

TUESDAY, JANUARY 24, 2023

12:53 P.M.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The House will come to order.

In the absence of clergy, let us pause for a moment of silence, and also in that silence remember those who lost their lives in California just last night.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

Visitors are invited to join members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, Acting Speaker Aubry led visitors and members in the Pledge of Allegiance.)

A quorum being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of Monday, January 23rd.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the further reading of the Journal of Monday, January the 23rd and ask that the same will stand approved.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, colleagues and guests who are in the Chambers, it's a pleasure to see you all today. I do have a quote for today, but before I do that, I would like to just express my gratitude for seeing our stenographers back in the front of our Chambers again, and I think it's a great thing.

(Applause)

Mr. Speaker, our quote today again is from Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. This one is really simple, but it's so powerful. It simply says, *True peace is not merely the absence of tension, it's the presence of justice.* Again, those words from Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King.

Mr. Speaker, members have on their desk a main Calendar. After introductions and housekeeping, we're going to take up the following Committees to meet off the floor. These Committees will meet in the Speaker's Conference Room. Ways and Means will go first and then, of course, Rules. These Committees will produce an A-Calendar which we will take up later on consent today. While these Committees are meeting, we are going to take up Calendar No. 3 on

page 6 by Ms. Seawright. Afterwards, we will announce any further floor activity. Mr. Speaker, that's a general outline of where we're going to go today in this Session. If there are introductions and/or housekeeping, now would be an appropriate time, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, Mrs. Peoples-Stokes, we do have introductions for the first introduction of the day.

Ms. Rajkumar.

MS. RAJKUMAR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today is Diwali Lobby Day, and hundreds of South Asian and Indo-Caribbean New Yorkers have joined me in our State Capitol from all across our great State. We're advocating for finally and once in for all making Diwali a school holiday in New York State. As the first South Asian woman ever elected to a New York State office, I greet them with great pride. Together we ask, can you see us? Has our time come?

So with enormous pride, I introduce you to Dr. Sheetal Desai, a great leader of our community; Neeta Bhasin, an incredible leader who spearheads Diwali in Times Square every year; Romeo Hitlall, President of United American Hindu Council; Dilip Nath, President of the New American Voters Association; Dharmacharya Pandit Ram Hardowar; Nikunj Trivedi, President of the Coalition of Hindus of North American; Gujrati Samaj of New York and its great leader, Ajay Patel; Amit Shah, great leader of the Nepali community; Milan Cultural Association; Tristate, Arya Samaj;

the American Indian Public Affairs Committee; Vaishnav Temple of New York; Bangladesh Puja Smiti; South Asian Women Activity Organization; Indian-American Association of Long Island; Viscan Temple; Richmond Hill-South Ozone Park Lions Club; United Hindus of USA; Beta Carataj Temple (phonetic), Vishal Hardowar; Dr. Rakesh Shredar; Maham Mundeer (phonetic).

Mr. Speaker, please welcome them and extend to them all the privileges of the floor. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly -- on behalf of --

(Applause)

-- on behalf of Ms. Rajkumar, the Speaker and all the members, we extend our welcome to these distinguished New Yorkers who have come here for their purpose. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. We hope your trip to Albany will be satisfying and successful. Continue the great work you do to strengthen the communities of New York State and to expand our freedoms. Thank you so very much, you're always welcome here.

(Applause)

(Chanting)

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Mr. Slater for the purposes of an introduction.

MR. SLATER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today

to introduce a wonderful community leader from my district, Dr. Rajeesh Gupta and his wonderful wife, Sima. Dr. Rajeesh Gupta is the medical director of a dozen urgent care centers throughout the Hudson Valley and the Tri-State area, and he owns four of them. He's also been a terrific voice and advocate for the Hindu community throughout the Hudson Valley, and it's an honor and privilege to welcome him here today along with, again, his wonderful wife, Sima. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Slater, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly, this fine couple. We hope you continue the great work that you're doing. You are always welcome here and you have the privileges of the floor. Thank you for joining us today.

(Applause)

Ms. Buttenschon for the purposes of an introduction.

MS. BUTTENSCHON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time, to my right, I would like to introduce Michael Scalese on behalf of Assemblymember Miller and I. Mr. Scalese is from Westerlind, New York, has a very keen interest in the political dynamics of -- of the State of New York and is spending the day with us to determine how important this is within our system. I feel that as this young man has spent the day greeting so many of -- of my colleagues as well as individuals that I have met with, that his sincere consideration for this field is one that is commendable. So on behalf

of Assemblymember Miller and I, we welcome him and ask you to extend that welcome, also.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Assemblywoman Buttenschon, Assemblyman Miller, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here, sir, to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Good luck on your remaining year in high school and we look forward to you coming here to Albany for college. Thank you so very much, we'll look for you. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mr. Weprin for the purposes of an introduction.

MR. WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It gives me great pleasure to introduce a -- a friend of mine who is a leader in the South Asian and Indian-American community, and is here today. He's also a member of the United Nations Development Corporation Board of Directors. My good friend, Andy Shenoy.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On behalf of Mr. Weprin, the Speaker and all the members, Andy, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor, hope that you will enjoy the proceedings today, and always welcome here. Please know that you can return, and will. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if we can now call the Ways and Means Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ways and Means, Speaker's Conference Room. Immediately, please.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Resolutions, page 3, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 49, Mr. Magnarelli.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim January 22-28, 2023, as National Passenger Safety Week in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Mr. Magnarelli on the bill -- on the resolution.

MR. MAGNARELLI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to make people aware of this resolution because it deals with passengers in cars. And especially young people, young adults, they have to speak up when they're in a car so that we don't have all of the injuries and fatalities that we have in vehicular accidents today. People texting, on the phone, driving while impaired. Don't get in the car, don't get in the car, or tell people to cut out what they're doing that is wrong. So just want to make people aware of this resolution, that's what it's all about. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Thank you.

On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying

aye; opposed, no. The resolution is passed [sic].

Page 6, Calendar No. 3, the Clerk will read the title --
the Clerk will read the title of the Concurrent Resolution.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01283, Calendar No. 3, Seawright, Lupardo, Solages, L. Rosenthal, Simon, Shrestha, Cruz, González-Rojas, Gallagher, Sillitti, Burgos, Otis, Dickens, Raga, Burdick, Bronson, Bores, Levenberg, Woerner, Lee, Paulin, Kelles, Simone. Concurrent Resolution of the Senate and Assembly proposing an amendment to Section 11 of Article I of the Constitution, in relation to equal protection.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: An explanation is requested.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. New Yorkers deserve a Constitution that recognizes that every person is entitled to equal rights and justice under the law, regardless of who they are, whom they love, or what their families look like. Because the Bill of Rights of the New York State Constitution does not currently contain a comprehensive equal rights provision, Section 1 of the resolution would expand the Civil Rights clause of Section 11 of Article I of the New York State Constitution to add ethnicity, national origin, disability, age and sex, including sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, pregnancy and pregnancy outcomes, and reproductive health care and autonomy to the existing list of protected classes for which discrimination in Civil Rights is prohibited. The concept of equality under the law is a foundational principle of our

democracy, but our understanding of what -- which groups deserve and receive enforceable legal protections has changed dramatically over our history. Our modern vision of equality demands comprehensive equal protection. Indeed, many individuals are themselves members of numerous communities, identities and protected classes. And true equality and justice demands protections that recognize the interconnected nature of discrimination. The purpose of this amendment is to ensure that our State Constitution extends to all New Yorkers, particularly those who have faced severe and pervasive injustice, the right to be free from discrimination. It does so by expanding the list of classes affirmatively protected by the New York State Constitution in recognition of the need for comprehensive, enforceable and intersectional equality under the law. At the same time, the amendment guarantees the validity of efforts to prevent or dismantle structural forms of inequality or discrimination against protected classes. The amendment achieves this by clarifying that it operates only to invalidate or prevent the adoption of State actions that do not serve essential remedial purpose. Further, by including a prohibition on sex discrimination, this amendment inherently prohibits discrimination on the basis of pregnancy, pregnancy outcome, reproductive health care and reproductive autonomy.

The amendment's explicit clarification is critical. Increasingly across the country in virtually every state, including New York, women face criminal and civil consequences related to their

pregnancies and pregnancy outcomes, including not only abortions, miscarriages, stillbirths or other adverse outcomes. This is particularly important for women at the intersection of multiple marginalized identities. Mainly Black women and women of color who are not only wrongly seen as less deserving of or fit for motherhood, but also experience disproportionate discrimination in our criminal law system and health disparities likely to lead to adverse outcomes that put them under scrutiny and surveillance. It's specific that the Legislature retain the power to enhance the Constitution's equal protection guarantee with appropriate legislation designed to achieve the full equal rights of any class listed in this section, and it clarifies that this section will operate to invalidate or prevent the adoption of those laws, regulations, programs or practices that do not serve such a remedial purpose.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Will the sponsor yield?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: The sponsor yields.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Ms. Seawright, and thank you for that explanation of this bill. I want to just make sure we all understand this provision, if approved by the voters -- approved by us and approved by the voters, would apply to every person, firm,

corporation or institution, as well as all government, correct?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Yes.

MR. GOODELL: And one of the -- one of the things it would address would be to prohibit any discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity, correct?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Yes.

MR. GOODELL: Or gender expression. So as you know, many states have enacted legislation designed to protect women's sports by providing that you have to be genetically a woman in order to participate in women's sports. And the rationale for many of those states that have adopted that resolution is that it's fundamentally unfair to women if they're competing against someone who is genetically a male but might identify as a female by their sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. That type of legislation would be expressly prohibited by this, correct?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Single-sex sports, high school and college, State and Federal law already permits single-sex sports. It's been determined that it's not discriminatory as long as there is equality of opportunity, meaning schools cannot only offer boys sports teams without offering comparable programming for girls sports teams.

MR. GOODELL: Well, I under -- oh, I'm sorry. I didn't mean to interrupt.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: This amendment would not impact these existing laws, but it would memorialize these protections

in the State Constitution for public institutions.

MR. GOODELL: Well, you mentioned that existing State law and Federal law authorize this type of program to help and protect women who want to participate in sports on a fair and equitable basis, but nothing in Federal law would require that type of protection, right? And in other words, the states are free to enact more stringent or less stringent provisions. The fact it's not barred by Federal law still allows a state to act. And doesn't this specifically bar any discrimination based a person's sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: So State and Federal law provides protections for trans youth from discrimination in multiple aspects of education and educational activities, including athletics. This amendment would not impact these existing laws, but it would memorialize these protections in the State Constitution.

MR. GOODELL: So would you agree with me that if you have an organization or an institution and they limit membership to genetic women, women who have the genetic composition of a woman, and bar men, or people who have the genetic characteristics of a man, notwithstanding their sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression. That type of activity would be banned by this legislation, wouldn't it? I mean, if you have an organization that says, We don't care if you're transgender, we don't care what your sexual orientation is, you can't join us unless you're genetically a man or genetically a female. We don't care about your gender expression.

That would be expressly banned by this constitutional amendment, correct?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: State and Federal laws provide protections for trans youth from discrimination in multiple aspects.

MR. GOODELL: Right, but --

MS. SEAWRIGHT: This amendment, let me finish, would not impact those existing laws, but would memorialize those protections in the State Constitution.

MR. GOODELL: But the Constitution overrides all existing State laws, rules and regulations, correct?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Trans people can participate in team sports that comports with their gender identity.

MR. GOODELL: But I mean, just to be clear so everyone here understands, a constitutional amendment overrides anything that's inconsistent in State law, statute, regulation, correct? I mean, that's a yes or no. Either the Constitution overrides it and is supreme or it's not. Aren't we under the rule of law where the Constitution is supreme and any conflicting laws must be disregarded or held unconstitutional?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: This is not inconsistent with State law.

MR. GOODELL: So you're saying -- so you're saying that a constitutional amendment that says that you cannot discriminate based on gender identity, gender expression or sexual orientation would still allow an organization to ban someone based on

their sexual orientation, gender identity or gender expression? How -- how do we make those two concepts fit? I mean, aren't we either banning it or not banning it?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: It's banning it in Civil Rights Law, but nothing in this section that we're dealing with today, Article I, Section 11, nothing in this section shall invalidate or prevent the adoption of any law, regulation, program or practice that is designed to prevent or dismantle discrimination on the basis of a characteristic listed in this section.

MR. GOODELL: Okay. So the first section says you can't have any discrimination, and then the second section says, well, you can if it's intended to prevent or dismantle, correct? So there's some discrimination that this constitutional amendment would expressly authorize?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Subsection 2 of this proposal merely clarifies what courts have already upheld, which is that the State can enact laws or advance programs aimed at remedying past discrimination. These laws and programs would remain subject to the same standards of scrutiny as they have been in the past.

MR. GOODELL: Well, let me give you a specific example. Would this new constitutional language prohibit the State from enacting a program that says if you grow up in a privileged household and you're White, and you're a multi-millionaire, you can still get a contract preference and avoid competitive bidding up to \$500,000 as long as you're a woman, but not if you're a man. Would

that fall within this exception? Because right now, the MWBE Program says that if you're a White woman, and you grew up in a privileged family and you're a multi-millionaire, you can still qualify for the MWBE and avoid competitive bidding and get a contract, even though you bid higher than the next lowest -- than the lowest responsible bidder. How does that fit within this constitutional framework? Because I just don't understand how that's remediating or preventing or dismantling discrimination, because I'm not aware of discrimination against privileged, wealthy, White women. Is there, or am I missing something?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Historically, women in business have been discriminated against. The MWBE Program has been found constitutional, and there is a government interest in remedying past discrimination. These programs must be narrowly-tailored, a standard for Minority-Owned Businesses, or substantially related, a standard for Women-Owned Businesses, to the goal and interest of remedying past discrimination. This amendment does not change that, nor does it automatically provide preferential treatment in bidding to the additional classifications of people being added today.

MR. GOODELL: So -- and I appreciate the legal standard, and I'm always amazed how it's applied because a few years ago this Legislature, with the approval of the Senate, as well, passed a law that would grant MWBE status, minority status, to native American-owned companies; these would be companies owned by the nation itself. And that was vetoed by Governor Cuomo who said it's

not narrowly-tailored, the same language you just cited. Yet, the MWBE Program is eligible -- is available for all women, that's more than half of the New York population, and all minorities; in fact, it's available basically to everyone except White men, right? And White men constitute a small fraction of the total population. So tell me, how is it that a program that covers like 60 or 70 percent of the population is narrowly-tailored?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Can you cite for me, Mr. Goodell, where White men have historically been discriminated against in business?

MR. GOODELL: Can you cite where 70 percent of the State's population has been discriminated against? It's a responsibility of those who support discriminatory programs to establish that they're narrowly-tailored, and I'm just suggesting that maybe a program that covers 70 percent of the population is not narrowly-tailored. But is it your opinion that this constitutional amendment would allow that type of overt discrimination that applies to 70 percent of the New York State population?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: This amendment does not change those standards. The MWBE Program is a wonderful program that is designed to right the wrongs with discrimination with regards to women and minorities.

MR. GOODELL: And no doubt, it's a wonderful program if you're amongst that 70 percent that would be eligible. But let me move on. This also would ban any discrimination based on

pregnancy outcomes and reproductive health care and autonomy.

What's meant by reproductive health care and autonomy? What's meant by autonomy in this situation?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Reproductive autonomy is the power to decide and control one's own contraceptive use, pregnancy and child-bearing; for example, people with reproductive autonomy could control whether and when to become pregnant, whether and when to use contraception, which method to use, whether and when to continue a pregnancy and decisions in childbirth.

MR. GOODELL: So would this constitutional amendment then create a constitutional right to have an abortion at any time for any reason?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: No.

MR. GOODELL: And so what part of autonomy is not included within the word "autonomy" when it comes to abortion decisions?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: This is consistent with our State's long history of protecting bodily autonomy long enshrined in our Common Law as established in 1914 with Justice Cardozo's famous articulation of the doctrine in Schloendorff v. The Society of New York Hospital, where every human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with his or her own body.

MR. GOODELL: Well, under current New York State law, you can have an abortion right up until the day the child is

born and the criteria for having that abortion the day before the child would have otherwise been born was if the woman's health or life were in danger, correct? That's the current statutory provision in New York State, the most generous in the nation; am I correct?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Well, I'm not here to -- to debate what the law is on, you know --

MR. GOODELL: Abortion?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: We did the 2019 Reproductive Health Act and what we're focused on today is preventing discrimination --

MR. GOODELL: Okay, so --

MS. SEAWRIGHT: -- righting the wrong, adding categories to our State Constitution that are long overdue.

MR. GOODELL: So this would give a constitutional protection, wouldn't it, to a woman who wants to have an abortion the day before the child is born, even though there's no risk to her health or life? I mean, this says you have a constitutional protection --

MS. SEAWRIGHT: No, I don't --

MR. GOODELL: -- on reproductive health care and autonomy. Or doesn't it mean what it says?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Those choices are still bound by New York State law.

MR. GOODELL: I understand, but the Constitution, as we keep talking about it, the Constitution overrides any contrary provisions in State law, right? That's why it's in the Constitution.

(Pause)

If I may, can I move on? So we have a number of statutory provisions that recognize that religious organizations can have sincerely held religious beliefs affecting reproductive health. The Catholic Church, for example, won't do abortions, right? Not only won't they do abortions, their insurance doesn't cover abortions, they expect those who teach the faith, whether it's a priest or nuns or other employees not to engage in abortion because that would be contrary to their religious teaching. Is there any exception in this language for the Catholic Church or other religious organizations that have a sincerely held religious belief against abortion?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: No.

MR. GOODELL: And, of course, it's not limited to the Catholic Church, there's a number of Protestant Churches that also have problems with abortion at-will or late-term abortions, in particular. Even a number of Jewish organizations, as you know, have a great deal of concern over late-term abortions. Is there any exception in this language for any of those other religious organizations?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Religion is protected and referred twice in our State Constitution: Article I in Section 3 and Article I in Section 11. We are not disrupting the religious protections. The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution has a ministerial exemption which allows religious institutions to make employment decisions regarding employees of the institution who are

considered ministers pursuant to the law.

(Buzzer sounding)

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Mrs.

Peoples-Stokes for an announcement.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: If you could please call the Rules Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Rules Committee, Speaker's Conference Room.

Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: On the bill.

MR. GOODELL: This is a proposed constitutional amendment, as most of you know, that would ban any discrimination by anybody; private organization, individuals, corporations, anybody, on a number of factors, including sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression. But if you think about it, a constitutional amendment does a couple of things. First, a constitutional amendment overrides any other State law, rule or regulation. So it doesn't matter what protections are out there under current law, it doesn't matter what exceptions there are under current law, a constitutional amendment overrides all of it. The second thing that happens when you have a constitutional amendment is it removes power from the State Legislature because it removes our ability to pass legislation on those subjects. And that means it removes our ability to fine-tune

legislation to meet changing circumstances. And we start out every year, including this year, with dozens and dozens of chapter amendments, don't we? And those chapter amendments are fine-tuning legislation that we thought was fine when we adopted it and upon retrospect, realized it needed to be tweaked.

So keep in mind if you vote for this constitutional amendment, you are voting to reduce your authority to pass statutory provisions and fine-tune them as circumstances change by encouraging a constitutional amendment that overrides every single State law, rule, regulation that might be inconsistent.

And so why does that create a problem for us? Because as my colleague pointed out, there are many State laws, rules and regulations on both the State level and the Federal level that recognize that it is valuable to have differences in the way we treat men and women. It's not bad, it's a good thing that we have single-sex housing at some of our colleges. It's a good thing we have single-sex colleges. I'm mindful that, you know, one of our luminaries in New York State, Hillary Clinton, graduated from Wells College. It was an all-woman's college. They wouldn't let you in if you were a man no matter what your gender identity, expression or perspective was. And that's not bad. We have Girl Scouts that are limited to girls. It doesn't matter if you're a man and you have a different gender expression or gender identity, you have to be a woman to be in Girl Scouts. Same with the YWCA, right? Same with sororities and fraternities. And when it comes to women's sports, don't we want our women and our

young girls and our young women to be able to compete fairly? And this says no, because if you have a man who has a gender identity or gender expression as a woman, they have a constitutional protection by this language.

So before we sweep every one of those laws and rules and regulations out the door, we ought to know what they are and we ought to think about whether or not that's a scenario we want to go in. Now, I mentioned one specific program, the MWBE Program. Hey, if anyone thinks the MWBE Program is not discriminatory, you don't understand the program. What it says is if you're a qualified MWBE, you can avoid competitive bidding and get awarded a contract in New York City for a half a million dollars with no competitive bidding. It means that you can submit a bid that's 5 or 10 percent higher than everyone else and you get the contract. If you don't think that's discriminatory, you're not a business person and you don't understand the program. It is intentionally discriminatory.

But this constitutional amendment says you can only have a discriminatory program if it's intended to prevent or dismantle discrimination. And as I pointed out, about 70 percent of the New York population qualifies for MWBE status should they apply. Hardly narrowly drafted. And, by the way, if you think the MWBE is just helping out poor minorities and women get their feet on the ground, you can be a multi-millionaire and qualify.

And then we look at the reproductive health provisions. This constitutional amendment would override all New

York State's laws, rules, and regulations as it relates to discrimination involving reproductive health care and autonomy. Well, what are those? You know, despite the fact that we have the most generous, broadest abortion laws in the nation, even New York State requires a showing or a claim that the woman's health or life is at risk for a late-term abortion. But this is a constitutional amendment that says you can't discriminate at all on reproductive autonomy. And as my colleague mentioned, autonomy means you do whatever you want. That's the nature of autonomy. And that's the actual language.

And all of our statutes, whether it's the Domestic Relations Law, the Insurance Law or other laws recognize that major organizations can have a sincerely held religious belief against abortion. And that means Catholic hospitals won't do abortions, it means Jewish hospitals won't do late-term abortions absent extraordinary circumstances. It means the Catholic Church, it's very clear to its staff that if you're preaching against abortion, you can't have one yourself. This language has no exceptions, none.

My friends, we already have a Humans -- Human Rights Law, that covers these subjects. But the Human Rights Law has restrictions on it, it has exceptions for the Catholic Church, it has exceptions for religious organizations, including Orthodox Jewish organizations. It has exemptions to protect young women from unfair competition and to allow these organizations to continue. That's the difference between current law and this language which has no exceptions. And accordingly, I would -- I will be voting against it and

I recommend my colleagues do as well. And I note that last year when this was presented, there were 45 no votes, and I hope even more of my Democratic colleagues oppose this legislation this year, recognizing that if you oppose a constitutional amendment that's too broad, you still retain the authority yourself to pass legislation to address any perceived shortcomings. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Goodell.

(Pause)

Mr. DiPietro.

MR. DIPIETRO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill, please.

ACTING SPEAKER TAYLOR: On the bill.

MR. DIPIETRO: Okay. I support protection under the law. I also support a constitutional ban on discrimination based on ethnicity, national origin, disability. The Constitution already bans discrimination based upon race, color, creed and religion, and religion. The New York State Constitution should continue to protect New Yorkers in the exercise of our first freedom, freedom of religion. Religious freedom is a bedrock principle on which our nation is based, because it is unjust to treat individuals differently due to matters over which they have no control. The New York State Constitution should also protect New Yorkers against discrimination based on immutable characteristics. Adding constitutional protection based on categories

like abortion, homosexuality, transgenderism would force the State of New York to take sides on controversial matters of personal choice. That is not the purpose of the New York State Constitution.

Furthermore, the passage of the Equality Amendment would result in the further erosion of religious liberty for New Yorkers whose faith traditions teach that abortion, homosexuality and/or transgenderism are immoral and could subject many faith-based charities and schools to catastrophic liability. So this is a legal situation where you're going to put Catholic schools that maybe your children attend to, religious schools, religious hospitals, organizations that are faith-based, you're going to put them in legal jeopardy. Make no doubt about it, folks, this bill is an attack on your religion. This bill is an attack on God. This bill is an attack on abortion, on the ability of the baby - that's right, it's not a -- it's not a living cell, it's not an amoeba, it's a baby from conception - and this is an attack on that. This is going to be murder, this is going to be legal lawsuits all over this State against entities that are trying to help most of us and your kids, and your relatives, and your neighbors.

Taking away religious exemption is one of the most heinous things this Body can do. I'll never agree to it, and I'll stand up to it and I'll fight it because I don't believe in it, and my God doesn't believe in it. And hopefully yours doesn't, if you believe in God, doesn't believe in it, also. If you believe in *The Good Book* - many of you do, a lot of you don't - read it, it spells it all out. This is ridiculous. I would at least hope that the Minority side would vote

against this. And I would hope that there's a lot on the Majority side who have a backbone that would vote against this. This goes to the fundamental heart of our heart. What it takes away, what it does to people who are faith-based, who don't believe in abortion, this is literally ramming it down their throat. I vote no and I hope I see a lot of others do, also. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Seawright on the Concurrent Resolution.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: On the bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in this Chamber on the shoulders of all those in history who have fought for a New York State Equal Rights Amendment to ensure comprehensive protection for equal rights in our State. We have witnessed the obliteration by our nation's highest judicial tribunal of 50 years of Federal protection of the rights of women to determine the future of their bodies. We have seen the Federal courts turn the clock back on civil, human, and voting rights. We cannot and must not stand by while freedom of choice and freedom from discrimination are so outrageously denied.

Why is now the time to update, to amend, to modernize the New York State Constitution? It is not only because we need broader safeguards against discrimination on account of a person's ethnicity, national origin, age, disability or sex, including sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, pregnancy outcomes and reproductive health care and autonomy. It is not only because State statutes in place today that matter so immensely can be

superceded significantly more easily than overturning the enshrining of equal rights in our State Constitution. And no one should live in fear of discrimination because of who they love or because of how they express their identity, or because of who they are.

The Equality Amendment is necessary because we have been waiting since the fourth State Constitutional Convention in 1867 right here in Albany, when Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady statin -- Stanton, tried to amend the Constitution to make men and women equal from voter rights to gender neutrality, to basic citizenship rights. Frederick Douglass was there, but those in power controlled the day and the resistant forces of change won the day. No changes were made. Now, we are 156 years later. That's right. We sit here 156 years later from the time when suffragettes devoted their efforts in this State Capitol to the pursuit of equality for all.

The time for a constitutional change is long overdue. It has arrived and it is now. The State Constitution was last amended to address the topic of equality under law in 1938 when Section 11 was first adopted. This was prior to the Civil Rights Movement, the movement for gender justice, the LGBTQ movement, the Disability Rights Movement, and developments in anti-discrimination laws. The proposed amendment reflects those movements for reform. The reality is, we simply lack a comprehensive equal protection rights provision in our State Constitution. As the late Associate Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said, *We will never have complete equality until the equivalent of an equal rights amendment is included in our*

Constitutions.

This past weekend I attended the City University of New York Wheelchair Basketball Tournament, played at Queens College with guest players from all throughout Long Island. I wanted to be there in my new role as Chair of the Assembly Committee on Disabilities. And the participants included the CUNY Women's Wheelchair Basketball Team, one of only seven such teams in this country. Kudos to Dr. Christopher Rosa for his pioneering work in establishing the sports competition. I do not know how many of us know how challenging it is to shoot a basketball towards the hoop from a sitting position, much less from a moving wheelchair.

I was thinking while watching these wonderfully engaged students that as they work to overcome the challenges that they've been dealt in life, the least we can do, the least we can do is to explicitly offer them protection from discrimination in the governing document we are empowered to recommend to the voters, the New York State Constitution. As Crystal Eastman, founder of the ACLU said so honorably, *Equal rights, the very passion for which it is opposed, suggests it is vital*. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the passage of this very important amendment, and champion equal rights for all New Yorkers.

(Applause).

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ra.

MR. RA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Seawright, will you yield?

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Sponsor yields, sir.

MR. RA: Thank you. So I just had a quick question. I mean, as you know, we did first passage of this last year but it came about kind of rapidly and I think we've had a little bit more time to look at the language and consider some of the implications of it. But I was wondering if you can kind of explain Subsection B in terms of how this would work. Because what it -- what it seems to basically say is, you know, one of these protected classes, right, would be -- you know, you have protection from one of the other ones if it's -- you know, they could interfere with each other so-to-speak. But that's almost kind of circular to me because, you know, they're all obviously equally important in our -- in our State Constitution if this were to become part of our Constitution. So what is that language intended to -- to accomplish? And just to give you a little context, I mean the question relates to say if, you know, the reproductive healthcare and autonomy section may be conflicted with a religious protection which is also in here.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: So this constitutional amendment does not significantly change the substantive law of New York when it comes to protecting the human rights of its people. It simply moves those protections from human rights of New Yorkers and it should not be subject to the simple Majority of the Houses of

the Legislature but should be an expression of and protected by all New Yorkers. The courts are very familiar with the standards of review associated with each of the protected classes in this Amendment. And the Civil Rights currently set forth in statute and will employ those same standards when addressing claims regarding violations of these constitutional provisions just as they do now when addressing claims regarding violations of state and federal laws protecting these same rights.

MR. RA: Well, yes, we've had, you know, situations with the interplay of these rights but I don't think they could interpret it in the same way because some of them are currently in our State Constitution while others may be statutory rights so, you know, the constitutional right may, you know, supersede when they come into conflict. So I'm trying to understand how they would interplay with each other where there was a conflict between what would now be two constitutional rights if -- if one were to conflict, you know, with -- with another. And again, I would say, you know, say a faith-based hospital who currently, as a matter of policy, doesn't perform certain procedures that they feel conflict with -- with, you know, their faith and the central tenets of their faith.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: So these laws stem from the free exercise of religion which is not affected by this section of the State Constitution. It's also protected by the U.S. Constitution which would preempt the State if the State had fewer protections for free exercise.

MR. RA: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Speaker. On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. RA: So I do very much have a concern with this language because there is the possibility of conflict. Some of these -- some of these that are being put into law obviously I think there would be widespread support for if we were doing them on their own. But there's a whole host of potential conflicts I see in particular with some of those provisions as they relate to what the protections that are already in -- in our Constitution, that being religion as a protected class. And, you know, it may come down to what happens if a situation should arise and the courts but, you know, it's not the same situation as we would have currently if you had something in statute but you have a constitutional right of religion and there's a conflict there, then that constitutional right is going to, you know, supersede that. So I think we need to think about finding a way to -- to clarify that so that those types of providers are not forced to -- to perform procedures and -- and services that conflict with the central tenets of their religion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Glick.

MS. GLICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to commend the sponsor but also to say that this is the second passage of a constitutional amendment which means that it will go before the public. So nobody's rights are being abrogated without their input and, you know, I've always felt that, you know, I -- I wish to respect

the beliefs of other people, their religious beliefs, and in the area of abortion, if you don't believe in abortion you don't have one but you don't force other people to live by your religious tenets. And that's what a democracy is, that's what a pluralistic society is. And so I believe that this is a reasonable measure and one that will go before the public and it is long overdue that we ensure that the people of the State of New York have an opportunity to weigh in on advancing -- advancing our Constitution and ensuring that it is brought in line with the majority view of people in the State of New York. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, Ms. Glick.

The Clerk will record the vote on the Concurrent Resolution.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Lavine to explain his vote.

MR. LAVINE: I would like to commend the sponsor for bringing to us this extraordinarily important constitutional provision. And I've listened to the argument and I've heard a lot of red herrings, and red herrings are simply distractions. I've heard that this bill is anti-God, it is not. I've heard it's anti-religious liberty, it is certainly not. I've heard this bill will enable and empower women to have abortions at the exact moment of birth, it is not. I've heard about the dangers of trans people in sports. I've heard about the

dangers of the victimization of White men this afternoon. But what I want to say is this: That when I vote for this, I will vote proudly as a member of the Legislature of the State of New York, because we are standing up for liberties, human liberties that are being abrogated in many of the states throughout the United States. New York remains a free State. And I want to say that as I cast my vote in favor of this what I have in mind are my daughter, and my granddaughters, and my daughter-in-law, and their children, both men and women, because the Constitution of the United States says were entitled to liberty and that means liberty for men and for women. So I am proudly casting my vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Lavine in the affirmative.

Ms. Simon to explain her vote.

MS. SIMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to explain my vote. I, too, will be voting in the affirmative of this incredibly important constitutional amendment legislation. I want to reiterate some comments that Mr. Lavine just made about the fact that this is not the way it's been portrayed. Abortion the day before birth is not a thing. Postpartum abortion is not a thing. These are not -- partial birth abortion is not a thing. We have to be dealing with facts, with medical facts, and recognize that all equal protection does is to say that I can't discriminate against you for any reason and you can't discriminate against me for any reason and if you do not believe in a right to abortion or you do not believe in trans rights don't do it. Don't

have an abortion if you don't believe in an abortion. But I am casting this vote for my granddaughter and for the young women of New York State to protect them from the forces that would seek to rob them of their rights. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Simon in the affirmative.

Mr. Bores.

MR. BORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be voting in the affirmative. My good colleague from the other side of the aisle implored us to read The Good Book. I would implore him to do the same. The Bible refers three times to life beginning at first breath and if he needs to read the -- The Good Book. It's Genesis 2:7, Job 33:4 and Ezekiel 37 NIV. But that's not why I rise today. I rise today to speak on behalf of someone who can't, which is my great grandmother, Mary Gigi. She died because abortion was illegal and I think it's important that her name is said in this Chamber as I cast this vote. Year was 1943, she like most people who had an abortion already had children, three in fact including my grandmother who was seven at the time. She knew she couldn't have a fourth. So she borrowed \$250 in 1943 and paid to have a procedure done. It went wrong, she started bleeding out. But she was too afraid of the law to actually go get health care. She died. It devastated the family, it's affected my family to this day and so in her name and in the name of preventing anyone else from joining her I proudly vote yes.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Excuse me. Mr. Bores in the affirmative. Thank you, sir.

Ms. Walsh to explain her vote.

MS. WALSH: Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So I rise to explain my vote. I've been an attorney for over 30 years. I know that a lot of people in this Chamber are not attorneys. Many of you came here through different paths to this Chamber. Many of you are community activists, many of you have brought in different backgrounds. I'm an attorney. When I was going through law school and I was taking Criminal Procedure Law, my professor Peter Prizer said never forget when you're suing a case remember the New York State Constitution and remember the U.S. Constitution. Never fail to plead those elements in the Constitutions because they're the strongest things that you can bring into a lawsuit. The message here is that let's be very, very careful about what we enshrine in the Constitution of our State because it's not malleable. Once it's in there, it's in there for better or for worse. Now we've been talking about and it's been mentioned about what things were like back in the 1800s, what things were like back in the 1940s. I'm talking about what we have right now in our New York State Constitution but more importantly in our Human Rights Law. Human Rights Law currently protects against discrimination based on age, race, creed, color, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, military status, sex, marital status or disability. It's already there. This is duplicative, this feels good and sure, to my

colleague who mentioned that it's going on the ballot. Sure, it's going to be put out there but we have a responsibility as members of the legislature to understand that -- how is the average voter going into that voter booth going to flip their ballot over and understand the nuances of making a change to the New York State Constitution versus legislation. Let's be careful. You know, there's -- things like abortion are nuance, it's not right line. Those things should be legislated, I believe, rather than placed and enshrined in an inflexible way into our Constitution. So I'll be voting in the negative for those reasons. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walsh in the negative.

Mr. Epstein to explain his vote.

MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote. I just want to remind people what we're talking about today. We're talking about someone's bodily autonomy. We're talking about someone having the right to make decisions over their own health care for their own body. We're talking about people making choices. Whether you agree with those choices or not it is their choices, their decisions. And whether it's to make a decision about what they're going to do or how they're going to look or how they're going to dress or who they're going to love or what they're going to do about health care, that is a fair choice. And for us to be voting against this to say that we don't believe in their rights, we don't believe in their opportunity and we don't believe in their freedom.

This bill will put into our Constitution those rights. It is critical after what we saw happen in the U.S. Supreme Court last year that these rights are enshrined in the New York State Constitution. I really want to applaud the sponsor and encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. I'll be voting yes and encourage us all to understand how critical this moment is and we stand on the right side of history. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Epstein in the affirmative.

Ms. González-Rojas to explain her vote.

MS. GONZÁLEZ-ROJAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before joining the Assembly I spent 13 years leading a reproductive justice organization. This is personal. Given the fall of Roe in the United States, the conservative bent on the Supreme Court and the far-right desire to oppress vulnerable communities. It is crucial that we do all that we can to protect New Yorkers, because the reality is that they're coming for all of us. We are seeing hate and violence and discrimination based on race, ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity, gender expression, not to mention the pervasive and the relentless efforts to destroy a pregnant person's ability to determine if, when, and how to create a family. But today, in New York, we are taking that step -- that second step in the bold and urgent action to ensure the equal protection of women, of people of color, of trans people, of people of diverse space, and people who could become pregnant especially given the erosion of our rights across the country.

New York can and must be a beacon for all people. So I want to thank my staff, I want to thank the staff, the Speaker, the bill sponsor especially for the decisive action that's being taken today. Today is an important day in our State and our nation's history and I'm so proud to vote in the affirmative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, Ms. González-Rojas in the affirmative.

Ms. Forrest.

MS. SOUFFRANT FORREST: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak and affirm in support of this bill. As a Black woman I know that equal protection under the law does not always mean equal protection and practice, but this is a first step. And I'd like to thank the sponsor for her wonderful work. And this step is also a critical step. This bill would expand protected classes, including people with disabilities and it would provide additional protections to all women. At a time when pregnant women are under attack across the country and their ability to make choices about their health care, it's especially important to protect pregnant women against discrimination based on the outcome of their pregnancy. I rise not only for Black women but I also rise up for all women. All women of all classes. And I want to emphasize that not only young women become pregnant and not only young women terminate their pregnancies. Again, this bill is for all women. Some of my colleagues have argued that religious institutions have the right to oppose abortions, and I'm not going to speak against anyone's

religious beliefs at this time but the Assembly is not a religious institution. It is a government Body. And we have a duty to protect our constituents from discrimination that can lead to deadly outcomes. I'm appalled to hear that -- or even hear the suggestion that we should use our government powers to protect the ability of religious institutions to discriminate against our constituents, my constituents. I am a Christian woman and I tell you this. This bill liberates me. Thank you.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Forrest in the affirmative.

Mr. Jacobson.

MR. JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote. First, I want to thank the sponsor for sponsoring this amendment and to -- and her excellent debate. We have learned in recent years that we cannot rely on Washington or the United States Supreme Court to protect our rights. I've heard some of these arguments before. I remember when we went to pass the Reproductive Health Act and people said why you bothering? You have *Roe vs. Wade*. This Amendment does not eliminate the word "religion" from our State Constitution. Does not eliminate the word "religion" from our State Constitution. And as far as our legislative powers, when we pass legislation, of course we have to comply with the Constitution, that's what we do now. We have to comply with the Federal Constitution and the State Constitution. So I think our powers are the

same there. We have a living Constitution. And from time to time we make amendments because the Constitution, like our laws, are not perfect. And to paraphrase the U.S. Constitution, we pass amendments through our Constitution and pass new laws in order to make a more perfect state. So, I proudly cast my vote for this amendment, urge my colleagues to and the voters of the State when they get their chance. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Jacobson in the affirmative.

Ms. Gallagher

MS. GALLAGHER: I rise to explain my vote and I would like to celebrate the sponsor of this bill for her dogged work at making sure that this was passed. I know that this has been a long journey not just for the sponsor but for womenkind. The *Declaration of Sentiments* was written here in New York State in the 1840s and it said equal -- all men and women are created equal and generations upon generations of women have been fighting for this and it is most appropriate in New York State which is the cradle of so much of the women's rights movement for this to be enshrined in our Constitution. And I could not be more proud to be here in the Assembly when it's passed. And I'm -- I'm hopeful that this is just one of many more protections that we offer so that every single constituent and every single one of our districts feels safe, secure, and -- and -- and hopeful about their future. Thank you so much to this Body and thank you again to the Speaker and to the sponsor. I'm a yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Gallagher in the affirmative.

Mr. Burdick.

One minute. They're adjusting your sound. Hold on.

MR. BURDICK: Sure.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Now try.

MR. BURDICK: Thank you. Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. I wish to thank the -- the sponsor and the Speaker for the tremendous and very effective work they've done to bring this critical amendment to the floor. Only a short while ago in 2019 when this state's Reproductive Health Act was being debated, our friends on the other side of the aisle argued that it was not needed because *Roe vs. Wade* was the law of the land and it was enshrined, it was immutable. And that was the overwhelming sentiment and thinking of the American people. Given what seems so improbable with the overturning last year of *Roe vs. Wade*, yes, it is also improbable that the Reproductive Health Act would be overturned by subsequent New York State Legislatures. But it is possible. It is possible. So also to my friends across the aisle, I could not agree more that we need to be very careful about what we put in the New York State Constitution. It is very purposeful, intentional, and critically important that we enshrine these rights into the Constitution. So I proudly vote yes and thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Burdick in the affirmative.

Mr. DiPietro.

MR. DIPIETRO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to clarify. First off, open invitation to anyone on this floor. I'll debate you on the Bible King James Version any time, anywhere. And throughout the Bible it says *how readest thou*. So I don't know what the gentleman referred to Ezekiel -- if he was referring to Ezekiel 9 where God told the Israelites to slay everyone because God was formed his judgment against that nation and he wanted to bring the Israelites back into the land. It's *how readest thou*. Psalm 139 says: *For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother's womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made. Wonderful are your works; my soul knows it very well. My frame was not hidden from you, when I was being made in secret, intricately woven in the depths of the earth. Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.* God formed us. You might not like that, you might not believe it, I do. And I want to just make sure. You can go back over to Jeremiah 1:5: *Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.* Again, I will gladly sit with anyone, have a Bible study. I will pray with anyone before these Chambers. If you want to call me before any Session, at any time and I'll read the Bible with you and I'll go through it and teach what I can and explain what I can. But one thing I don't like being called out is someone trying to tell me I

don't know the Bible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. DiPietro in the negative.

Mr. Pirozzolo

MR. PIROZZOLO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm here to explain why I'm voting in the negative on this and I would encourage colleagues to consider my words. You know, we talk about freedom, that this is bodily autonomy. It was not bodily autonomy when we were talking about COVID-19 mandates. That would have been the choice to give bodily autonomy. We're talking about that there are freedoms here. I don't see those freedoms where we've eliminated religious exemptions. Not only are these items we're talking about today already protected in State law, we're taking away the ability of this Legislature. Any time we make a constitutional amendment it is a very slippery slope. We are taking the ability of this State Legislature from adapting or making laws in the future that would be helpful. We are making this a constitutional issue and it is gone from us. Any time we want to make a change, are we going to have to make another constitutional amendment or say gee, we might have made a mistake? So I want to repeat that these protections already exist in the law and we have already taken away -- we have forced upon people mandates and we've taken away religious exemptions. So I kind of find the argument a little bit hypocritical. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Pirozzolo in the

negative.

Ms. Lunsford.

MS. LUNSFORD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise as a lawyer, I rise as a legislator and as someone who has been devoted to reproductive justice for my entire career. I've heard a lot in this Chamber today about concerns that we are limiting the ability of this government to protect our citizens through this law but it's quite the contrary. Constitutional amendments like the one here today are laws that allow us to limit the way we can hurt our citizenry. I've heard complaints that there are no exceptions, and there should be no exceptions. So when the government can interfere in someone's health care there shouldn't be an exception to when a government can interfere in someone's ability to love, or be who they are, or live their true selves. We should be limited in that ability. We should have no opportunity to take those rights from someone. And I'm glad that this is in our Constitution because we know how fragile our laws are, how fragile our case law is. We need to ensure that no matter which way the political wind is blowing that the rights of every person becomes present in this State is enshrined in our Constitution. That the right of every person who wakes up feeling like they don't belong, or like they're not good enough. When we look out at our youth and see them committing suicides at increased rates because they're afraid to tell their parents or their teachers who they really are. I'm glad and proud to stand here and support this amendment and to be a part of this Body who ensures that we will protect every New Yorker into the future. I

vote in the affirmative. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Lunsford -- Ms. Lunsford in the affirmative.

Ms. Byrnes to explain her vote.

MS. BYRNES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May -- may I be allowed to explain my vote?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: One minute, Ms. Byrnes. Please close those doors.

MS. BYRNES: Thank you, sir. Thank you for your courtesy. We live in the most progressive State in our nation. All of the things that I'm hearing individuals say that they want through this constitutional amendment already exists in this State. I suppose I should feel kind of empowered that you're concerned about the Minority retaking the Assembly Chambers as part of the justification for doing this and that we may change the laws in the future, but I'm pretty sure that I was still a youngin and I'm not anymore when the last time the Republicans controlled this House. So I think that is a very specious argument. We are the most progressive State if I like it or not and that's just a reality. And that reality means that this proposed amendment is unnecessary and in my opinion wrong. I'll be voting no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Byrnes in the negative.

Mr. Otis.

MR. OTIS: I came into the Chamber and I was thinking shouldn't we have done this like 40 years ago? We have an amendment here that we really should've passed something called the Equal Rights Amendment for -- based on sex many years ago. But over time this version protects other categories of people and activities that have been discriminated against in real life ways in this State. And it should be embedded in our Constitution. I'm glad we're doing it here today. But literally, we should've done this like in the 70s or the 80s, really. I vote aye.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Otis in the affirmative.

Ms. Wallace to explain her vote.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to explain my vote. It was only a few years ago that we were in this Chamber debating the Reproductive Health Act. Only a few short years ago. And at the time that we were debating that I never imagined that we would be where we are in this country today. Where but for that legislation, we women in this State wouldn't be protected. So this constitutional amendment will make sure that those protections are enshrined in our Constitution. A number of our colleagues have stood to say, you know, these things are already protected, most of these rights are already protected in the Human Rights Law and the Reproductive Health Act. Yeah, they are but legislation can change. This will make sure that these rights and protections against intentional discrimination are codified in our New

York State Constitution. I also want to clarify, because misinformation has been stated several times today, that there's absolutely nothing in this Amendment that would prohibit or would interfere with the cons -- the existing constitutional right to exercise freedom of religion. In fact that provision is in Section 3 of the Constitution and this section has nothing to do with that. So I just want to make sure that everybody understands for those people who have said repeatedly that somehow your free exercise religion is going to be interfered with as a result of this it is absolutely not true. So I rise to -- to vote in favor of this legislation proudly.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Wallace in the affirmative.

Mr. Simone.

MR. SIMONE: I want to thank Rebecca Seawright, my colleague, for sponsoring this amendment. I represent one of the largest LGTB districts in New York State. I'm the first openly LGBT elected official from the district. I follow in the step -- in the shoes of great leaders like Assemblymember Deborah Glick, Assemblymember Danny O'Donnell, Harry Bronson, and so many others. Our community has been a target of hate more than any time in this nation due to leaders on the Federal government and others. We have constant attacks on gender expression and identity and transgender community is often a target of people's vile evilness on the West Side of Manhattan. The same for a women's right to choose. We saw what happened on the Federal level. That is why New York must be a

leader. Today's my birthday and I recently married my husband. And what New York needs to do as it was always done on marriage equality is lead by enshrining this in the Constitution to ensure that New York is a leader on constitutional rights. It's a good thing.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr -- Mr. Simon [sic] in the affirmative. Happy birthday, sir.

Mr. Manktelow.

MR. MANKTELOW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just to explain my vote. I think I've listened here for the last 20 minutes to a half-hour. We talk about freedoms, we talk about freedoms for women, we talk about freedom across the board, what we're here to protect. And I do agree with some my colleagues that by doing this we are opening up Pandora's Box, we really are. And if we want to talk about religious freedoms, let's think about what we just went through through with the whole COVID experience of everything going on. Men and women, doctors, nurses, first responders had to be vaccinated, they weren't given the choice of what went in their body. So what I'm hearing today is we need to put this in place so we don't lose those religious freedoms. Well, some of these men and women -- yes, men and women have already lost those religious freedoms. They chose not to be vaccinated because their belief said I don't believe that we should. But yet they lost their job. Is that not discrimination? Is that not losing freedoms? We cannot have it both ways on this floor. And we can sit here and quote scripture left and right, but I do know

one thing. That our Heavenly Father is listening to each and every one of us. We may vote one way, but the most important thing is He knows the hearts of each and every one of us here. And some day whether we like it or not we're going to get to those pearly gates and we're going to have to make an account of what we did here. So just be very careful like some of my colleagues have said. Be careful where we're going to go because this Body will change, this State will change, and we can change a lot of things. So just consider where we're going and what we're actually voting on. So I will be voting in the negative. I do not agree with this. I think there's plenty of things. I'll be voting no, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Manktelow in the negative.

Ms. Levenberg

MS. LEVENBERG: Thank you to the amazing sponsor, to the Speaker, and to the members of this Body who passed this amendment last year. I know that we fought long and hard here in New York to get to where we are today, and as Assemblywoman Sandy Galef's Chief-of-Staff I witnessed the struggle to codify womens' reproductive rights under New York State law. And like so many of you I was dismayed and horrified when the Supreme Court struck down 50 years of precedent protecting a woman's right to choose. I was horrified to see that the Supreme Court appeared to be taking direct aim at the unenumerated rights that underpin so many of the freedoms we enjoy today, as many of my colleagues have

discussed, including the right to use birth control and even to love and marry freely. The Supreme Court is setting the stage for dramatic incursions into the right to privacy and we need strong constitutional language to protect all New Yorkers. And I'd just like to add that I do believe protecting New Yorkers includes protecting them against contagious diseases. As far as I know pregnancy is not contagious. This amendment will do that. I'm proud to cast my vote in the affirmative and thank you for your time.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Levenberg in the affirmative.

Mr. Novakhov.

MR. NOVAKHOV: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I vote no and I want to explain why I'm voting no. I'm voting no today for the simple reason that I feel this amendment is a necessary addition to our Constitution as the rights outlined are already protected. I firmly support a woman's right to choose and I believe that all people should have access to reproductive healthcare. However, this amendment is an unnecessary addition. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Novakhov in the negative.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes to explain her vote.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to explain my vote. I have intently listened to the multiple conversations around Constitutions. United States Constitution, the State of New York's Constitution, and I can

tell you that there are people who live in the State who have not been protected by that Constitution. They have not. And the fact that we're adding people into this constitutional amendment, I think that we stand a better chance of being protected. I think all of you already know that I would not ever think of or even want my -- want my daughter to have an abortion. But I don't think that should be my decision for everybody else. And nor do I think those of us in here can make that decision for the women across the State of New York. This amendment allows us to -- this bill rather allows us to amend the Constitution and send it to the voters, let them make the decision on how they feel about this. I think it's time -- as a matter of fact one of my colleagues said we should've did it 40 years ago, he's absolutely right. That may be the young lady who was in high school in Binghamton, New York where the teachers thought she had -- was on some sort of drugs or something. They stripped her down. She had nothing. She needs to be protected, too. We have to do a better job. And I think when we put this opportunity in front of the voters they're going to say yes, because I know I heard a lot of the Bible quoted here today, I can tell you God is not a (inaudible). So all this judging that you're doing around here, that's not what He does. It's free will. That's what He does. And so, Mr. Speaker, I want to honor the sponsor of this legislation and tell my colleagues that it's -- it's really time to be that just society that we talk about in the Bill of Rights, the Constitution and the one that we pledge to every day when we walk in these Chambers. Let's get serious about it, Mr. Speaker. I vote yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes in the affirmative.

Ms. Kelles to explain her vote.

MS. KELLES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. I hear a lot of rhetoric that this isn't needed and I take that very personally as a woman who now feels like a second-class citizen with my rights removed. But I just want to talk a bit about the entire group of people that this was designed to protect. If we had -- if we didn't have a situation where Black educated women were more likely to die in -- in childcare than uneducated White women, then this bill would not be necessary. If we did not have trans children and in particular Black trans women dying more often, being murdered more often, having more cases of mental health, then this bill would not be needed. This bill is needed because we are seeing systemic racism, we are still seeing prejudice against women, we are still seeing that women are treated differently when they go to the hospital than men are. Women are significantly more likely to be left in pain waiting longer for service than men and they are more likely to be told that their pain is psychosomatic. So if those things were not true then this bill would not be needed, but those things are true and this bill is for protection and we have to stand up for everyone. If we, as a Body, are here for equal rights that I'm hearing across the aisle in the same aisle then everyone should support this because all this is doing is ensuring that we all stand up for that. So I just want to say that I think this is the right thing to do because we all talk about equity, so let's stand up

and support that equity. Thank you very much. I stand in the affirmative.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Kelles in the affirmative.

Mr. Goodell to explain his vote.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today we've heard a lot of concerns and expressions that I think are legitimate about inequality amongst different people within our State between men and women between minorities and majorities. And we heard a lot of concerns on data that suggest that the outcomes for some demographics are not where we want them to be, and in my opinion those are all legitimate concerns. And they're all issues that I think we all ought to strive to address. We should pledge to do our utmost best to eliminate actual or perceive racism or discrimination against anyone. That should be our mission to seek justice, to seek mercy, to seek equality, and we're there. Every one of us is there. Doesn't matter if you're Republican, Democrat, man or woman, we all seek justice and equality and full human rights. That's not the vote today. This vote is whether we should continue our efforts as a Legislature with appropriate legislation and with the flexibility to address those issues or whether we should put something in the Constitution that's very broadly worded that has a lot of ramifications that may be far beyond what we intend. I'm voting against this while encouraging my colleagues to focus on the legislation they so aptly

identified as being needed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Goodell in the negative.

Ms. Seawright to close.

MS. SEAWRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to dedicate my vote on the New York State Equality Amendment to all of the suffragettes who came together in Albany 156 years ago to advocate that equality be included in our State Constitution. We honor their legacy by our actions today. New Yorkers deserve a Constitution that recognizes that every person is entitled to equal rights and justice under the law. The concept of equality under the law is a foundational principle of our democracy. I profoundly thank our Speaker, central staff, the advocates, members of the New York State ERA Coalition, NYCLU, Planned Parenthood, the National Institute for Reproductive Health, my Chief-of-Staff Courtney Ferrissey. I rise to dedicate my vote today to my dear friend the late *Roe vs. Wade* attorney who was here in the Chamber with us in 2019. It was 50 years ago that she argued and won *Roe vs. Wade*. The only way to avoid the horrors of illegal abortion is to keep it legal and State Constitutions are the vehicle for that purpose. I rise to dedicate my vote to my dear friend the late Edie Windsor. Together with her wife they paved the road for marriage equality on a Federal level. In the wake of a terribly regressive United States Supreme Court, we are protecting their legacy and the rights of the LGBTQ+ community. Most importantly, the voters of our great State will have the

opportunity to assure themselves and future generations of New Yorkers that equality belongs in their Constitution. I proudly cast my vote in the affirmative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Seawright in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The Concurrent Resolution is adopted.

(Applause)

Thank you, thank you.

Thank you.

(Applause)

Members, thank you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, there's an A-Calendar on the members' desks. I would like to move to advance that A-Calendar, please.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On Mrs. Peoples-Stokes' motion the A-Calendar is advanced.

Page 3, Rules Report No. 39, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00601, Rules Report No. 39, Thiele. An act to amend the chapter of the Laws of 2022 relating to repealing Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Chapter 330 of the Laws of 2011 amending the Town Law relating to payments of certain school, fire, fire protection, and ambulance districts for the lands

exempt from real property taxation for purposes which implement the Peconic Bay Community Preservation Fund, as proposed in legislative bills numbers S. 8025 and A. 9158, in relation to assessment of certain land parcels for the purposes of determining payments to eligible school, fire, fire protection, and ambulance districts.

ACTING SPEAKER CLARK: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER CLARK: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00602, Rules Report No. 40, Fahy. An act to amend the Highway Law, in relation to the percentage responsibility of the state for federally-assisted projects; and to amend Chapter 329 of the Laws of 1991 amending the State Finance Law and other laws relating to establishing the Dedicated Highway and Bridge Trust Fund and the dedicated Mass Transportation Fund, in relation to the state share of municipal projects where the municipality funds a complete street design.

ACTING SPEAKER CLARK: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER CLARK: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Ms. Fahy to explain her vote.

MS. FAHY: Thank you, Speaker. I rise in support of this bill and just want to thank so many. This bill has been many, many, years in the making. These are some Chapter Amendments to what is called the Complete Streets Bill and has had just tremendous advocacy to include -- which will include increases in traffic safety, we hope. I know today others were here on other bills promoting traffic safety particularly for pedestrians, cyclists and more. And this bill, which was passed last year, this is a Chapter Amendment to that bill but I -- I would be remiss if I didn't thank all the advocates who have moved to -- to promote safer streets for all; vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and more. So -- and to thank the Chair for the help in moving this as well as the Leader. Thank you. And again I rise in support.

ACTING SPEAKER CLARK: Ms. Fahy in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00967, Rules Report No. 41, McDonald. An act to amend the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, in relation to notice of certain proceedings to convey title to abandoned commercial and industrial real property to a city, town, or village; and to repeal certain provisions of such law

relating thereto.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On a motion by Mr. McDonald, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced. And the bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00969, Rules Report No. 42, Burdick. An act to amend the Civil Rights Law, in relation to the amount of damages recoverable in a cause of action for unlawful interference with protected rights.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00970, Rules Report No. 43, Gunther. An act to amend the Labor Law, in relation to the restrictions on consecutive hours of work for nurses; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2022 amending the Labor Law relating to the restrictions on consecutive hours of work for nurses, as proposed in legislative bills numbers S. 1997-A and A. 286-A, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mrs. Gunther to explain her vote.

MRS. GUNTHER: As a registered nurse and somebody that volunteered during the pandemic for about eight months, I think this bill is so, so very important for the nurses around

New York State who dedicate their lives to save -- to saving lives. So I think the restriction on consecutive hours is so important. Nurses work very hard. We do 12 hours shifts. Sometimes if we have to, if there's an emergent situation we do 16 hour shifts and I just want to thank all the nurses around New York State and around the nation for all they did during the pandemic and do each and every day and I'm -- I'm really proud to carry this bill. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Gunther in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00975, Rules Report No. 44, Buttenschon, Pheffer Amato. An act to amend the Penal Law, in relation to the certain offenses and provisions related to the unlawful dissemination of a personal image; to amend the Civil Rights Law, in relation to the private right of action for such offenses; and to repeal certain provisions of the Penal Law relating thereto.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Ms. Glick to explain her vote.

Ms. Walsh to explain her vote.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So last year for the members, you know, who were present, Ms. Buttenschon and I had a -- oh, I'm sorry, the sponsor of this bill and I had a nice debate about this particular piece of legislation. We had two no votes last year. There were some concerns raised at the time from some of the media like print media and TV about the bill in its form but the bill has been amended now through this Chapter Amendment. They've withdrawn any kind of opposition that they had previously had to this bill. I think that the Chapter Amendment really properly focuses on the dissemination of a harmful image through social media that's designed to embarrass or humiliate a victim or a victim's family. So I will continue to support this bill. I would encourage my colleagues to do the same and many thanks to the sponsor for the adjustments that she made and was willing to make with this bill. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Buttenschon to explain her vote.

MS. BUTTENSCHON: Again, Mr. Speaker, thank you. This bill evolved from a very horrific murder of a young woman in Utica and that murder was disseminated over social media time and time again. So as my colleague stated the important aspect is the intent of the individual that is posting on social media. So this would be something that clearly rectifies the individual's intent. So again, I thank you and I request that my colleagues support this legislation. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walsh and Ms.

Buttenschon in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00976, Rules Report No. 45, Paulin. An act to amend the Public Health Law, in relation to implementing a statewide electronic tracking system for evidence collection kits used to collect and preserve evidence of a sexual assault or other sex offense that are submitted to the custody of law enforcement; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2022 amending the Public Health Law relating to implementing a statewide electronic tracking system for evidence of a sexual assault or other sex offense, as proposed in legislative bills numbers S. 7867-A and A. 9596-A, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00977, Rules Report No. 46, Solages. An act to amend the General Municipal Law and the Public Authorities Law, in relation to notice procedures prior to

approval of projects by industrial development agencies.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00980, Rules Report No. 47, Benedetto. An act to amend the Education Law, in relation to dates of commencement of membership of certain positions of school governance in the City of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On a motion by Mr. Benedetto, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced. Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00984, Rules Report No. 48, Magnarelli. An act to amend the Labor Law, in relation to

clarifying provisions related to a registration system for contractors and subcontractors engaged in public work and covered projects; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2022 amending the Labor Law relating to establishing a registration system for contractors and subcontractors engaged in public work and covered projects in order to better enforce existing Labor Laws and regulations in the public works industry, as proposed in legislative bills numbers S. 5994-C and A. 1338-C, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00999, Rules Report No. 49, Joyner. An act to amend the Labor Law, in relation to disclosure and advertisement of a job, promotion or transfer opportunity.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01000, Rules Report No. 50, Joyner. An act to amend the Labor Law, in relation to establishing the Warehouse Worker Protection Act; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2022 amending the Labor Law relating to establishing the Warehouse Worker Protection Act, as proposed in legislative bills numbers S. 8922-A and A. 10020-A, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01001, Rules Report No. 51, Conrad. An act to amend the Education Law and the Tax Law, in relation to the amount of lottery winnings and prizes which are excluded from a school district's adjusted gross income.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On a motion by Mr. Conrad, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced. And the bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01005, Rules Report No. 52, Lavine. An act to amend the Criminal Procedure Law and the Executive law, in relation to protections against the arrest and extradition of abortion providers.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A10006, Rules Report No. 53, De Los Santos. An act to amend the Education Law, in relation to contracts for excellence; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2022 amending the Education Law relating to the contract for excellence in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, as proposed in legislative bills numbers S. 9460 and A. 10498, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On a motion by Mr. De Los Santos, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is

advanced. Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. De Los Santos to explain his vote. Ladies and gentlemen, shh. The member is speaking.

MR. DE LOS SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on this important and informative piece of legislation plus-size which will create endless opportunity and engaging opportunity for our City students. I want to thank my colleagues for -- for the support and commitment to support New York City public school. I am proud to vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. De Los Santos in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01284, Rules Report No. 54, Reyes. An act to amend the Labor Law, in relation to the recognition of the establishment of a workplace safety committee by an employer.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On a motion by Ms. Reyes, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced. And the bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01322, Rules Report No. 55, Bichotte Hermelyn. An act to amend the Penal Law, in relation to crimes involving the death or serious physical injury of an employee; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2022 amending the Penal Law relating to crimes involving the death or injury of a worker, as proposed in legislative bills numbers S.621-B and A. 4947-B, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, do you have any other resolutions or housekeeping?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: We have numerous fine resolutions which we will take up with one vote. All those in favor of the resolutions please signify by saying aye; opposed, no.

The resolutions are adopted.

(Whereupon, Assembly Resolution Nos. 50-56 were unanimously approved.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the Assembly stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. Wednesday, January the 25th, tomorrow being a Session day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Assembly stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:52 p.m., the Assembly stood adjourned until Wednesday, January 25th at 10:00 a.m., Wednesday being a Session day.)