

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

LEGISLATIVE JOURNAL

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 2012

SESSION OF 2012

196TH OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

No. 16

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The House convened at 10 a.m., e.d.t.

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

PRAYER

The SPEAKER. The prayer will be offered by the Reverend Jake Lee, Trinity Wesleyan Church, from Allentown, Pennsylvania.

REV. JAKE LEE, Guest Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray together:

Heavenly Father, we are blessed by Your presence, amazed by Your grace, and dependent upon Your strength for each day. We praise You for Your abundant provision and are forever grateful for Your sustaining love. Forgive us when we forsake the blessings that have been granted to us, and may we make it our holy ambition to glorify You as we offer our lives in devoted service. We pray for one another with confidence that You hear repented hearts and respond to those who humbly seek You, obey You, and live by Your wisdom. May You bless this House with strength, wisdom, and courage as they endeavor to lead this great State. May You remind them that they are not only accountable for this Commonwealth but her people and You, Almighty God, that their service is a sacred service. We pray for personal renewal and a robust faith and a vibrant vision for the future. Remembering that righteousness exalts a nation, we turn to You and trust You not only to make us great but make us good.

We pray and thank You, Father, for this time together. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

JOURNAL APPROVAL POSTPONED

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the approval of the Journal of Tuesday, March 13, 2012, will be postponed until printed.

SENATE MESSAGE

AMENDED HOUSE BILL RETURNED
FOR CONCURRENCE AND
REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 424, PN 3197**, with information that the Senate has passed the same with amendment in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives is requested.

SENATE MESSAGE

HOUSE BILL
CONCURRED IN BY SENATE

The clerk of the Senate, being introduced, returned **HB 1355, PN 1584**, 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 1355, PN 1584

An Act designating the westbound bridge carrying Interstate 90 over Six Mile Creek in Harborcreek Township, Erie County, as the Jarrid L. King Memorial Bridge.

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

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. Are there requests for leaves of absence?

The Speaker recognizes the majority whip, who requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. KILLION, from Delaware County for the day, and the gentleman, Mr. O'NEILL, from Bucks County for the day. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

The minority whip requests a leave of absence for the gentleman, Mr. Brendan BOYLE, from Philadelphia County, for the day; the gentleman, Mr. DEASY, from Allegheny County for the day; and the gentleman, Mr. SANTARSIERO,

from Bucks County for the day. The minority whip additionally requests a leave of absence for the gentleman from Lawrence County, Mr. GIBBONS. Without objection, the leaves will be granted.

Returning to leaves of absence, the gentleman, Mr. Santarsiero, is present on the floor of the House. His name will be added to the master roll call.

HOUSE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED

No. 2191 By Representatives ROSS, BEAR, BARBIN, BOYD, BRENNAN, BRIGGS, BUXTON, CALTAGIRONE, CHRISTIANA, CREIGHTON, DALEY, DELOZIER, DeLUCA, ELLIS, FABRIZIO, FARRY, GEORGE, GERGELY, GIBBONS, GINGRICH, GROVE, HARHAI, HARHART, HARKINS, HARRIS, HENNESSEY, HICKERNELL, HORNAMAN, JOSEPHS, KILLION, KOTIK, MARSICO, MILLARD, MILLER, MILNE, MUNDY, MURT, O'NEILL, PASHINSKI, QUINN, RAPP, SAINATO, SAYLOR, SCHRODER, STEPHENS, SWANGER, TAYLOR, TOEPEL, VEREB, VULAKOVICH, WHITE, YOUNGBLOOD, DENLINGER, CARROLL, DONATUCCI, DERMODY, J. EVANS and MARKOSEK

An Act amending Titles 7 (Banks and Banking) and 18 (Crimes and Offenses) of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, in Title 7, providing for short-term loan protection; and, in Title 18, further providing for deceptive or fraudulent business practices and providing for unlicensed short-term lending.

Referred to Committee on CONSUMER AFFAIRS, March 14, 2012.

MASTER ROLL CALL

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

The following roll call was recorded:

PRESENT—191

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

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

ADDITIONS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Boyle, B.	Gibbons	Marsico	O'Neill
Deasy	Killion		

LEAVES ADDED—1

Tobash

LEAVES CANCELED—2

Gibbons	Tobash
---------	--------

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

UNCONTESTED CALENDAR

RESOLUTION PURSUANT TO RULE 35

Mr. CAUSER called up **HR 603, PN 3170**, entitled:

A Resolution designating the week of March 17 through 24, 2012, as "Maple Producers Week" in Pennsylvania.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—191

Adolph	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Aument	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Baker	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barrar	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Bear	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese
Benninghoff	Everett	Lawrence	Roae

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—6

Boyle, B.	Gibbons	Marsico	O'Neill
Deasy	Killion		

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

STATEMENT BY MR. CAUSER

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from McKean County, Mr. Causer, seeking recognition under unanimous consent relative to the resolution that just passed? The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CAUSER. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the members for their support of HR 603, designating the week of March 17 through the 24th as "Maple Producers Week" in Pennsylvania. I think it is important for us to highlight this very important industry. The candy that I put on all of your desks was made by the Hamilton family from Ulysses in northern Potter County. I certainly hope that you all enjoy, and thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

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 from Schuylkill County, Mr. TOBASH, for the day. Without objection, the leave will be granted.

We will return to consideration of HB 934, PN 3166, on page 6 of today's House calendar.

CALENDAR

BILL ON CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

The House proceeded to consideration of concurrence in Senate amendments to the following **HB 934, PN 3166**, 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; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official absentee ballots, for approval of application for absentee ballot, for delivering or mailing ballots, for canvassing of official absentee ballots and for public records; and providing for enforcement and for a special procedure at certain elections.

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

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Delaware County, Mr. Kirkland.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good morning.

Mr. Speaker, I rise on nonconcurrence of HB 934, but before I give my comments concerning HB 934, Mr. Speaker, I would like to address two issues, the first one being, Mr. Speaker, I want to say I appreciate and applaud the civil rights efforts, past and present, by my colleague and my friend from Philadelphia County in the 154th Legislative District. I appreciate all that he has done in the efforts in Selma, Alabama, and his work. If I were a soldier, I would salute him, but I am not a soldier, so I simply say to him, thank you for being who you are, and I am proud to be here in the House serving along with you.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I will respectfully request that the comments and statements made by the majority leader be stricken from the record, the ones concerning Supreme Court Justice Robert C. Nix. He had made a comment and spoke on a quotation given by the Supreme Court Justice pertaining to and tried to tie it to this HB 934. Mr. Speaker, I believe that his comments concerning that quotation were out of context and it does not represent the character of the Supreme Court Justice. He said, Mr. Speaker, just so we are clear, the quotation that he

spoke on said, "Elections are free and equal within the meaning of the Constitution when they are public and open to all qualified electors alike...." He went on to say, "...when every voter has the same right as any other voter, when each voter under the law has the right to cast his ballot...." That lesson leaves me to note, Mr. Speaker, that as long as you are an elected voter, whether you have an ID, a registered voter, Mr. Speaker, whether you have an ID or not, that you are afforded the opportunity to vote. So I respectfully ask that those comments or using that quotation from the Supreme Court Justice be stricken from the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend one second, please.

I will take a second look at that. It is my initial impression that it was not something said in an inflammatory way, and if you believe that the quote was taken out of context – and you have just obviously made that point – and want to put it into context to refute that element of argument, I think that is perfectly legitimate, but I do not believe that the comments made previously by the majority leader rise to a level of being stricken from the record, but I will take a look at it. I believe you have already made your point that you believe they were not in context, and I think that is fair and reasonable in the sense that it was not the nature of his statement to be inflammatory, nor was it out of line in that way, but we will take a look at it.

The gentleman may proceed on the bill.

Mr. KIRKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I did not mean it to be inflammatory, but as I said, out of context, and simply, it does not reflect the character of the Supreme Court Justice, but I appreciate the Speaker taking a closer look at the matter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As we look here at HB 934, and once again, Mr. Speaker, I am asking for nonconcurrency, I want to go look at this in a different light, in a different perspective. We have already talked about some things that we already know, so I do not want to rehash those things, like we already know that HB 934 will hurt seniors severely and seriously inconvenience them as they go to the polls. We already know that. We already know that persons with disabilities will probably be totally discouraged from voting after they have to go through some struggles and trials and tribulations even to get to the polls, only to find out that now you have to go back home and get an ID. So we already know that. We already know that persons of color, minorities, will probably be turned away from the voting polls because, once again, IDs are required. We already know that. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, we already know that this is simply an effort to make sure, Mr. Speaker, to make positively sure that the first African-American President will never be President again. We already know what this bill is set out to do. We already know that.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is set out to make sure that no minority, no Asian-American, no Latino-American, or other American will ever have the opportunity to be President because of such a bill. We already know that. So, Mr. Speaker, I want to come from a different perspective. I want to come from the perspective of those persons who sit inside the polling booth, sit inside the polling stations and work, the judges of election. I want to come from the perspective, Mr. Speaker, of those persons who are Democrats, Republicans, Independent, those persons who sit inside and work tirelessly year after year, persons who are Black, persons who are White, persons who are Latino, persons

who are Asian, persons who are other. I want to come from that perspective, Mr. Speaker. I want to come from the perspective, Mr. Speaker, where persons who work from 7 a.m. – I am sorry – from 6 a.m., because they have to open the poll, get up and open the polls and make sure they are running at 7 a.m., or quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, from 5 a.m., because they have to prepare themselves to get to the polls to open the polls. So I want to come from the perspective of 5 a.m. to 8 p.m. and beyond, because after the polls close, they have to make sure those machines are secured, they have to make sure the votes are counted, they have to turn in the information.

So I want to come from that perspective of these persons who work tirelessly each and every year for mere chicken change, persons who have done their job year after year after year after year. They have done their jobs, Mr. Speaker, with dignity, honesty, and integrity. And now, Mr. Speaker, now we want them to change the way they do things. We want them to change the way they do things by saying, by listening to the "Simon Says" HB 934. And for what, Mr. Speaker? For what? Simply because, quite frankly, my colleagues on the other side want to suppress the vote. I know everybody says that is not what we want to do, that is not where we are going, but that is exactly what is happening, Mr. Speaker. Watch this. Change the way you do things, and if you do not, and we are talking to those persons on the inside of the polls, those persons who work tirelessly, we want you to change the way you do things. If you do not, we, the Republicans, will make sure that you are fined \$1,000. So the persons on the inside of the polls, the persons like Miss Wilson, who is 75 years old in my district; the persons like Mr. and Mrs. Gyant, who have worked the polls down through the years and they are 75 years old and more; persons like Mrs. Pearl, who works the polls day in and day out, who is 75 years old, we are telling Mrs. Pearl that – Mrs. Pearl, Mrs. Gyant, if you do not do as the "Simon Says" HB 934, if you do not do that, we are going to fine you \$1,000. We can care less about the fact that you are on a limited and set income. We can care less that you have always done your job with dignity and honesty, but right now, if you do not do it the way we say do it, if you do not do it the way HB 934 says do it, then we are going to penalize you and fine you \$1,000. We are talking about a 75-year-old individual.

Second point is, if they do not do and follow the new rules of the "Simon Says" HB 934, then guess what we are going to do next? We are going to take this 75-year-old seasoned person who has worked so hard down through the years and we are going to place them in jail for 1 year; place them in jail for 1 year, Mr. Speaker, all because I did not tell my next-door neighbor, whom I have known all my life, all my life, my next-door neighbor, whom I helped raise their children, we are talking about a senior, a grandparent, my next-door neighbor, whom we have been friends for a lifetime, because I did not tell my next-door neighbor, I need to see your ID before I allow you to vote. And because I did not want to ruin a relationship, a friendship, that has been intact for some 50 years, now you are telling me I have to go to jail and I have to serve time. I have to serve 1 year because I did not follow the rules of the "Simon Says" HB 934.

And then finally, Mr. Speaker, once again, we are talking about those persons who work on the inside, who have worked down through the years with honesty, integrity, and dignity. Finally, we are telling them, if you do not follow the rules, the new rules of the "Simon Says" HB 934, we, the Republicans,

will not allow you to vote for the next 4 years, 4 years. Folks have fought and died for the right to vote, but we are now going to take that right away from them. And for the next 4 years, you will not be able to vote all because, all because you did not follow the rules of the "Simon Says" HB 934.

Watch this, Mr. Speaker. A person has gone to jail and spent their time in jail and done their time. Guess what? As soon as they are released from jail, they are allowed to register and vote. Imagine that. They spend 10 years or whatever in jail, and as soon as they are released, now they can register to vote, but here a 75-year-old individual who has been working the polls for some 30 years has now been incarcerated and now told, because you did not follow the rules, because you did not do it the way we said do it, because you did not disallow your neighbor or lifelong friend the opportunity to vote because they did not show you their voter registration, now you do not have the right or opportunity to vote for the next 4 years. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. That is wrong. And guess what? Those next 4 years for a 75-year-old person could, quite frankly, be the rest of their lives. Is that not something?

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure, I want to make really, really sure, make it clear that these persons that we are talking about today, these persons that we are putting more and more pressure on have been the persons at the forefront time and time and time again. Many persons, even in this room, would never ever sit in a polling booth all day and half the night for chicken change, work diligently, and now be penalized for their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, let us call it what it is, "Simon Says" HB 934. Let us call it what it is. This is a Jim Crow voter suppression bill. That is exactly what it is, Mr. Speaker. I know it. You know it. We all know it. I am just not afraid to say it. Vote "no" on concurrence of HB 934. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Mercer County, Mr. Longietti.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Would the maker of the bill please stand for interrogation?

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

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, is there anything in this bill that excuses the requirement of a photo identification when the election worker personally knows the person coming to vote?

Mr. METCALFE. No. Every voter that would go to the polling place to cast their vote would be required to show their photo ID. Now, in the primary, it is going to be the responsibility of the workers to ask for it. The primary is kind of a dry run, a soft rollout for us, if you will, so that it will also help with the educational needs of ensuring the people know that they need the ID. And then in November, we will see it go into full effect. And in fact, I was talking with the Secretary of State from Kansas yesterday, who had called me, where they have had this, and he says they have run 10 elections and they have had less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the people show up without ID, and at that point that they do, it has been rectified through the provisions that are provided in their law, as we have provided for also, that you can either go home and get your ID or use a provisional ballot and then follow up with your ID to the courthouse.

Mr. LONGIETTI. So I take it from your answer, Mr. Speaker, that if it is a person who has voted 50 years in a row or if it is a person who lives next door to the poll worker inside and they know them personally from either of those two instances, under the bill, they are still required to produce photo ID.

Mr. METCALFE. When we drafted the bill, Mr. Speaker, of course when you draft policy and you draft law, you want to ensure that it is not arbitrarily enforced. To try and write in exceptions for somebody because they may know somebody or they may have had coffee with somebody or they may think that they know somebody, it just is not good policy to try and write this law in a way that allows for an arbitrary decision to be made by every individual judge of elections across the State of Pennsylvania. I know that you believe as I believe that nobody should be above the law, and just because we are known in our districts and when we go to vote, we should have to show our ID also. That is what we have to do. When we vote, when the Governor votes, we will each have to show our respective photo ID at our polling precincts, even though the majority of our residents know us and most certainly the judge of elections and those working the polls would most likely know each of us.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Looking at page 12 of the bill, on line 17, and I just want to make sure my understanding is correct, if you could verify that when the voter comes in and presents their ID, that the election worker must sign an affidavit for each voter stating that they have examined that voter's proof of identification. Is that a requirement under this bill, that the election worker is required to sign an affidavit for each voter stating that they have examined the proof of identification?

Mr. METCALFE. As it is written, the language that you are referring to, most of it is already current law, that they have to already make those judgments, but not on the proof. As you see, the underlying language is what is being added, but the language that is not underlying, that is already the current law.

Mr. LONGIETTI. But correct me if I am wrong, under current law, that only comes into play when you are a first-time voter in that precinct. Under current law, there is a requirement to produce photo ID, and then there is a requirement for the election worker to sign an affidavit, only for those new voters, those first-time voters, in that precinct. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. METCALFE. That is correct.

Mr. LONGIETTI. So in this case, if this law passed, tell me if I am wrong, if 1,000 voters came into that precinct to vote, each thousand would have to produce identification and then there would be 1,000 affidavits that the election workers would have to sign, verifying that they did examine proof of identification. Is that the way the bill is written?

Mr. METCALFE. The current law requires it is signed for each person that is going to be presenting it. So "THE ELECTION OFFICER SHALL EXAMINE THE PROOF OF IDENTIFICATION PRESENTED BY THE ELECTOR AND SIGN AN AFFIDAVIT STATING THAT THIS HAS BEEN DONE." That is going to happen for each individual that it has been done.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Okay. So if there were 1,000 voters, then there would be 1,000 affidavits signed by the election workers.

Mr. METCALFE. I am not familiar with what form of an affidavit they are using or if it is in the book or if it is an

affidavit that is covering all of those that have signed in. I mean, we do not specify that in the language. It is an affidavit that that has been done. I do not believe it would take 1,000 signatures to comply with that by the judge; that it would be signing off that you had examined 1,000 signatures, but not that you would need 1,000 different, 1,000 signatures of the individual.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, in the current scenario, we are only asking people who are first-time voters to come in, so I would assume that there is an affidavit for each voter under current law, and you indicated they are only amending one word, "proof of identification," so you would assume, would you not, that there would be, just like there is currently, an affidavit for each voter then?

Mr. METCALFE. That is what the current language provides. Like I said, I am not sure how, when the voter is signing in and you sign the book, are they signing next to it that, yes, this has been done? That may be taking place. I have not really watched what they do each and every time when they do that, but the current law requires that they do it. This is just adding that now they are actually certifying that it has been done each time.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Mr. Speaker, could we get some order? I am having a little bit of difficulty hearing.

The SPEAKER. Is that good enough?

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Your presence is strong enough to get order, and I appreciate it.

Just to verify – and I think this has been answered; I just want to make sure – election workers are required to take an oath of office. Is that your understanding, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. METCALFE. Could you repeat that again, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. LONGIETTI. I just want to verify, I think you indicated this before, but just to verify, election workers are required to take an oath of office. Is that your understanding?

Mr. METCALFE. My understanding is the judge of elections that is elected has to take that oath.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Is there anything in the bill that provides for the training of election workers on this, on what would be a new requirement? Is there anything in your bill that requires training?

Mr. METCALFE. We require that the State Department work with the counties to disseminate the information that is needed to implement this law, and then that is left up to the discretion of the department.

Mr. LONGIETTI. But in your bill specifically, can you point me to any section or page of your bill that requires training of election workers?

Mr. METCALFE. As I said, and as I answered yesterday, there is training that occurs of the workers throughout the State at the county level with each election cycle that I have been aware of.

Mr. LONGIETTI. So that is something that the election board in the county does on their own.

Mr. METCALFE. And the State Department will be working with those county boards of elections to disseminate the information that is needed for implementation of this law so that they can then facilitate the training at that normal level.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Is there anything in your bill that requires election workers to pass an exam on what they are required to do in order to serve as an election worker?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I think presenting a driver's license or a passport and having somebody compare your name and your photo with the name that is registered, we did not

believe would require testing of anybody. We think it is pretty much common sense and pretty straightforward. Right now they are instructing you to sign in and they have the signatures to compare. Now, rather than just relying on the signatures to compare, they will be able to actually compare your photo with the person standing in front of them, with the name that is before them in the book.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Is there anything in your bill that provides for penalties if an election worker fails to do what is required under the bill?

Mr. METCALFE. We did not include additional penalties in the bill. There are penalties under current law as we had answered during yesterday's extensive debate. I know we had talked about that at length yesterday also.

Mr. LONGIETTI. So your understanding is the same as mine, which is the current provisions in the Election Code that specify penalties would be the ones that would apply in this case if the election worker does not follow the requirements under your legislation.

Mr. METCALFE. I believe from, it was hard hearing the trailing end of your statement, Mr. Speaker, but I believe you said that we both agree that the current law is what would dictate the penalties.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, could I be recognized on the bill, please?

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

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know what is going to happen if this bill were to become law. We have heard from the gentleman who is offering the bill that even in the case of somebody that has voted for 50 years at a particular precinct, they are going to be required to produce photo ID, or even in the case of a voter who lives across the street from the judge of elections or the majority or the minority inspector or one of the clerks that is serving in the precinct, they are going to have to produce a photo ID, and invariably, what is going to happen is this: We are going to have a situation where a senior citizen, perhaps they voted 40, 50 years in a row, never missed an election, perhaps they live across the street from one of the poll workers inside, and they are going to come in and they are going to expect that they are going to cast their vote using the machine. And the poll worker is going to say, "Hi, Joe. How are you doing? Good to see you." And they are going to exchange their pleasantries. They know each other; they know each other well. And then the poll worker is going to say, "Joe, I need to see photo ID." Joe is going to say, "What gives here? I mean, you know me. I have been here every year. You live across the street from me. We've known each other for a long time. Why do you have to see my ID?" And the poll worker is going to say, "Because the legislators, you know, your State Representative, your State Senator, they passed a new law that says I have to ask you for your ID and I have to see it." And Joe is going to say, "But, Bill, you know that I don't have a driver's license. I haven't driven in 10 years. You live right across the street from me. You know that. I don't have a photo ID." Bill is going to say, "Joe, I am sorry, you cannot vote using the machine. We have this thing called a provisional ballot. We can go over here. You can fill that out, but you cannot use the machine."

And so a couple things are going to happen, I think. I think there are a couple scenarios. Number one, Bill is going to say, "You know what? I am going to let him vote anyhow. I know him. I am not going to embarrass him by telling him he has to

get a provisional ballot, so I'm going to let him vote." So what happens then? Then what happens is, Bill has got to sign an affidavit that he examined the person's ID, and if Bill signs that affidavit, under the Election Code, section 1802, he committed perjury, and that is punishable by up to a \$10,000 fine or 5 years in jail, or both. Can we get some order, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order. Members will please hold the conversations down. If they are necessary, please take them to the rear of the House.

Thank you. The Speaker thanks the members.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. LONGIETTI. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So in that case, scenario number one, Bill commits perjury. He can be jailed up to 5 years. He can get up to a \$10,000 fine and he can be disqualified for voting for up to 4 years. That is scenario number one.

Scenario number two is that Bill does not sign the affidavit. He decides, I cannot sign a false affidavit, so he does not do that. So then he violates section 1810, which is the oath of his office, to make a true and perfect return. He fails to do that. Or he violates section 1848 of the Election Code, "Failure to Perform Duty." In either case, it is either up to a \$1,000 fine, a year in jail, or both, or the failure to perform duty, it is up to a \$1,000 fine, 2 years in jail. And in both cases, they lose their right to vote for 4 years. So that is scenario number two.

Scenario number three is that Bill follows the law and he tells his friend, Joe, whom he has seen vote there for 50 years or however long, he is his next-door neighbor, you have to fill out the provisional ballot, and Joe gets very upset and he leaves his polling place because he feels that he is being picked on, that he cannot use the machine. This is embarrassing to him and he walks out. Not a good result.

Scenario number four is that the county board of elections does what it ought to do, which is an unfunded mandate. It trains the election workers and tells them, this is what you have to do, even if you know the person, you must, in every single case, demand photo ID, and if they do not have photo ID, you must tell them they cannot vote on the machine. All they can do is do a provisional ballot, and then they have to go up to the courthouse 6 days later and prove by photo ID they are who they are. And what is going to happen in scenario number four is that a number of our election workers are going to say, I did not sign up for this. It is a long day, I am not being paid a lot of money, and the last thing I am going to do is hassle my neighbors over ID, when I know that they are my neighbor and I know that they are a registered voter and they have voted there every year. So none of those are good results.

Now, we have heard a lot of examples of different instances where people are supposed to present identification, and I listened carefully to those. I listened to examples of somebody going to a bar. I listened to examples of somebody appearing before a notary. I listened to examples of somebody going to the drugstore, and in each and every one of those cases, it did not involve a fundamental constitutional right. Voting is a fundamental constitutional right, and in virtually each and every one of those cases, there was no legal requirement for an ID. There was nothing written into law that required it. It was a policy that was established, and there were no criminal penalties for somebody who did not demand to look at the ID.

There is only one case that I think there is a variance to that, and that is when you go to the airport to get on an airplane. I do believe that that is a Federal requirement to show an ID. Now,

here is the difference. We did not always have that requirement for airports, and if you have been on an airplane recently, you will know that they tell you to get there 2 hours in advance because there is a lengthy process to get on an airplane that includes showing photo ID. And getting on an airplane is not a fundamental constitutional right, but it is something that people do all the time. But the reason that we have it for airports is that we have documented cases of people committing serious offenses, whether it is the shoe bomber that got on the airplane, or 9/11 that occurred that was an extreme tragedy. We have had documented cases where the public, even though they do not like the long lines, even though they do not like the inconvenience, they have come to accept that it is required to have a photo ID to get on an airplane.

With voting, which is a fundamental right, a constitutional right, we have a lack of documented cases of people committing any kind of serious infraction involving voting. So I do not think the public is going to accept this. And the reason that we have a lack of documented cases is based on logic. And I heard the gentleman from Philadelphia express his views the other day on this, but let us think about it logically. If I am going to vote for somebody else, a few things have to happen. Number one, I have to be lucky and know that that person has not already voted, because if they have already voted, they came in, they signed the book as required, and I am going to get caught immediately because I am going to go to vote for Joe Smith. They are going to pull out the book. Joe Smith already voted, he already signed the book, and they are going to say, "You're not Joe Smith, and we are calling the authorities. We want to see your ID. We want to know what's going on because you're trying to vote for somebody who already voted." So that is risk number one.

Risk number two is, in order for me to vote for Joe Smith, I not only have to hope that he has not already voted, I also have to match his signature. He already voted in previous elections and signed the book, and I have to instantaneously forge his signature and make it look like his in the book or else I am going to get caught. That is scenario number two.

Number three is, I have to hope that nobody in that voting precinct who is there knows Joe Smith, because what happens when I go to vote is they ask me my name and they announce my name publicly. So you have present a judge of elections, you have a minority inspector, you have a majority inspector, you have clerks, and you may also have poll workers for the various candidates, poll watchers that are sitting inside. All those people hear the name Joe Smith on Smith Drive, and if one of those knows Joe Smith on Smith Drive, they are going to say, that is not Joe Smith. I know him, and I am going to get caught. So there are three ways that I get caught.

Then on top of all that, if I want to influence an election, I have got to convince enough people to do that to actually influence the election. I have got to recruit perhaps hundreds of people to go in, lie about who they are, risk being caught under all the scenarios that I mentioned in order to influence an election. And when I recruit those people, one thing that I know in my experience is, when I start talking to people out there, people talk, and somebody is going to talk and say, Mark Longietti, or whoever, is recruiting me to commit voter fraud, and I am going to get caught. So that is why we do not have documented cases, actual documented cases of this occurring.

So unlike the airport scenario, which I may accept as a citizen, I may accept a long line, I may accept a requirement of

ID because I know there have been documented cases of terrorist acts that could kill me or could injure me or cause great mayhem, and so I accept that. In the voting case, I am not going to accept that, because there are no documented cases of voter fraud and there is no serious problem here.

And as a result of that, I think the scenarios that I went through where Joe, the poll worker, does not sign the affidavit or Joe, the poll worker, allows the person to vote and commits a serious criminal offense are going to occur or the voter is going to walk out disgusted and embarrassed, and that is not what we are here to do as a General Assembly. We are here to address serious problems, not made-up problems, and we are not here to put unfunded mandates on our counties.

I have heard a lot of talk over my time in the legislature about unfunded mandates. Well, I know from reading my newspaper this morning, my county elections director is talking about putting signs up outside of voting places in advance, letting people know that they are going to be required to bring ID with them. He is talking about extra trainings, and it is not that easy, because you have got to go through the litany of what is acceptable photo ID, what is not; if the person has a religious objection; if they have an exception there, they can have an ID but it does not have to have a photo. So there is a significant amount of training that takes place, and I know that that is going to cost money and I know that there are going to be poll workers that do not go to the trainings because they do not. They do not get paid a lot of money, and they are not going to know what the law is. And I know that ignorance of the law is no excuse, and so if they do not sign their affidavit or check that ID, they are going to commit a serious criminal offense, even though they did not know that.

So here we are as a General Assembly, we have a lot of other important business to do, and we are taking up a piece of business that citizens are not asking us to do; that is going to hassle, in too many cases, senior citizen voters who are used to voting; that is going to put poll workers in jeopardy of committing criminal offenses that are very serious; and we are going to create lines at polling places, particularly in a Presidential election year, where thousands of affidavits have to be signed now by poll workers. And we are not addressing any problem; we are creating the problem.

So this bill creates the problem. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on concurrence. Let us get down to the business that the people sent us here. Let us not make work business that hassles our citizens and creates problems. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Northampton County, Mr. Brennan. The gentleman indicates he waives off. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the maker of the bill if he will stand for interrogation, please.

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

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my questions have to do with the PA care facility segment of the legislation. I know what is defined as a PA care facility. My first question is, is there any data that supports that these facilities have the capability of taking the photos?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, was the question, if the care facilities have the ability to produce the photo ID?

Ms. DeLISSIO. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. METCALFE. As we negotiated with the Senate, this was one of the changes that the Senate advocated for at the Senate State Government Committee, and from speaking with the chairman in that committee, he had indicated that some of the care facilities in his area already produced an ID, I believe, but that they would need to alter that ID to comply with the requirements under the law and that they were willing to do that if the law would accommodate the issuance of an ID from one of those care facilities.

So our expectation is the care facilities that do issue IDs will produce them and produce those with an expiration date as would be required. But I am not sure if every care facility has the ability to produce the IDs or not, and that is why we have accommodated the voter with a free ID in the legislation if they do not have another form of ID as one might have if they do live in one of the care facilities.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of my—

The SPEAKER. Will the lady suspend just one minute.

Will the House please come to order. I know we have a lot of guests on the floor, and it is just a little bit noisy. We would appreciate it, especially under interrogation when it is hard to hear back and forth, we would certainly appreciate the members' indulgence.

The lady may proceed.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, having been the CEO (chief executive officer) of a number of these care facilities over a 20-year career, it is not a requirement that these facilities produce an ID. And I have checked with at least one State trade association who indicates that in a very informal poll of their members, and they have north of 300 to 400 members, less than 50 percent may have the capability. So I just want to make sure that our colleagues here today understand that even though this is an option in the bill, the reality of this producing and leading to the outcome that is desired is not a strong outcome.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of issuing the appropriate photo ID by a PA care facility, will they have to verify citizenship as part of that process?

Mr. METCALFE. Did you conclude with a question at the end of your statement, Mr. Speaker?

Ms. DeLISSIO. Will the care facilities need to verify citizenship as part of the photo ID process, as part of the process to issue the photo ID?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I wish that we required that citizenship be noted on driver's licenses and every type of ID that was being accepted so that we could ensure that component to the integrity of our system also and that we also did so upfront with voter registration, Mr. Speaker, but we do not do that currently. It is a change that I would like to make. As I had said to the gentleman from Centre County yesterday, it is a change that I would be willing to work on with anybody from the other side of the aisle to ensure that when somebody has ID that they are presenting, that it is actually indicating whether or not they are a citizen that is eligible to cast a vote in this great nation, but that would not be the case at these residential care facilities, as it is not the case at PENNDOT. We issue driver's licenses to foreign exchange students that are here or foreign students that are here attending our universities and other individuals. So that is something that really would not be relevant to the debate since none of the IDs have that indicator when somebody is granted one, of course other than a U.S. passport.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Then I must have been a little confused on Tuesday, perhaps it was Monday, when I believe the amendment came up about churches and houses of worship being able to produce the photo ID, and I thought, and I may have misheard, that the majority leader referenced that because citizenship needed to be verified, house of worship would not be in that position to issue a photo ID. And quite truthfully, I am not sure what the difference is between a PA care facility and a house of worship as it pertains to ensuring that these photo IDs are in everybody's hands timely.

Do you happen to recall, Mr. Speaker, what the specific objection was to the houses of worship being able to issue the photo ID?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, we are not on that amendment currently. We are on final passage of HB 934 as amended by the Senate, and that question you had would have been pertinent to the debate on that amendment but certainly is not to this debate.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Okay. I will review the tapes and get my answer directly. Thank you.

In terms of that photo ID, there is obviously a cost involved to do this by PA care facilities. There is a cost of materials; there is a cost of staff time. Is this cost assumed to be borne by the care facility?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, this is not a mandate that those facilities produce the ID. If they want to serve their residents of their facility by producing an ID, then that would be fully within their ability to do so under the law to have that recognized by the election workers, but there is no mandate on them. So if they choose to within the marketplace to accommodate their residents with that, I think that actually would be a decision. If I were their CEO, I would certainly want to accommodate my residents. So if they choose to, I am sure they will figure a way out to do it in a cost-efficient manner, Mr. Speaker.

Ms. DeLISSIO. And, Mr. Speaker, just to be clear, they are prohibited then from charging their residents for this photo ID, because then that would be interpreted as a poll tax. Is that correct?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, we provide free of charge from the State IDs. We do not mandate to private organizations whether or not they are going to charge someone for an ID from their facility or from their university or from the college, but we do provide free of charge from the State, ultimately from we the people of Pennsylvania as taxpayers, where we will provide an ID to ensure that people who do not have one will have one to vote if they need it to vote.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Again, Mr. Speaker, my concern is, the way it is in the legislation, it looks like it is an option. A constituent would be led to believe that this is a viable option, and I am just trying to determine that it is an option, but there are a lot of questions behind it as to whether or not that can be realistically produced in a cost-effective manner.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of the election boards, I do have a few more questions. Mr. Speaker, the election board workers will all have to bring with them and produce an ID, correct?

Mr. METCALFE. If they plan on voting that day, they will have to have their photo ID also; yes.

Ms. DeLISSIO. And is there any one person who will be responsible for— I guess I am getting at the person who is actually checking the IDs. Who would be responsible to check their ID?

Mr. METCALFE. Whomever they are presenting their ID to, that election officer who is actually signing them in to vote.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Okay.

Mr. METCALFE. I am sure it is one of their fellow election workers or the judge of elections, inspector of elections there.

Ms. DeLISSIO. And I know we have had questions already about the affidavit. I had some similar questions. I do not think we are clear that the affidavit – what the affidavit process is. I am going to make the assumption for the time being that the affidavit process is going to be a separate form for each and every voter that somebody has to fill out.

I have no more questions for the maker of the bill, Mr. Speaker, but I do have comments on the bill itself.

The SPEAKER. The lady is in order on the bill.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have been working as I go about community meetings to actively try to recruit poll workers, because in the 194th I have seen this kind of scramble for poll workers right ahead of whether it is the primary or the general election, and a lot of good people have decided to step up to do this. They tend to be older citizens who are responding to a civic duty, certainly not responding to the monetary incentive to do this.

My concern is the amount of training. The training I believe is currently optional for working on a poll board, although it is highly encouraged. With even the rollout of this at the primary April 24, which is literally days away, as well as with the general election, there is barely sufficient time to develop a training curriculum let alone administer it, let alone ensure that people are comfortable and confident enough with this new routine to be able to implement it. That is one of the concerns that I would like to share.

Also, I think as soon as the constituents understand that these penalties are real, I think they will have quite a chilling effect on the recruitment of folks for working these election boards. I know I myself would not want to necessarily place myself at risk when there is such confusion. My own mom was a judge of elections for many, many years and did that, again, as part of her civic duty, and I think she would be very concerned that any number of her actions throughout the day could trip a fine and a penalty let alone jeopardize her right to vote going forward.

I have been getting a lot of mail on this issue, as I am sure we all have, and one piece of mail from the League of Women Voters indicates that seven counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania lack Department of Motor Vehicles offices. If in fact that is an accurate statistic, this just reinforces yet again that obtaining a photo ID at one of these venues is going to be very difficult for any number of our Commonwealth's citizens.

I have also heard mentioned this commission that former President Jimmy Carter and James Baker participated in, and I would like to read for the record a little synopsis about not only the purpose of that commission but one of its recommendations. "In 2005, we led a bipartisan Commission on Federal Election Reform and concluded that both parties' concerns were legitimate" – Mr. Speaker, both parties' concerns were legitimate – "a free and fair election requires both ballot security and full access to voting." The commission "...offered a proposal to bridge the partisan divide by suggesting a uniform voter photo ID, based on the federal Real ID Act of 2005, to be phased in over five years." Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous difference between a proposal that would phase something in over 5 years let alone something that is going to phase something in over a few short months, including a dry rollout that will happen in a matter of weeks. This document further states, "To help with the transition, states would provide free voter photo ID cards for eligible citizens; mobile units would be sent out to provide the IDs and register voters." Again, mobile units would be sent out to provide the IDs and register voters. A consistent concern here by all constituents is the ability of constituents to get to the appropriate venue to get a voter ID. I think these are important aspects of this commission report that I have heard cited here many times over the last couple of days. Again, I never liked my words taken out of context, and I do not think we should take any report or any other document out of context either.

My further concern is the length of time that this could take at the polls to vote. I know that, like many of my constituents, I have a very hectic and full schedule. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we have one 13-hour window to exercise our right to vote, unlike some States that have more open election systems. You have days to vote or even weeks to vote in some instances.

Mr. Speaker, it is a little loud.

The SPEAKER. The House will please come to order.

Ms. DeLISSIO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I appreciate if the members and guests would please hold the conversations down.

The lady may proceed.

Ms. DeLISSIO. So I have arrived at the polling place at 7 a.m. because my schedule could not guarantee me that I would be able to return at 8 p.m. to exercise the right to vote. Given the very busy and hectic lives of everyone, I think that if this situation creates a situation whereby it could take 20 or 30 or 40 minutes to vote or longer, that this is very concerning,

and there can be a very high dropout rate due to circumstances beyond voters' controls. And that should concern us as well, and I do not believe that this legislation addresses that.

Lastly, I have spent a lot of time conducting town hall meetings in the district to engage citizens, and I tell them and share with them that I evaluate public policy and legislation based on data and evidence. Is the law addressing something where I could evaluate a trend or a pattern? And the statistics that have been cited here are either extremely dated or extremely isolated. So there has been no trend or pattern to support this particular piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents do have priorities, and they identify those priorities as the must-haves, and the must-haves for my constituents are appropriately funded public school systems, sustainable jobs, and a thriving economy to create and support those jobs, in addition to well-maintained roads, bridges, and mass transit. These are my constituents' must-haves, their priorities.

HB 934, the voter ID bill, is not a must-have and it is not even a nice-to-have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

BILL PASSED OVER TEMPORARILY

The SPEAKER. We are going to temporarily go over HB 934. We would like to introduce some of the guests that are with us today and take up a couple other legislative matters, and then we will return to the debate on HB 934.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. Located to the left of the rostrum, I would like to welcome Chantel Murillo. Chantel is an exchange student from Panama studying political science at Lincoln University, and she hopes to become an attorney. She is here as a guest of Representative John Lawrence. Will our guest please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

In the rear of the House, we would like to welcome William Keyser and a group of constituents from Tredyffrin Township, and they are here as guests of Representative Kampf. Will our guests please rise, back in the far left. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also in the rear of the House, we have some visitors. They are guests of Representative Doyle Heffley from the Carbon County-Penn State Extension. It is Tony Boyle, Emma Boyle, Joan Woll, Monro Cressley, Thomas Reed, and Emily Stemler. Will they please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also located in the rear of the House, we would like to welcome a group of undergraduate students from the 14 State-owned universities who are part of the spring Harrisburg Internship Semester. Will our guests please rise, the interns. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Over here to the left of the Speaker, as guests of Representative DeWeese, I would like to welcome 1st Lt. Leo Donohue and his wife, Ginny. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Also in the rear of the House, as guests of Representative Scavello, we welcome Jim Reinhardt, executive director of the American Red Cross in Monroe County, and several Red Cross board members: Dick Vollmer, Lorna O'Farrell, Kevin Lavelle, and Alma Ruiz-Smith. Will our guests please rise. Welcome to the hall of the House.

WYOMING SEMINARY HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS FIELD HOCKEY TEAM PRESENTED

The SPEAKER. I would like to invite Representative Mundy to the rostrum for the purpose of presenting a citation to the Wyoming Seminary Girls Field Hockey Team.

Ms. MUNDY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my great pleasure to introduce you to some outstanding athletes from the Greater Wilkes-Barre area who made the trip to Harrisburg today. The Wyoming Seminary Girls Field Hockey Team is with us in the hall of the House. These girls won the PIAA Class II Field Hockey Championship in November with a win against Villa Maria. Mr. Speaker, this victory was Wyoming Seminary's fifth State title since 2001 and the first consecutive State championship for the Wyoming Seminary Knights.

Clearly, these young women are shining examples of talent and dedication as well as personal sacrifice and impressive commitment to their sport. Of course, these achievements would not have been possible without the guidance, support, and encouragement of their coaches and their families.

Today we are joined by their outstanding head coach, Karen Klassner. Coach Klassner has coached at Wyoming Seminary for 42 years and presided over many, many State championship teams. Assistant coaches Kim Barbacci, Margaret Kerrick, Antoinette Allen, and Stephanie Beres could not be here with us today, but I would like to extend my congratulations and appreciation to them as well.

Representing the team up here are captains Ann Romanowski, AshLeigh Sebia, and Kristian Stefanides, and if the remaining team members seated in the back of the House would please stand, they are Bethany Brody, Taylor Bell, Corinne Conynham, Francesca Domiano, Madison Dowd, Hannah Dressler, Tali Dressler, Nora Fierman, Mackenzie Gagliardi, Emily Granger, Julia Grosek, Katrina Grosek, Devin Holmes, Cheyenne Kimble, Lauren Lamar, Mallory Lefkowitz, Ellie McDougal, Bridget McMullan, Kristen Mericle, Ines Nowack, Madison Policare, Alexis Quick, Catherine Partsch, Rebecca Schulman, Sejal Sharma, Sarah Spillane, Katelyn Stemrich, Molly Turner, Marra Wagner, and Marguerite Wiles.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that many of these girls have played in three championship games, some of them in their freshman year, in their junior year, and in their senior year, and they are a really remarkable group of girls, and I am just thrilled to have them here today.

Mr. Speaker, we in the House think it is important that State champion athletes be acknowledged. It is with this in mind that I present the Wyoming Seminary Knights Girls Field Hockey Team with their citation recognizing their outstanding achievement.

On behalf of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, I commend you all for your hard work, your impressive consecutive State championships, and I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

Thanks for being here, girls.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER. A few other guests that are with us in the balcony, the Pottsville High School seniors, and they are the guests of Representatives Tobash, Knowles, and Goodman. Will

our guests please rise from Pottsville High. Welcome to the hall of the House.

Located to the left of the rostrum, we would also like to welcome Alecia Pagerly and her daughter, Savannah; Paul and Michelle Moyer; David and Lisa Pagerly; and John Masciotti. Will our guests please rise.

And also with them in the rear of the House are Western Berks Regional Police Department Chief Scott Wagner; his wife, Kathleen, and daughter, Amy; Jonny Mashburn; and Western Berks Regional Police Department Commission Chairman Edward Evans. They are all here as guests of Representative Jim Cox, and with that we would like to welcome our guests.

BILL ON THIRD CONSIDERATION

The House proceeded to third consideration of **HB 2027, PN 2776**, entitled:

An Act designating State Route 422, from its intersection with State Route 724 in the Borough of Sinking Spring, Berks County, to the west end of the Borough of Robesonia, Berks County, as the Kyle D. Pagerly Memorial Highway.

On the question,

Will the House agree to the bill on third consideration?

Bill was agreed to.

(Bill analysis was read.)

The SPEAKER. The House will come to order. The members will please take their seats.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE CANCELED

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

CONSIDERATION OF HB 2027 CONTINUED

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

The question is, shall the bill pass finally?

On that question, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Berks County, Mr. Cox.

Mr. COX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 29, 2011—

The SPEAKER. Excuse me. Will the gentleman suspend.

Will the members please take their seats.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. COX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On Wednesday, June 29, 2011, Berks County and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania lost a true American hero. Deputy Kyle David Pagerly was only 28 years old when he lost his life in the line of duty that day.

Deputy Pagerly was a canine deputy sheriff with the Berks County Sheriff's Department, where he had served since 2006. He also worked part-time with the Western Berks Regional Police Department, the U.S. Marshals Task Force, and was a

lieutenant for the Spring Township Fire Department. In addition, Deputy Pagerly was a U.S. Army Military Police veteran who served in Kosovo and Iraq. Mr. Speaker, Deputy Pagerly spent his life serving others.

On that dreadful June evening, Deputy Pagerly was among those tasked with serving a search warrant in Albany Township. The group included members of the Pennsylvania State Police, the fugitive task force, the U.S. Marshals Service, and the Berks County Sheriff's Office. The event culminated in a gun battle, where Deputy Pagerly was mortally wounded. He was airlifted to Lehigh Valley Hospital, but ultimately succumbed to his injuries.

Even in death, Deputy Pagerly served others. You see, he was an organ donor, and upon his untimely death, his organs and his tissues were donated so that some others might live.

Deputy Pagerly was instrumental in setting up the Berks County Sheriff's Department K-9 unit. His loyal K-9 partner, a 3-year-old German shepherd named Jynx, reportedly grabbed Kyle's pant leg and attempted to pull him to safety during the deadly gun battle. For his bravery, Jynx was awarded a Medal of Honor, and he now lives with Kyle's widow, Alecia, who is with us today.

Perhaps most heartbreaking of all, Deputy Pagerly will never have an opportunity to know his daughter, Savannah, whom his wife, Alecia, delivered in January.

Mr. Speaker, Deputy Pagerly served his community, his Commonwealth, and his country.

In an effort to honor Deputy Pagerly's service, I have asked my colleagues to join me today in supporting HB 2027, and I am joined by Representative Mark Gillen, where the Pagerlys live at this point. This legislation would designate State Route 422 from its intersection with State Route 724 in the borough of Sinking Spring to the west end of the borough of Robesonia as the "Kyle D. Pagerly Memorial Highway."

We owe Deputy Pagerly a debt of gratitude that we will never be able to repay. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in approving this legislation as a small but hopefully meaningful gesture of appreciation for the sacrifice Deputy Pagerly made. Let this road stand as a constant reminder of Kyle D. Pagerly and his service to others. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. Members and all guests will please rise in a moment of silence out of respect for the fallen law enforcement officer and in prayer for his family and friends.

(A moment of silence was observed.)

On the question recurring,

Shall the bill pass finally?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

Adolph	Dunbar	Kirkland	Quinn
Aument	Ellis	Knowles	Rapp
Baker	Emrick	Kortz	Ravenstahl
Barbin	Evankovich	Kotik	Readshaw
Barrar	Evans, D.	Krieger	Reed
Bear	Evans, J.	Kula	Reese

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

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Boyle, B.	Killion	Marsico	O'Neill
Deasy			

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

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

BILLS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE, CONSIDERED FIRST TIME, AND TABLED

HB 1767, PN 3217 (Amended)

By Rep. ROSS

An Act amending the act of November 24, 1976 (P.L.1176, No.261), known as the Manufactured Home Community Rights Act, further providing for definitions; providing for determination of abandonment, for abandoned manufactured homes, for immunity from liability, for sale or lease of manufactured home communities, for

closure of manufactured home communities, for notice requirements in the event of closure of manufactured home community and for remedies; and repealing certain provisions of The Landlord and Tenant Act of 1951.

URBAN AFFAIRS.

HB 2137, PN 3218 (Amended)

By Rep. ROSS

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

URBAN AFFAIRS.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The Speaker would like to welcome Representative Hennessey, the chairman of the House Irish Caucus, and invite him to the reader's desk relative to Irish Caucus Day.

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen here in the House of Representatives and to our viewers across the Commonwealth joining us on Pennsylvania Cable Network, good morning.

As we approach that holiest of holy days, March 17, the Feast of St. Patrick, it is good to remind ourselves that Pennsylvania and, indeed, all of America is a society of immigrants, a melting pot of cultures, and a tapestry woven by the efforts of our ancestors from so many different nationalities. Immigrants from around the world found their way to America's shores seeking a better life for themselves and their families. Many of those immigrant families came from Ireland and many settled right here in Pennsylvania.

What began as a trickle – about 6,000 people, our census figures reveal, in 1815 – built over the years, and eventually thousands of Irish laborers came here to build the railroads across the United States. They dug the Erie Canal. At one point over 3,000 Irish workers labored for the Erie Canal Co., and here in Pennsylvania the Irish worked in our coal mines and our steel mills. As one journalist of the time wrote, in Pennsylvania "There are several kinds of power...water-power, steam-power and Irish-power. The last works hardest of all."

The Irish potato famine gave impetus to Irish immigration into America, and between 1846 and 1854 nearly 2 million people, one-quarter of the population of Ireland, came to America. The Irish joined Germans, Italians, eastern Europeans, and immigrants from around the world to form the fabric of today's Pennsylvania, and like many cultures, the Irish crystallized their traditions into music and dance.

COYLE SCHOOL OF IRISH DANCERS PRESENTED

Mr. HENNESSEY. And so today to honor our ancestry and preserve our traditions, we are joined by dancers from the Coyle School of Irish Dance, now located in New Cumberland, Pennsylvania, and it was formerly in Mechanicsburg right across the river, the Susquehanna River, from Harrisburg, but now located in New Cumberland.

Our dancers today are Samantha Lynch, Abby Jordan, Patrice Lonardi, Maddy Logan, Maren Logan, and Jack Logan.

Our first dance is a four-hand reel. And by the way, do we have four dancers now? I think we might have lost one. Okay; it is a three-hand reel then, I guess. Okay. So, girls, if you would do the three-hand reel, we would appreciate that.

(A three-hand reel was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you, girls.

The next dance is a girls slip jig.

(A slip jig was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Just like me, I sometimes come untracked.

Thank you, girls.

Next we have the Logan family – Maddy, Maren, and Jack. Jack is John Patrick Logan. He told me he was not 6. He had just turned 7, I believe, last week. So Jack is here to hold down the masculine side of this Logan family light jig.

(A light jig was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you to the Logan family.

Now, to close out our dancing on the House floor this morning, we are going to have a treble reel. It is done in soft shoes. Because of the carpeting on the House floor, we are not doing any of the hard shoe dances here, but from 12 to 12:30 the Coyle School of Irish Dance will be performing in the East Wing Rotunda, and I will mention that again in just a second, but for right now we are going to do a treble reel. Thank you.

(A treble reel was performed.)

Mr. HENNESSEY. Thank you very much.

Please note that even when the CD (compact disk) skipped a track, the girls did not miss a step.

Thank you again to the Coyle School of Irish Dance in New Cumberland, Pennsylvania. There we go. Thank you once again.

Ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of the Irish Caucus of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, we want to thank you for enjoying our dancers from the Coyle School of Irish Dance.

Good kids doing good things is a theme that we probably ought to mention many more times in our public dialogue, because when we read about some kids doing things wrong, that hits the newspapers, but there are lots more good kids doing good things every day in our society.

I would also like to invite our members, our visitors, and our staff to an Irish lunch in room 60, East Wing. We are going to be working continually right through lunch here on the House floor, but if you can break away for a few minutes to get some traditional Irish fare down at 60 East Wing, you are certainly welcome as are staff here in the Capitol.

And also, as I had started to mention, from 12 to 12:30 the Coyle School will be dancing in the East Wing Rotunda.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing the Irish Caucus to celebrate with Pennsylvanians across the Commonwealth the Irish history, which laces Pennsylvania history.

Thank you very much.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. FARRY called up **HR 510, PN 2798**, entitled:

A Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to support full funding for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

(Members proceeded to vote.)

The SPEAKER. There is nothing in order but the taking of the vote.

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

Mr. VITALI. It seems that this could potentially have some controversy. If we could just back it up a bit. I do not think this has been caucused on that I am aware of.

The SPEAKER. There is nothing in order but the taking of the vote. I am sorry.

On the question recurring,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—186

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

Dermody	Kauffman	Pickett	Youngblood
DeWeese	Kavulich	Preston	
DiGirolamo	Keller, F.	Pyle	Smith, S.,
Donatucci	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	Speaker

NAYS—3

DeLissio	Josephs	Vitali
----------	---------	--------

NOT VOTING—3

Brown, V.	Myers	Parker
-----------	-------	--------

EXCUSED—5

Boyle, B.	Killion	Marsico	O'Neill
Deasy			

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

* * *

Mr. FARRY called up **HR 607, PN 3174**, entitled:

A Resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to enact H.R. 4018 (2012), which would enhance and improve the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program.

On the question,
Will the House adopt the resolution?

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—192

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

Curry	Harris	O'Brien, M.	Toohil
Cutler	Heffley	Oberlander	Truitt
Daley	Helm	Parker	Turzai
Davidson	Hennessey	Pashinski	Vereb
Davis	Hess	Payne	Vitali
Day	Hickernell	Payton	Vulakovich
DeLissio	Hornaman	Peifer	Waters
Delozier	Hutchinson	Perry	Watson
DeLuca	Josephs	Petrarca	Wheatley
Denlinger	Kampf	Petri	White
DePasquale	Kauffman	Pickett	Youngblood
Dermody	Kavulich	Preston	
DeWeese	Keller, F.	Pyle	Smith, S.,
DiGirolamo	Keller, M.K.	Quigley	Speaker
Donatucci	Keller, W.		

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Boyle, B.	Killion	Marsico	O'Neill
Deasy			

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

STATEMENT BY MR. FARRY

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Farry, from Bucks County is recognized under unanimous consent relative to the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. FARRY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I can submit comments for the record on HR 510.

Also, regarding HR 607 I would like to thank my colleagues for their support on this resolution. This resolution memorializes the passing of paramedic Dan McIntosh, who was from Representative DiGirolamo's district.

With the passing of Paramedic McIntosh, it brought to light an issue with the Federal Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program. That program actually has a loophole in it. The program is intended to provide emergency service providers – police, fire, and EMS (emergency medical services) – with a Federal death benefit for their family upon a line-of-duty death. Paramedic McIntosh passed away in the line of duty on March 7, 2010. Because Paramedic McIntosh was employed by a nonprofit EMS provider that provided emergency services in Bucks County and was not a municipal employee, was not affiliated with a fire department, Officer McIntosh's wife and two children are not eligible for that Federal death benefit.

Congressman Fitzpatrick from Bucks County has introduced legislation to close that loophole. I think it is important that the members realize that nonprofit ambulance squads that provide 911 service to much of the Commonwealth will fall within this loophole, their EMTs (emergency medical technicians), and paramedics.

So I encourage you to please speak to your Congressman or woman as well as our U.S. Senators. Encourage them to help support Congressman Fitzpatrick's legislation to close this loophole.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker thanks the gentleman.

REMARKS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

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

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to urge our U.S. Congressmen and women to support full funding of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.

The F-35 program is important because it supplies the United States with a single family of highly capable, interoperable, and affordable stealth fighter aircrafts. Countries like China and Russia are aggressively investing in fighter jet development that can compete with the best planes the United States has to offer. The F-35 represents the most cost-effective and broad-based aviation solution to serve tomorrow's military needs.

Pennsylvania has a critical role as part of the supplier base for the F-35 military aircraft. The project creates more than 1,000 direct and indirect jobs in our State. It also pumps more than \$65 million into the Commonwealth's economy. We have seen firsthand what this program means for our economy and for our national defense.

Located in Bucks County, a company called Teletronics is a large supplier of the F-35 and a true success story. Years ago Teletronics received a low-interest loan from the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development and they were able to acquire the type of equipment necessary to become a supplier on projects like the F-35. Today Teletronics employs more than 100 people. During this time of economic uncertainty, the F-35 program is a precious investment we do not want to lose.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all members to join me today in passing HR 510 and sending a strong message to the United States Congress urging them to fully fund this vital program, to give our men and women in the armed services the tools they need to continue the air superiority of the U.S. and our allies, and to support Pennsylvania's job growth and economy.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. SCHRODER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Schroder, rise?

Mr. SCHRODER. A brief point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his point of personal privilege.

Mr. SCHRODER. Mr. Speaker, I just thought it would be appropriate to take a moment here in the House and recognize the newest grandparent among us in the State House of Representatives, and that would be our colleague, Representative Steve "Gramps" Bloom back here. He became a grandparent yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, grandfather.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER. The House returns to consideration of HB 934, PN 3166.

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

The SPEAKER. On that question, the Speaker recognizes—
For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Vitali, rise?

Mr. VITALI. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his inquiry.

Mr. VITALI. I wanted to go back to HR 510, which would give our support to Congress of the most expensive—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. VITALI. —military program in the nation's history.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VITALI. Yes. The inquiry is – and I am laying the groundwork, because it is an enormously expensive and controversial military expense.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

Do you have a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VITALI. The parliamentary inquiry is twofold. A, our rules require that a brief description of each resolution, amendment, bill be read prior to voting. A, I am wondering if that was done in this case, and if not, what are the consequences?

And B, a question, this was not caucused on, and I am wondering if that is required by the rules, and if not, what would be the implications of voting on the bill that was not caucused on?

The SPEAKER. We are reviewing, checking through the rules. There is nothing immediately, to my attention, that would require caucusing by rule, and there is nothing that requires a description of the resolution to be read prior to its voting.

Mr. VITALI. All right. Let me just be clear about the reading, because that was actually a rule reform that I actually proposed. So I know there is something in the rules with regard to that unless it was deleted.

The SPEAKER. That is relative to bills as in legislation, not—

Mr. VITALI. Bills and amendments. You are saying bills and amendments, but not resolutions? Is that how that—

The SPEAKER. It does not apply. A quick review of the rules, I do not see anything that says that that applies to resolutions.

Mr. VITALI. I just want to double-check it. The wording is not the question, because then that would also apply to resolutions. I just want to make sure with regard to that.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman have a further parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. VITALI. No, but I would like to speak on unanimous consent, if I could, on that issue.

The SPEAKER. With all due respect, the Speaker had recalled HB 934, had restated the question, and that is the business before the House at this point in time. I would suggest that the next time that we would break away from the bill or towards the end of the session day, a unanimous consent relative to a resolution would be more in order then. At this point the business before the House is HB 934.

Mr. VITALI. Thank you.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

Ms. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like for a quick moment just to share with this House of Representatives an article that I found on Philly.com. It gives an indication as to what some of the people outside of this House might be feeling about those of us who are in the House and those of us who make law. It began by telling us that "A Wisconsin judge has halted implementation of that state's voter identification law before its April primary, responding to an NAACP lawsuit that contends voters without driver's licenses are 'disproportionately elderly, indigent, or members of a racial minority.' Likewise, the...proposal in Pennsylvania is nothing more than a new form of a poll tax, similar to those imposed to turn away black voters in the old, segregated South.

"So-called voter-ID rules would hit the old, young, poor, and minority voters the hardest – a slice of the electorate least likely to have government-issued identification of the type required under the measure approved Wednesday by the state Senate.

"The fact that this group of voters disproportionately leans toward Democratic candidates, particularly in Philadelphia and other urban areas, uncovers the voter-ID proposal for what it is – a blatant bid for GOP advantage at the polls.

"It's all the more outrageous that this tactic would be employed in a presidential decision year, given that the Nov. 6 election would be the first in which photo ID would be demanded for every Keystone State voter."

We end that, and we are turning back the hands of time, Mr. Speaker. We in this House are turning back the hands of time. We are targeting women voters. Women change their names at least 90 percent of the time – when they get married, when they get divorced, when they remarry. So women whose legal names sometimes do not match their current legal ID could find themselves barred from voting. This bill would ultimately disenfranchise women. Women who are victims of domestic violence would be targeted and women who may find it difficult or impossible to locate their birth certificate.

And I want to say the birth certificate issue is an issue that was brushed over in this House, but years ago when people migrated from Southern States into Pennsylvania, many of them were coming from poor, rural areas where in the thirties, in the twenties, in the forties some of them were still under the influence of midwives, midwives who lived in the country on the farm who did not often go into town. When they did turn in names, months later perhaps, there were several names at one time, and those names oftentimes became confused. And when later they moved into various places up North, getting a birth certificate became extremely difficult to get it accurately.

As a legislator in my first year, some of my responsibilities were to try to help a family who had 12 children, and all of them had mixed-up names. I succeeded in correcting the birth certificate of most of my siblings by law, expensive law work, and finally getting it done prior to one's death.

It is impossible to locate birth certificates sometimes. Social Security cards are being targeted. So how much has Pennsylvania changed as far as suppressing the women vote?

Mr. Speaker, this is the same kind of thing that caused Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and States throughout the South to erupt with violent demonstrations because people were treated unfairly. They wanted an opportunity to be able to vote. They wanted an opportunity to

go to school. They wanted the same kind of opportunity everyone else had, and so they met their desires with dogs, water hoses, killing. And do not let us for one moment forget the first blood that was shed during the civil rights march was the blood of a White woman out of Michigan who was killed in the midst of the struggle. She left her home and went to Montgomery, where she was killed on the spot, to join the fight for equal justice for every woman, for every man. She never returned home, never lived to see her dream become alive. Mr. Speaker, we did. You and I and the rest of us have lived to see her dream become a reality, but her dream is also in jeopardy for our children in HB 934.

We in Pennsylvania can do better. The place that is the birth of our nation, we can do better. Yes, this great State with liberty, freedom, justice for all, we can do better. I believe William Penn, if he had an opportunity and could, would turn over in his grave. What happened to our country, "My country, 'tis of thee, Sweet land of liberty"?

I am hoping that everyone in this room will realize the danger in HB 934. I know that all kinds of accusations have been launched against the makers of this bill, but I believe in my heart of hearts, knowing and having lived with many of you for 24 years, if you realize the danger in how far this bill sets us back, you would vote "no" on HB 934.

So I thank you and I pray that you will let your conscience be your guide.

THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE (MATTHEW E. BAKER) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Kotik.

Mr. KOTIK. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 minutes of wisdom here.

Mr. Speaker, I find this debate on HB 934 quite incredulous. When we pull away all the rhetoric and rationalizations for the necessity of this legislation, we are confronted with some historical facts about the impact of fraud in statewide elections. Pennsylvania in 2012 is not Florida in 2000. We are basically a swing State that seems to have a permanent 8-year cycle in effect that greatly illustrates the independence and wisdom of Pennsylvania voters, because after 8 years, the voters for the last 7 years have decided it is time for a change, and they make a change in the Governor's Office and they often make a change in this General Assembly. So we go back and forth, and these trends are beyond, they are trends that flow back and forth, the ebb and flow of politics and of government in this Commonwealth.

And to imply that one party can organize a massive conspiracy to organize or orchestrate voter fraud flies in the face of our recent electoral history. Tom Corbett won the governorship in 2010 despite a registration edge of 1 million voters for the Democrats. So that says a lot about Pennsylvania voters. That says they are not intimidated. That says that no matter what you try to do to influence an election, if people want to make a change, they will make a change.

The Pennsylvania Supreme Court is comprised of four Republicans and three Democrats. Commonwealth Court has seven Republicans and two Democrats. The General Assembly has solid Republican majorities in both houses.

The proponents of this legislation do not have the facts on their side. The voters of this Commonwealth will make their decisions based on a number of factors and democracy will prevail.

And in closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to note for the record that Dan Onorato and I visited all the cemeteries in Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties prior to the gubernatorial election. In Philadelphia the residents were concerned with the upcoming mayor's race in 2011, and in Allegheny County the residents of those cemeteries were overwhelming in their support of Tom Corbett, who carried the county by 6,000 votes.

HB 934 will create chaos and ultimately have no positive impact. However, it will disillusion a lot of prospective voters and lead to less participation throughout our Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on concurrence. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from York County, Mr. DePasquale.

Mr. DePASQUALE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB 934, I want to point out at least one interesting fact. Since about 1977 Republicans have universally condemned Jimmy Carter. However, since this debate has begun, he now has seemed to have grown favor at least with Harrisburg Republicans who continue to tout how important Jimmy Carter is to the future of democracy because there is some report that has him supporting some level of an ID card. I wish they were that supportive of him in 1980. Maybe we would not have had the great recession of 1982, but I digress.

I also find it interesting – and again, I appreciate the majority leader; we passed very important RCAP (Redevelopment Assistance Capital Program) legislation this past week that can reform that and make it more open and transparent, and I appreciate that – but there was a capital budget item that we heard a lot about last year called the Arlen Specter Library, and I think the reform measure that we passed here this week can go a long way towards stopping that type, but that library cost significantly less than what HB 934 will cost. And somehow the spending on the Specter Library was seen as outrageous and would hurt the economy of Pennsylvania, but the amount of spending for HB 934 and the \$11 million price tag seems to just get swept under the rug as, well, that is just what we have to do. So we have \$11 million as apparently a drop in the bucket if you support HB 934, and now Jimmy Carter is back in the graces of Harrisburg Republicans. Politics does make strange bedfellows.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to HB 934 because I believe we need to be encouraging more people to vote, not making it harder for people that are already eligible to vote to cast that ballot. I am also opposed to it because HB 934 will cause further cuts to education and environmental protection and to our roads and bridges that need more investment, not less.

Other States that have taken similar voter ID provisions have also done other items to make voting easier, by making it easier to vote by mail or expanding early voting hours. If you are a working family in York County, many of them work in Maryland. If you are an hourly worker and you have to get to work and that line gets 2 to 3 hours long, they are going to simply have to get out of that line so they can get to work and put dinner on the table for their family. There are no provisions in this legislation for that type of group. Even if they are in line

with their ID, the lines that this will cause will be around the corner and sometimes many blocks and sometimes several hours.

As we now see out of Wisconsin when they passed their voter ID, immediately after that the Governor, because it was passed on the idea that, well, people can get their ID at the DMV (Department of Motor Vehicles), and then immediately after he signed the law, the Governor of Wisconsin then began shutting down departments of motor vehicles. While we do not know that is going to happen in Pennsylvania, keep in mind that the Governor's Transportation Advisory Commission recommends as a way to save money closing department facilities. So if you are in a rural area, the more urban areas will actually probably be more manageable on this. Areas like York and some of your larger urban areas have several DMV facilities, but the more rural areas that may only have one or two in a county, believe me when I tell you, if you look at that Transportation Advisory Commission report, they recommend closing more rural DMV facilities, which will only make it harder for people to get their voter ID.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that HB 934 be rejected, that we work together on a bipartisan plan that would make it easier for eligible citizens to vote, not harder.

And I also want to finally point out that again it is heartwarming to hear something nice being said about Jimmy Carter from the other side of the aisle. It is about 30 years in the making.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lackawanna County, Mr. Ken Smith.

Mr. K. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on HB 934 in its concurrence. For the past 3 days I have listened, and most times in an attentive manner, to the debate on HB 934 and the voter ID bill, better known as the voter ID bill, and there is not anything that I could add to the argument on either side of it.

And, Mr. Speaker, I know this, there are many Pennsylvanians out there that are sick, they are tired, they are hungry, and they need family-sustaining jobs. And when I go home later today or tomorrow, I do not know, when I go to the grocery store, if anyone will approach me about HB 934, but I know with certainty the next time I am out in public that somebody will approach me about, what are we as a legislature doing to protect our vulnerable population, whether it be our children with respect to education, our institutions of higher education with our State colleges and universities, our seniors that are trying to age in place, our mentally challenged, and those that face physical disabilities as well?

During the past budget cycle and this budget cycle coming up, we face more cuts and more trials. Pennsylvanians, I think, want us as a legislature to address the pressing needs, and that is protecting our vulnerable population, protecting our children, making sure that we prepare them for the 21st century and their education, making sure that we are business-friendly in this Commonwealth and that we create family-sustaining jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is, I think we took our eye off the ball. I am not trying to minimize the importance of HB 934, but I know there are more pressing issues facing Pennsylvanians. So please, Mr. Speaker, at the end of the day when we vote on HB 934, what I am asking my colleagues is to

make sure that we refocus on those pressing issues that face Pennsylvanians in today's difficult economy.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lawrence County, Mr. Sainato.

Mr. SAINATO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have sat here and listened to this debate now for 2 days. There is not a whole lot more to say, but I have a few comments.

If you look at the voter history in Pennsylvania, you look at the people that work at the polls and you look at the people that vote. I am from Lawrence County. I believe the poll workers that work inside, the people that run the elections have integrity and honesty. I believe that happens in all 67 counties in Pennsylvania.

I think it is wrong that we are looking here telling everyone how bad the system is. I think we have a serious problem on our hands, Mr. Speaker, and the problem is going to be when people come in who have been voting for 40 and 50 years at certain precincts and they are no longer eligible to vote because they have no ID.

What do you do when someone is 80, 85, 90 years old and they do not have that voter ID and they have been there and they know the people that have been there? These are not people that are corrupt. These are people that have been doing their civic duty for the past 40 or 50 years.

About 10 years ago we honored the election workers in Lawrence County, and many of those election workers had worked on the precinct polls for 20, 30, 40, and 50 years. Those are the type of people in rural Pennsylvania that work at the polls. I have a fear, Mr. Speaker, that in about another year or so many of those people will not be working at the polls anymore. For the small amount of money they get, they are not going to want to go through the hassle and the grief that is going to be perpetuated upon them by HB 934.

Right now in Pennsylvania, you must show an ID the first time that you vote. When I go into my high schools and I talk to the kids to get registered to vote – they are going to be 18 – I say, you must bring an ID to vote. I think it is great. You should have an ID to vote for the first time. That is present law. You should have an ID to vote. You show that ID, and the second time you come, they know who you are and you do not have to show that ID.

I had heard the argument yesterday that you have to show ID to go into a bar. Guess what? No, you do not. No, you do not. You have to be 21 years of age to go in that bar, and that bar owner will ask you for an ID the first time you go in there. But the second, the third, the fourth time you go into that bar, they are not going to ask you for an ID. That is the same premise we have with the voting system we have in Pennsylvania right now. You show an ID the first time you vote. They know who you are.

You have a Democrat and a Republican judge of elections. They have a right anytime to question anybody to show an ID. If they feel someone is committing fraud or someone is not who they are, they have a right to ask for that ID now. We do not need a new law. We are going to have someone show an ID every time? That is like this analogy about the bar; every time you go into a bar, you should have your ID and you have to show your ID. Unfortunately, I have not been asked for an ID

for a long time, but am I supposed to show an ID every time I go into a bar? So I am using that analogy, Mr. Speaker, but this is the same thing. A 90-year-old woman who has been voting for the same precinct for the last 40 years now has to show an ID.

I used to deal with passports when I was a congressional aide, and you do not know the difficulty some of our old senior citizens had if they did not have a birth certificate. They came either from the old country or they were born in the United States before we had the vital records system that we have today. It was a real problem to get them an ID to get a passport.

What happens now to these people? You can educate them all you want. They are going to go in on election day, whether it is the primary or the general, and they are not going to have an ID and they are not going to be very happy people. And the abuse that is going to be given is going to be given to the people that work at the precincts – the judges of elections, the people that provide public service. They do public service to work on election day, because it surely is not about the money. And in my area, these are older people that have been doing it for years and years. I pity them if this bill passes, because the grief that they are going to have to put up with is going to be wrong, Mr. Speaker.

So in conclusion, I just think this is a bill that is well intended. We want to keep the integrity of the voting system, but we have it now in Pennsylvania. There have been so few cases of voter fraud over the last 10, 20, 30 years. This just amazes me that we spent 3 days on this. As the previous speaker, Mr. Speaker, has talked about, there are other issues we need to deal with. But I think this issue, if this bill becomes law, it is going to be long-term consequences that nobody thought of. When people start quitting from working at the polls and the precincts, when the grief and aggravation of people who feel they are being disenfranchised happens, it is going to be a very sad day for the voters of Pennsylvania.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to interrogate the maker of HB 934.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady asked for interrogation of the maker of the legislation. He has agreed, and you may proceed, Ms. Josephs.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to page 9, line 24, in HB 934. That is the line on which the term "substantially conforms" is found, and what the line says is that the name on the person's photo ID must substantially conform to the same person's name in the voter roll book. My question is about the interpretation that was given to those terms in the Indiana law, because the maker and many of my good friends from the other side of the aisle have, over and over again, said that this is based, this bill is based on the Indiana law.

So in Indiana we have found out that conforming, according to the way they interpret the law, does not mean identical, and I am going to read you 5 names – 10 names; I am sorry – that would conform under Indiana law to the name Robert John Crew – Robert John Crew. And in Indiana they would let Robert John Crew vote if his photo ID said a number of things, certainly "Robert John Crew," but also "Robert J. Crew," "Robert Crew," "R. John Crew," "R. J. Crew," "Bob John

Crew," "Bob J. Crew," "Bob Crew," "John Crew," and "J. Crew," and this comes from the documents, part of the documents used to train the poll workers.

My question is, do you see this bill, when it passes – I think we all know that is what is going to happen – as having this kind of definition for the term "substantially conforms" in your bill, and do you believe that it would be legal under your bill for Pennsylvania election authorities to give this type of interpretation to those words in your bill?

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The language in the bill as was referenced, the "SUBSTANTIALLY CONFORMS TO THE NAME OF THE INDIVIDUAL AS IT APPEARS IN THE DISTRICT REGISTER," of course we were modeling, as the lady knows, after the law in Indiana. And "substantially conforms" is certainly intended to ensure that if there is a typographical error or something of that nature, that you can accommodate that, that the name is similar but does not have to be exact but substantially conforms. So that is the intent, of course, of not having a very strict definition but to allow for some of those instances that you might need to allow for to ensure that the voter can move forward with casting their vote.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you. I would like to follow up. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I read you a list. I would be happy to read it again. It is hard to get things when it is oral, I know.

In your opinion, would this latitude that is allowed in Indiana be similar to the latitude that you would allow under your bill in Pennsylvania?

Mr. METCALFE. I would expect that it would be similar to how it is worked out in Indiana, although to try and get into specific examples I think is not productive. And the language is what it states, that it is going to be substantially conforming to that of the individual as it appears on the district register, and I think that is very clear.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you. I do not have any more questions for you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. METCALFE. Thank you.

Ms. JOSEPHS. I appreciate your willingness to stand and take interrogation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The lady has concluded her interrogation and may proceed on the question.

Ms. JOSEPHS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a tremendous amount of discussion from the people on the other side of the aisle and incidents cited about all kinds of voter fraud, most of which has absolutely nothing to do with any crime that would be prevented by this bill. But some of it does, and I want to reference the hearing that we held in the State Government Committee when a witness said that in 2004 – and this is on the record; it is all in your e-mail or all on the site – in 2004 she said, busload after busload – I am paraphrasing – of voters, fake voters, were taken into Allegheny County, and perhaps environs, to vote for the Democratic candidate in the Presidential election. I did not really have a chance to question her, so I do not know if she reported this incident, which, if true, would be really awful and which I would be the first person to say should be prosecuted. I did not have the opportunity because of the way the hearing was run to ask her, did she report it? And if she reported it, was there any investigation? were there any charges? were there any prosecutions? Because if this was true, there should have been a lot of prosecutions. And as I said, I would be the first person

interested in doing that, making sure that prosecution went forward.

So since I did not have an answer from our witnesses, I wrote some letters. I wrote the Attorney General of the United States to ask whether he had any complaints about this alleged incident in 2004 in Allegheny County. I asked the Allegheny County district attorney, Stephen A. Zappala, the same question. I asked, at the time, a different Attorney General here, but was referred to our present Attorney General, Linda Kelly, and I also wrote to the Governor in his capacity as the Attorney General before he became the Governor.

The answers I got were very interesting, and I have the letters, and I am going to submit them to the record so that the public can see how people answered. A spokeswoman for the Governor gave an answer that was, I consider, boilerplate; did not refer to the incident at all about which I asked and simply reiterated the kinds of arguments, nonspecific arguments that we have heard on the floor from our good comrades – or bad word – our good colleagues on the Republican side. As I said, I will put these into the record.

The Attorney General of the United States had a spokesperson answer for him. He said, I never heard anything about this incident, but the general tenor of the letter was, if you hear about these things, please tell us; we want to prosecute. And I got this same kind of letter as this spokesperson from Mr. Zappala.

I also, I am not going to read these letters; it is much too long, but there is a paragraph that I am interested in just putting in the record, so I will read that. It is from the County of Allegheny, Department of Administrative Services, Elections Division, was part of the answer that I got when I wrote to Mr. Zappala. And the person who wrote, who is the division manager, Mark Wolosik, says this: "It is not uncommon in high-profile elections of this type for unfounded allegations of election irregularities and election fraud to be made. However, neither..." – and he mentioned the name of the person he works with – "nor I am aware of the allegation that 'students were bused in from New York to vote illegally at the campus of the University of Pittsburgh,' " which is what our witness said. "While Attorney Ronald Hicks, representing the Republican Committee of Allegheny County, secured an Election-Day Court Order impounding the election materials used at the University of Pittsburgh Litchfield Towers polling place, he did not object to Common Pleas Court Judge..." who was Lawrence J. O'Toole, "terminating the same" investigation "approximately 5 months later." And I have a copy of that order terminating the investigation.

Now, I am concerned on many fronts here, not the least one being that the woman who testified about these busloads of illegal voters was an attorney, as I am, and attorneys are held—Attorneys, and I myself as well, are officers of the court. We are bound to act more ethically than a person who is not the attorney. We have a higher standard of reporting the truth, of saying what we know to be the truth, of not misrepresenting, and of course you can see why that would be, because when we are in trials, if we are not truthful, we are not getting to the real answer that the public deserves and demands. That higher standard of care, as all the attorneys here understand a higher standard of ethics, applies in all of our dealings in and out of court. And I am pretty upset that we could, that the witness who said she saw all of this, A, did not report it, apparently – that is

certainly a violation of the standard that attorneys are supposed to hold themselves to – and that she could not give me an answer, because I copied all these letters to her about that, about her allegation, and I got no response whatsoever.

I do not know about you, Mr. Speaker, but when I do not get a response, I assume that the response I expected is the true one, which is it did not happen and she did not report it. And I am just appalled to hear talk from the Republicans about this huge massive voter impersonation scheme, cabal, syndicate, that is overwhelming our elections here in Pennsylvania, but nobody reports it. I could not even find any records and nobody showed me any records that this was all reported but ignored. These incidents are not reported to me. That goes to the credibility of the person making the statements about them. That is all I want to say about that, and I will submit these letters and the answers to the public record.

I am almost finished, Mr. Speaker.

There has been a lot of talk here from my good colleagues on the other side of the aisle along the lines of, what is the big deal about getting photo ID? I need a photo ID to swim in the gym, and the maker of that remark, I have to tell you, our leader, is a great swimmer. He is up and down the aisle. He knows I admire his swimming, and I am sorry neither one of us has time to do it anymore. So what is the big deal? I had to give them, I had to give them a photo ID, too, so what is the big deal? You need a photo ID, if you look youthful, to buy a pack of cigarettes. You need a photo ID to open a bank account or get a credit card. I think there is a difference, and this is what it is: Nobody died to swim in a pool, no matter how good he or she was at swimming. Nobody died to buy a pack of smokes. Nobody died for the right to buy a drink. Nobody died for the right to open a credit account or a bank account. We have died, we are dying now, for the right to vote, and that, Mr. Speaker, is the big deal.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady.

LETTERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Ms. JOSEPHS submitted letters for the Legislative Journal.

(For letters, see Appendix.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Clearfield County, Mr. George, for the second time.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the majority leader for his philosophy: those that want to present something should be allowed. I will not be very long. I am simply saying that with all of this, my biggest concern, since we all believe in the Constitution and the right to vote and that the people should be those that run the government, what about that election board and the possibility that someone who recognizes someone and they do not have the proper ID can be fined? We have got to remind ourselves that most of the boards are with older people, and they are there from 7 in the morning until 8 at night and a couple hours later – a 14-hour day. I am worried about whether we can keep our elections, our offices, our polls open.

Please give this every bit of consideration. This is the most important part of elections, that that all of us are involved in. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Allegheny County, Mr. Frankel, for the second time.

Mr. FRANKEL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am reluctantly standing up here for the second time, merely because I think it is very important that we correct some mischaracterizations of information that were made by a number of members, particularly since most certainly when this bill passes, and apparently it will, it will be headed for extensive litigation. But yesterday I heard the majority leader and others speak extensively about the Carter-Baker Commission, and I think it is very important to really look at that commission and see it in its entirety as opposed to the selective information that was communicated to this chamber.

There are a couple of points that I would like to raise that relate to the commission's report that were entirely overlooked yesterday. First, yes, the Carter-Baker Commission did call for voter ID in its recommendations. However, that recommendation was made under the expectation that we all have a national photo ID card by now, the REAL photo ID that so many in this chamber oppose so vigorously and so passionately.

The second misconception, Mr. Speaker, is the more important one, I believe. I find it curious that the other side refuses to acknowledge one of the primary recommendations of the Carter-Baker Commission report, the recommendation that States should "...adopt an 'affirmative' – affirmative – "role to go to the homes of those who might not have ID cards, register them, and provide the cards for free." Almost like going through the census – a rather extensive and expensive process of education and voter outreach. Mr. Speaker, I do not see any effort to do that under the provisions of HB 934, the Republican voter suppression bill. I see only limited, minuscule, ineffective outreach in this bill. It is posturing at its worst.

What is Pennsylvania's plan? When the Secretary of State was talking in front of the Appropriations Committee, they talked about having funds for outreach and communication that would be the funds that the Federal government provides under the Help America Vote Act. That is about \$3 1/2 to \$4 million – \$3 1/2 to \$4 million of outreach on something this extensive. You could spend that in 2 weeks of television time in Philadelphia. We all know that from our political campaigns, how expensive it is. Three and a half, four million dollars is a pittance, a pittance in terms of investing what we would need to to educate and make sure that people get registered and get this photo ID.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth noting that before the other side cut off debate on this bill back in June, I had, I had introduced an amendment inspired by the Carter-Baker Commission's recommendation for extensive voter outreach and education. My amendment at that time would have required the Department of Transportation to establish a mobile voter outreach program across the entire Commonwealth. Outreach, Mr. Speaker; that is what we needed.

My amendment would have also exposed one of the hidden costs behind HB 934 by requiring the Department of Health to waive the burdensome fees for birth certificates needed to obtain these photo IDs. But alas, my amendment was never brought to the floor for a vote, as debate was prematurely cut.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about just one of these burdensome requirements that I see in this bill. The bill will give registered voters only 6 days to show proof of identification to the county board of elections if they do not come to the poll with an ID. I can do the math, Mr. Speaker. Elections are held on a Tuesday. Counting Tuesday, you have only 4 business days until the weekend – 4 business days. That means that 2 of the 6 days that are allotted under this bill for a registered voter to show his ID to the board of elections occurs on days when I am not willing to say even 99 percent of county offices are even open.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as said by so many today and yesterday, is modeled after the Indiana voter ID law. But, Mr. Speaker, under the Indiana law, a registered voter has 10 days to show proof of identification. Even when fairly not counting weekends, that is 8 days, double the time under this bill. Mr. Speaker, for that citizen who may be a wounded veteran, who may be disabled, who may be a senior citizen, they will be overly, overly burdened by the provisions of the bill before us today. I believe, I sincerely believe the courts will rule this bill unconstitutional for this very reason.

But for the time being, we are here in the final minutes, hopefully, of this debate, however long the Republican majority in the House kindly allows us to debate one of the most significant voter issues of the session, and I am still voting not to concur with this disastrous, offensive bill. I am still not voting to concur in a move to squash the voice and rights of so many of our young and elderly and voters who are disadvantaged. I am still not voting to concur in a bill that I strongly believe will be overturned by the courts, and I am still not voting to concur in a bill with a present-day, modern poll tax.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, for the second time, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has agreed, and you may proceed.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on page 10 of your legislation, lines 16 and 17, it says that an accredited Pennsylvania public or private institution of higher learning is able to issue photo IDs. Can you tell me, does that include like a school of cosmetology?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I do not have a list of what that would include, but it would include any higher education institution that is accredited in Pennsylvania.

Mr. STURLA. So then I can assume because we accredit cosmetology schools and technical schools, that those would all qualify. Assuming that they receive some form of accreditation, you would agree that they would then qualify?

Mr. METCALFE. Well, I am not going to agree with your assumptions. You and I have a lot of different assumptions at many different times, so—

Mr. STURLA. Well, then I guess I would be interested to know whether those types of institutions do or do not under your interpretation.

Mr. METCALFE. Well, we have the drafted language. It is the accredited institutions of higher learning, how it is stated, and—

Mr. STURLA. Does it say who they need to be accredited by or just that they are an accredited institution?

Mr. METCALFE. The language just has an accredited institution.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, in order to obtain that ID from that accredited institution, do you need to be enrolled in that institution? Is there anything in the bill that says that you need to be enrolled in that institution to get an ID from that accredited institution?

Mr. METCALFE. It does not specify that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, if I am getting an ID from that accredited institution, do I need to provide a birth certificate or a passport to that institution to get an ID from that accredited institution?

Mr. METCALFE. It is not specified in the legislation what that institution would require from you to provide that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STURLA. So let me paint a scenario here. I am an accredited institution, let us say a cosmetology school or a technical school, somebody who qualifies for dollars under PHEAA (Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency) for reimbursement for students that come. I am assuming they have to be accredited in order to do that. And I decide that I am going to start issuing photo IDs to friends of, let us say Joe's Cosmetology School. All somebody needs to do is walk through the door and pay me a buck or 2 or 5, or whatever I want to charge, and I can issue them a photo ID without them ever proving to me who they are. There is no penalty for me if I issue them a photo ID, because I do not have to establish who they are. I can just start a photo ID mill and have that as my side business. Would you agree?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, in the legislation as originally drafted, we did not include for this. This was negotiated language that was added. You can paint a lot of scenarios on how people might try and do work-arounds and end-runs around the law. That would certainly put that institution in jeopardy of any credibility that they would have in the marketplace and ultimately leave quite a paper trail for anybody that was producing IDs like that, that would be open to helping the hand of those who would commit the corrupting influences that we are trying to stop with this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker—

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TURZAI. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, a point of— Mr. Speaker, a point of inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes. The Chair recognizes the leader for his point.

Mr. TURZAI. Sir, my understanding is that an interrogation with respect to legislation is to be about questions about the particular bill and it is not hypotheticals, or if you already know the answer or you know what answer you want, you are to include that in your floor remarks. I believe that the interrogation here is far afield from what the purposes of interrogation are under our rules. I do not think that they should be positing hypotheticals. We have been very, very patient with

respect to interrogation. The maker of the bill has been very diligent, very patient, but I think this is really quite far afield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does agree that the gentleman is stretching his line of interrogation a bit far afield and would encourage him to confine that to true interrogation and receiving the information that he may not know.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, on the bill, page 10, lines 16 and 17, it says, "AN ACCREDITED PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING." I was trying to ascertain, what is an accredited Pennsylvania public or private institution of higher learning? The speaker said to me—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

Is the gentleman arguing now with the Chair or is he going back to interrogation, or have you concluded your interrogation, Mr. Sturla?

Mr. STURLA. No, I have not concluded my interrogation, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may resume your interrogation, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, on page 10, lines 16 and 17, it says, "AN ACCREDITED PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INSTITUTION OF HIGHER..." education. What I am trying to ascertain is, what is an accredited Pennsylvania public or private institution of higher education? Whether you put that language there or not, it is there. It is what we are going to vote on today. Can you tell me, what is an accredited public or private institution of higher learning in Pennsylvania?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, the language was drafted with the intention of covering the universities and colleges that are in the State of Pennsylvania, that are accredited in Pennsylvania, and if the interpretation of it in the future, as you are interpreting, allows for cosmetology schools that may be accredited or other higher education institutions, then we would certainly have to either assume that that is going to work okay as far as the policy that we are trying to set or we would have to revisit that and address it at that time. But the intention was to cover the universities and colleges here in Pennsylvania so that the issuance of student IDs would be in play for students to use when they did go to vote.

Mr. STURLA. Well—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

For what purpose does the lady from Lebanon County rise, Mrs. Swanger? Are you seeking recognition?

Mrs. SWANGER. Yes, I am. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to address an e-mail or read an e-mail that I got from an elderly, disabled—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the lady please suspend. There is ongoing interrogation regarding the bill currently before us.

Mrs. SWANGER. I am sorry. I thought you were— Okay. No problem. I will wait. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No problem. Thank you, Mrs. Swanger.

Mr. Sturla, you may resume.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, whether it is Penn State that is allowed to or whether it is the cosmetology school that is allowed to,

assuming that this bill passes today, I am assuming it will be signed into law the day the Governor gets back from his junket to Europe, and—

Mr. TURZAI. Objection.

Mr. STURLA. —that happening—

Mr. TURZAI. Objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

The Chair recognizes the leader.

Mr. Sturla, would you like to retract your "junket" remark?

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I will revise my comments to say his trip to Europe.

Mr. TURZAI. Mr. Speaker, I would move to strike that, Mr. Speaker.

Look, this has been, with all due respect, a very deliberative, thoughtful debate on the issue at hand. Both sides of the aisle have expressed their perspectives and their positions, well thought out. As we near our final vote, for there to be use of such pejorative terms is inappropriate on the House floor. The maker of the bill has been nothing but patient, thoughtful, deliberative. I would ask the good gentleman from Lancaster County to not try to be pejorative. Those remarks need to be stricken from the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the leader.

Mr. Sturla.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my "junket" remark and say that as soon as the Governor gets back from his trip to Europe, I believe he will most likely sign this into law. At that point in time—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at that point in time, there will be tens of thousands of poll workers that will be charged with accepting or denying a person's ability to vote based on the type of ID that they provide, and what I am trying to determine, for those tens of thousands of poll workers that will be trained in the interim, is what type of ID qualifies? Does an ID— For instance, I have an ID from an institution of higher education that says I get to use their gym facility. Does that qualify me if there is a photograph on it with an expiration date?

I do not currently attend that institution, but I have a photo ID from them with an expiration date on it. Would that qualify me?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go through a lot of different scenarios with you. The language is what it states, that it is an institution of higher education. We are doing some research to try and find the exact answer that you would want to narrow it down to. But as I said, the intent was to cover the universities, the colleges, in Pennsylvania and those student IDs that are issued as the department disseminates information to the counties for the poll workers and for their ultimate training updates before the elections occur. I am sure that they will receive information that directs them in what types of institutions will be allowed. But beyond that, if you have further questions, I am happy to take those, but I am not going to take any further questions in this line of questioning, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STURLA. Mr. Speaker, I guess what I am trying to determine is, you just said that they would accept student IDs, but earlier you had said that it would be an ID issued by an institution in Pennsylvania, a public or private institution of higher learning. And if we cannot answer that question now but

we are expected to vote on a bill that we do not know what it does and that you believe that that would be cleared up later with, I am assuming, some sort of promulgation of regulation, although I do not think you can promulgate regulations fast enough, who would make that determination?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Sturla, the Chair has been advised that the gentleman has rescinded his agreement for interrogation.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what is pretty obvious is that the gentleman who is the author of this bill does not even know what IDs apply or do not apply here. If the maker of the bill does not know whether an ID would be valid or not if presented at the polling place, how is a poll worker supposed to know if the ID that is presented is acceptable or not when the maker of the bill does not know if the ID is acceptable or not?

Mr. Speaker, this, along with an issue yesterday that was raised with respect to nonphoto IDs, at that point in time the prime sponsor of the bill said in fact those people that would vote with nonphoto IDs would have to pay for their IDs and would not be eligible for the, quote, unquote, "free" IDs that were issued that were photo IDs because they only applied to photo IDs. Later in the day the prime sponsor of the bill got up and said, no, no, no, he was wrong; that was actually covered by regulation. Now, there is no current regulation that covers the bill that has not been passed yet, and I have reviewed the current regulations and could not find any waiver to any such language. So if the prime sponsor believes that this poll-tax problem can be resolved through promulgation of regulations, I beg to differ with him on that.

Secondly, the bill clearly excludes an applicant for a nonphoto ID card from the category of individuals who are entitled to a free card. Any regulation promulgated to change that would be outside the scope of the legislation and would be illegal. So now let us say for argument's sake that the department could promulgate such a regulation, even though it would be against the law. Does anyone really believe that the regulation process, even if it was expedited, could be implemented in time for those individuals to obtain the appropriate ID cards for the November election?

Mr. Speaker, the example I just gave with relationship to which institutions of higher education in Pennsylvania would be allowed to issue which photo ID cards to whom and the issue that we know, that is clearly stated in the bill, that would preclude people for religious purposes that insist on not having their photograph taken, I believe those in and of themselves are two glaring examples of how this bill is wholly inadequate.

Now, if the intent here is to root out voter fraud and to make sure that free IDs are available to anyone that wants them, regardless of whether or not they have a religious belief that precludes them from having their photograph taken, then there is a simple solution to this: Vote to nonconcur. Put this in a conference committee. A day later, you should be able to kick back out a conference committee report that corrects these problems. But to vote "yes" for a bill that the prime sponsor says he does not even know the ramifications of makes no sense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman please suspend.

I do not believe that remark is entirely accurate, Mr. Sturla.

Mr. Metcalfe, would you like to be recognized? Please suspend.

POINT OF ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are you raising a point of order, Mr. Metcalfe?

Mr. METCALFE. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Please state your point of order.

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, the member making assertions as to what I do or do not know and the ramifications to the extent that he has been trying to say, if he did not get a substantial answer that he is satisfied with to his question, that is one thing. But to try and express what I do or do not know, Mr. Speaker, I do not think is appropriate any more than expressing my motivations, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlemen, Mr. Metcalfe and Mr. Sturla, kindly come to the rostrum. Thank you.

(Conference held at Speaker's podium.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman, Mr. Sturla, may continue.

Mr. STURLA. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for whatever reasons, I have not found anyone on the floor of the House that can tell me whether an ID issued by a school of cosmetology in the State of Pennsylvania would be valid, or issued by any other institution of higher learning in the State of Pennsylvania, because no one has been able to tell me exactly what that definition is. And so what we have done is left something up to interpretation to an unknown group that may or may not be able to promulgate regulations that would clarify this in time for election workers to be trained.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason as well as the reason that we know in the law as proposed it says that persons that would need to obtain an ID without a photograph would have to pay for their ID, I would encourage members to vote "no" on concurrence of HB 934.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Lancaster County, Mr. Aument.

Will the gentleman please suspend.

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair gives permission to Annie McCormick and David Oliver of WHP 21 Harrisburg, permission for the media to access the floor.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. Aument, you may proceed. Mr. AUMENT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the last few days I have heard much conversation on this floor that HB 934 is a solution in need of a problem, an unnecessary burden, and an effort to suppress turnout among the poor, our elderly, minorities, and disabled. Some would have you believe that this Commonwealth should be reactionary and not proactive in modernizing our election process, in deterring and detecting fraud, and safeguarding voter confidence.

In recent studies, 62 percent of Americans felt voter fraud was very common or somewhat common. Nearly 82 percent of Americans support photo ID laws. Why? Because confidence in the integrity of our system is important. A photo identification is not an unnecessary burden. It has been stated clearly, and true, that you cannot board an airplane, purchase many over-the-counter drugs, or exercise your constitutional right to bear arms without a photo ID.

We have heard of the very real cases of fraud. Regardless, is it not all really too late when an election is fraudulently won or lost, when we have a simple modernization available to us? Perhaps most appalling to me has been the suggestion that this bill and those of us who support it are somehow party to a covert attempt to suppress turnout among the poor, elderly, minority, and veterans.

Mr. Speaker, 9 years ago this summer I was a captain serving with the 4th Infantry Division in central Iraq. The young men I served with fought not just for the rights, our rights, as citizens of this country, but to extend the right to vote to Iraqis who did not previously have the privilege to choose their leaders. In June of 2003, I was in Tuz, Iraq. Tuz was a small Kurdish village on the outskirts of Kirkuk. The Kurds were a people brutally terrorized by Saddam Hussein's regime. The young men in my infantry company, engaged in a war far from the borders of their own country, fought to ensure those people were able to vote in a local town council election for the very first time in the summer of 2003. Those young men I served with fought for the right to vote, but for the integrity of that young system as well. Remember the purple-stained finger.

Some have used the term "fought and shed blood" rather casually. I do not. I can still hear the call of the wounded. I can close my eyes and still see the wounded soldiers evacuated from the field of battle. The "shedding of blood" is not a casual term for me. It is very, very real. The idea that my support of this bill would somehow constitute voter suppression is personally offensive and it is wrong.

I utterly reject the notion that insisting on one person, one vote; insisting on integrity; and insisting that voter confidence is somehow misguided will suppress turnout. Turnout is suppressed when political leaders engage in heated, heated negative rhetoric that has no relation to fact.

I encourage a vote to concur on HB 934.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Centre County, Mr. Conklin.

Mr. CONKLIN. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And that is for the second time, as I understand it.

Mr. CONKLIN. Yes, it is, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. You may proceed.

Mr. CONKLIN. I want to thank the Speaker.

Would the maker of the bill just stand for just a quick clarification for me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has agreed. You may proceed.

Mr. CONKLIN. I want to thank him for coming back to the microphone again.

Over the last couple of days there have been some comments made, one, by yourself, and other members have brought it up,

and I am just trying to get some clarification. Some members had mentioned, such as yourself, that you would take folks to go get their IDs. I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, would our staff be allowed, if a constituent needed assistance getting an ID, would our staff be allowed to assist them with that?

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, our offices certainly provide constituent assistance in many ways and the balance-of-power focus of what we do as legislators in the legislative branch of government to balance out with the Executive and the bureaucracies under the Executive and the judiciary branch. But, Mr. Speaker, I think that type of question you might better pose to the Ethics Commission to see if that would be a legitimate use of your staff. Certainly you would be free to do what you will with taking somebody to the PENNDOT facilities. But as far as utilizing your staff to do something like that I think would be a better question for the Ethics Commission, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CONKLIN. I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker.

May I just speak on the bill again on concurrence?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman concludes his interrogation and may proceed on the question.

Mr. CONKLIN. Mr. Speaker, I want you to listen to the last two interrogations, listen to what has been said, the gentleman, a couple ago, and myself. I just asked a very important question that the members of this House should be very aware of. Listen to what the answer was. The question was, and because it has been said that we are going to assist our constituents to get the proper documentation, the answer just was, you better go before the Ethics Commission. Wait a minute. We are going to pass a bill that, again, and I do not want to put the maker on the spot for this and there is no – I do not want to do his integrity, but this is one of the reasons why I asked to have this bill put over, why we asked to send it back to conference committee. This is very important. There are people going to jail for the question I asked. We could be putting our staff at risk. We could be putting ourselves at risk. This is so important.

And there are other things that have been said today that I think need clarification over the last couple of days. God love the majority leader. Like him, I appreciate a good beer now and then. But unlike the majority leader when he bought a six-pack, I do not have the boyish, young, good looks as he does. I end up not getting carded when I buy mine. I did not have to show any ID. You see, where I am going with this is that we are using things that have nothing to do with this bill.

You know, when you go to your local pub or your local six-pack and you buy your six-pack of beer, maybe you are carded the first time because you may have those boyish good looks and you are just handsome, or the person behind the counter makes a decision. They look at you and say, you know what? I am pretty sure the gray hair and the wrinkles, that guy is well over 21 years old, so I am going to use common sense; I am going to give him the alcohol he asked for.

You know, when you go get your Sudafed, you know, you get up to the counter and the girl behind the counter can ask me for my driver's license. But guess what? It is my neighbor. She knows I am well of age. She knows I only want one box. I am not setting up a meth lab in my basement. I am just going to take it to get home with and get feeling better. She reaches behind the counter, without any ID, and she hands me my Sudafed.

You know what? I come to work here. We have security at the door. Now, some of you think maybe I should not get in; I understand that. But they get to know us, and they do not ask us to show our ID anymore and we walk in.

The other day I was telling a friend of mine, I said, you know, this reminds me of the TSAs (Transportation Security Administration), these airport security folks that do not use common sense, and if you walk through and it beeps, they do not allow you to walk through again. Although it is just your car keys, you have got to go back out again and you got to get strip searched.

You see, we do not give our election workers common sense. You know, although my mother may be working at the polling place, gave birth to me, if she allows me to vote without asking for my ID, my mother is going to jail. This bill is without common sense.

This House recently changed our pension plans, which was a good thing. What we did was that we said everybody new has a new rule. You see, when you vote the first time, you have to show ID. We are acting like there is no way that we can find out if anybody does anything, because you have got to show ID the first time. If you are really serious about it, we would vote "no," we would send it back to conference committee, and maybe we would make the rules for new voters, to allow our senior citizens and our veterans.

You know, to the young man who is a veteran, thank you so very much for serving our country. As I said, I lost both my brother and my brother-in-law from the Vietnam war. I lost them both, and there is not a day that goes by that, just like yourself, you do not remember those individuals. But, you know, when those folks dipped their finger, not one of them had to show an ID. They did it because that was democracy. That was the people's voice being heard, without any type of ramifications.

You know, back in the 1800s, being Irish and celebrating our Irish descent, and I appreciate those folks for joining in, they tried to make it that the Irish could not vote, the Catholic Irish could not vote, and it was repealed.

So as we are going through this, let us remember, what you are doing and what we are saying, we are getting it separated. We are losing what we want to do. We want to make people able to vote. You know, let us think about it. You use things that we need ID, when in reality it is common sense. The bartender can use common sense. The store clerk can use common sense. The security guard can use common sense. But we are not going to allow our poll workers to use common sense.

We have two incidents that cannot even be answered today. One, if we help somebody, do we go to jail? If our staff helps somebody, are they in violation of the ethics laws? You know, I think that needs to be answered before we vote for this. I think there are too many questions.

Let us vote "no" on concurrence. We are not saying by a "no" vote that you are against it. What you are saying is, maybe we should actually look at some of these things that have been brought up.

I am thanking you all for listening to me. I want you to do the right thing. Let us send this back to committee. Let us take care of those problems we have. Let us not use examples that have nothing to do with the game we are playing, but let us do it in a correct way and stop playing the game.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

GUESTS INTRODUCED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To the left of the Speaker, the Chair welcomes Bob Slater and Susan Parker, visiting in support of Penn State College of Agricultural Sciences, who are guests of Representative Leader Turzai. Please rise and be recognized.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Berks County, Mr. Gillen.

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

We have heard a great deal during the course of this debate about disenfranchisement, about denying, about suppressing, and I would like to commend the House, commend you, Mr. Speaker, that no one has been disenfranchised in this debate. It has been full. It has been vigorous. No one has been suppressed. No one has been lacking in opportunity here to express themselves.

As I listened to the long list of people, there was an expression of concern about them being disenfranchised – the frail elderly, those over 85 years of age, the World War II generation, those that do not have many resources. Those that live in Philadelphia were even mentioned. Women were invoked, Democrats, those that do not have requisite ID.

Last evening I took it upon myself to call a woman from Philadelphia who meets the qualifications of frail elderly. She is 86 years of age. She is of the World War II generation. Her husband was an aviator in World War II off the aircraft carrier Hancock. Because she was working to support the war effort, she has no high school diploma and she relies entirely on her Social Security checks, so by any standard and measure of the United States government, she, too, would be considered poor.

She is a Philadelphian and a lifelong Democrat who does not drive a car. I call her Mom, and I wished her a happy birthday last night, and I said with all sincerity as I explained this law to her, Mom, is this a law that you could support? And I think her view needs to be represented. There is a notion, especially on one side of the aisle, that they have got a lock on the poor, that they are representing lifelong Democrats, that they are the only ones who represent women, that they are representing the frail elderly. Mr. Speaker, we have a significant group who will decide – we can have a debate another day as to whether it is a majority – we have a significant group of elderly men and women and poor people and indeed urban dwellers who are supporting HB 934, and I encourage you to support this bill with my frail, elderly, Democratic mother from Philadelphia.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the gentleman from Cambria County, for the second time, Mr. Barbin.

Mr. BARBIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be brief.

I would just like to indicate today that Pennsylvania does need a voter ID bill. The problem has been not whether Pennsylvania needs a voter ID bill; the problem is, are we willing to put the strictest voter ID requirements in the bill because we can use this as cover for the Presidential election,

and I would say no to that. I would say yes, there should be a voter ID bill, but no, we do not have to have this one.

This is a vote on concurrence. The good thing about our last 3 days is, at least the people of Pennsylvania had a chance to see what the warts were, what the strengths were, and what the weaknesses were. They did not do that in the Senate. They passed it on party-line votes. If we do not concur on this bill, it goes to a committee and we can fix the problems.

Now, I would say this quickly, just to not belabor the point: Truth is like gold. It is obtained not by growth but by washing away all that it is not. Now, the last 3 days we have been able to see what it is not. This bill is not devoid of politics. It is intended to be effective before the next Presidential election, even though the Carter-Baker Commission said, get to the people who do not have IDs; go with mobile units; make sure that you get it right; take 5 years if you have to. We are not taking 5 years; we are taking 5 months.

Number two, this bill is not a voter ID bill that is passed by the majority of States that have a voter ID bill. There are 20 States that have a photo ID jurisdiction, but in all 20 of those States, there are ways, if you go to the polling place and you do not have the driver's license, that you still get to vote. You bring alternative proofs of residency. You are still signing the registration book. All you are doing is you are saying, yeah, my name is Bryan Barbin; here is my utility bill; I live at 1150 Franklin. That is what we should be doing, because that is fair. Five jurisdictions have a little more strict provision, but nothing compared to the one that you are asking us to vote for today. And there are four jurisdictions that fall in the Indiana category, although this bill is not Indiana either. Indiana allows 10 days to correct the problem.

This bill is also not free no matter what anybody says, and it is not a funded mandate. If you do not have a license that is required under these strict provisions, you have got to show up with a sealed birth certificate. That costs money. So this is another unfunded mandate. It is an unfunded mandate to the county commissioners. That is why they opposed it.

It is not veteran-friendly. As my highly regarded friend from Lancaster County has pointed out, this bill will immediately need to be revised. We should do it by nonconcurring. Veterans who have an ID that does not have an expiration date will not be allowed to vote. If they go to PENNDOT and ask for a birth certificate, it is going to take 18 weeks. Bad idea.

This bill is not woman-friendly. It is not senior-friendly. It is not disabled-friendly. It is not indigent-friendly. It is not any of those friendly, because it causes extra costs that we do not care about.

This bill is not about going to a pharmacy and asking for Sudafed. Voting is the most fundamental right you have. If you do not have it, you do not have liberty.

And most importantly, while this is not going to sway any of my Republican members, the 3 days of testimony are going to be provided to the courts and they are going to say something: Did Pennsylvania do it the way the other 20 jurisdictions did that have the photo ID version, and they are going to say no. And all of the transcript that shows the debate back and forth is going to prove a single fact, and that fact is, we had a chance to make this the least restrictive possible on all those people – the military, the women, the seniors, the indigent – and we chose not to. We chose not to go to the House-Senate conference committee and fix the problems. We chose to ram it down

somebody's throat because there was an effect that was going to help for politics.

So what do we have? I would suggest that the term "acceptable collateral damage" is the best explanation of this bill. The question of what "acceptable" is, is whether or not you see a benefit to your party. Well, that is not what you are supposed to be doing with the fundamental right, and that is the reason the courts are going to throw this out.

I would like to close and just say this: There is a judge who spoke early in the 20th century on this issue, and he said, what is the spirit of liberty? The spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him, who nearly 2,000 years ago taught mankind a lesson it has never learned but has never quite forgotten: that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest. The problem with this bill is the fact that if you are going to have liberty, you cannot have it unless you give it to everybody. It does not give liberty to one man, one vote. It does not give liberty to everybody; it is just, everybody else, you are on your own.

I respectfully ask that before this matter moves to the courts, that we consider handing this back to the Senate and at least fixing the military exception, which everyone concedes on both sides of the aisle has to be fixed, before this becomes law. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman and recognizes the lady from Montgomery County, Ms. Harper.

Ms. HARPER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For 3 days now I have been worrying about whether or not I should vote for or against this bill. Like many people, I do believe there is voter fraud in Pennsylvania and that while it may not be a big problem in the district I represent, the voters in the district I represent deserve to have their votes counted as well as anyone else's, and if there is voter fraud elsewhere, as there has been in Pennsylvania, my voters get disenfranchised.

At the same time, I have been worried that seniors who do not drive and who have been voting for years and years will not be allowed to vote without voter ID. I wanted to let the members know that the Corbett administration has just agreed that they will help seniors get the necessary ID if they do not have driver's licenses. They will – and I did send this to all of you by e-mail – they will work with the Department of Aging and the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation to make sure that any senior who no longer has a valid driver's license can nevertheless vote with a PENNDOT nondriving voter ID. Because they have made this commitment, I feel sure that every Pennsylvanian who is eligible to vote and who wants to vote will be able to do so, and I will personally make sure that my constituents take full advantage of this opportunity to get a nondriving voter ID if that is what they need.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair thanks the lady and recognizes the lady from Philadelphia County, Ms. Brownlee, for the second time.

Ms. BROWNLEE. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon for the second time to clarify a few things in my mind and for the record, I believe.

In yesterday's debate regarding this bill, the vote and the registration was linked, the ID was linked to some everyday occurrences that we all require, like gaining entry into a gym or picking up allergy drugs. Mr. Speaker, I think this is outrageous.

African-American people and Caucasian people fought, bled, and died for the right to vote, not for the privilege of a gym membership.

And by the way, that ID that you and I must have and must show to buy Sudafed or Sudafed-like drugs is to track the purchases, to make sure the person is not going home to cook up an illegal drug such as methadone or a methamphetamine – a requirement, I might add, that we instituted several years ago before I was a member.

Mr. Speaker, let me make myself perfectly clear or as clear as possible. March 7, 1965, 47 years ago and several days, over 500 civil rights demonstrators took part in a march between Selma and Montgomery, Alabama. As my honorable colleagues reminded us yesterday, some of us can visualize the pictures: the snarling German shepherds, the water cannons, the cops with guns, the billy clubs, on the Edmund Pettus Bridge. Mr. Speaker, some of us might be able to visualize those German shepherds, some of us may not, but we can put a face to the names of the people who fought, bled, and died for the right to vote.

Rev. George Lee was murdered in Belzoni, Mississippi, because he would not stop his voter registration efforts.

Mr. Lamar Smith of Brookhaven, Mississippi, was shot in broad daylight because he refused to stop organizing Black people to vote in 1955.

Mr. Herbert Lee, who was allegedly killed in 1961 by a State legislator in Liberty, Mississippi, because he helped register Black voters.

Mr. William Lewis Moore, a Caucasian Baltimore postman who was killed in Alabama during a one-man march against segregation.

Let us not forget Medgar Evers. I know many of you remember his assassination in 1963. If you do not remember, you may have heard about it.

Those four little Black girls in the church in Birmingham: little Addie Mae Collins, Denise McNair, Carole Robertson, and Cynthia Wesley.

Mr. James Earl Chaney, Mr. Andrew Goodman, and Mr. Michael Henry Schwerner – the young civil rights workers who were shot and bodies buried and dumped in a landfill by the KKK (Ku Klux Klan).

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. Thousands bled and many hundreds died for my right to vote and many of our rights to vote. Mr. Speaker, I and many African-Americans, women, people of color, still live that hard-fought struggle. Most of us can still put faces to that 1965 march over the Edmund Pettus Bridge from Selma to Montgomery.

Mr. Speaker, we are outraged that any one of you would equate the constitutional right to vote with the elitist ability to secure a gym membership and buy over-the-counter drugs. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of concurrence with HB 934.

THE SPEAKER (SAMUEL H. SMITH) PRESIDING

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

According to the Speaker's list, we are down to the Democrat leader and I believe the prime sponsor of the bill.

On the question, the Speaker recognizes the minority leader, Mr. Dermody.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I do have some comments, but I have some additional remarks that I would like to submit for the record. I would like to be able to do that at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may submit his remarks, and the Speaker thanks the gentleman.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Mr. DERMODY submitted documents for the Legislative Journal.

(For documents, see Appendix.)

Mr. DERMODY. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard over and over, this bill tries to fix something that is not broken. We have heard over and over again that it is a solution in search of a problem, and we keep hearing it because it is the truth.

Impersonation at the polling place, voter impersonation, is the only fraud that this bill attempts or tries to address, which is virtually nonexistent in Pennsylvania. But in order to get at a so-called problem that really does not exist, this bill will endanger the constitutional right to vote of thousands of Pennsylvanians, and that is the real agenda for this bill. It is an attack on people, an attack on people usually of limited means who tend not to vote the way that the Republicans would like them to vote.

And after last year's budget and the budget proposal this year, where you cut basic education, cut higher education – as a matter of fact, parents and children will find it harder and harder, almost impossible, to afford a college education in our State universities because of these budget proposals – you have cut programs for the disabled seniors and disabled children, you have cut programs for seniors, and yet, well, first of all, it is no wonder you do not want them to come to the polls—

Mr. TURZAI. Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DERMODY. —after cutting those programs.

Mr. TURZAI. It is far afield, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

For what purpose does the majority leader rise?

Mr. TURZAI. Mr. Speaker, for my good friend from the other side of the aisle, the minority leader, I would just ask that he confine his remarks to the bill at hand, not to any other bills. Thank you.

Mr. DERMODY. Well, it certainly— Fine, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. With respect, I think generally speaking, we have been able to stay significantly on the bill. I do believe that it has been the past practice of the House to let either of the two floor leaders wander a little bit from that more confined definition. So I would ask the minority leader to stay as much on the bill as possible, but leader courtesy, I generally give both leaders a little bit of leeway.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

All I was saying is that after all the cuts we have just listed, it is no wonder that you want to keep people from coming to the polls. You do not want people to vote. It is interesting, we found out just here, right now we got I guess a memo or an e-mail from the Governor's Office saying we found new money somewhere that we can fund a program that was virtually cut out to get people who need Medicaid, seniors on Medicaid, to

their doctors and to get seniors out to other services, but we found money to put them back in place so we can get them to our PENNDOT centers so they can get their free voter ID card.

Well, I want to talk about that so-called free voter ID card. First of all, it is not free. Let us look at what is involved and what is required to get a PENNDOT-issued nondriver's ID card. In order to get a PENNDOT nondriver's ID card, you have to complete an application and provide proof of identification. What type of identification does PENNDOT require? PENNDOT requires that you provide a nonlaminated Social Security card, and two, one of the following documents: a valid passport, a birth certificate, an immigration and naturalization service document proving citizenship or naturalization. Photocopies are not accepted, and the documents must be original documents. And in addition to those requirements, you also must provide two of the following: a lease agreement, mortgage documents, a current weapons permit, current utility bills, or a W-2 form or tax records.

Now, to review those basic requirements, in order to receive a nondriver's license ID, citizens, citizens must provide a nonlaminated Social Security card. Many people do not have a Social Security card at all. We did a little survey just on my staff, and we have three who do not possess a nonlaminated Social Security card. So what is involved in obtaining a nonlaminated Social Security card? The good news is, the Social Security card is free. The bad news is twofold. First, in order to get a replacement Social Security card, you must provide original versions – copies are not accepted – of one of the following: a valid passport, a U.S. driver's license, a U.S. birth certificate, or a State-issued ID. Of these choices, a person seeking a replacement Social Security card, in order to get a PENNDOT-issued nondriver's license, has no choice but to obtain a valid U.S. passport or certified copy of their birth certificate. It should be noted that the only valid birth certificate for these IDs is a United States birth certificate.

So if you were born overseas, if you were born to military parents overseas, you must obtain a passport. Passports are not free. Passports take months to obtain and cost \$140. You can expedite that and pay another \$60. So it will cost you \$200. There is nothing free about \$140 or \$200.

For United States citizens born here in the United States, the birth certificate seems to be the way to go. Certified copies of U.S. birth certificates, if you can obtain one, are not free either. They must be obtained from the Department of Health, and they cost \$10 apiece. If you pay for that copy of your birth certificate by money order through the mail, the price goes up to \$13. And if you pay online with a credit card, you will be charged \$20.

Mr. Speaker, whether it is \$20, \$13, or \$10, or even just \$1, it is not free. And remember, this would be required for United States citizens to exercise their right to vote, a constitutional right at the heart of what our country was founded on. It takes approximately 3 to 4 months to get a copy of a birth certificate, thanks to the deep budget cuts that Governor Corbett and our Republican colleagues made last year. Now, it looks like the Governor may be saying he found money, so he will continue to cut higher education, basic education, so we could pass this bill that makes no sense. He will find money so that he may shorten the 3- to 4-month period so you can get a photo ID to vote, a citizen to get a photo ID to vote. We will see.

If you were born in another State, what do you do? I have no idea what you do, and I guarantee you that it will cost you a lot

of money and take months to obtain the documents you need to receive. It will not be easy. It will not be free. Now, once a person seeking a so-called free PENNDOT-issued nondriver's license pays either up to \$20 for a birth certificate or \$140 for a passport, then waits several weeks or months for them to arrive, that person will receive a nonlaminated replacement Social Security card. And remember, that is just the first step in being able to vote.

So that same person will be required to return to PENNDOT with the nonlaminated replacement Social Security card and either the newly obtained \$140 U.S. passport or the newly obtained \$20 birth certificate, and still, that American citizen will not be able to vote under the mandates of this bill. That is because PENNDOT requires more documentation to get the so-called free nondriver's license ID. That American citizen, after already shelling out anywhere from \$10 to \$150 for required documents, will still be required to provide a lease agreement, a mortgage document, a valid weapons permit, current utility bills, or a W-2 form or some other tax record.

If you are lucky enough to own your own home with no mortgage, if you do not carry a gun, are retired, and have a spouse who pays the utilities, you are not fortunate enough to be able to obtain a PENNDOT-issued ID unless your utility-paying spouse accompanies you to PENNDOT to vouch for your residence and you bring along magazines or other mail containing your name and address.

But what if you are a woman who married and took your husband's name? If you spend that \$10 or \$20 to get a copy of your birth certificate, you still cannot vote. You cannot vote because your name on your birth certificate will not match your mail. So PENNDOT requires that you also provide a certified copy of your marriage license. Guess what? A certified copy of your marriage license is not free. It can only be obtained from the county where you were married, and in Pennsylvania, the cost and wait times for obtaining a marriage license depend on what county you are from, and it varies county by county. If you were married in another State or another county, I cannot imagine the hurdles you are going to have to overcome and the price you would have to pay for your right to vote. Only after that American citizen obtains a certified copy of your marriage license, that is only when you can obtain your so-called free PENNDOT-issued ID card. And by that point, that American citizen will have paid upwards of \$200 just to exercise their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, all of us should be honest about what this requirement is, because it is not free. It is not free. This is a stealth poll tax. We are going back to the old days. It is a stealth poll tax. It is wrong. It is undemocratic. It is un-American. This bill, this bill should not be concurred in. It should be thrown out. It should be voted against. We need to protect people's right to vote. We need to encourage people to go to the polls, not discourage them, not deprive them of their right to vote for reasons that are suspect. We all know they are. The goal of this bill is to suppress voter turnout in Pennsylvania in a Presidential year, and it costs hundreds of dollars for your senior citizens, for your disabled, for folks that are down on their luck to be able to go out and exercise their right to vote. That is what this bill is about, and that is why it should be defeated.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask everyone to please vote for this commonsense legislation that has been designed to protect the integrity of each legal vote.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is, will the House concur in the amendments inserted by the Senate?

FILMING PERMISSION

The SPEAKER. The Speaker gives permission for media access to the floor to Jamie McGlinchy of CBS News for videotaping with audio.

CONSIDERATION OF HB 934 CONTINUED

On the question recurring,

Will the House concur in Senate amendments?

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

The following roll call was recorded:

YEAS—104

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

NAYS—88

Barbin	DeLuca	Keller, W.	Petrarca
Bishop	DePasquale	Kirkland	Preston
Boyle, K.	Dermody	Kortz	Quinn
Bradford	DeWeese	Kotik	Ravenstahl
Brennan	Donatucci	Kula	Readshaw
Briggs	Evans, D.	Longietti	Roebuck
Brown, V.	Fabrizio	Mahoney	Ross
Brownlee	Frankel	Mann	Sabatina
Burns	Freeman	Markosek	Sainato
Buxton	Galloway	Masser	Samuelson
Caltagirone	George	Matzie	Santarsiero
Carroll	Gerber	McGeehan	Santoni

Cohen	Gergely	Mirabito	Smith, K.
Conklin	Gibbons	Mullery	Smith, M.
Costa, D.	Goodman	Mundy	Staback
Costa, P.	Haluska	Murphy	Sturla
Cruz	Hanna	Myers	Thomas
Curry	Harhai	Neuman	Vitali
Daley	Harkins	O'Brien, M.	Waters
Davidson	Hornaman	Parker	Wheatley
Davis	Josephs	Pashinski	White
DeLissio	Kavulich	Payton	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—0

EXCUSED—5

Boyle, B.	Killion	Marsico	O'Neill
Deasy			

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

Ordered, That the clerk inform the Senate accordingly.

RECONSIDERATION MOTION FILED

The SPEAKER. The Speaker is in receipt of a motion to reconsider the vote by which HR 510 passed the House earlier today on a vote of 186 to 3. It is filed by Representatives Vitali and Josephs. We are not going to take up the motion to reconsider at this moment. We will take it up the next day we are in session.

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 934, PN 3166

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; in preparation for and conduct of primaries and elections, further providing for manner of applying to vote, persons entitled to vote, voter's certificates, entries to be made in district register, numbered lists of voters and challenges; in voting by qualified absentee electors, further providing for applications for official absentee ballots, for approval of application for absentee ballot, for delivering or mailing ballots, for canvassing of official absentee ballots and for public records; and providing for enforcement and for a special procedure at certain elections.

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

STATEMENT BY MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the majority leader, Mr. Turzai.

Mr. TURZAI. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker.

On unanimous consent.

It has been 3 long days of debate on HB 934, very open and deliberative process here on the House floor, and I want to congratulate all members for their earnest debate, their honest perspectives, and in significant part, sticking to the facts at hand, and their perspective based on those facts. I do congratulate the maker on moving a commonsense piece of legislation.

The only thing I do want to say is this: I felt as if at one point charges in late remarks from one of my colleagues that I personally or others were somehow elitists or racists, and I did not want to interrupt the flow of debate, I must tell you that many of us feel very, very honored to work with each and every one of our colleagues, myself included, and that I have significant respect for everybody on both sides of the aisle. And my good parents have worked hard to instill in me a sense that each and every human being has the same level of dignity, no matter their religion, race, ethnicity, or background. And I must tell you, we must continue to move forward in that direction that we respect the individual's dignity throughout the course of these debates. I appreciate the honor to work with each and every one of you, and I would hope that we can move away from those sorts of charges to just a sense that each and every one of us is equal to bring our perspective to the table in a dignified manner.

Thank you very, very much.

GAME AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Crawford County, Mr. Evans, for the purpose of making a committee announcement.

Mr. J. EVANS. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time we are calling an immediate meeting of the House Game and Fisheries Committee. All members of the House Game and Fisheries Committee, please report to the Ryan Office Building, room 205. It should be a very brief meeting, but nevertheless, we need to get together. So I am informing all members of the committee, room 205, Ryan Office Building, immediately at the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. There will be an immediate Game and Fisheries Committee meeting in Ryan Office Building, room 205.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS COMMITTEE MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Speaker recognizes the gentleman from Montgomery County, Mr. Godshall, for the purpose of an announcement.

Mr. GODSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be a very brief meeting of the House Consumer Affairs Committee in room 148, which is directly across from my office. Thank you. Very brief meeting.

The SPEAKER. There will be an immediate meeting of the House Consumer Affairs Committee in room 148.

STATEMENT BY MR. SANTARSIERO

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Santarsiero, rise?

Mr. SANTARSIERO. Unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized under unanimous consent.

Mr. SANTARSIERO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 weeks since the passage of HB 1950, 5 weeks since this chamber—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

OBJECTION TO UNANIMOUS CONSENT

The SPEAKER. The unanimous consent has been objected to. You no longer have unanimous consent to speak.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. BAKER

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. Baker, rise?

Mr. BAKER. Announcement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, Mr. Baker, is recognized for the purpose of making an announcement.

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

Just a friendly reminder, the Health Committee will have a hearing tomorrow morning at 9:30 in room G-50 regarding the LIHEAP program (Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program). Thank you.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY MR. DiGIROLAMO

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman, Mr. DiGirolamo, rise?

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Committee announcement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may state his announcement.

Mr. DiGIROLAMO. Reminder, Human Services Committee will have an informational hearing tomorrow morning at 9:30 in room 60, East Wing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

STATEMENT BY MINORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman, Mr. Dermody, seeking recognition?

Mr. DERMODY. Unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The minority leader has the floor and may speak.

Mr. DERMODY. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just briefly to follow up to the majority leader's comments. I would just like to make sure that everyone understands here and the leader understands that nobody on our side of the aisle ever intended to call anybody or did call anybody a racist or an elitist, and that was not the intention of the comments.

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

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 1908;
HB 1913;
HB 1915;
HB 2245;
HB 2246;
SB 110;
SB 730;
SB 743; and
SB 815.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. One other announcement for the members, tomorrow's session day has been canceled.

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. Seeing no further business before the House, the Speaker recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Kavulich, from Lackawanna County, who moves that this House do adjourn until Monday, March 26, 2012, at 1 p.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 2:10 p.m., e.d.t., the House adjourned.