trust the results.

So I think if you want to honor veterans today, vote against this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

Does the gentleman, Mr. Saccone, seek recognition on the amendment? The gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Saccone, is recognized on the amendment.

Mr. SACCONI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As a veteran, I would say that I am not averse to showing an ID card. In fact, as a veteran, as a military member, I am used to having to show an ID card for almost any situation or any circumstance. Military people are accustomed to that. And as a veteran, I am proud to defend the integrity of the system that I fought to protect, and showing an ID card is not disenfranchising; it actually protects the right of every voter to have one man and one vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Greene County, Mr. DeWeese, for the second time.

Mr. DeWEESE. I will be brief.

Just to the gentleman from Westmoreland County who politely and appropriately reminded me that the United States Marine Corps is a department of the Navy, I would say what I have said to many sailors over the years: It is the men's department. That is as old as the proverbial hills or the briny main.

In conclusion, in conclusion to the gentleman from Westmoreland, and maybe elliptically to the honorable colleague who has just joined us this term, the gentleman from Allegheny who preceded me at the microphone, there is a veterans' preference for our National Guard and our active duty and our veterans. It is in our health care, and it is ensconced in statute. It is in our education opportunities, and it is ensconced in statute. So for anyone to say that all they want is something equal, well, that is okay if that is what you believe, but you gainsay veterans' preference, and veterans' preference has been a part of the warp and woof of this body since time immemorial.

I will offer the final observation. I can count the votes. In American colloquialisms, one of the oldest is, it is time to quit beating a dead horse, and colloquialisms are enshrined in our language because they mean something. We do not have the votes, but this is not an appropriate way to do business in this chamber, and because of this proposal, fewer Pennsylvanians will be voting as the years roll forward.

Thank you very much, and I ask for my Republican colleagues to have a change of heart and to support the DeWeese amendment. Thank you.

On the question recurring,

Will the House agree to the amendment?

The following roll call was recorded:

#### YEAS—87

Barbin	DeLissio	Kavulich	Preston
Bishop	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl
Boyle, B.	DePasquale	Kirkland	Readshaw
Boyle, K.	Dermody	Kortz	Roebuck
Bradford	DeWeese	Kotik	Sabatina
Brennan	Donatucci	Kula	Sainato
Briggs	Evans, D.	Longietti	Samuelson
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Mahoney	Santarsiero
Brownlee	Frankel	Mann	Santoni
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Shapiro
Buxton	Galloway	Matzie	Smith, K.
Caltagirone	George	Mirabito	Smith, M.
Carroll	Gergely	Mullery	Staback
Cohen	Gibbons	Mundy	Sturla
Conklin	Goodman	Murphy	Thomas
Costa, D.	Haluska	Myers	Vitali
Costa, P.	Hanna	Neuman	Waters
Cruz	Harhai	O'Brien, M.	Wheatley
Curry	Harkins	Parker	White
Daley	Hornaman	Pashinski	Williams
Davidson	Johnson	Payton	Youngblood
Davis	Josephs	Petrarca	

#### NAYS—110

Adolph	Farry	Lawrence	Reese
Aument	Fleck	Maher	Reichley
Baker	Gabler	Major	Roae
Barrar	Geist	Maloney	Rock
Bear	Gillen	Marshall	Ross
Benninghoff	Gillespie	Marsico	Saccone
Bloom	Gingrich	Masser	Saylor
Boback	Godshall	Metcalfe	Scavello
Boyd	Grell	Metzgar	Schroder
Brooks	Grove	Miccarelli	Simmons
Brown, R.	Hackett	Micozzie	Sonney
Causer	Hahn	Millard	Stephens
Christiana	Harhart	Miller	Stern
Clymer	Harper	Milne	Stevenson
Cox	Harris	Moul	Swanger
Creighton	Heffley	Murt	Tallman
Culver	Helm	Mustio	Taylor
Cutler	Hennessey	O'Neill	Tobash
Day	Hess	Oberlander	Toepel
Delozier	Hickernell	Payne	Toohil
Denlinger	Hutchinson	Peifer	Truitt
DiGirolamo	Kampf	Petri	Turzai
Dunbar	Kauffman	Pickett	Vereb
Ellis	Keller, F.	Pyle	Vulakovich
Emrick	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	Watson
Evankovich	Killion	Quinn	
Evans, J.	Knowles	Rapp	Smith, S.,
Everett	Krieger	Reed	Speaker

#### NOT VOTING—0

#### EXCUSED—6

Deasy	McGeehan	Perry	Wagner
Gerber	O'Brien, D.		

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

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

Mr. **LAWRENCE** offered the following amendment  
No. **A02391**:

Amend Bill, page 2, lines 6 through 17, by striking out "a" in line 6 and all of lines 7 through 17 and inserting

(1) In the case of an elector who has a religious objection to being photographed, a valid-without-photo driver's license or a valid-without-photo identification card issued by the Department of Transportation.

(2) In the case of all other electors, a document that:

(i) shows the name of the individual to whom the document was issued and the name conforms to the name of the individual as it appears in the district register;

(ii) shows a photograph of the individual to whom the document was issued;

(iii) includes an expiration date;

(iv) is not expired or expired after the date of the most recent general election; and

(v) was issued by the United States or the Commonwealth.

Amend Bill, page 5, lines 9 through 12, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 5, line 13, by striking out "(2)" and inserting

(1)

Amend Bill, page 5, line 16, by striking out "(3)" and inserting

(2)

Amend Bill, page 8, lines 6 through 15, by striking out all of said lines

Amend Bill, page 8, line 16, by striking out "(E)" and inserting

(D)

Amend Bill, page 8, line 25, by striking out "(F)" and inserting

(E)

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Lawrence.

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment would allow an elector who has any religious objection to being photographed to present a valid-without-photo driver's license or a valid-without-photo identification card duly issued by the Department of Transportation.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Metcalfe.

Mr. **METCALFE**. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of amendment 2391. This is an agreed-to amendment. We had considerations in the committee and discussions on other amendments. This amendment has been proposed to deal with an issue that was brought to my attention after we had done the work of the committee and discussed it with Representative Lawrence and a few other members and came up with this language. And this amendment is agreed to, and I would ask the members for an affirmative vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. **STURLA**. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, will the maker of the amendment rise for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. **STURLA**. Mr. Speaker, under your amendment, how do you identify which religions are opposed to a person's photograph being taken?

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. I am sorry; I could not hear the question.

Mr. **STURLA**. Mr. Speaker, under your amendment, how do you identify which religions oppose their members' photograph being taken?

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. Mr. Speaker, the process set in place by the Department of Transportation is very specific for the issuance of such IDs for religious objection. The process is already in place as of today.

Mr. **STURLA**. So, Mr. Speaker, your amendment says that you have to follow the procedure that the Department of Transportation currently uses?

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. The amendment states that an elector who has a religious objection to being photographed may present a valid and duly issued photo identification, a valid-without-photo identification issued by the Department of Transportation.

Mr. **STURLA**. Mr. Speaker, how do I determine, though, that— I guess I cannot just claim that I have an objection to being photographed without getting an ID that says I have an objection to being photographed. Is that correct?

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. I am sorry; I did not follow your question.

Mr. **STURLA**. I have to go through the Department of Transportation process in order to claim that I have a religious exemption. Is that correct?

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. There is a process set in place, Mr. Speaker, today, enforced by PENNDOT, for those who have a religious objection to being photographed to obtain a valid-without-photo identification.

Mr. **STURLA**. Mr. Speaker, can you tell me what that process is?

Mr. **LAWRENCE**. Mr. Speaker, the process is the exact same process that you or I would follow to obtain a photo ID or a driver's license with a photograph.

In addition, in addition, those with a religious objection must present a special PENNDOT form, of which I have a copy if you would like to review, that lists— In fact, I will read it to you, if you would like: "I request that I be issued a State of Pennsylvania non-photo, ID..." or driver's license. "As a member of the \_\_\_\_\_ Community, I do not knowingly permit myself to be photographed based on a sincerely held religious belief. Therefore I request that this card be issued without a photograph being taken." They must list their name, their address, their date of birth, their sex, their height, their eye color, their Social Security number, then sign the form, and the form must also be signed by an authorized representative of that religious sect, and PENNDOT keeps a file and a book of such approved sects.

Mr. STURLA. So, Mr. Speaker, if I do not have a driver's license, how do I get to PENNDOT to fill out this form?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I am sorry. Forgive me; I am having difficulty hearing you. Could you repeat your question?

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, if I do not have a driver's license, how do I get to PENNDOT to fill out this form?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Is your question, if you do not have a driver's license, how do you get to PENNDOT to fill out this form?

Mr. STURLA. Yes.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, being one from Lancaster County, I am sure you are familiar with the practice of those who have a religious objection to being photographed generally are rather familiar with the process of hiring a taxi.

Mr. STURLA. Okay, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, if I swear that I belong to a religion that objects to being photographed, can I object to being photographed—Like, could someone who is really upset with this voter ID bill go online, start themselves a religion, which you could do tomorrow, and call it the "Against Voter ID Religion," and could members join that and would that be accepted by PENNDOT as a valid religion? With people who have objections to this, deep-felt, heartfelt objections to this, would they be able to obtain a nonphoto ID then from the State of Pennsylvania?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

### POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Saylor, seek to raise a point of order?

Mr. SAYLOR. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. SAYLOR. I thought the Speaker had ruled in the past that you could not present as questions hypotheticals when questioning members on amendments or legislation? And this is a hypothetical question: If this happens, what happens?

The SPEAKER. I am not sure that the Speaker ruled that. I think we try to minimize the broadness of a hypothetical. We will monitor the question. I do not think he is too far out of it yet.

Would the gentleman restate his question? The gentleman from Lancaster, please restate his question.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I simply have perhaps a concern or maybe a notion that given the fact that I believe there are a lot of voters that are upset about this, that someone will, online, the day after this becomes law, start the religion of "I Am Upset About Having to Present a Photo ID to Vote."

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman still under interrogation?

Mr. STURLA. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Please state his question.

Mr. STURLA. So what I am asking is, what is the determining factor that PENNDOT uses to constitute what is a religion? I mean, they will probably have an ordained minister, because they can get that over the Internet, and they will probably have some pretty deep-felt convictions about this. So will PENNDOT accept that?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that your hypothetical example would be one where a person has a legitimately held political belief, not a religious objection to being photographed.

Mr. STURLA. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I missed that. Could you repeat the answer?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I would be happy to.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that under the hypothetical example submitted by the gentleman from Lancaster, the individual would have a sincerely held political belief but not a sincere objection, a religious objection, to being photographed.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, PENNDOT offers nonphoto IDs to people who, for example, are undergoing chemotherapy because they do not want to have themselves photographed that way. Would this exemption cover them also? Would it cover anyone that PENNDOT issues a nonphoto ID to, or would it just be somebody who had a deeply held religious conviction?

Mr. LAWRENCE. The amendment deals with those that have a sincerely held religious belief.

Mr. STURLA. Okay. And, Mr. Speaker, I guess my question is, who at PENNDOT determines whether my religious beliefs are sincerely held or not? You know, there is a saying that there are two kinds of Catholics, devout ones and fallen ones. Who makes that determination over at PENNDOT?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

I do not think that question is quite in order.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, if I could, on the amendment then.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is in order, on the amendment.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, once again here, while I believe that the intent of what the Representative wants to do is noble, we are going through and making exceptions that we think are okay for the "right" people to vote but we are not making exceptions for seniors or veterans or other people to vote. And this law or this bill which is being amended I believe is unconstitutional, and the more times you carve out, well, there is this group and there is that group, as was the argument made prior to this, the more unconstitutional it becomes.

So I just think that the definition here is rather fuzzy. It is only taking care of part of the problem that we need to address if we are going to go along with this legislation. I just think that, again, it is an amendment that should not even have to be offered if the underlying legislation was not here.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the lady from Philadelphia, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is amazing to me that somehow the argument is about exceptions, and heaven forbid we should allow anybody to come to the polling place without a photo ID kind of melted away here, and I applaud that, because that is what I am for, too.

Now, I do not think this bill goes far enough to help people who have religious objections to having their picture taken, but at least it is a step in the right direction and it shows that we do understand there are groups of people who cannot, will not, cannot, do not have photo ID. So I am hoping that all of us will vote for this amendment, and I am hoping when this bill gets to the Senate, they will make some more exceptions along the lines of what we have been suggesting.

So, you know, it is an amendment that is acceptable. It is not great, that goes without saying, but I am going to vote for it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.



The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Pashinski.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the gentleman from Chester County please stand for brief interrogation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman indicates he will stand for interrogation. You may proceed.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Thank you very much, sir, and I certainly appreciate the gentleman's offer for this amendment.

Would you please mind, just so that I am clear on this, so if an individual with a certain religious right does not have a photo ID and they come to a polling place that they are designated to come to, how do the polling workers, how do they identify this individual as being the individual that will cast the vote?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I am sorry, and please forgive me; I am having difficulty hearing. Could you please restate the question?

Mr. PASHINSKI. Yes. That is quite all right.

If a person that is under your auspices, which means they do not have a photo ID because of their religious right, if they come to their polling place, how do the polling workers identify this individual as the person who should be casting the ballot?

Mr. LAWRENCE. If there is any doubt as to the identification of the individual in question, or truly, if there is any doubt to anyone's identification should they come to vote, it is always within the right of the poll worker to challenge the veracity of that identification.

Mr. PASHINSKI. And I understand that and I agree with that, but here comes a person who does not have a photo ID. I am trying to ascertain from you, the maker of this amendment, how would this person be identified to be allowed to cast the vote?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Again, I offer the same answer. If there is a doubt as to the identification of the individual, the poll worker can challenge the veracity of that elector.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Okay, let us forget about the doubt. A person that you are referring to who has a particular religious sect that now permitted that person not to have a photo ID comes to a particular polling place that they are supposedly registered to, and they now want to cast their vote; my question to you, sir, is, when they come, how does the polling worker, how do the polling workers identify this person in order to allow them to cast the vote?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, the elector would not be appearing without identification. They would be appearing with a duly issued State identification card that states "Valid Without Photo," and again, if there is any doubt as to their identification, their identity can be challenged. The veracity of their identification can be challenged by the poll worker.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Now the person comes with the proper identification. What is on that identification, sir?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I am sorry; what was the question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. PASHINSKI. The question is, you said the individual that will be coming to the voting polling place to cast their vote that does not have a photo identification card will have an alternate form of identification that will allow the poll workers to identify the individual that will be casting the vote. I am

asking you, sir, what does that particular second piece of notification look like, what does it have on it, and how does the person cast the vote? Does that person still sign their name?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I do not believe that you completely understand the identification at hand. The valid-without-photo identification card or the valid-without-photo driver's license is duly issued today by PENNDOT. This is not something new. This is not a second form of identification. This is a duly issued State identification that has been issued for some time in the Commonwealth.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Okay. So they have the plastic ID card that has—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Kind of hold the conversations down, please. A few people are having trouble hearing. I would ask the members to limit the conversations; take them in the back, if necessary.

The gentleman may proceed with his interrogation.

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

To the gentleman who has proposed the amendment, I am sorry about the volume. Could you identify what is on that card, and then after identifying the person with that card, do they then sign the voter registration book?

Mr. LAWRENCE. The valid-without-photo identification card is identical in every way to a standard identification card issued by the Commonwealth. The valid-without-photo driver's license card is identical to a standard driver's license issued by the Commonwealth. All of the information that is listed on a standard ID card or driver's license issued by the Commonwealth would be contained on the valid-without-photo identification or driver's license card except that in place of a photograph, the words "Valid Without Photo" appear.

To answer your second question, Mr. Speaker, indeed they would sign the voter log just as any other elector would.

Mr. PASHINSKI. And in the final analysis, sir, the signature would have to be validated against the card?

Mr. LAWRENCE. I am sorry; what was your question?

Mr. PASHINSKI. And in final validation of that individual, the signature would validate the identification of that person based upon the signature on that card?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, the answer to your question is that it would. I also would submit to the speaker that the valid-without-photo identification card and the valid-without-photo driver's license card is not without information that is not standardly available on other forms of identification such as height, weight, eye color, hair color, et cetera.

Mr. PASHINSKI. I am sorry, sir; I did not hear you. Would you repeat the answer?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend.

Will the members please hold the conversations down. The two members engaged in interrogation, debate on this, are having trouble hearing each other, and that is only delaying the process for all of us. The Speaker would ask members, clear the aisles, please. If you need to talk, I would appreciate if you would take it to the back of the hall of the House. The members will hold the conversations down. I would appreciate if you would keep the conversations down.

The gentleman may proceed.

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

The SPEAKER. You may have to restate the question, because I do not remember where you were.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Okay, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully this will be the last question.

The question that I asked was, the individual that comes to the polling place with the valid identification card that does not have a photo, that has all the information on it as any other valid identification card with a photo, and I am trying to establish that the last way to recognize the individual with that card becomes the signature of the person signing the voter registration book. Is that correct?

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, just as it would be with anyone casting a ballot, any elector presenting a photo identification or a driver's license with a photograph, much in the same way that they sign the voter roll, the individual elector possessing the valid-without-photo ID or driver's license would also sign, would also sign the elector roll as well. And as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the valid-without-photo identification card or driver's license also has information that is not standardly available such as height, weight, eye color, et cetera.

Mr. PASHINSKI. And I appreciate your answer, sir, but in the final analysis, it is the signature that validates the individual that is getting ready to vote in that polling place.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with your statement. I think there is additional information that verifies their identification on the valid-without-photo identification card, with all due respect.

Mr. PASHINSKI. Well, with the exception of eye color, a person's weight and potential height alters dramatically over time, whether it be that of a senior citizen who, over time, does reduce in size, and weight can change within a relatively short period of time. So with the exception of the color of the eyes and the signature, I think it is just simply the signature that really validates that individual.

Mr. LAWRENCE. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that if there is any doubt to the identification of the voter present to cast their vote, that the elector that has presented themselves, if there is any doubt as to their identification, the poll worker can challenge the veracity of their identification under this legislation.

Mr. PASHINSKI. And I appreciate that is exactly what happens currently right now in law.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House agree to the amendment?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Somerset County, Mr. Metzgar.

Mr. METZGAR. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I like consistency whenever I speak about constitutional things particularly, and I know that the fine gentleman from Lancaster alluded to the fact that perhaps this is somewhat inconsistent that we would support a religious exemption for photo identification as opposed to some other type of exemption. I just wanted to try and help clarify that for him.

Of course, Article I, section 5, referring to elections, which has been bandied about all over this particular House today, does say that in fact elections shall be free and, of course, equal. However, there are other provisions in the Constitution that play as well. Article VII, section 6, establishes the general rule that laws regulating an election shall be uniform throughout the State; once again, an equal requirement. However, there is a provision in the Constitution that says that if there is a

competing provision, that provision shall prevail, and in this case, Article I, section 3, which refers to "religious freedom," a freedom that many have died for, and of course, everyone here I think believes in, says that "...no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience...." Well, Mr. Speaker, the "rights of conscience" include, in all of our case law, the right to be free from having one's image taken and used. Well, this is a long-respected tradition in our law. As a matter of fact, Title 75, section 6111, has a provision in it that says that we will give these exemptions for another constitutionally protected right.

Mr. Speaker, this is nothing new, and this is our duty to make sure that this amendment actually goes in. So for the fine gentleman from Lancaster or anyone else here, I want to point out that we are, of course, being constitutionally consistent by supporting this. Please vote in favor of the amendment.

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

(Members proceeded to vote.)

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Speaker returns to leaves of absence and recognizes the minority leader, who requests a leave for the gentleman, Mr. KIRKLAND, from Delaware County for the remainder of the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

## CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

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

The following roll call was recorded:

### YEAS—189

Adolph	Emrick	Knowles	Reed
Aument	Evankovich	Kortz	Reese
Baker	Evans, D.	Kotik	Reichley
Barrar	Evans, J.	Krieger	Roae
Bear	Everett	Lawrence	Rock
Benninghoff	Fabrizio	Longietti	Roebuck
Bishop	Farry	Maher	Ross
Bloom	Fleck	Mahoney	Sabatina
Boback	Frankel	Major	Sacccone
Boyd	Freeman	Maloney	Sainato
Boyle, B.	Gabler	Mann	Samuelson
Boyle, K.	Galloway	Markosek	Santarsiero
Bradford	Geist	Marshall	Santoni
Brennan	George	Marsico	Saylor
Briggs	Gergely	Masser	Scavello
Brooks	Gibbons	Matzie	Schroder
Brown, R.	Gillen	Metcalf	Shapiro
Brown, V.	Gillespie	Metzgar	Simmons
Brownlee	Gingrich	Miccarelli	Smith, K.
Burns	Godshall	Micozzie	Smith, M.
Buxton	Goodman	Millard	Sonney
Caltagirone	Grell	Miller	Staback
Causar	Grove	Milne	Stephens
Christiana	Hackett	Mirabito	Stern
Clymer	Hahn	Moul	Stevenson
Cohen	Haluska	Mundy	Sturla
Conklin	Hanna	Murphy	Swanger
Costa, P.	Harhai	Murt	Tallman

Cox	Harhart	Mustio	Taylor
Creighton	Harkins	Myers	Thomas
Cruz	Harper	Neuman	Tobash
Culver	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toepel
Curry	Heffley	O'Neill	Toohil
Cutler	Helm	Oberlander	Truitt
Daley	Hennessey	Parker	Turzai
Davidson	Hess	Payne	Vereb
Davis	Hickernell	Payton	Vitali
Day	Hornaman	Peifer	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Hutchinson	Petrarca	Waters
DeLozier	Johnson	Petri	Watson
Denlinger	Josephs	Pickett	Wheatley
DePasquale	Kampf	Preston	White
Dermody	Kauffman	Pyle	Williams
DeWeese	Kavulich	Quigley	Youngblood
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Quinn	
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Rapp	Smith, S.,
Dunbar	Keller, W.	Ravenstahl	Speaker
Ellis	Killion	Readshaw	

## NAYS—7

Barbin	Costa, D.	Kula	Pashinski
Carroll	DeLuca	Mullery	

## NOT VOTING—0

## EXCUSED—7

Deasy	Kirkland	O'Brien, D.	Wagner
Gerber	McGeehan	Perry	

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 PASSED OVER

The SPEAKER. For the information of the members, HB 934 is over for the day. We will resume deliberation on these amendments tomorrow.

There will be no further votes.

## HEALTH COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Baker, seek recognition for the purpose of making an announcement?

Mr. BAKER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Hopefully we will have a quick Health Committee meeting in room G-50, one bill to consider, immediately upon the break. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

The Health Committee will meet immediately upon the break in room G-50.

## ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman, Mr. Hutchinson, seek recognition for the purpose of an announcement?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce a meeting of the House Environmental Resources and Energy Committee. The meeting will be held on Wednesday, June 22, at 10 a.m. in room B-31, Main Capitol.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

Environmental Resources and Energy will meet on June 22 at 10 a.m. in room B-31 of the Main Capitol.

## SENATE MESSAGE

## HOUSE BILL

## CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 40, PN 1038**, with information that the Senate has passed the same without amendment.

## BILL SIGNED BY SPEAKER

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

## HB 40, PN 1038

An Act amending Titles 18 (Crimes and Offenses) and 42 (Judiciary and Judicial Procedure) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, further providing, in general principles of justification, for definitions, for use of force in self-protection, for use of force for the protection of other persons, for grading of theft offenses and for licenses to carry firearms; and providing for civil immunity for use of force.

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

## BILLS RECOMMITTED

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

HB 338;  
HB 720;  
HB 797;  
HB 1054;  
HB 1264; and  
HB 1618.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the motion?

Motion was agreed to.

**BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

HB 755;  
HB 1026;  
HB 1269;  
HB 1355;  
SB 1055;  
SB 1056;  
SB 1057;  
SB 1058;  
SB 1059;  
SB 1060;  
SB 1061; and  
SB 1062.

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

**BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that the following bills be removed from the tabled calendar and placed on the active calendar:

HB 247;  
HB 1363; and  
HB 1407.

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

**BILLS TABLED**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that the following bills be removed from the active calendar and placed on the tabled calendar:

HB 247;  
HB 1363; and  
HB 1407.

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

**BILLS REMOVED FROM TABLE**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 946 and SB 907 be removed from the tabled calendar.

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

**BILLS RECOMMITTED**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, who moves that HB 946 and SB 907 be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee.

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

**BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER**

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

**ADJOURNMENT**

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Hackett, from Delaware County, who moves that this House do adjourn until Tuesday, June 21, 2011, at 11 a.m., e.d.t., unless sooner recalled by the Speaker.

On the question,  
Will the House agree to the motion?  
Motion was agreed to, and at 6:39 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.