

PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE
Of The
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE
MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Public Safety Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on March 15, 2007.

Members Present:

Legislator Jack Eddington - Chairman
Legislator Kate Browning - Vice Chair
Legislator Joseph Caracappa
Legislator Elie Mystal
Legislator Daniel Losquadro
Legislator Lynne Nowick

Members Not In Attendance:

Legislator Wayne Horsley

Also In Attendance:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk/Legislature
Robert Calarco - Aide to Legislator Eddington
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Jon Cooper
Linda Burkhardt - Aide to P.O. Lindsay
Jim Maggio - Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Chief Robert Moore - Chief of the Suffolk County Police Department
Tom Muratore - Suffolk County PBA.
Debra Alloncius - AME Legislative Director
Rabbi Steven Moss - Human Rights Commission
James Claffey - Long Island Community Foundation
Charles Zerilli
Cesar Malaga - Hispanic American Association
Dr. Luis Valenzuela - Long Island Immigrant Alliance
Don Seubert - Medford Tax and Civic Association
Pat Seubert
Pat Young - CARECEW
Maureen Jones
John Madigan
Ian Wilder
William Page
Michael O'Neill - Southampton Coalition
Nadia Marin-Molina

Helen Mattadeen
Rosario Pellegrino - Carpenters Local Union 7
Robert Springer - Crime Watch
Regina Corby Graham
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Kimberly Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:36 AM)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. I'd like to call the Public Safety Committee meeting to order and I'd like to start with the Pledge of a Allegiance, led by Legislator Joe Caracappa.

(Salutation)

I'd like to ask you to stand for a moment of silence for the men and women that are fighting overseas and who have lost their lives and who have come back disabled.

(Moment of Silence)

Thank you very much. I have no speakers so we'll get right to the public portion. I have a couple of cards here. I'd like to ask Rabbi Steven Moss to come forward for three minutes.

RABBI MOSS:

Good morning. Good morning everyone. Not on, right? Okay. Good morning. The Suffolk County Human Rights Commission and the Suffolk County's Antibias Task Force feel compelled to express the following to you, our serious concerns about the escalating hostility that has manifest in public discourse as well as in recently proposed legislation towards people living in Suffolk County who are living in the U.S. illegally.

While we acknowledge the necessity to address the issues and implications related to changes in the County's demographics, we are alarmed at the increasingly inflammatory tenor that is both implicit and explicit in such discussions by our County's leadership. It is well established when a community's leadership seems to target a defined groups within that community as the cause of others distress, it often provokes aggressive actions outside the bounds of the law by those who are seeking a scapegoat towards whom they can vent their frustrations and anger. As you know, these actions can range from individually or group initiated harassment to violence, even terrible violence.

We know full well that it is not your intention to incite or even condone bigoted reaction or reactions towards any human being, regardless of their legal status. However, we must urge you to ensure that our great county's and country's principles regarding human dignity and human rights be foremost in public discussions and public policy efforts to address issues and concerns related to immigration. We look forward to continuing dialogue in an effort to seek constructive and positive resolutions.

Resolution 1022 is just so divisive for our Suffolk community. It simply ignites the worst of feelings in people as evidenced by Legislator Mystal's unintentional but unfortunate comments made the other day. It is a negative and simplistic and piecemeal way of dealing with a very difficult and complex problem.

I, therefore, as Chair of the Human Rights Commission and Co-Chair of the Antibias Task Force, call upon this committee to prevent this legislation from going further and begin the task, arduous as it is, to create legislation dealing with the day laborer and immigrant issue that will, as President Bush said yesterday, enable us to respect the law and at the same time respect humanity. This law fails to do this.

If I were to respond to Legislator Caracappa's question of the other day, I certainly would agree that I would be most upset by day laborers in front of my home, congregating there for jobs, no question of this. But my response would be to work with others in the community to create a place, a safe place, where those who wish to obtain work in this County can come together and offer that work to those in need of such labor. This has been accomplished in many other communities throughout the country, as well as in the New York metropolitan area. Why can't we do the same here in Suffolk. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. James Claffey.

MR. CLAFFEY:

Yes, good morning. James Claffey. I'm a Program Officer at the Long Island Community Foundation. We're a public charity that provides funding for non-profits across the Island in many different kinds of programs. I'm here to speak against Resolution 1022. I would agree with everything Rabbi Moss just had to say, but add the following.

It's uplifting, at least for me, it gives me some optimism to see that increasingly people are beginning to talk about real solutions instead of these ill-advised proposals like 1022, the latest in a series of ill-advised initiatives here in Suffolk County that do nothing really to address the problem. They may be helpful politically for some people, but they do nothing, really, to address the problem. And I think the press coverage and the opinion expressed by the great majority of the public at the last hearing is proof of that.

But what gives me some optimism in the middle of this debate is that at least people are beginning to talk again now about worker centers that would be hope open to all unemployed people, places that could be helpful to all of the unemployed in their search for jobs. And hopefully we can work on that. That at least is a real solution that has provided some relief for the day laborer issue in different parts -- across the country.

Now I just want to say one thing, though. I'm in a position because of my work in philanthropy, to say this. It is very important to know that there will be no philanthropic dollars from the private sector unless these centers are -- Joe, hold on, I'll explain it, Joe -- are a public and private partnership. It's a public issue and the public sector must be involved. There can be private funding as long as the public sector at the very least provides support. What we fear is that a center can be organized and as soon as the strident minority that never is in favor of any of these real solutions will speak up, we're afraid that then public officials will head for cover and leave us out there alone. So there must be a public and private partnership and if we can forge that, and there's no reason why we should not be able to, then indeed these worker centers can be a partial, at least, solution to the problems that are before us in this area.

So I'm here to remind all of us that this is a workable solution, it's worked in other places. There's no reason why it would not work in Suffolk County, but it must be a public and private partnership. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

No questions.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Thank you very much. Charles Zerilli.

MR. ZERILLI:

Good morning, gentlemen, Legislative body. My name is Charles Zerilli and I'm a homeowner residing in Farmingville. I am here today to request approval of 1022, obstruction of County roads. This bill has been introduced as a safety issue only. My district has suffered hundreds of accidents, auto, pedestrian and bicycle. This large amount of accidents in addition to what we would normally encounter is overwhelming for our residents. We are in jeopardy every day if we drive, walk, or other. This bill would substantially reduce people being killed on our roadways. All these accidents have been brought about by the large congregations and soliciting.

I wish to point out that I do not belong to any political hate group. I am here representing myself and many of my neighbors. Many families in my district work two and three jobs, and besides raising families, cannot afford the time off to express their support. The Latino advocates for vocations such as lawyers, reverends, civil liberty advocates organizations, can easily attend these meetings. They take any opportunity on any issue to twist it into a racial political battle. This immigrant problem is a separate issue that hopefully in my remaining years will be addressed lawfully.

We always hear about compassion for the laborers. What happened to the rights and compassion of the hardworking families who pay taxes and have created a quality of life they wish to protect?

With spring and summer, the huge increase of congregations and soliciting will impact every district and cause deaths on our roadways without doubt. Could we have saved lives with this type of legislation? Let your conscious guide you.

This would not affect labor protests, since they rarely occur, and if carried out lawfully would not be affected. Our problem is occurrences happening seven days per week yearly. As our elected Legislators representing your constituents, I submit that if a true polling were made it would indicate very strong support by the residents. I hope as an intelligent body you will do the right thing by not being misled in approving this bill. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you, sir.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Cesar Malaga.

MR. MALAGA:

Good morning. My name is Cesar Malaga of the Hispanic American Association. We agree with the first two previous speakers concerning, you know, these aren't solution to the problem that we have here in Suffolk County. We know that you heard that this bill is anti-Latino, it's also anti-immigrant. The only people standing looking for work are Latinos. You indicate that this prevents accidents at the place where these people congregate. These people do not interfere with the flow of traffic nor did they cause any traffic accidents. There is no need for bill I.R. 1022. There are a number of existing laws that focus on traffic safety.

You should not pass this bill because some of the people do not want Latinos here in Suffolk County. Immigration is a problem of the Federal Government, not the County. Many of you said they should not be here illegally, that they broke the laws of the United States. I had mentioned to you many times at this meeting room that it takes from 12, 15 or more years to get an immigrant's Visa to come legally to the United States. You cannot wait that long if there is a need to take care of your family. All those people are here because they need to work to take care of their families. They have to go to places where there's work available so they can work hard, get paid so they can take care of their families back home. No one wants to leave their families, risk their life to go to another country where some residents don't want you there.

Remember, that all of us, including you, are immigrants or descendent of immigrants. You should also remember that the ancestors of Mexicans and Central Americans were natives of what we call now the United States of America. All the different groups of immigrants that come to this country for a better life have problem with some people already here. I think all of you remember {Nina} and many other problems that the new immigrants faced.

Many of you said my parents and grandparents came here legally from Europe. Well, they did not have to wait for a visa, but they did not have to ask for a Visa. They got into a ship bound to New York, they were allowed to enter this country if they were not sick. Here you are, the children or grandchildren of an immigrant. There is no welfare in Latin America, so if you have a family you have to find work to take care of them.

I'm sure that -- I'm sure that some of you go to a house of worship. Well, this is the season to reflect for Latinos who are here to work and take care of their families. We need to help them. So there was a saying that you have to go to places where you can find work so that you can take care of your family. Have mercy on these people, those who's only crime is to find work to take care of their families.

Anti-Latino immigration bill I.R. 1022 should die in this committee. Why waste Suffolk County taxpayers money? We need Latinos, Latino immigrants. They are hardworking people. These Latino's are part of the economy of Suffolk County and our country. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you, sir. Dr. Valenzuela.

DR. VALENZUELA:

Good morning. I'm Dr. Luis Valenzuela, the Executive Director of the Long Island Immigrant Alliance, the President of the National Association of Puerto Rican Hispanic Social Workers and a board member of the Latino Jewish Council of Long Island. All three organizations urge you to kill this bill in committee. It's unfortunate that we're here urging you to vote against this bill.

When residents of a county need solutions to real problems, real concerns, we'd like to think that we can turn to government for real solutions. 1022 is not a real solution. As I said last week, it is a bill that is divisive. It targets Latinos. It does nothing to solve the problem. It fans the flames of hatred. It gives license to animosity against Latinos. People with hate in their heart will take this as a pass to continue to harass Latinos.

There are real problems that our residents in Suffolk County have which beg for real solutions. I urge this committee to vote this bill down, to table it subject to call, and to instead start to think about a process where we can engage all concerned in finding real solutions. Vote this bill down. It does nothing to solve the real problems that we have here. Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Question.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes, Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you, Doctor, for coming down today. What do you say to the constituents here that are in the communities, like the gentleman who spoke earlier. What do you tell them?

DR. VALENZUELA:

He has valid concerns.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

But then Mr. Claffey, who I have to say Jimmy is a great guy. I've worked with him for years on this problem very early on. Long before anybody even was discussing this problem, Jim and I were talking about it. When he says well, we're not going to do a thing by way of philanthropy because government is not going to give us the green light. So what do you say. You are saying give us a real solution, this doesn't work, and you don't know what to tell these residents who are being adversely affected day in and day out. So the private community who's urging us to do something

won't do it, and you're turning your backs on real people and a real problem in my personal estimation. How do you explain that to the tax paying citizens of communities that are dealing with it every single day?

DR. VALENZUELA:

Okay. A couple of points. I think that Mr. Claffey is basing his position on his personal experience, but also on national empirical data that clearly states that when work centers are to work, there has to be a public and private partnership. As I said, you know, we look to government to solve real problems, not to create other problems. Unfortunately, I lost what the second point was.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

What do you say to the residents?

DR. VALENZUELA:

Right. Well, what I say to the residents, again, is that I validate their concerns. I have the same concerns that we all have here. You know, here on Long Island and in Suffolk County in particular, there's a lot of economic anxiety, insecurity. We all have issues with housing, health care, pensions. We don't know whether we're going to have a job tomorrow. Everyone is in the same boat. However, the solutions that are being proposed are not real solutions, they're divisive.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Just one last thing. Having worked on this issue for 12 years, and Legislator Eddington knows the community, he's been serving now for a year and change. A super, super-duper majority of the residents in our affected area of Medford, Farmingville, Selden, Centereach, have said no hiring hall. Do not even think about using my tax dollars for a hiring hall. So you come here saying yes, we understand there's a problem, we're looking for real solutions, but we're telling the residents where they are truly affected that we don't care what they say, put a hiring hall in your backyard even though you don't want one. How do you respond to that?

DR. VALENZUELA:

Well, it's absolutely untrue that we are saying to them that we don't care. Again, we validate their concerns. We want to work on solving these problems. I think that the community has a legitimate right to be engaged in this dialogue. I think that government has a legitimate and principle role in working with residents to find solutions.

(Presiding Officer Lindsay entered the meeting)

I think that we just can't end a conversation that is so important to the residents of these communities in Suffolk County in general when it gets to that point that we don't want it in our backyard and then walk away from it and start passing legislation that targets one particular group. I think that there is a legitimate and needed conversation with the residents and government.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'm sorry. One last.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Go ahead.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I appreciate you actually gave me an answer to my question, and -- but I'm kind of -- I'm confused, because one second out of one side of everyone's mouth you're saying people who are opposed to this, who are trying to make a difference, are racist, anti-immigrant, anti-Latino and I believe you used or one of your colleagues used illegal while Latino -- "standing while Latino" in the last meeting. But then on the other side you say, "Oh, yes, absolutely, we hear the people who are affected and it's a real problem." You know, which one is it? Are they racist, xenophobic or is it a real problem, because it can't be both ways. Yes, we all know there's racism in every community.

We know that and we try to push that element aside, both sides of the fringe, the fringe that, you know, we really don't want to bring in to the middle of the dialogue. But which is it, are these people racist, are they xenophobic or are they legitimate tax paying citizens with real problems in their community.

DR. VALENZUELA:

I think two things. One, the solution is disconnected from the problem. The other thing is that we live in a problematic world. It's not necessary for us to impute intentions to the bills that you propose that we say target Latinos. If the result discriminates against a particular group of people, then, obviously, it's racist. The Supreme Court has ruled on that very issue.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

If the results of a particular bill single out any group of individuals who are doing something that is causing a problem, diminishing a quality of life, or acting in a manner that is illegal, I don't see how that's racist, but you and I can differ on that. The one thing that I want to bring up in this, and it's something that we all know, but I don't want the conversation just to be focused on one community. This problem is pervasive. It is throughout the United States, in particular, because of our population density, because of a service driven economy. This problem is particularly significant in Suffolk County, not just in the community represented by these two districts, but I have had this conversation.

You say have the conversation with your constituents. I have had this conversation with my constituents and at another 7-Eleven in Miller Place. At a Spanish deli in Rocky Point. We've seen large groups of individuals congregate, block traffic, create situations where I have calls to my office where women are uncomfortable getting out of their car. They call my office and tell me this -- I am uncomfortable getting out of my car. I don't want to walk past there with my child because I have large groups of men, some of them catcalling at me. I don't feel comfortable in this situation. None of them mention the race, what language they're speaking. They're telling me they feel uncomfortable because of this situation.

So I see a solution, something we have in our control, that we can say we're going to address this problem, and yet, when we go that route, Legislator Caracappa just asked you a simple question, are these people racist or are they -- or do they have legitimate concern. You didn't answer the question.

DR. VALENZUELA:

Well, I beg to differ. I think I answered the question.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Sir, I do not believe you answered the question. I believe you spun an answer and did not give a straightforward answer. It's a very simple question and you gave a very convoluted answer to a very simple question. Maybe you should be sitting back here with the politicians.

My point is we have a legitimate problem and a legitimate solution to try to begin to address that problem on a local level. Begin to address that problem. I know we don't have all the answers, I know we don't have the solutions. I know we need help from the State and mostly the Federal Government on this issue. But when we have a mechanism at our control by which we can begin to

address this problem, I know I can speak for myself and some of my colleagues, we're going to take it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you, Legislator Losquadro. Legislator Nowick.

DR. VALENZUELA:

Well, anyway, irrespective of your disagreement with me with respect to my answering your question, the bill is racist.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just needed to make one -- is that working? Hello?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

No.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just wanted to make a comment because I just don't like that word racist, because I can't help thinking a few years ago in my neighborhood, in my downtown, very large groups of young people gathered every night by the 7-Eleven in the local area, obstructing traffic. It became very burdensome to the town, and so the people that lived there called their local police departments to stop it. It was large groups of people. It wasn't black or blue or green, it was just obstruction of traffic and it was burdensome to the town. It's the same kind of thing. It didn't make -- nobody called me and -- or nobody came here and said we were anti-teenagers. It's just obstructing the flow of the town. So I just -- the word that you used is just -- it's a little offensive.

DR. VALENZUELA:

Yeah. I don't think that we can equate the concerns that we have with our adolescent population. I mean, they -- certainly throughout history there's been a prejudice against adolescents that's based perhaps on not understanding their developmental needs and etcetera.

LEG. NOWICK:

No. There just were so many of them. So we had to --

DR. VALENZUELA:

No, I understand, and I was going to --

LEG. NOWICK:

We in my town needed to try to control it. That's all I'm trying to equate it to.

DR. VALENZUELA:

No, I appreciate it. One of the things is that there's lack of resources for our adolescents. I mean, study the issues about gangs and all of that. We have all types of data, we have all types of studies that suggest that prevention is rather than -- it's more effective and cost efficient than some of the remedies that we proposed. Similar like this remedy that's being proposed.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you.

DR. VALENZUELA:

We don't have the resources to enforce it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Doctor, just one more thing. With your background obviously you realize that proactive approaches are much better. But also being a social worker, I just wondered, do you think that name-calling is an effective way to bring people together?

DR. VALENZUELA:

I think that there is no instance that I -- that can be attributed to me and saying that I'm name-calling. I explained to you --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

You just called us racist.

DR. VALENZUELA:

I mean, if the results of an action is racist, is it not racist?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I'm asking you a question that I guess what you're saying is that there are some times appropriate to call people names. In my background, my schooling has taught me that is no way -- in fact, that initiates more problems and divides people. So that I just would say you have to be consistent with your argument and calling people names, which is what I heard Legislator Nowick respond to, is not an effective tool ever. And I believe you would agree with that.

DR. VALENZUELA:

Again, I think that the bill is racist. The results will support that. I think that if you look at, you know, the history of immigration in the country, and you can go to Benjamin Franklin in 1771 when he wrote a paper with the name something like observations on the population, concerned about German's, concerned about German's deteriorating the culture, the society, concerned about the complexion. I mean --

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Excuse me, Doctor. I appreciate the history lesson, but I really just wanted an answer to my question and we have a lot more people that would like to speak.

DR. VALENZUELA:

Well, I've answered your questions, I think, fully.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Pat Seubert.

MS. SEUBERT:

Good morning, everyone. As you all know, I spoke at the last meeting in favor of this bill. I really would like to say, first of all, it's been a long time since I've been to a work session and I really want to say that I appreciate the lists of bills that you're considering again, tabled bills. Mrs. Brownings's, Mrs. Fisher's, all of these public safety issues, and public wellness groups -- issues, are something that I'm glad you're all working on.

I am here to speak, though, in favor of 1022. I happen to live in that North Ocean Avenue/Horseblock Road area. It is a safety issue. This is the committee for public safety. Something needs to be done. Why has everyone turned this into an issue against people? The only ones we should be against are the -- I'm sorry -- are the group -- are the gentlemen who hire these people and who cause the problems on the roadside. Something has to be done. This is a much bigger issue. And I'm somebody who has always believed in the American dream. This is not it, and this is not doing anything for them or for us. I would appreciate you all think twice. And I would like you all to understand that we feel this is a safety issue. Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

One second. Legislator Browning has a question.

LEG. BROWNING:

Good morning.

MS. SEUBERT:

Good morning.

LEG. BROWNING:

One of my questions for you is, you know, my union background, I've stood on many a picket line, and my concern with this bill is if we're going to enforce it, we have to enforce it across the board. And that's whether they're undocumented people standing on a corner or if they're union workers or if they are like, for example, in my district. We stood on the corner of two County roads with my constituents protesting against the saturation of sex offenders, sober homes. So my question for you is, is you're here to complain and you have a valid complaint. I do understand, I've been to Farmingville, I've seen what you're dealing with and yes, we need a solution to the problem.

I do believe that basically this is just a shell game. They're going to move to the Stop and Shop parking lot or they're going to move to a town road. That's what I believe. However, if in the event that a union chooses to organize on that same corner and there's a large group of union workers who stand in that corner with a rat, are you going to complain to the Police Department or to your local Legislator if they're creating a traffic problem?

MS. SEUBERT:

Miss Browning, I, too, have a long union history and I've been on a picket line, and I know that. But we stand orderly, usually near the place of business, not necessarily all over the roads. Don't run in the roads, don't cause traffic accidents. You may have stood out on a County road, yes, and for the illegals I think it's -- I think it's wonderful work. But you know what? It's not in -- on roads where they're doing 55 miles an hour. It's not the same as the creepy little traffic in all the other little towns. Something needs to be done.

And I tell you, I'm very offended by all of these people who are here against this bill. The statements that go on are just totally shocking. We're supposed to be considerate of all of these people who want to come here and work and all of these people who support them, and yet they stand here and call us names. That's a whole other issue. There are too many issues. This is a traffic safety issue.

LEG. BROWNING:

I don't necessarily know that I got the answer. I'm asking if there was a union or a local group of people who were protesting and traffic is being impeded by what they're doing, would you call and make that complaint?

MS. SEUBERT:

Yes, I would.

LEG. BROWNING:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Don Seubert.

MR. SEUBERT:

Good morning members of the Public Safety Committee. My name is Don Seubert and as I believe you already know, I'm with the Medford Taxpayers and Civic Association which strongly supports this legislation. I also believe you will hear support from civic associations and groups across Brookhaven regarding this, Centereach and Mastic/Shirley, and the Country Roadblock Association,

and a group called the Southaven Medford North Patchogue Group also. They, too, know well how their local 7-Eleven Granny Road/Horsblock Road/Long Island Avenue entrances on to North Ocean Avenue is encumbered by trucks and workers racing up to vehicles. The area residents and civics stand as one in how our area is impacted, that is Farmingville, Holtzville, Medford, Patchogue. From Huntington through Brentwood, Shirley to East Hampton, it is the same.

The legislation is a start, is an equal opportunity offender or ticketer. Obstruction of our highways, intimidating motorists on their morning commute by traffickers looking for employment endangers residents lives and protects all people. We know this simple step will take the cooperation of each township, village and state to make it fully effective. Each government entity blames the other and the news media blames the government for not being proactive, then critiques the simplest action. I think if this legislation saves one live, prevents one collision, prevents one injury, it will make a difference. Like the starfish, to that person and to that family, no matter the ethnicity, preventing workers prospective employers, innocent motorists intimidated to make the wrong quick decision place us all at unnecessary risk. The County roads are for the most part high speed 55 mile traffic roads, the most dangerous of all, blocking entrances, exits, on to main thoroughfares as Woodside Avenue, Horseblock Road, Coram/Mt. Sinai Road, and I'm sure all the other hamlets throughout the County.

With that, I'd like to add a few other comments. Rhetoric does not solve the problems. Demonize and canonize as saints the people that are breaking the laws, that's what's happening. I have heard the rhetoric that this legislation demonizes the Hispanic day laborer worker, when in fact it is the true demonizes only the law abiding Hispanic American citizen who is categorized as a law breaker or a labor camp runner, a smuggler etcetera. My neighbor, he's afraid. I asked him to speak about this issue. He said don't let me speak, no don't ask me that question. He walks around his neighborhood, because he looks like a quote typical Hispanic from Mexico or from South America somewhere, he's afraid. People look at him. He wants to sell his house. He's the type of American dream person that we talk about. He's from Puerto Rico, he loves his Aguadilla where he came from. He's intimidated out there on the streets every single day. He sees his house value going down.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Please wrap up.

MR. SEUBERT:

Okay. I just also -- Medford is an area that's not just involved with -- we have a great Turkish population that also have illegal housing and whatever throughout the whole community. I just want to say about the one family that he was a Suffolk County -- had the rushing yardage, a 12 high hit, twice the SAT scores. You've intimidated that good person through this type of legislation. They need your help.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much.

MR. SUEBERT:

Okay. You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Tom Muratore.

MR. MURATORE:

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Public Safety Committee. My name is Tom Muratore and I am officially the First Vice President of the Suffolk County PBA, but I'm also a resident of Suffolk County and a taxpayer. I would like to thank the committee for allowing me to come to speak. I'm here to speak on behalf of Introductory Resolution 1022.

For the last several years the law enforcement community has listened to the concerns of everyday Suffolk County residents about the dangers that exist because of motorists who carelessly exceed the speed limits and for that the law enforcement community can penalize those reckless individuals. However, more recently Suffolk County residents have expressed deep concerns about the problems associated with roadsides being congested. As a law enforcement officer and on behalf of the brave men and women I represent, I can only tell you plain and simple, this is a public safety issue. The fact that these sideways are being obstructed will only lead to a potentially dangerous situation for pedestrians and motorists.

In addition, we have heard various complaints from residents who are beyond impatient about the issues associated with roadside solicitations and have time and time again requested that the law enforcement community do something about this. Unfortunately, we can only enforce the laws that the County has implemented and directed us to enforce. This is why we strongly back the proposal crafted by Legislators Caracappa and Eddington. Approval of this greatly important legislation will provide local law enforcement with the authority we need to ensure the pedestrians and motorists can operate along our roadways in a safe manner, free from the distractions that currently exist along some of our sideways.

Considering this bill may face an uphill fight to get to the County Executive's desk, now is the time for the Legislators to stand up and demonstrate to the people of Suffolk County that protecting the public safety is priority number one. I urge this committee and the full Legislature not to backtrack. Do the right thing for the safety of our residents and approve this critically important resolution immediately. And realize there are safe hiring halls in Suffolk County; they're called union halls. And there are places that people who can go who are unemployed; it's called the State Unemployment Office.

And far as Mrs. Browning and her request or her question about what goes on in a picket line, when the laws are violated at a picket line, we arrest those involved that are committing the crimes. So you give the Police Department and the Sheriff's Department and all other law enforcement in Suffolk County the ability to go out and enforce law, we make arrests for people who violate the laws. So no matter what you're doing, if you're doing it wrong, you get arrested. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you. Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thanks, Tom, for coming down. You have the ability to talk to the patrolmen and women on the Suffolk County Police force in an informal way by way of doing business at the union hall, whether it be a social gathering, because they're your members and you listen to their concerns. I'm curious, off the record, on this record, but off the record between you and patrolmen who you are just chatting with about this issue and I know you do -- who will remain nameless, of course. How do they -- how do they respond? What are they saying as officers out there doing their job confronting these issues everyday, having to come up with some law and order with the limited tools that they have to do so? What are the men and women who are patrolling our streets saying about this issue?

MR. MURATORE:

Well, they're frustrated. I mean, they are absolutely at wits end. I mean, like the one gentlemen said, the number of motor vehicles accidents in that area, and I'm sure we can find out from the Police Department through their system, the number of accidents there is putting an extra burden. You know, it's usually at rush hour when the Police Department, we're changing tours. I mean, we have tried to change relief time, but they're overburdened and they're frustrated. I mean, we don't know what to do. The only place for us to look for help is from initially the Public Safety Committee and then the full Legislature. And they're crying out. They're asking give us tools to do our job.

You know, I always come here and ask for more personnel, we need more cops, but now I'm asking

for you to give more work to an undermanned Police Department already. But that shows you how frustrated and desperate we are in the law enforcement community and I'm sure other members of the community, of the law enforcement community, are saying the same thing.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I guess I lobbed that question out there maybe not so articulately, but I guess the real question is are you saying that your brothers and sisters in law enforcement are saying there's an absolute and legitimate problem as it relates to the congestion of County roadways and right of ways?

MR. MURATORE:

Yes, Legislator Caracappa, definitely. I mean, you just have to ride past there and see in the morning. You know, now it's pretty quiet because it's winter, but come the spring clean up time it's only going to get progressively worse. And someone is going to get hurt.

Just to give you a little story. I've been a cop a long, long time. My very first call was a pedestrian motor vehicle -- was a pedestrian accident where a young girl walking across the street to step into a car for a ride to school was killed. So I know what traffic can do to people, and that was 34 years ago. So that was a long time ago and traffic is much different in Suffolk County today as we all know. Again, thank you for your time.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you. I have one question from Legislator Mystal.

LEG. MYSTAL:

Good morning, Tom. I just -- Paul just gave you the Penal Code, and I want you to read paragraph 1157, pedestrians soliciting ride or business. (A), no person shall stand in a roadway for the purpose of soliciting a ride or to solicit from or sell to the occupant of any vehicle. (B), no person shall stand on or in proximity to a street or highway for the purpose of soliciting to watching or guarding of any vehicle while parked or about to park on a street or highway. This is the existing law. Why can't you use that law to enforce what's happening now in these communities? You said you don't have the tools. The law is there.

MR. MURATORE:

The vehicle and traffic is here. So now we're looking to add a County policy to it also, to enhance it, to make it stronger.

LEG. MYSTAL:

To make it stronger? Are you enforcing the one that's on the books now?

MR. MURATORE:

I'm sure they are. We enforce all the laws in Suffolk County in the Vehicle and Traffic Law.

LEG. MYSTAL:

And you need this law?

MR. MURATORE:

This one you're talking to, 1157?

LEG. MYSTAL:

You need the new proposed 1022.

MR. MURATORE:

Well, I don't think it would hurt. Do you?

LEG. MYSTAL:

I'm not asking you if it would hurt or not. I'm saying are you enforcing the present Penal Code that is now in the books? Because you're saying you don't have the tools.

MR. MURATORE:

No, I didn't say that. I said we need more tools. Give us the tools.

LEG. MYSTAL:

But are you enforcing the one that you have now?

MR. MURATORE:

I'm sure we are. And we'll enforce the new law.

LEG. MYSTAL:

If you are enforcing the law that we have now, how come we still have the problem?

MR. MURATORE:

Because we need more tools. We need a better tool to enforce a law that much better. We enhance the law, we make it easier to enforce the law.

LEG. MYSTAL:

It's circular reasoning.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much.

MR. MURATORE:

Okay.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thanks, Tom.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Pat Young.

MR. YOUNG:

Hi. I'm Pat Young from the Central American Refugee Center in Brentwood. You know, we always hear that this bill is about traffic regulation and then we also have thrown into it issues about women being afraid of groups of men. You know, I mean, we sort of can't have it both ways. We can't have discussions by Legislators about distinguishing illegal and legal immigrants, illegal housing and so forth. If this is really about traffic regulation, if this is really about traffic regulation and congestion, it shouldn't matter what the reason is that the congestion occurs. This is obviously a bill that was directed against day laborers and attempts to say now, after press statements were made that this was specifically designed to address the day laborer issue -- it's really disingenuous.

It's interesting that the issue of hiring halls came up. Legislator Caracappa talked about the lack of solutions coming from the private sector. Five years ago the County Legislature tried to pass a bill to set up a hiring hall and Legislator Caracappa said that that would hurt Farmingville. So I'm assuming right now that things have improved in Farmingville because we've had the solution that he's proposed, which is no hiring hall.

The bill that's being offered today is a sop, it's not a solution. What it's going to do is it's going to keep the same economic factors in place, which are not put in by the Latino advocates, those despised Latino advocates who are often referred to. Who brings the immigrants here to the United States illegally? Homeowners. These folks are not getting picked up to go and work in some exotic

locale in some other state for some very wealthy people. Walk through the streets of any Long Island village at eight o'clock in the morning and you will see the men who are picked up on the street corner, who are so feared, are now mowing the lawns of the very houses of the people who oppose their being here. Their wives are going into the homes and taking care of the children of the people who claim to fear this alien group.

We really need to start to address the fact that one in seven people in Suffolk County is an immigrant. We need to begin to look at how we integrate these folks into our society here, and we need to stop looking at things that will not solve anyone's problem, but will simply fan the flames of hatred.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. Maureen Jones.

MS. JONES:

Good morning. I'm here to represent a group of my neighbors. We live in Farmingville. I've been a resident there for 22 years. I've seen a lot of changes in my community. Some have been good and others I really can't say. Introductory Resolution 1022 is something that is good for our community and other communities in Suffolk County. This issue has been a long time waiting to be addressed and finally two Legislators that live in our area see that this resolution will help our community.

This is a public safety issue, a health issue, an environment issue, nothing more. I invite the Public Safety Committee to drive through our town and see what we experience every day. There is litter being generated every day. There is private and public property being destroyed, fences being knocked down, County signs leaning, town signs leaning, not to mention what we experience on Saturday and Sunday afternoons.

In my community, I have a few neighbors who have had accidents because of this. I used to be able to walk home from a local gas station while my car was being inspected or repaired, but this year ended that for me. I had to walk through the ruffraff and hear comments that I did not wish to hear. I'm asking this committee to please consider resolution 1022 to help improve our community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

John Madigan.

MR. MADIGAN:

How are you doing? My name is John Madigan. I am also a local homeowner in Farmingville. I'm here in support, again, of resolution 1022. You know, I have three young children in the area. I've been there for ten years. You know, I do have a wife who drives my kids around, I go to the 7-Eleven on North Ocean Avenue and Horseblock, get my coffee and bagel every day and I see what happens. The congregations causes a major traffic problem. They even wait in the middle of the divider on North Ocean Avenue when people are going 55 miles an hour trying to run across the street. I've seen a couple of accidents and I've seen, you know, a person hit on a bike because of that.

You know, I have three young in the area, including two daughters. My wife drives my kids around. I do not want to see my wife get into an accident because some contractor stopped on the side of the road, you know, to pick up somebody for work. It's not a racist issue, it's a public safety issue. Again, I jog through the town, I see what happens. I'm there in the morning and, you know, I urge you to pass the resolution for the tax abiding citizens of Farmingville. And this is the first step.

Legislator Browning, again, as far as your comment on the, you know, the waiting and the unions waiting on the side of the road. I've seen that happen too. They waited when the Hampton Inn came up in Farmingville. They stayed there legally, they didn't obstruct traffic, they are not throwing their garbage, they are not urinating on the streets or urinating behind our businesses, and that's what happens. That's, again, a public safety issue as well, as they are throwing the garbage on our streets and urinating on our property in our community, it creates issues that way as well.

Again I just wanted to express my opinion for the overwhelmingly silent majority in Farmingville that cannot be here because of work considerations or they are taking care of their children. I want to represent them as well. Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Thank you.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. Ian Wilber.

MR. WILDER:

I apologize for my awful handwriting. It's Ian Wilder, but it's my fault. I want to thank the Legislature and all the people who came out today. I hope people on both sides appreciate how wonderful democracy is, that we have a Legislative body sitting here having a discussion with the citizens to try and decide how to solve an issue.

The Suffolk County Legislature is something I've actually often defended. There are people out in the County who think it's a wasted level of government, why can't the towns take care of all this? I have said to them that the Suffolk County Legislature is probably one of the most innovative bodies in the country. Laws are passed here that are copied in the state, they're copied nationally. On this issue, I look to this body to be innovative also.

Now, I've been a resident of Suffolk County for 37, 38 years. I am very involved in my community. I have sat on the board of my Local Chamber of Commerce for four or five years. I am now Treasurer of my co-op. I was State Chair of the Green Party in New York and I sit on the board of a National Alternative Economics Organization. But all that said, this is the first time I've been in front of the Legislature because I happen to have a day off. I'm not here because I can be here, I'm here by happenstance because of timing.

I agree that this should not be a racial issue. And I agree -- I also agree that this is also not a public safety issue. This is an economics issue. The law that will pass today will not solve what people consider a problem, it will just move it. The problem here is what happens under the cutting edge of science, complexity theory. It's used not only in physics, it's used in economics, it's used in all the soft and social sciences. Basically what it says is when a system starts to move toward a certain thing, there's a very great difficulty moving away from that. For instance, the keyboards on these computers make no sense. They were set up for typewriters. They were actually set up to slow down typing speed so the keys don't stick. There are no keys to stick.

We have the same problem with this law. We've moved towards one idea of a solution, and we have

trouble moving away from that. Now, that's a human fallibility. I have the same problems as everybody else, but this will not solve the problem. What we need to do is see this as an economic problem and solve it that way, just as the problem of large groups of teenagers congregating in a certain area. It's not solved by a public safety issue. Obviously, their time is not being better used, they are not getting the services or the opportunities they needed. That example also shows that this type of public safety enforcement for a problem like this does not ultimately cause a solution. I ask the Legislature, I ask this committee, to not put forward this bill and I ask them to hold hearings to solve this as an economic problem for all our County. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. One second, please. Legislator Losquadro has a question.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I just want to pose to you another theory that I happen to prescribe to, and it's one the law enforcement community called the broken window theory. I'm sure you've probably heard of it. You begin to address problems as they arise, you do not let a particular problem fester because it only leads to additional problems. I believe in this case you begin to create an environment and you can affect the economic model by ultimately creating an environment which is not conducive to this type of business taking place. So I think that the two are not mutually exclusive. I think the two can work together. I think that law enforcement as they address problems, not only in this particular area, but in other areas, you -- law enforcement can work with that economic model to create an environment that is not conducive to a particular activity taking place. And that, in turn, can change the economic model.

So I disagree with you. I think that the two are not mutually exclusive. I think they can work together and that's why I think that government, which is responsible for more overarching concerns when we look at social services, we look at law enforcement. All of those different things work in concert with each other. Nothing exists in a vacuum. So I would just say that I disagree with you, that the law enforcement model does not affect the economic model.

MR. WILDER:

May I respond? I'm familiar with the broken window theory. There is also some concern these days that actually it doesn't work. But I do -- law enforcement is a solution. I do agree with you that when a problem arises it should not be ignored, it should be addressed. But the broken windows are problems of abandoned buildings. The broken windows are problems of either people with time on their hands or people who have the inability to get their basic needs met by other ways. Those are social service problems and should be solved by that. By arresting people you are not solving the underlying problem. You are treating the symptoms and not the cause. The cause will still exist. It will just crop up somewhere else and that's what I believe is the problem with this bill.

Now, I agree, I'm asking the Legislature to address this. Obviously there is a problem. There's very strong feelings about this. It should be addressed one way -- it should be addressed in some manner. What I'm saying is the manner it's being addressed right now will not solve the underlying cause and it will create more division in our County.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much, sir.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you for your comments.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

William Page.

MR. PAGE:

Good morning. I believe your intent for the law is good, but the way it's written, the way it's going

to be understood and enacted, well, that's something entirely different. I'm a sheet metal worker from Local 137. We build signs. The only way we can stop work from coming in from Pennsylvania or out of state that's being built and installed by underpaid workers -- when I say underpaid workers I'm talking about people who are doing this construction work that are making less than seven dollars hour and I've seen it. Now, we go out, picket, we only have the time they're there, usually they are only there for seven hours. We try to get our own men on it. We explain to these people that you should be getting paid what we get paid. And if we go out there according to this law, they can call the police. The person who's having the job done can call the police, not the residents. An officer is going to come down and his understanding of the law is that we're doing something guilty. Meanwhile, the fact these other people are getting paid -- underpaid, well, he's not going to know anything about that.

Like I said, the intent of the law is good, but it is just the reading of it, it is too vague and unions are going to suffer. My own union, 50% of the membership in New York live here in Suffolk County. Twenty-five percent live in Nassau County. The other 25% live in New York and New Jersey. My union covers from Westchester County to Montauk Point to Atlantic City. In New York we have 2,500 members and we have over 1,000 living here in Long Island. We're not going to be able to afford to live here in Long Island anymore if we can't stop this work that's coming in from out of state and that's what this law is going to do. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. Michael O'Neill.

MR. O'NEILL:

I thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. My name is Michael O'Neill and I'm with the Coalition for the Workplace in Southampton where we are attempting to help solve the problem of workers gathering along the sides of roads or in front of 7-Eleven's by establishing a work center.

We've heard many contradictions here today. People stand up and say this is not a law against any group and then they continue to go into their exaggeration of what one group is doing. We know this law is specifically aimed not at safety at all, but to try to solve a problem of immigration and perceptions about immigration. Are you going to arrest Cub Scout and Girl Scout and Boy Scouts for having -- selling things on the side of the road? Are you going to arrest high school students who are having a car wash? In my neighborhood they have a school that is on a County road. Is that going -- or is this law only going to be interpreted to persecute immigrants?

You know, I believe that this law will be thrown out of court if it is passed. So, therefore, I believe your intention as not at all for safety or even the passage of this law, but to further flame the hostility and misperceptions about immigrants. I would hope that you would, as many other communities across the country have done, see the enormous contributions that these people are making to us, the enormous -- they have helped our economy, they have expanded our economy, they have created jobs, not taken jobs away. That has been established by economists like David Card and Giovanni Perry and there is no evidence whatsoever that this has been -- that they have taken services that are greater than their contribution in taxes. In fact, we would not even have a Social Security right now if we did not have the 50 billion, we are told, is in the Sunshine Fund.

You will cause the exodus of not just the young people in Suffolk County who cannot remain here because of the high cost of housing, which this Legislature seems to have done very little about, but you will also cause the exodus of thousands of seniors who will not be able to maintain their houses because taxes will rise enormously without the continued income, revenue, without the businesses, without the work that is done by the immigrants that have been so helpful to us.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Just one comment, sir.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

One question sir, from Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I don't want to get into a protracted discussion with you, we can differ on viewpoint on certain things, but I just -- there was one particular term you used and I just wanted to caution you. You seemed to want to talk about tolerance and have people work together to find a solution to this, is that correct?

MR. O'NEILL:

I hope so, yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yet when you first got up you said that people who were getting up here talking about this problem, you used the term exaggeration, and I don't appreciate that. I'm sure the people who are testifying about their feelings and their viewpoints and their community don't appreciate you telling them that they're exaggerating. That's their viewpoint, you have your viewpoint, and I would just say practice what you preach. I didn't appreciate that comment. These people have a right to their viewpoint just as you have a right to yours.

As Legislator Caracappa pointed out earlier to a speaker, as Legislator Eddington pointed out earlier to a speaker, you know, you're saying name-calling, racism, none of this works, yet listening to your commentary, you're belittling the individuals who are coming and sharing with us their viewpoints as well. We have to take everybody's viewpoint into account, yours and theirs. I just wanted to make you aware, in case you missed that comment, as soon as you said it I wrote it down. So be careful when you're discussing this, because you, through that comment, are belittling those individuals and their viewpoint on this.

MR. O'NEILL:

May I respond?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Certainly.

MR. O'NEILL:

I appreciate very much what you're saying. I did not call or refer to anybody as racist. In fact, what I'm referring to is not so much the neighbors who have stood up and testified --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Sir, I don't want -- like I said, I don't want a protracted discussion. Did or did you not say that people were exaggerating?

MR. O'NEILL:

Yes, I did.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you.

MR. O'NEILL:

And they are. People are not blocking the 7-Elevens as has been said. People are not running out in traffic in 55 mile an hour zones.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

That is your view. Individuals have expressed their viewpoint.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. You know what, I thank you for your opinions and we'll go on. Legislator Caracappa.

(Applause)

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Do you know that for a fact? Do you live in the communities that are affected?

MR. O'NEILL:

Of course.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

You live in Farmingville, Medford?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Southampton I believe.

MR. O'NEILL:

I think this is going to be a County law, and not just a Medford, a Farmingville, a Horseblock Road Law.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

But the people that came and spoke today --

MR. O'NEILL:

I live in Suffolk County, I live in Sag Harbor, and yes, it will affect our community drastically like it will affect all of Suffolk County. Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

People that spoke, though, were from certain communities and you're telling us that they're exaggerating.

MR. O'NEILL:

I would even say that you are exaggerating.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

They're right behind you. Look them right in the eye and say it.

MR. O'NEILL:

I believe that all these men who have put this law up have exaggerated and have inflamed feelings and perceptions.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. I appreciate your commentary.

MR. O'NEILL:

You are entirely welcome.

CHAIRPERSON EDDINGTON:

Okay. Next speaker, Nadia Marin-Molina.

MS. MARIN-MOLINA:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm speaking -- I hadn't really been prepared to speak, but just with some of the things that were said I had a question. I'm speaking on behalf of the Workplace Project. We're an immigrant worker organization, a community organization. We have an office in Hempstead and an office in Farmingville. So we're very well acquainted with the Farmingville area, although as was mentioned, the law is actually going to affect all of Suffolk County -- Brentwood, Huntington, Southampton, etcetera.

So one thing which has been mentioned a few times, and I would just like to know if we could have access to a copy of the study that has been used as sort of siting how many accidents there have been in that area. It's been -- it was mentioned in Newsday that there were 400 and something accidents and I don't know how many of them were at night, which obviously weren't caused by day laborers, but it would be good to have that information so that we could see it before the next hearing.

That would be one request on our part.

Another -- another issue, which just has come up over and over again is sort of an implication that as people who are standing up against 1022 we're not offering any alternatives. Well, a day laborer center is not practical, I mean, but there are a couple of alternatives which I think really have to be looked at and taken into consideration. One is all of you in one way or another have talked about the need for solutions from the Federal Government. As Legislators, you can make a resolution, pass it and send it to the Federal Government saying we support a legalization, we support the integration of these workers into our communities, and we ask that the Federal Government actually allow this to happen. Pass immigration reform. Protect workers, protect -- change their immigration status, allow people to legalize, allow people to pay taxes, allow people to get on the books, which is what every single worker, given a chance, would want to be able to do and they're not allowed to do it now. That's one thing.

And another thing which we're -- you know, we would be happy and we've come here before and mentioned it to you, and we'd be happy to work with any of you on is the most pervasive problem faced by workers is not the danger of traffic, although that can be a danger, but the most pervasive problem faced by immigrants who are on the corners is actually unpaid wages. So people work, work for a week, work for two weeks, work for a month, and don't get paid. You know, crack down on the contractors. We are willing to work with you to crack down on the people who are exploiting the workers, the bosses who can actually stand to be targeted. Rather than going after the weakest and most vulnerable population you have here in Suffolk County, let's go after some of the big people.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. Legislator Caracappa, you have a question?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I remember vividly trying to send messages to the Federal Government through resolutions like you just mentioned, and I remember vividly you coming to speak out against our efforts to do that time and time again, Nadia. And, you know, just as we'll try and pull the report that you are asking for about traffic accidents, I'll make sure I pull the minutes and the meetings when we did try exactly what you just told us to do and you spoke out against it time and time and time again. Tell me you didn't.

MS. MARIN-MOLINA:

You don't need to pull the resolution, I remember it. It was in August of 2000, one month before two day laborers were attacked and nearly killed, and the resolution specifically was to sue the Federal Government, because immigrants --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

For their failures to deal with immigration.

MS. MARIN-MOLINA:

Because there was a spate, I think that was the word that you used, there was a spate, an immigration and increase in crime, which the Police Commissioner came here and said actually there was an increase in crime. So --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

One week in committee he said yes there was and seven days later with political pressure from then Presiding Officer Tonna his whole story changed.

MS. MARIN-MOLINA:

In front of us he didn't.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I'd rather not get into a history lesson at this time.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'm just saying, you say to do one thing and we've tried to do that. You're asking us to stay consistent, I'm asking you to stay consistent. We tried to pass a resolution, just a Sense Resolution which we can't do anymore, just asking the Federal Government to get their act together with relation to immigration. We didn't say what they should do. We didn't say, you know, close the borders, we didn't say anything like that. We said please get your act together, in so many words, with relation to illegal immigration and you came here and you urged us not to pass it.

MS. MARIN-MOLINA:

You sued the --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

No, no, no. Not that one. I'm talking about other attempts to do Sense Resolutions which allowed this Legislature as a body to pass an opinion, a non-binding resolution saying to our federal representatives please do something about this illegal immigration problem because the trickle down effect is affecting us here locally by way of taxes, Social Services, and other things. You came and said don't pass it, don't do anything about it. So don't come here and tell us to do it and then in retrospect you remember oh yeah, I told you not to do it. So stay consistent.

MS. MARIN-MOLINA:

The one that I -- I'm sorry, I really want just at least to respond to that. The one that I remember that I know that we spoke out against was that one, which was suing immigration for -- because of an increase in crime, supposed. Other ones I don't remember. And --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Of course.

MS. MARIN-MOLINA:

And I don't know if you can pass resolutions, but if there is any Legislator who wants to send a letter to Immigration in favor of comprehensive immigration reform we would work with you and I'm sure there are a lot of other people here who would too.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. I appreciate your comments. Helen Mattadeen. Is Helen Mattadeen here?

MS. MATTADEEN:

Yes, I'm coming.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. MATTADEEN:

Good morning, everybody. My name is Helen Mattadeen and I'm representing ACORN. ACORN is opposed to the I.R. 1022 because it could hurt our ability to picket as an organization that uses people power to win justice. I.R. 1022 would hurt our organization. Also ACORN stands for Association for Community of Reform Now, which means our members are workers. ACORN is a members ran organization. The bill will make it more difficult for our members, working people, to get jobs. You should be supportive of people who want to work here, so that -- so let's try to work together and try to make a resolution to this, because we're saying that you want people to work and these people want to work. They're in a situation where they can't help or control what's going on, but you can. And all we're doing is trying to find a situation in which that they can do this. So if you propose 1022, that would hurt. Then we'd have more people not working, then you'd have something else to say. Let's try all getting on the same page and say the same thing. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. And last but not least, Rosario Pellegrino.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

Good morning, everybody. My name is Rosario Pellegrino. I'm a Council rep with Carpenters Local 7. I'm also a union organizer. I really don't understand what this is all about here today. You know, a basic rule of physics is for every action there is an opposite and equal reaction. To put this bill in effect would hurt the labor movement immensely. Most of our power in what we do hinges on our right to assemble, our right to congregate. Every single time I put up a picket line or a banner line there's police there within moments making sure we're following the letter of the law, called by whomever. You know, I don't believe this has anything to do with loitering. Every law in this resolution is already a law. You are not allowed to loiter, you're not allowed to pull over on the side of the road where it's unsafe. I mean, these are things that are all ticketable offenses.

I believe the whole thing hinges on enforcement. I mean, isn't it really the problem? What if we enforce the rules that we have now and the laws we have now? I think it's just -- it's not a good thing to do for labor -- anybody. And the very second we do this -- which I really think it's an immigrant issue. I think it's just a nice way to or a different way to wrap it up like as if people can't tell that's really the problem. I think it's a farce. I think it will hurt the community immensely. Other people have their opinions. You know, this gentleman says they help the community. I don't see that at all.

I'm not nor have I ever been anti-immigrant. You know, I'm first generation American. I mean, my parents came off the boat with a kid in each hand and they made a life for themselves and they did it right. They didn't just hop a fence or anything to get here and I do resent people jumping fences or however they got here and not helping me pay, like we all do, our taxes. There is a legal and a right way to do it and I get very upset when they do this and they just pop up and here they are and they are working. They hurt our economy. But they are -- these are people and they have to do it the right way. So whatever the reason, how or why they are here, they are here.

To say it's not an issue them being at 7-Eleven in Farmingville, to say that, then you've never been there, because they are. I pass there every morning. And I used to leave for work at 5:30 in the morning and I used to pass them on their bicycles almost hitting them. They're a problem. It is a problem and I think it all hinges on enforcement. None of that stuff is legal now anyway without passing any of these laws.

If you do this, every anti-labor organization is going to come after us. We have an organization called the ABC. There are organizations in this room that if you stop those guys from congregating, the next picket line some labor organization puts up, they'd have that stopped because any first year law student could blow holes right through it and give reasons why we shouldn't be there. I think it has to be enforced, laws now. This is just too vague, too light worker. It just can't be put this way. That's it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Quick question.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

One question from Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

It was just mentioned earlier by someone from Farmingville and based on Legislator Browning's question, when you do organize, and I've been on picket lines myself, I've walked them for my own union --

MR. PELLEGRINO:

Yeah, I've had other members of the board --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Never have I seen you do what like the gentlemen said from Farmingville, urinate on site, intentionally block traffic, always been respectful to anyone needing the right of way to access past the picket line. You've always been very respectful of the law. Never, never jumped in front of traffic, never blocked traffic, never impeded flow of pedestrians and/or traffic. So that's the problem we're facing and that's what we're trying to address with this will. Never was it intended -- it was just someone planted the seed that this would block labor unions from protesting. It's, I think, as much as I appreciate your testimony, I think it's a bogus argument.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

No, it's not bogus.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

It has nothing to do with that. You guys don't break the law when you --

MR. PELLEGRINO:

What I'm saying is there's already a law on the books that says we're not allowed to pee on the sidewalk. I'm sure it's there. Have I seen it, no, but I know it exists. That's because you're in favor of this. Now, somebody who's opposed to my organization, or opposed to me picketing, it is too vague. They can make an argument that will hold in court saying that I'm not allowed to be there either, because in that resolution, and I read it, it doesn't say you're not allowed to pee or you got to be respectful and neat. You're not allowed to be there. Period.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

No. You didn't read it right, then.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

I read it perfectly. I'm a real good reader.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

You know what, I appreciate it --

LEG. CARACAPPA:

It's obstructing the free flow of traffic on a sidewalk and/or County roadway. Blocking, stopping, impeding.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

But we're not allowed to do that now. Those laws exist. That's why we follow the law so well as a labor organization. That's why we do it so well and do it right. Hey, three years ago, two years ago in July I lost two guys on my picket line, they got killed, you know, if you are aware of that or you heard that. And that was with following the law and everything. So people can get hurt and they do get hurt. This guy drove down the sidewalk.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I have another question for you from Legislator Browning.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

Sure.

LEG. BROWNING:

Rosario, you know I stood on the corner of Montauk Highway and William Floyd Parkway with you guys.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

You certainly did.

LEG. BROWNING:

Two County roads, while you guys were picketing outside the {Parisi} development. Would you say that when you were standing there at many times people would slow up or honk their horns or, you know, pull over or say, you know, what's going on, why are you doing this.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

Absolutely.

LEG. BROWNING:

That's impeding traffic; correct?

MR. PELLEGRINO:

As a matter of fact, we try to avoid that at all costs because if they get into an accident we're going to get sued.

LEG. BROWNING:

But it did happen when you stood there for those number of months that you were there.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

That's an excellent point. You go to all costs to make sure that that doesn't happen. See, what's happening here is they go through every possible route to make sure traffic comes to a stop, that the free flow of pedestrian traffic comes to a stop. That's the goal that's going on here. You do it right. What's happening is completely wrong and that's why we're trying to change it.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

Listen, we're not on different sides.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I know and I appreciate it.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

I oppose people taking my work, too. I got 2,000 members. You know, not unlike yourself, I have constituents myself and they count on me to get their work. So when I have somebody underbidding my guys and doing the work for \$100 a day or whatever it hurts me too and I don't like it. But this isn't the way to fix it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I appreciate your comments. Thank you very much.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

This isn't the way to do it. It's just too vague.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I have one last minute. Antonio Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ:

Good morning. Thank you. My name is Antonio Martinez. I'm also a representative of the Carpenters Union here in Long Island, 270 Motor Parkway, Hauppauge, New York. And as my colleague said, we're a little concerned about the law because obviously, you know, we are a very regulated organization. Unions are very regulated. We wish we could be deregulated as everybody else is, you know, that way we can do a lot more. But the matter is that our -- when we do picket, people do slow down, too, and our what do you call it, our nemesis or our, what do you call it, people who, what do you call it, do not want us in front of their -- while we're picketing, seeking work, that this could also affect us. They could use the law and say that the law is going to be -- they can say how can you separate these guys from these guys, you know, and that's what we're concerned of. And I hear Mr. Caracappa's point that they jump on to the road, blah, blah, blah. I haven't seen it, you know what I mean, and I know that it is an issue, but that could also affect us.

Now, why are they -- I think this body can do something a little stronger, you know, and create some other site, you know what I mean, because right now what this law is going to do is going to push this problem on to another municipality, you know. So that's -- I think the issue here is not to -- as a labor organization we cannot be against employees, against workers. These guys are here to work and it's a matter of, what do you call it, supply and demand. They say demand from the unscrupulous contractors. If you want to go after somebody, you've got to go after the unscrupulous contractors and try to figure that out.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. And that will conclude the public portion. Oh, is there anybody else?

MR. SPRINGER:

Mr. Chairman, I had a request. I'm not sure where my card went. May I speak?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yeah. Just give you name.

MR. SPRINGER:

Robert Springer. I'm with the Medford Crime Watch in Medford. I came down today to talk in favor of resolution 1022, but I need to get on the record first off that I'm highly offended that as a supporter of this bill I am a racist. I did not come down here -- I am so offended. You come to my employment, I own a company, you look at my diverse workforce, you talk to my family, you talk to my friends and you sit there and you call supporters in this bill a racist issue. It absolutely blows my mind.

I also take exception to the fact that we're exaggerating the challenges that we've having with safety over there. I welcome the gentleman from Southampton to come and look at the video and film that we have of folks darting across County Road 83, standing in the median of County Road 83.

I got involved with this issue because Medford Crime Watch is a new organization. We had a general meeting last Friday night, the ninth, and a good half of our meeting was dedicated to this issue. The residents of Medford asked that we come down and talk about this. It's a serious issue. We have folks that cannot make a right-hand off of Robinhood on to 83 because you need to look 5,000 different ways because there is traffic coming one way, there is people standing here and there's people coming across the median. I also don't think it's fair that our wives and children need to be subjected to the congregation of people that are taking place there. It's very intimidating, it's not right, and it's not fair.

The other issue is as the crime watch group, you know, we've had large groups of students leave the Pat-Med High School, maybe 40 or 50 at a time. We gotten involved and called Suffolk County Police on them because they were causing problems on Buffalo Avenue, and they came down and broke up that group. Why should our residents have that law and the police respond to that, but we have so many people on the County roads and there's nothing that we can do about it. What we're really asking for is we need to get this out committee, we need this to get to a full vote and we need 1022 passed. Thanks very much.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much. Okay. Then that --

MS. GRAHAM:

Excuse me. May I?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

One more speaker. Okay. Yes, why not?

MS. GRAHAM:

I'm Regina Corby Graham. I didn't sign up to speak this morning. I spoke last week, and I just came here this morning to be here. But I just want to make a very brief comment. Excuse me. I was just thinking, if I somehow was a person from outer space and appeared here and didn't know anything about our society and the remarks that I've heard this morning, I would -- and I'm a very strong union supporter, I'm a working families person, but it sounds like union members went to finishing school and immigrants are riffraff, and I heard a lot of mention of urine. I mean, if that doesn't tell you something about this whole bill, then what more can I say? But, again, I just urge you to, you know, the point has been made so clearly that there are already laws on the books to take care of this problem. Let's go for work centers and do something, something other than this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Anybody else? Okay. Then we will start on the agenda. And I'm going to make a motion to take I.R. 1020 out of order.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

1022.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

1022 out of order.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Caracappa. Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay.

On the resolution **1022, A Local Law to prohibit the obstruction of County roadways.** Do I have a motion?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion by Legislator Caracappa to approve. I'll second that.

LEG. MYSTAL:

I'll make a motion to table.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

A motion to table by Legislator Mystal.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

The motion is seconded by Legislator Browning.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Roll call.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Roll call on the motion.

LEG. MYSTAL:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

You want to speak on the motion?

LEG. MYSTAL:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Legislator Mystal.

LEG. MYSTAL:

My heart goes out to the people in the community. It is a real problem that will not be solved by this law. As I pointed out before, there are already Penal Law addressing this problem. I hope somehow the community, and the different communities in Suffolk County, and the people representing or advocating for the day laborers would come together and find some way to a permanent solution. This law will only band aid the problem, pass over it, push it down to another road maybe, if it is even enforced or enforceable. The last speaker who spoke I think said, one of the speakers who spoke said that they had broken up a group of teenagers coming out of school and they called the police and why can't the police do the same thing? What the police have done, if the police can group -- can break up a group of teenagers coming out of school, it's because they are using laws that already exist. Why can't they do the same thing on Horseblock Road and North Ocean Avenue?

MR. PELLEGRINO:

Because they are scared.

LEG. MYSTAL:

In defense of something that had been said, I do not believe that there is a racist bone in Mr. Caracappa or Mr. Eddington. I have known Joe for a long, long time, and I don't think he's a racist, has never been, he's a good union person. He came from a union background. Mr. Eddington, the same way I think is a good social worker all of his life. I don't think he has a racist bone in his body. So sometime to the fervor of advocating for a position we say thing that we don't mean and we say thing that are -- a good example is me last meeting. I don't think this body, all 18 of us, are acting on a racist basis, and that I really resent sometime.

The effect of the bill, as Dr. Valenzuela said, the effect of the bill, not the bill itself, may become a racial issue because it will target one particular group. Not the intention of the sponsors. For example, I don't think the bill will be enforced if a group of Boy Scouts gather around a block soliciting cars to be washed for a fund-raiser. They will impede traffic, they will slow down traffic, and they will be soliciting business, but it will not be enforced against them because they're Boy Scout. I do not believe that this bill will be enforced on union picketing. Though the employer may call the Police Department and say I want to use that law, the Police Department, having a lot to do, will not enforce against probably against union.

MR. PELLEGRINO:

They have to.

LEG. MYSTAL:

They have to. I know they have to.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I'd appreciate if you'd just listen now.

LEG. MYSTAL:

They will come, but the effect of the bill would be to target a particular group. The community is under siege, and that is the truth that we have to say. We have to say that the community of Farmingville especially is under siege and the quality of life have gone down to the point where most people would rather sell their house if they could find a buyer. Something has to be done. Something must be done. If the Federal Government is abdicating on its own -- abdicating from this issue, we as a County Legislature must take some action. But the action have to be balanced between two groups, the community who is being assailed and attacked, and the day laborers who are trying to feed their families. Those are two issues that must come together and hopefully we'll

come up with a permanent solution. It is not going to be solved with laws that already exist on the book.

I understand the position of the community. There is a theory in psychology. There are two points of psychology. One is Freudian, one is called behavior modification. Freudian will say let's look at the problem, let's get to the root of it and treat it until we find a solution for the problem. Behavior modification would say let's remove the problem then find the root cause and deal with that. The community want behavior modification, they want to find a quick solution and remove the problem. The day laborers advocate want to do a Freudian by treating the root cause first before we remove the problem. Somewhere in between those two theories there must be, there must be a solution that we as Legislators, men and women of good conscience must come to a solution. And somebody's given an example the other day. If you have a hammer in your hand and that's what you have, then everything will look like a nail.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Abraham Maslow.

LEG. MYSTAL:

So therefore I'm saying let's remove the hammer, let's find a solution. This bill will not do it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Thank you. One of the reasons I would like to see this bill tabled is because currently Legislator Eddington and I are working on the problems of Woodside Avenue. Woodside Avenue is a death trap. I believe at this time we have improved enforcement on Woodside Avenue to tackle the speeding problem. When it comes to this particular corner, like we've already heard, there are laws that are in effect. Then maybe we need to step up enforcement on that particular corner. The one problem we have is these contractors who are pulling up, those are the people who we need to target. We need to go after those illegal contractors, we need to go after those contractors who are pulling up on the side of the road impeding traffic, and they're the ones who are causing all of the accidents.

The other thing is, is we do have signs that can be posted. They say No Stopping or Standing. Those signs maybe need to be posted. We don't need a bill to do that.

And again, my concern is, is I have residents in my community who through freedom of speech and the right to assemble, have stood on the corner of County roads to protest the saturation of the sex offenders and the sober homes. I'm not going to take it away from them. We have the right to life people who stand and protest outside Planned Parenthood. My concern is we have had problems at Planned Parenthood where they have been targeted by radicals. Are we going to take away their right, no matter how you feel about the issues, are we taking away people's rights to freedom of speech and assembly. I grew up in a country where freedom of speech wasn't available. We couldn't do that, and if you assembled, you get shot at, so I'm not taking it away.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Caracappa.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Well, we're certainly not taking that away, Legislator Browning, and you certainly didn't feel that way when you voted to ban certain populations from gathering in park areas just a few months ago.

So, again, consistency is the key here.

I think what Legislator Eddington and I are trying to do is solve a problem that's real. We're not trying to -- and through that debate, it seems like people are blowing what we're trying to do so far out of proportion, which usually happens during this argument and on this issue. Legislator Mystal, I appreciate the words you said about Legislator Eddington and I, and you and I go way back, and you know, with Maxine and everything. And you use an analogy of Boy Scouts with a car wash. They would not be doing the car wash on a County sidewalk. They would not be stopping and washing cars on a County roadway. They would be in a parking lot somewhere. They may be waving at people to come into their car wash, but they would not be doing it on the roadside in the roadway. That is what's happening here.

We have been cracking down on the contractors, we do because we can. But there's been one element that we have not been able to touch, and I heard you say it, because the cops have been afraid, politicians have been afraid, and that's been the person gathering, blocking access on the right-of-way and the County roadways and that has got to stop. Yes, this bill is not the panacea, we all know that. And, yes, it may be a quick remedy and not the root remedy, Legislator Mystal, but it is a remedy. It's a start. It's something that's going to provide relief. It is truly going to provide better safety measures along a very dangerous County roadway and it should be looked at for what it is and not for what it's not. And the arguments that have been brought up against the bill quite frankly, though I appreciate them, it's not what the bill is about. And that's just the bottom line.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you. Legislator Browning or Legislator Lindsay. Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes, briefly on the -- when you're talking about the sex offender bill. The sex offenders are convicted felons and they prey on our children. Pedophiles prey on children. They are convicted felons. These people that you're talking about have not yet been convicted of a crime. Innocent until proven guilty.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

It has nothing to do with that.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you. Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, I want to take a few minutes and comment about the ongoing debate. I listened to all of the speakers, and most of the speakers in the early part of the debate. I was in my office and I was listening to it over the microphone. And it's -- I find it interesting and a lot of it I can relate to myself and my own experiences in life. My family moved to Suffolk County 30 years ago from Nassau County, and one of the first houses we looked at was in Farmingville. It was a beautiful new house, and it boiled down to that community or Islip. And truthfully, we moved to Islip because the taxes were a little cheaper. But what has happened to Farmingville is disturbing. I think anybody that would go down County Road 83 in the morning and see literally hundreds of people standing along the side of the road makes you stop and notice, what's going on here?

Mr. O'Neill made some comments that I disagree with, and some I agree with. I think he exaggerated a little bit about the affect of this bill, that it would hurt senior citizens in our economy. If anybody in their right mind thinks the passage or failure of this bill is going to affect much of anything you're crazy, because it really isn't. And I do agree with Mr. O'Neill in that our communities are part of the problem, and part of the problem because they hire these people. They hire contractors that employ people that aren't here legally. And I try very hard not to do that and

any contractor that comes to my house I specifically ask the contractor do you have all legal workers because I think it's important.

My problem at this point with the bill has to do with the labor issues. When I was first approached by some of the unions about could this be applied to labor disputes, you know, I had a discussion with our Counsel. He assured me that it couldn't be applied to labor disputes. I had another discussion with him last night and he isn't quite as sure that it doesn't apply to labor disputes.

I think everybody knows I was in the labor movement for many, many years and I am -- I know a little bit about labor history because I've studied it. About 100 years ago, a law was passed on a federal level called the Sherman Antitrust Act. The purpose of it was to curb monopolies, to curb big business that had dominated workers and consumers and was just sucking the life blood out of the American way of life. And ironically, I don't know how much it affected the monopolies, but it's been used and still used to this day against worker organizations. And that's -- that's upsetting. So I do not have a comfort level at this time until I get a definitive answer on how this is going to affect labor unions. So I'm going to support the tabling this morning until I get a more clear-cut answer on this issue.

As far as enforcement, I believe it's an enforcement issue as well. I really think that if the powers to be want to enforce the statutes that are on the books we could be doing it now. I've probably been on more picket lines than anybody in this room. Some of them we don't obstruct traffic, once in a while we do obstruct traffic, and sometimes it doesn't make any difference. Not so much in this County, but Nassau County I've had a couple of picket lines and we had a cop say you've got to disperse, and if you didn't disperse, they made you disperse. On two occasions they brought in the mounted police. And if you want to see something scary you go against a horse, because I was there.

So I'm going to ask my colleagues to back the tabling motion this morning to give us a little bit more time to get a clear-cut answer on the labor dispute part of it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Let's have a roll call vote on that. This is for tabling.

(Roll Called by Ms. Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

No.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

No.

LEG. HORSLEY:

(Not Present)

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No to table.

LEG. MYSTAL:

Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:

No.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
The count?

MS. ORTIZ:
Three.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
So the motion fails.

MS. ORTIZ:
It fails.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
Okay. Then the motion to approve and a second by Legislator Caracappa. We'll have a roll call on the motion.

(Roll Called by Ms. Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk)

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
No.

LEG. CARACAPPA:
Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:
(Not Present)

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Yes.

LEG. MYSTAL:
No.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:
No.

MS. ORTIZ:
Four.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:
Motion is approved. **(Vote: 4/3/0/1 Opposed: Legislators Browning, Mystal and Lindsay; Not Present: Legislator Horsley).** Okay. Let's get to the rest of the agenda.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 2173-06, A Local Law establishing crime prevention requirements for scrap metal dealers.

This needs to be tabled for a public hearing, so I'll make a motion to table, second by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley)**

Chief, did you want to address this?

CHIEF MOORE:

No, sir, just in case.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

All right. **IR 2268-06, A Local Law to strengthen ATV seizure and forfeiture provisions.**

This has to be tabled for public hearing. Yes, Counsel?

MR. NOLAN:

To the Clerk's Office, Renee, the sponsor has indicated that this resolution should be **withdrawn**.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Just to complete the record, I had a meeting the other day with the Police Department and the Parks Department and we've come to a compromise on this issue. It really -- I'm introducing a new bill. I haven't had a chance to talk to Legislator Losquadro, who was involved in this with me, but we will be reintroducing a new bill. They would prefer the existing statute be strengthened rather than a new statute be put in place. And I apologize, Legislator Losquadro, that I haven't had a chance to brief you on that.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

We did speak briefly regarding this issue, Mr. Presiding Officer, and I think this is, you know, an issue that we've looked at obviously for quite some time. And strengthening the existing statute I believe will negate some of the constitutional issues of asset forfeiture that we've run afoul of with this particular bill with a prior offense. Counsel and I have discussed that at length. So I'm happy to work with you. I was happy to work with you on this legislation, happy to work with you on strengthening our existing statutes.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Thank you, Dan. We'll go to **IR 2290-06, A Local Law to require landlords to register with the Department of Probation prior to renting to sex offenders.**

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

There's a motion to approve.

LEG. MYSTAL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Seconded by Legislator Mystal. All those in favor? Opposed abstentions? Approved. **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

LEG. MYSTAL:

Cosponsor.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

IR 2514-06, Requiring a detailed report on the progress of civilianization within the Suffolk County Police Department. I'm going to make a motion to table.

LEG. MYSTAL:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Mystal. But on the motion I just wanted to say that the quarterly report is pretty close to due again so I want to make sure that we do all get that, all the members.

CHIEF MOORE:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you. Okay. On the motion, all those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

One opposed. **(Vote: 6-1-0-1 Opposed: Legislator Losquadro; Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

IR 1012, Amending the 2007 Capital Program and Budget and appropriating funds for the purchase of speed indicator signs for the Police Department (CP 3100).

P.O. LINDSAY:

If I might, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I have an amended copy. Has that's been filed yet, George?

MR. NOLAN:

It was filed timely.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Then I'm going to make a motion to approve. I've been holding this up because of some concerns by the Police Department. The amount of money I had appropriated for the signs we had bought in the past, the signs haven't been the most reliable. They break quite a bit, and they wanted to upgrade so they wanted a couple of more bucks to buy a more expensive sign that I think will be more durable. I think we've made those changes and so I'd like to move the bill.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. So a motion to --

P.O. LINDSAY:

There's seven indicator signs that I'm making a motion to purchase that there'll be an additional one for each of the seven precincts. The original appropriation was 42,000.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Right, that's what I --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Now we need like 100,000? I think we rounded it to 100,000.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

One-hundred thousand. Budget Review, a hundred thousand?

MR. MAGGIO:

Yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Presiding Officer Lindsay made a motion to approve. I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

IR 1051, A Local Law to permit polygraph examinations of civilian applicants to the Suffolk County Police Department, Sheriff's Department and District Attorney's Office.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to approve.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Seconded by Legislator Caracappa. On the motion? Chief?

CHIEF MOORE:

Good morning. Chief of Department, Robert Anthony Moore, Suffolk County Police Department. I think that the Police Department has already gone on record. We have nothing more to add other than that the Police Department is not comfortable with this piece of legislation. And again, for the reasons that we had previously stated.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Thank you very much.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you and I would just say I appreciate the Police Department's position on this. I again just reiterate this bill simply gives them the option of implementing this policy and that to the best of my knowledge, and I see Mr. Kearon in the back there, that the District Attorney's position and the Sheriff's position have not changed on this issue and they feel that this would be a good tool in their investigative arsenal.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Just for clarification, Legislator. In other words, it doesn't require anybody, it's just another tool that could be used if you do feel it's necessary or --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

It is at the discretion of the individual department head.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Thank you very much. On the motion, Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And I don't mean to put words in the Police Department's mouth, but one of their other concerns, Legislator Losquadro, is the PD is the one that gives the polygraph exams and they were worried about staffing and budgetary if this -- requirements of this is used extensively. Have you given any consideration that the departments that want to use this tool would contract themselves out of their own budget to do this?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

That is a possibility. This would only be for new hires. Some of the discussion that we had early on in this process when I passed the first bill, numbers were being put out there that included the total number of civilians within the department including crossing guards. These individuals were already hired within the department. This would only be for new hires at the discretion of the individual department head. They would decide for which positions they felt it was necessary.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But it doesn't mandate that PD do the test?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No, it does not. Well, the PD is the only one that has the ability to conduct the polygraph examination. My point was as we see these quarterly reports, what I would like to see is, as we go through one cycle of this being in place, see what our average is. See how many civilian applicants, the departments who do choose to use this, are hiring and who are sending through this. I have a feeling it's not going to be a significant number. And if the Police Department truly feels that they need additional resources or additional man power to staff this I would be certainly willing to put in a bill to amend our budget to give them some additional resources to do that because I feel that for the departments that do want to use it, it's going to be a very good tool for them.

P.O. LINDSAY:

If I might.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes, Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

My point was simply this, that if the DA and the Sheriff wants to use it, you know, they can contract with a private agency to do this, which might be even a more efficient way to go because I would see this as sporadic employment. I don't know whether it's worth hiring additional personnel or buying additional equipment for something that might not be used frequently.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Well, as I said, I would like to determine whether or not that is necessary.

P.O. LINDSAY:

All right.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I would like to give the opportunity for this to go through at least a quarterly cycle and we see that report, see how many we're actually averaging in terms of new hires. As I said, I do not feel that this is going to be a significant number. And from what I understand, with this unit, it could just be a matter of them perhaps working within this capacity for some additional time. I don't even think it would necessitate the hiring of additional staff.

So, as I said, I would like to see what the actual numbers turn out to be, you know, for a quarter and then we could make a determination as to whether or not we need to either give the Police Department additional resources or perhaps have those individual -- those other departments contract out for it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Thank you. So we have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

IR 1100, Extending certain benefits to Suffolk County Auxiliary Police Officers.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Motion, Mr. Chairman.

LEG. NOWICK:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion by Legislator Caracappa, second by Legislator Nowick.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Is that to approve?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Isn't it subject to -- no.

LEG. MYSTAL:

This is 1100.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm on the wrong one. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Caracappa, did the Executive's Office reach out to you?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Just yesterday Jeff Tempera reached out to me and this bill has been pending for what, a month now, and he and I didn't get to touch base. But regardless of what Mr. Tempera may have by way of objections, I think it's already dealt with in the bill and it's very unfortunate that, you know, just last night in Greenwich Village an auxiliary police in New York City was killed doing a job that has -- well, in Suffolk County I can say, really offsets a tremendous amount of tax dollars that we would otherwise be using for overtime, whether it be parade duty or crowd control or things where our uniform sworn personnel could be better off serving someplace else.

The dollar amount really can't even be quantified by the amount of man hours that have been put in by auxiliary police officers over the years, but I could tell you, with the minor objections by way of potential cost that Mr. Tempera had is totally offset a hundred times over by the savings that these good men and women provide by way of a volunteer service.

Basically what this bill does is just bring them up -- they've been kind of like the stepchild of volunteer agencies over the years because we kind of -- we take care of our volunteer fire departments, we take care of our volunteer ambulance companies, in giving them extended benefits whether it be in our parks or reduced fees or things of that nature. They haven't received any of those and this kind of brings them up to speed with the other volunteers in that regard. It also allows them to, because they have to purchase all of their own equipment by way of even bulletproof vests, which obviously last night's incident shows that they need, because they do wear uniforms. They have to pay for that themselves as well. They do ride in police cars, though it does

say auxiliary on the bottom of Suffolk County. They do put themselves in harms way, and they just are not compensated fairly by way of a volunteer and by way of the necessary means of doing that volunteer job.

I think this brings them all up to speed to do that job for us and continue saving Suffolk County residents millions and millions of dollars in what could be potentially a cost to the regular police services.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yes, Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Do we have a financial impact? What is this going to cost us?

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Counsel?

MR. NOLAN:

The financial impact is estimated to be minor in nature, less than \$10,000 according to the financial impact statement.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. Then we have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

IR 1143, A Local Law to protect children by prohibiting smoking in passenger vehicles within Suffolk County where children are passengers.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Unfortunately the public hearing was recessed, so I have to make a motion to table, which is unfortunate. I wish it was before us, but motion to table for a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. I'll second that. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).

P.O. LINDSAY:

Why is that, Dan? You're so much in favor of this bill that you want to move on it?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Not quite.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

He just wants to get to the snow one the cars.

LEG. MYSTAL:

I think Legislator Losquadro is the only one who's against this as much as I am.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

IR 1148, A Local Law to prohibit text messaging while driving. This needs to be tabled. I'm making a motion to table at the time. I've spoke with the -- I've heard that the sponsor has said that it could be tabled.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

Did he text that message?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Yeah, he text messaged it.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Counsel, the public hearing is closed on this?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Motion to approve.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

The sponsor asked for it to be tabled.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I was told that he asked.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

All right.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I checked yesterday and that's what I was told.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

I'll second the motion to table because the sponsor asked, but I'm kind of with Legislator Losquadro here. I would love to take this up in committee right now for obvious reasons.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

In deference to the sponsor, I'll withdraw my motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Okay. We have a motion to table. Do I have a second?

P.O. LINDSAY:

To table? Yes.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Table, second. Okay. Then all those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley)**

IR 1162, Establishing the Suffolk County Multi-Level CPEP Working Committee to address Suffolk County's emergency psychiatric needs.

LEG. MYSTAL:

I think the sponsor is still working on this bill.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

The amended copy was filed. I have the amended copy as of 3/12. I spoke to the sponsor regarding this.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I haven't seen it.

LEG. MYSTAL:

I haven't seen it either.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Has the department had a chance to review this?

CHIEF MOORE:

No, sir.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

A brief explanation. I've been working with Legislator Kennedy on this. He's, I'm sure as you're very well aware, more conversant with the legalese than I am, but the amended version of the bill in response to some of the comments from the department would set up a short-term, with a very defined timeframe, of a working committee to look at this issue, and a 12 member board for that committee is outlined in the bill. Sixty days would be the length of this term to meet at a minimum of three times to discuss this.

I think Legislator Kennedy's background in this and the research that he and I have conducted on this, with the number of staff and the sheer number of man hours that have been devoted to this, and not something that the department is at fault for, as the requirement stand, you know, we have to stay with those individuals, but in looking at this, we feel that there is perhaps a better way to do it and still maintain that chain of custody, if you will, of those individuals who are being transported to the CPEP Unit, those emotionally disturbed persons.

So I think that forming this committee would be a good step towards finding a solution to a very complex problem that we have, a problem that's costing us quite a bit of money with the amount of staff that we have to devote to this transport and staying with these individuals until they're admitted. So I think the committee is a good thing.

It's unfortunate that we haven't had a chance to review this. I would very much like to see this move forward, even if we discharge it without recommendation, but we'll see what the committee's pleasure is because it doesn't seem like a lot of people have had a chance to review it and it is a bit complex.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Browning, you have a question?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yes, a quick question on the EDP's. My husband worked in the subways for a lot of years, and picking up those EDP's. Now, you can pick them up because they're an EDP, or they're under arrest. I know that when he takes EDP's to the hospital, if they're not under arrest, as soon as the hospital takes them, they leave. Is that what's currently done here in Suffolk County?

CHIEF MOORE:

It is not.

LEG. BROWNING:

So a police officer stays with them.

CHIEF MOORE:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. That's my question. Why are our police officers, if they're not under arrest, they're just an

EDP, they're getting picked for, you know, whatever and they need to take them to the hospital, why are our police officers, if they're not under arrest, staying with them when the hospital now has assumed responsibility?

CHIEF MOORE:

Because the individual is in the custody of the police, although it's not an arrest situation. The individual is in the care of the police and until the police can properly turn that individual over to a competent authority, the police have the responsibility and the obligation to ensure the safety and protection of the individual. It is very different from an arrest situation and in Suffolk County that is the major reason why the police spend sometimes horrifically long periods of time with the individual.

But I am a little confused about this bit of legislation. Mr. Kennedy has really done yeoman's work. He's really stepped up to support us and help us in our dealings with individuals with mental health challenges. And I'm gratified to see that our deep concerns about the legislation as it was written have caused him to consider changes. Unfortunately, we haven't had the opportunity to review the legislation.

But having said that, if it's calling for a task force or working group, there already is a working group. The working group includes members from the psychiatric community, local and County, Stony Brook is a member. It includes some members of the Police Department.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

There was a meeting yesterday. My staff was there.

CHIEF MOORE:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

And Legislator Kennedy wasn't, right.

CHIEF MOORE:

But Legislator Kennedy has been invited to be a member of this working group. So I'm not sure -- there is a working group, sir. That was the only point that I wanted to make. Is it -- I'd have to speak -- I'm sorry. I haven't spoken to the Legislator and I'm not sure --

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Well, that's why I think maybe --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I was going to ask how long has this working group been formulated and how long have they been looking at this?

CHIEF MOORE:

This particular working group has been meeting on a fairly regular basis over the past 18 months, and while I don't have the statistics with me, they have made impressive gains. Unfortunately, the core issue is the number of psychiatric beds. That is determined by the State. And no amount of local legislation is going to change that.

One of the largest problems, unlike, for example, New York City environment, in Suffolk County, up until the early 90's we had a number of mental health facilities. We had Pilgrim State and Kings Park and CI and on and on, which really made it -- it was still a problem at the time, but far less a problem than it is today. Even up until 1990 or perhaps even 1996, even though the others had closed Kings Park was still open and available. The crushing blow for the police when it comes to transportation and protection of these individuals came with the closing of Kings Park State Hospital. At that point the number of psychiatric beds available plummeted. And now, even local hospitals,

because unfortunately for the local hospitals, it is an economic issue. Those that have psychiatric beds are reducing the number of psychiatric beds.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Chief, you know, I'm going to just stop you for a second because we're getting into a history lesson.

CHIEF MOORE:

I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I understand that this is asking for a committee. There is a committee so what I'm going to ask is to reinforce the tabling.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

On just the --

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Well, let me just finish my sentence.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

No problem.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

I'm going to ask for us to reinforce the tabling because I want to make sure that Legislator Kennedy is on top of whatever -- I don't want him to miss anything, so. But go ahead, Legislator.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

What I was going to say was with this group having looked at this for some time, I know that this legislation, the initial legislation and this legislation, was born out of frustration.

CHIEF MOORE:

Yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

And I know for myself the primary factor that had me join forces with Legislator Kennedy and begin to address this was a night that when I did a ride along, we did a transport up to CPEP. And I was amazed at what our officers have to do in a situation. Again, knowing that this is no fault of theirs and they have to wait until the actual admission of the individual, and that can take quite a long time, and I really sympathize with the position the department is put in here. And as I said, that this legislation, prior piece of legislation, is really born out of frustration, and to try to find a new and innovative way to deal with the problem that we've been facing, as you said, since the closure of the last psychiatric facility which is now better than a decade ago. So this is a long-standing problem.

I'll certainly speak with Legislator Kennedy. If it is the will of this committee to table this that's fine, but I do think that this is something that needs to be addressed in a very timely fashion. You know, 18 months of looking at this, you know, at some point fish or cut bait. So, you know, I think we need to pull the trigger on this, no pun intended to the Police Department.

CHIEF MOORE:

That's quite all right.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

This is something that really needs to be addressed and it's causing, I sure, immense headaches for the hierarchy in the department and the individual precinct commanders having multiple sectors down in any given time sitting on these transports and admissions. So I look forward to help solving

that problem and getting more police officers back out on the street because that is what this is about.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I don't disagree with Legislator Losquadro, I don't have the revised bill. As soon as I have the revised bill I would be happy to support it.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Myself also. Okay, then I have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? To table. Let me start again. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? That was to table. **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

IR 1163, To enhance the requirement for consideration as a Suffolk County depository bank.

LEG. MYSTAL:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Motion to table. Second by Legislator Nowick. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

Introductory Resolutions

IR 1184, Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of \$65,600 from the State of New York Governor's Traffic Safety Committee, to target speeding and aggressive driving with 84.5% support.

Motion to approve. Do I have a second?

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstention? It's passed. All right. **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley)**

IR 1186, Appoint member to Suffolk County Citizens Corps Council (Michael LeBate). I am going to ask for this to be tabled. Michael couldn't make this meeting, but he will come next month, so motion to table.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley).**

IR 1243, A Local Law to prohibit the operation of a motor vehicle within Suffolk County with an accumulation of snow or ice on the vehicle.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

This has to be tabled for a public hearing. Legislator Browning made the motion. I'll second it. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 7-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Horsley)**.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm thinking school buses. How do you get it off the top?

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

That's what it says here. Okay. Then I will ask for a motion to adjourn. Motion by Legislator Caracappa --

LEG. MYSTAL:

We have a Home Rule.

HR 02, Home Rule Message requesting New York State Legislature to allow Suffolk County to install and operate Red-Light Camera Program (Assembly Bill A.1314).

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

It was withdrawn.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

It was withdrawn.

LEG. CARACAPPA:

You got that motion from me, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN EDDINGTON:

Thank you very much and I'll second it. This committee is adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 11:51 AM)

{ } Indicates Spelled Phonetically