

**TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2023**

**2:04 P.M.**

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The House will come to order.

In the absence of clergy, let us pause for a moment of silence.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

Visitors are invited to join the 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, May 22nd.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the further reading of the Journal of Monday, May the 22nd and that the same stand approved.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, sir. To colleagues and the many guests that are in the Chambers with us today, I'd like to share some words with you from Sheila Crump Johnson. Sheila is an American businesswoman and founder of BET and the CEO of Salamander Hotels and Resorts, and the first African-American woman to attain a net worth of at least \$1 billion. Her words for us today, *Life has never been about you or about me. Life and all that matters within it is always about us.* These words, again, from Sheila Crump Johnson, Mr. Speaker.

Colleagues have on their desk a main Calendar. We also have a debate list. After any housekeeping and/or introductions we will be calling for the following committees to meet off the floor: Banks, Consumer Affairs, Correction, Housing and Ways and Means. We're going to take up the following bills on the debate list: First we're going to go to Rules Report No. 159 by Ms. Wallace; second, Calendar No. 4 by Ms. Paulin; and third, Calendar No. 176 by Mr. Lavine. Members should also be mindful that we're going to take up all the resolutions at the beginning of our Calendar at the end of the

day. I will announce if there's going to be a need for further floor activity, Mr. Speaker. That's a general outline of where we're going today. If you have any housekeeping and/or introductions, now would be an appropriate time.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. No housekeeping, but we do have introductions.

Mr. Mamdani for the purposes of a introduction.

MR. MAMDANI: Thank you very much. Today, we are honored by the presence of many from Queens, from Long Island, from across New York State who are coming to join us here from the Bangladeshi-American Advocacy Group, which is under the leadership of Joynal Abedin and Shahana Masum. We have members from the Council of American-Islamic Relations. I would invite everyone to get up who is coming to visit us here in Albany today, led by (inaudible), and we also have the New York Muslim Action Network, led by (inaudible). So it is a great pleasure to see so many, as we say in our community, uncles and aunties who have led us through so many years and so many decades of advocacy as Muslims across the State who have found great success in legislation that has passed in this very Chamber that they have advocated for in the past and who we welcome here today to be a part of this civic and political process. Thank you very much.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Mamdani, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the

privileges of the floor. Glad that you have joined us today, know that you always have friends here in Albany. And we wish you well.

Salaam-Alaikum.

(Applause)

Ms. Lee for the purposes of a introduction.

MS. LEE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to introduce my distinguished guests from the Taiwan community who are here today for the passing of a resolution memorializing the Governor to proclaim May 23rd as Taiwan Heritage Day in the State of New York. It is my distinct pleasure to have here today the Consul General James Lee as well as Hans Chang, Deputy Consul General of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in New York; Mr. Raymond Tsang, President of the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association of New York and from my district; Mr. Tom Su, President of the Taiwan Center of New York; Mr. Kevin Wu, President of the Taiwanese American Association of the Capital District, New York; Ms. Patsy Chen, Vice President of Taiwan Center of New York; Ms. May Tien, Board Member of the Chinese Chamber of Commerce of New York; Yu-Chi Young, President, Taiwanese American Cultural Society of the Capital District; and Mr. Lou Fu Youn, Director of the Political Division of Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in New York.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in welcoming my guests here today to Albany and extend to them all the cordialities of the House.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. Lee, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Appreciate that you've taken the time to come and share this day with us. We wish you well, we wish the relationships between our countries always stay well and relationship between New York State and Taiwan always stay well. Thank you so very much for being with us Consul General and friends.

(Applause)

Mr. Alvarez for the purposes of a introduction.

MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to do this introduction today as we celebrate the second annual Dominican in Albany. We take this opportunity to introduce important visitors from our Dominican Republic. Congressmembers Ignacio Aracena; Congresswoman Kenia Bido; Congresswoman Veronica Contreras; Congressman Luis Baez, who represent with honor and dignity (speaking foreign language). Mr. Speaker, please welcome them and show them the cordialities of the People [sic] House.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Alvarez, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome this distinguished group here to the New York State Assembly. Hope that your time here has been well spent, that you have enjoyed your trip. We extend to you the privileges of the floor and our appreciation for the services and work that you provide in our communities. Continue

that great work. Thank you so very much for being here.

(Applause)

Ms. González-Rojas for the purposes of a  
introduction.

MS. GONZÁLEZ-ROJAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am so excited to welcome the Lexington School of the Deaf, their CEO and Superintendent Russell Wells [sic] and their incredible staff, and 21 of their students who are here to visit the Capitol. The Lexington School of the Deaf was founded in 1864 when a first -- a class of six children and an instructor that convened to learn in the home of Isaac and Hannah Rosenfeld. The school grew over several years until it relocated in 1968 from Lexington Avenue in Manhattan to its new home in East Elmhurst Queens in my district. Today, the Lexington School of the Deaf has a student body of over 350 folks making it the largest school of the deaf in New York. It has been recognized at the local, national and international levels for their pioneering programs, including the first nursing program for deaf children on the East Coast, a research department to promote the investigation of educational development and vocational issues, and a special education unit for deaf children of all ages. I am proud to share that the school also provides comprehensive services via its affiliates, including a Mental Health Service Center, the Hearing and Speech Center, and the Lexington Vocational Services. In fact, my office has partnered with them for this month which is Better Hearing and Speech Month to provide free hearing screenings for the

community. And, the Lexington -- the students of the Lexington School of [sic] the Deaf have come here today to our State's Capitol to play basketball. And so it is with great pride that I join you, Mr. Speaker, in welcoming everyone to join us tonight at the KIPP Tech Valley School Gymnasium at 321 Northern Boulevard tonight at 6 p.m. for the 26th Annual Esther Lustig Memorial Basketball Classic during which our students will face off against the All-Star members of the Senate and the Assembly right here in the Legislature.

So as a person with a hearing disability myself, a client of their hearing and speech center, as a mom, as a very proud Assemblymember for the Lexington School of [sic] the Deaf, I would like to just name the students that are here with us: Christian De La Cruz (phonetic), Steven Fang (phonetic), Salvador Fazino (phonetic), Naquad Sexton (phonetic), Juan Valdez (phonetic), William Mora (phonetic), Joslyn Oliveraz (phonetic), Tiacha (inaudible), Malaca Lewis (phonetic), Shana Amachad (phonetic) and Ricardo Rosairo Friaz (phonetic). And please extend the cordialities of the House to our wonderful students from the Lexington School of [sic] the Deaf, and let's root them on tonight.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. González-Rojas, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome this distinguished, this great school, this body of students who have come here to not only learn about Albany, but to in fact compete against Albany. We beg your indulgence for the beating that you're going to give us tonight. We appreciate the fact (inaudible/mic cut

out) in a row and that there is a real bond between the Lexington School and the New York State Assembly and Senate. Know that you are always welcome here, know that you always will have privileges of the floor. Thank you so very much, gentleman and ladies.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes for the purposes of an introduction.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to introduce one of our former colleagues. He is in Albany today. He usually is here a few times a year, he would bring his daughter and I understand he's got to be back today for a recital, but if you could please welcome our colleague, Mr. Cusick, back to our Chambers today and give him all the cordialities of the floor, sir. Thank you so much.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. Michael, once a member, always a member. You've heard it a million times, it's true again today. You always have the privileges of the floor. It's great to see you, hope that you are doing well, understanding that we miss you as much as you miss us. Thank you so very much. And as I tell members, I still keep the most famous photo that I've ever taken up here of you and your daughter here. Thank you so very much. Glad to have you, Mike.

(Applause)

Mr. Cunningham for the purposes of a introduction.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: Mr. Speaker, thank you so



much for the opportunity to bring greetings and welcome. Medgar Evers is very famous in Brooklyn. We have a train station, a college, and also a high school. Today, we have our high school here, Medgar Evers High School. We wanted to just welcome them to the floor and give them the full cordialities of the floor. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Cunningham, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. You have also our great wishes for your futures. We know they will be bright. Continue to follow the straight and direct path that you have towards excellence in education and in life. Thank you so much for being here.

(Applause)

Mr. Jones for the purposes of an introduction.

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce students from the State and Local Government Class from Clinton Community College. Their professor, Tom Mandeville, has been teaching at Clinton Community College since 1990 and has been bringing students down to Albany annually. I'd like to welcome them here today and hope that they may have a great experience learning about the legislative process firsthand.

With us today are: Sam Hooker, Macy Hosler, Angela Lawler, Aoife Lawliss, Richard Mason, Jesse McLean, Braden Peluso, and accompanying them today were Matt Bergeron and, of course, Professor Thomas Mandeville, who knows this building better

than some of us. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that you extend all of the cordialities of the floor to the students and their chaperones and welcome them to the People's House.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Jones, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome these students here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Hope that your time here will be beneficial and that your observation of the New York State Assembly will leave an impression on you that may lead you one day to seek a seat here. Thank you again for your attendance. Please know that we welcome you always. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mr. Alvarez for the purposes of an introduction.

MR. ALVAREZ: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to do this second introduction. And as I said, today we celebrate the second Annual Dominican in Albany, and I would like to take this opportunity to welcome over 40 bodega owners, over 40 bodegas. And as you know, bodega has been consistent support, consistent in New York City since the early '90s. These historic stores have kept the City alive, serving the community and its constituents, the culture within these store is innumerable. There is no better way for New York to show bodega owner the proper gratitude they deserve after keeping our community afloat after so many decades. That's why I am introducing today a resolution proclaiming June 25th, 2023, as El Dia Del Bodeguero. Mr. Speaker,

please welcome them and show them the cordialities of the People's House.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Alvarez, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome this distinguished group here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Our thanks for the work that you have done keeping New York City alive through your stores and your interest in your own communities. (Inaudible/mic cut out) Again, thank you so much for being here and we hope you will return soon. Thank you.

(Applause)

Ms. Shimsky for the purposes of a introduction.

MS. SHIMSKY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I -- I rise to introduce Zac Schwartz. He is volunteering in my district office while awaiting graduation from Irvington High School. He is an extremely civic-minded young man. He is also volunteering with the Tarrytown Fire Department. He is in the district office, but he wanted to come up to Albany one day to get some perspective on how the sausage is made. So I ask you to welcome Zachary and extend to him all the privileges of the floor.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. Shimsky, the Speaker and all the members, sir, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. And like sausage, we may not look good being made, but we taste a lot better, all right? Thank you so very much.

We're happy to have you. Thank you.

(Applause)

Ms. Fahy for the purposes of an introduction.

MS. FAHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to welcome a number of Albany High students who didn't realize were coming up, but as part of their class, and it's two classes headed by Ms -- their teachers, Mr. Fitzsimons as well -- Mr. Fitzsimons as well Ms. Leah Evans, to advocate for AP, Advanced Placement, classes and broadening the access because they enjoy their AP classes so much. I'm a proud parent of two Albany High students, so very pleased to think that I can be here to welcome these students including their promotion of AP courses. Mr. Speaker, if you would welcome them and grant them the cordialities of the House, thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. Fahy, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome these Albany students here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Thank you for coming and advocating for your own better education and the education for those who will follow you, and to your teachers and guidance folks, thank you, you're doing a great job in developing young minds and young students for leadership of tomorrow. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

Mr. DiPietro for the purposes of a introduction.

MR. DIPIETRO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of an introduction, I'd like to introduce Tatyana Tymkiv.

She's a Ukrainian National. She represents the Ukrainian National Women's League of America. She is the branch president. And then also Slaga Meetras (phonetic), great friends of mine. She represents the Jewish Federation of Greater Rochester of the Women's Philanthropic. Also, Slaga (phonetic) herself represents the Hillel Jewish Community School, and they were here today bringing their students to -- to meet with all of us and to -- here representing the need to fight anti-Semitism in our schools. If you would please give them the cordialities of the House, that would be greatly appreciated. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. DiPietro, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you both here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Our thanks for the work that you're doing. Know that you're well-represented here in Albany, and we appreciate the friendship that you have shown with our members, as well as this State. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes for the purposes of a  
announcement.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if you could please call the Banks Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you so very much. Banks Committee, Speaker's Conference Room immediately,

please.

Go to page 6, Rules Report No. 159, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A05212, Rules Report No. 159, Wallace, Aubry, Jean-Pierre, Seawright, Epstein, Taylor, Cruz, Simon, Dickens, Cook, Otis, Reyes, Colton. An act to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to gender balance in State and local public authorities; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon the expiration thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: An explanation is requested, Ms. Wallace. One minute, Ms. Wallace. Let's kind of see if we can settle the House down.

MS. WALLACE: So thank you, Mr. Speaker. This --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Not quite yet, not quite yet. Members, please take your seats, please. If you are departing, do it now and quietly.

Proceed, Ms. Wallace.

MS. WALLACE: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. So this bill would amend the Public Authorities Law to create a preference for women to be appointed on State and local boards.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALLACE: Pardon me, let me clarify. Public Authority Boards.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield for some questions?

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

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Thank you very much. So I've actually debated this bill before but not with you, so what -- what I'm really interested in knowing I guess first is you mentioned that this applies to State and Local Authority Boards, correct?

MS. WALLACE: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Do you happen to know how many there are?

MS. WALLACE: Several hundred at the local level and I do have that number somewhere, give me a second.

(Pause)

Well, okay. Here we go. Yes. I think there's approximately 531 local authorities, including 109 IDAs and 292 non-profits -- not-for-profits.

MS. WALSH: Thank you. And could you just explain how this -- how this bill would work.

MS. WALLACE: Yes. So when there is a vacancy on any of those boards, the board would solicit applications, and when those applications came in, a preference would be granted in favor of women for the position. It's just a factor, it's not dispositive, but it is a preference to be considered by the individuals who are doing the

appointing.

MS. WALSH: So yeah. So the way that I see the bill is there are three pieces to it. There's the -- the creation of the list, the recommendations for appointment, or the -- yeah, the recommendations. The appointment itself, and then reappointment as the case -- as the case may be. Would you agree with that?

MS. WALLACE: Well, I would say the appointment and the reappointment are probably the same thing.

MS. WALSH: Right, probably. Yeah, that's right because for an existing board --

MS. WALLACE: It's a vacancy.

MS. WALSH: -- because it's a vacancy, okay. So as far as the actual creation of the list for people to be considered for appointment or reappointment, does that list have to be gender balanced, the list itself?

MS. WALLACE: No, I think -- well, I think whoever applies would -- and is qualified would be on the list.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So is there any requirement then under the -- the bill that -- okay, so I'm looking at the bill, let's see, that talks about, let's see if I can give you a line, under Section 3, "All appointive State and local authorities heretofore or hereafter established by law or resolution shall have recommendations for appointments or reappointments that are gender balanced as provided by this section." So does that mean that the actual list of recommendations must be gender balanced? That's the way I'm



reading that section of the law.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah, I guess -- yeah, now that you point that out, I do -- I do agree with you. I think that, you know the factors should be considered even when making the recommendation on the list and then also when the appointment itself.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So just take for an example, you know, I -- I represent in some parts of my district, kind of rural areas. What -- we always have a hard time whether it's filling -- and I know that that doesn't cover here, but like a planning board or a zoning board or even a town board position, sometimes it's just really hard to find people that are interested and qualify to serve. What if you have that situation where you just -- you're having a hard time despite best efforts finding interested, qualified women to go onto that list. What -- what it says under Section 3 that I just read that they shall have recommendations that are gender balanced. What is that State or local authority to do?

MS. WALLACE: Well, I think that there are certainly a lot of qualified women who would be interested if there was a conscious effort being made to reach out and -- and encourage them to apply. I don't necessarily think that that is the case right now so this is really a bill that says we need to make a conscious and deliberate effort to encourage women and to really think about how important it is to have gender diversity on these government boards.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Well -- and -- and the bill doesn't actually specify how they're -- - they're supposed to do that.

We know that in private industry, for example, Goldman Sachs has come out with their own policy that -- that company of saying we want to have at least X number, not so much a -- a quota, per se, but to really encourage more women to sit on that board. But taking some of these local authorities, what if despite their best efforts they can't -- they cannot find qualified, interested -- interested is another point, interested women in serving on these boards. I think we all agree that the idea -- I mean we're -- we, in this Body, have representation of both men and women and we believe that the work that we do in this Body is improved because we have that diversity, that gender diversity, and I'm not questioning that at all. But I'm just saying, what do you -- you know, what do you do if you -- if you can't, despite best efforts, find a list with qualified, interested women who are willing to step up and serve on this -- on a particular board?

MS. WALLACE: There's -- there's nothing in this bill that would say that if somebody isn't qualified they must be appointed to the board. It's just saying that, you know, there's -- when there is -- that as part of the solicitation process, when a vacancy is available, that a conscious effort should be made to consider gender amongst the pool of people who have expressed interest and who are qualified to consider gender in making the ultimate selection.

MS. WALSH: Well, I think -- I think it's actually interesting to me that while the bill talks about gender and balance, it does not talk about candidates who are interested. It does not talk about candidates who are qualified. Those words aren't used in the

bill at all. Those are words that I used because I think that they're important when figuring out who's going to serve on different boards but the -- but the language of the bill just only speaks to gender.

MS. WALLACE: Well, I don't think that -- I would hope that no board is going to select somebody who's not qualified and not interested in serving. So I don't really think that that needs to be outlined.

MS. WALSH: I would -- no, I would hope so, too, but when you -- and we're both attorneys --

MS. WALLACE: I mean, there's no law right now and I would imagine the existing boards that we have, I would hope that everybody on those boards are both qualified and interested in serving.

MS. WALSH: I -- I would agree with you. However, adding this layer or this requirement to the selection process that's already used, that when it only speaks to gender and uses the word "shall," not "may" or "should encourage" or something softer, but uses the -- the mandate and directive of "shall," my concern is that -- my concern is that you may end up creating a list of including women who may not be -- may be -- may be qualified by virtue of being a woman, by meeting that gender requirement but may not be particularly that interested or that qualified. And I think that that's -- that's one of the issues that I've got with the bill.

So we've talked a little bit about the creation of the list for recommendations. Now let's talk about the actual appointment

or reappointment, which I would agree with you for an existing board it's really largely the same thing. Take the example of you've got, say a man who is coming up at the end of his term on a particular board, he has served well, he is definitely qualified, he is definitely interested in continuing to serve. His appointment is coming -- or his reappointment is coming up, you've generated a list where you have men and women on this list, including the person that's currently serving. If you have a board that is all male, can that board, or can they reappoint the man that has continued to serve, because under this legislation it talks about the power of the preference getting stronger the more male the existing board is. I'd just like to get your thoughts on that.

MS. WALLACE: Yeah, so it is inversely proportionate. So the -- the stronger the consideration -- the less diverse the board, the stronger the consideration; I would agree with that. But, yet again, it is not a quota, it is a factor. So I would have a hard time believing that there wouldn't also be an equally qualified woman who might be interested in applying and if that's true, there would be a preference for that woman, but that doesn't mean that that woman would automatically get it. Again, it is a factor to be considered.

MS. WALSH: Okay. I'd like to turn your attention, though, to Section 4 of the bill and -- and I'm just going -- I'm just going to read this part, "An appointing power shall make one; recommendations, two; appointments and three; reappointments to

State and local authorities in a manner which will ensure a gender balanced appointment or reappointment for each public authority." So in the hypothetical that I gave you, how does that give them leeway to select that man and reappoint him as qualified and as interested and as dedicated to his service as he has been when you have a gender and balanced board under Section 4 of this, how do you do that?

MS. WALLACE: Well, I guess under your hypothetical, is there also an equally qualified woman?

MS. WALSH: Well, again, the word "qualified" isn't used in the bill, but there is a woman on the list. So does the woman get chosen or can the man be reappointed?

MS. WALLACE: Well, it would be a fact to be considered, ultimately.

MS. WALSH: Okay.

MS. WALLACE: There's no -- there's no mandate to -- to nominate the woman. It is just a factor to be considered. The stronger, the more -- the strength of sort of the weight is stronger when there's less men on the board, but I think one thing that you're missing is that one thing that has been shown is study after study after study has shown that public -- that boards in general benefit from diversity of voices. I mean, there are tons of studies that support this proposition. So to -- one thing that's missing I think from your analogy or your hypothetical is that the board itself and the public wouldn't benefit from the voice of a woman. So it's not just giving the woman creative -- but that's one of the criteria, one of the reasons

behind the bill is because in general, we know that a diversity of boards does result in more innovation and more creativity and so these are public boards. It would benefit not only the individuals but also society to have a woman's voice in the room.

MS. WALSH: Yeah, and as I said before, I don't dispute the fact that all other things being equal, that having, you know, all other things being equal that it wouldn't be a bad idea to have both genders represented on a particular board. But, again, focusing on that Section 4, it says that "the reappointment must be made, shall be made, in a manner which will ensure a gender balanced appointment or reappointment for each public authority." It says "will." So you can -- you can tell me that -- that there's no quota, and I -- I would agree with you that this legislation doesn't say there must be X percentage or X number per board, that is true, but the way that the preference is structured, given the example that I gave you, I believe that the public authority would be constrained to tell that well-serving experienced board member, bye, thanks for your service; under this legislation we must, we shall, in order to create a gender balanced reappointment, we must put the woman on in your place. And I don't think that that's really fair, you know. I don't think that that's fair, and I think that that's my -- that's my problem with the bill and that's I think the part of the problem that other members do have with this bill.

MS. WALLACE: If I may, let me just clarify.

MS. WALSH: Sure.

MS. WALLACE: So I think you're taking Section 4 out of context of the rest of the bill, because while it does say, "Shall make recommendations and appointments to ensure gender balanced appointment." If you go back to Section 2a of the bill, gender balanced is defined as "providing women candidates with a preference." So I don't think it's a mandate. It's again just saying that there would be sort of a preferential factor to be considered when there is an opening.

MS. WALSH: Yeah, I just think that -- I think that there are two competing ideas within the legislation, and I've tried to bring this out when the bill was debated in previous years. And I -- I do think that if it really truly is the legislative intent to only create more gender balance by getting more women on the list, if it was trying to get more women on the list from which to select qualified individuals to serve, I would have no issue with that. My issue comes with appointment or reappointment itself is being made off of that list, that if you have a male-dominated board currently, you can say that it's just a factor, it is just a preference but that language in Section 4 I think is a real problem, because I think that we know their quota is not supported by the Supreme Court Case, *U.S. v. Virginia*, but it really ends up operating in a much more directive way than just a -- than just a preference. So I -- I think at this point I want to thank you for your answers and I'd like to -- I know I'm coming close to the end of my first 15 and if I spill over, I'd like to continue to take a little bit more time. But I'd like to go on the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: You may go on the bill, and you will be on the second 15.

MS. WALSH: Thank you very much. So I appreciate the -- the rationale behind trying to make sure that our State and local public authorities have both qualified men and qualified women serving. I think that the way that the legislation is written, though, is a problem. And I think that the problem really comes from the language that I questioned the sponsor about which says that when you're developing -- not only when you're developing the list of individuals to recommend for vacancies and appointments, but also when you're making those appointments or reappointments it shall be done in a manner which will ensure a gender balanced appointment or reappointment. And what I'm afraid of, and I think what none of us want, we know that with over 500 of these authorities spread throughout the State, we rely upon individuals who are willing to step up and to serve on these boards. And sometimes a -- sometimes a board has a huge waiting list of many people just -- just chomping at the bit and really dying to serve on these boards. In other areas, it's very difficult.

So as I used in the example, what if you have an area where it's very difficult to find women to want to step up and serve? Do I think that we could all encourage and encourage more women to participate and to -- and to lean in and to try and participate on these boards, and should more efforts be made? Absolutely. Do I think that there should be this piece of legislation which is creating a -- a -- a



preference, I would argue it's a little bit more than a preference the way that it's actually worded. I think that that goes a little bit too far.

And so for that reason, there is opposition to this bill, we've had opposition as we voted on it in the past, and I think that we will continue to do so. I think that in the end, I think what all of us really want is that we want interested, qualified people, hopefully of both genders serving on boards throughout the State, but I think the way we do it is -- has got to be I think more -- less -- less of a mandate and more of trying -- trying to encourage women to -- to do so rather than through this piece of legislation and what it requires. So for those reasons, I'll continue to be in the negative on this bill. I would encourage my colleagues to think about it and to do the same, and I thank the sponsor for her answers to all my questions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect August 1, 2023.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: A Party vote has been requested.

Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir. The Republican Conference is generally opposed to this. Those who support are certainly welcome and encouraged to vote in favor of it here on the floor. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. The Majority Conference is generally going to be in favor of this piece of legislation. We will be voting in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Ms. Wallace to explain her vote.

MS. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to explain my vote. This bill requires that when making appointments on State and local authority boards, a conscious effort be made to diversify the board by requiring gender to be a factor, not dispositive, but a factor, to be considered when making an appointment. The bill seeks to overcome the implicit bias that currently exists, which has resulted in women being unrepresented on very important government boards.

The bill, in my mind, serves two compelling State interests. One, it would give women more of an opportunity for their voice to be heard, and to benefit from the prestige and the networking and the resume building and the influence that comes with these prestigious appointments. Second, the boards and the public themselves would all benefit from diversity of voices. Study after study after study has shown that boards perform better, make better judgments and have better outcomes when there is a diversity of voices on their boards.

So for that reason, diversity fosters creativity and innovation, and so it would benefit basically all of New York State to have that diversity of voices on the boards. So for that reason, I vote in the affirmative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Wallace in the affirmative.

Mr. Goodell to explain his vote.

Shh.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we're here on the floor of the Legislature, we vote on bills that -- and we vote on the language of the bill. And sometimes what we want to accomplish and what the bill language says can be different. And so I appreciate the sponsor's desire that we seek gender balance on boards and commissions, and that that be a goal. A goal I and many of my colleagues support. But the actual language of the bill is much stronger than that and creates real challenges, because the actual language of the bill says that an appointing power shall make recommendations in a manner that will ensure gender balance. Shall is not a factor, it's not encouraging, it's mandatory. And the word "ensure" gender balance, is also mandatory.

And then if that's not convincing enough, it goes on to say that, you know, again recommendations must be based on gender. The definition of discrimination is when you give a preference to one individual over another individual based on factors that are outside of the individual's power. And our gender, by and

large, is outside our power. You are either born a male or female, and I understand that can get more complicated as life goes on, but we should be making all the appointments based on the qualifications of the individual, what they bring to the table, their experience, their background, their knowledge, and not on factors that are inherently outside of the scope of their control and unrelated to their ability to serve in an admirable manner. For that reason, I will not be supporting it. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Goodell in the negative.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes to explain her vote.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, sir, for the opportunity to explain my vote. I want to first of all rise and commend the sponsor for even thinking that we should create opportunities for boards and authorities to consider the diversity on who serves in their house and in their respective places. Not many years ago, Mr. Speaker, as you know, historically this country has never really thought about who was the most qualified to serve in positions. They've always thought about who's the right man to be in positions. And I think that it makes sense for us now at this point in America, of course we can only deal with New York State right now, but soon others will follow, is that you do want to give women an opportunity to serve now. If you are not able to find the right woman that's interested, has the expertise to serve, I'm almost sure we can easily move back to where we've always been in this country, is just

selecting the right man to serve in that position.

And so I think at this point it really makes a lot of sense for us on a common sense basis think about including the value that women will have to add to all of these multiple authorities and boards across the State. So thank you to the sponsor for introducing it, and I honor my colleagues in their opposition thought. I do honor that thought. I think they put a lot into formulating their thoughts on it. They read the words, they looked up the definition of the words and they somehow see something exclusionary; I don't. I agree with the sponsor and I'm happy to vote in favor of it.

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

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Page 18, Calendar No. 176, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A05772, Calendar No. 176, Lavine, Simon, Wallace, Simone. An act to amend the Civil Practice Law and Rules, in relation to an affirmation by any other person, wherever made, in a civil action.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: An explanation is requested, Mr. Lavine.

MR. LAVINE: Thank you. This bill allows anyone to submit an affirmation under penalty of perjury in a civil action instead of being forced to execute an affidavit in front of a notary

public.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Lavine, will you yield?

MR. LAVINE: Of course.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MS. WALSH: Thank you so much. So your explanation was great, it was short. I just have a couple of questions just to clarify what we're doing here. What -- first of all I guess, big picture, why do we -- why do we need to do this, why do we need to enact this legislation?

MR. LAVINE: Well, we will then join 20 other states that have abandoned this ancient requirement, and it is ancient, going back thousands of years, to have documents notarized. So on a personal level, I'm happy we're doing this because I've lost quite a few friends when I was a notary when I would not notarize the signatures of their dead parents, but that's just a personal, a personal issue.

MS. WALSH: Mm-hmm.

MR. LAVINE: These requirements for notaries to execute affidavits go back more than, just about 4,000 years to Ancient Egypt and to Rome at a time when illiteracy was rampant. We no longer face that dilemma; we have plenty of dilemmas but that's -- that's one we don't face. So we can join the Federal courts,

which have abandoned this requirement years ago, and the fact of the matter is is that if you affirm under the penalty of perjury, it is -- it carries every bit as much weight as an affidavit executed in front of a -- a notary public.

MS. WALSH: Are there any instances where the notary public will be necessary in order to assist in the execution of documents used in court after this legislation is passed?

MR. LAVINE: We're dealing only with matters in the civil courts.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So the criminal courts is a separate -- separate matter. And the affidavits -- or the -- pardon me, the affirmations that will be submitted can be from anyone, not just a party to an action, but anybody, a witness, anybody.

MR. LAVINE: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Because I was -- I had to go back and research, but under current law an attorney admitted to New York practice, a physician, an osteopath or a dentist, they can all currently utilize the affirmation now. This would just expand it to everybody else?

MR. LAVINE: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So, the -- what -- to me, the purpose of a notary is to, one, verify the signer's identity, and two, to -- to try to ascertain their willingness to sign the document, at least as far as they can -- they can tell. So do you see any problem with eliminating a notary when you consider those two aspects?

MR. LAVINE: No. The -- whatever is going to be signed carries with it prosecution for perjury, and -- and that ought to be sufficient indicia of reliability.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So like, for -- for example, just from my own -- from my own personal experience, I was -- I was asked one time to meet with somebody and take their -- take their notary on a document, and I met with the individual and that individual was clearly very confused, did not know -- was not -- in the medical world you'd say that they weren't oriented to time and place, did not know what day it was, didn't know who the President was and I refused to notarize the document. If that person just signed an affirmation after -- under this legislation, you -- the court may have really no idea about whether that individual knew what they were doing at the time they did it, and that's really what the notary's -- or a part of the notary's role is. So going back to that idea, isn't that -- isn't that a problem? I mean, yeah, the person is signing it under penalties of perjury but they might not know who the President is, so...

MR. LAVINE: This is -- everything we do is a matter of balance. And if the dangers were rife the Federal Judiciary system would not have abandoned this anachronism years ago, nor would 20 other of our sister states.

MS. WALSH: Well, I believe we have 49 of the other states in the Union that adopt a -- a different standard when making bail determinations and we haven't gone that way, so we don't always follow the act. So in this case you think it's a good idea,



though.

MR. LAVINE: But we -- but we do follow the path of -- of our own -- I'm sorry, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, it's -- I'm just having a tough time hearing because of the --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly, thank you. Members, please?

MR. LAVINE: Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Let's show some respect.

MR. LAVINE: On -- on the subject of 49 other states or 48 other states and the issue of dangerousness in terms of bail, we have our own very proud New York history, and New York has always been at the forefront of the battle for equal rights and justice. And that consideration -- and I can share with you how I know this because a long time ago I worked in the courts and made recommendations to the judges about who should be released and who shouldn't based on verifiable bail facts. My recommendations were treated -- treated -- were not considered at all. It was a terrible system. A terrible system involving bail bondsmen at every street corner near every courthouse in the State of New York with the bright neon signs. That -- that consideration of dangerousness has never been part of our system of justice in the State of New York, and that's assuming --

MS. WALSH: Maybe that's a conversation for another day.

MR. LAVINE: Assuming someone could define --

MS. WALSH: Let's talk about the bill itself.

MR. LAVINE: Assuming someone could define what dangerousness actually really means. But I just wanted to respond to your oblique reference with a lengthy (inaudible).

MS. WALSH: Well, thank you for putting such a fine point on your opinion. Maybe we can talk about the bill itself, though. Part of what a notary does is verifies the identity of the person who is asking to have their -- their signature verified. A current government ID card with a photo, a physical description and a signature, or two current documents issued by a business entity, institution, Federal or State government with the individual's signature will suffice for a notary. So for example, a driver's license, a passport or government-issued non-driver ID card which is unexpired and current are considered to be appropriate for verifying identity. If an affirmation simply comes in from, say, a non-party in a civil matter, how will the court know whether this -- the identity of the person is -- they are who they say they are? Are you -- are we just going to rely upon the parties to the matter to try to bring -- bring any concerns to the court? Won't this just require the court to engage in perhaps protracted hearing and, you know, an examination of the authentic -- authenticity of the person who's signing an affirmation?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes, why do you rise?

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you for allowing

me to interrupt our procedure so that we can call the Consumer Affairs Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room, please, sir. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, Mrs. Peoples-Stokes. Consumer Affairs, Speaker's Conference Room. And we have an awful lot of activity in and around the Chamber. I'd really appreciate it if people would sit down. And if people are traveling through the Chamber, take another route. I see a lot of people are just moving right past. This is not a showplace. Members will take their seats. Staff that is not necessary, please sit in the back.

MR. LAVINE: Is it show time again? So, perhaps --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Proceed. Did you finish your question, Ms. -- Ms. Walsh?

MR. LAVINE: I -- I do remember it, and the answer is no.

MS. WALSH: So a court -- how is the court going to ascertain whether the person that presented this affirmation is who they say they are and that it was voluntary if they don't themselves appear in court? Is the court just going to be relying upon the other parties to make allegations that it wasn't knowing or voluntary or that the person isn't who they say they are? Is this something that just brings up -- that -- doesn't that bring it all into the court where a notary public's job resolves that issue largely outside of court?

MR. LAVINE: Well, that -- that's if -- if we assume that every notary follows the letter of the law, and that may be

debatable. But I'm not casting aspersions on notaries considering I'm an ex-notary myself. But, I mean, the same logic that concerns you is -- is the same logic that goes into the first section of 2106 where doctors, lawyers, osteopaths, I don't remember if it's podiatrists or not, but there's a few others.

MS. WALSH: Dentists.

MR. LAVINE: And dentists don't have to go have things notarized.

MS. WALSH: Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, ma'am.

MS. WALSH: Thank you. So I -- I guess, you know, what I thought of when I saw this bill was kind of the old saying that if it ain't broke, don't fix it. I don't -- I don't know what's the matter with our current law, the way that it allows notaries to -- we have -- in 2017 there were approximately 291,000 commissioned notary public in -- in New York State. They're not hard to find. Most of them don't even charge for their services. And, you know, what they do is a very important service. They verify the identity of the person coming in front of them, they check their ID, they make sure that the person is who they say they are, and they also can assess whether the person is willing to sign the document. We don't want coerced signatures on documents. We don't want coerced statements. We don't -- we don't want statements that the -- where the affiant clearly doesn't understand what they're signing, and a notary performs a very important role in

trying to figure that out. And I'm appreciative of the fact that other states have a different point of view, but I -- I believe that in New York State I hope that, you know, we -- we prefer not to cut corners in the state of expediency. I think that in this case, the role of the notary is an important one and I think it's one that we should be maintaining.

So for those reasons I'll be opposed to this particular piece of legislation. I would encourage my colleagues to also vote in the negative. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, ma'am.

Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect January 1st.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: A Party vote has been requested.

Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republican Conference is generally opposed for the reasons mentioned by my colleague, but those who support this legislation are certainly encouraged to vote yes here on the floor of the Assembly. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Majority Conference is going to be in favor of this piece of legislation. Perhaps there are some exceptions, but this is a good piece of legislation. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, ma'am.

The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Goodell to explain his vote.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir. I'll be generally opposed for the reasons mentioned by my colleague. I would also mention, though, that we currently provide four exceptions for licensed physicians, dentists, accountants, I think, and lawyers. And the difference between that and opening it up for everyone else is those particular professions have a license that backs up everything they do, and that license ensures that they take these affirmations very seriously. The last thing we want to do is question whether or not an affirmation we get from somebody who might work for one of those others as being coerced or is not otherwise freely given or that there's a question whether or not the person was the person they claim to be.

So I appreciate my colleague and the sponsor's desire to make life easier by eliminating notaries. You know, it's a balancing act for all of us and I come out on that balancing act with the current process that we have. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Goodell in the negative.

Mr. Lavine to explain his vote.

MR. LAVINE: Thanks. Just a few words from the State Bar Association, which supports this measure. *An undue burden falls on unrepresented parties when they need to file a sworn*

*document such as an affidavit in civil actions. This requirement poses a barrier to access to justice for anyone unrepresented and for those who do not have easy access to a notary. In many parts of the -- of the State, especially in the more rural or remote parts of the State, especially outside cities, finding a notary is difficult and presents a huge challenge to those unable to travel or with limited public transportation options.*

Since 1976, Federal law has allowed us to do this. The same affirmation ought to be acceptable from everyone in the United States. I'm voting in the affirmative. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Lavine in the affirmative.

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

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill has passed.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes for the purpose of an announcement.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if you could please call the Ways and Means Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: Ways and Means meeting in the Speaker's Conference Room.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, sir.

Colleagues that are still in the Chambers, we could go to Rules Report No. 171 by Mr. Epstein. And if folks who are on Ways and Means, please make your way there quickly. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: Page 6, Rules Report No. 171, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A06672-A, Rules Report No. 171, Epstein, Burdick, Clark, Colton, Dinowitz, Gallagher, Gibbs, Jackson, Kelles, Magnarelli, Seawright, Simon, Steck, Zinerman, Dickens. An act to amend the Civil Practice Law and Rules, in relation to establishing venue in actions to recover student debt.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Epstein to explain his vote.

MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote. Two years ago we introduced a bill to talk about students who had outstanding loans with the State of New York, and that -- we learned that everyone in the State of New York was being sued in Albany County and we introduced a bill to stop that. And when after we sat down and talked to the Attorney General's Office, they realized that people who are living in Suffolk County who maybe



had some outstanding student debt or were living in Oneonta and had outstanding student debt couldn't always come to Albany to defend their cases. And people who had debt who were getting -- being brought to court, you know, were in a really precarious situation. The Attorney General at the time agreed to change the policy and sue people in the counties that they live in. This is really to codify to ensure that when students who attended SUNY and CUNY had outstanding debt, they are sued in the county where they live to ensure they can defend themselves and ensure they have a right to really for understanding the case itself and can really have insurance of their defenses. And so I would encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this, especially Mr. Reilly -- I apologize, Speaker -- and I encourage everyone to stand with us and support students throughout the State.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: Mr. Epstein in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. If we could now go to page 3 and take up the resolutions.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: Resolutions, page 3, Assembly No. 524, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 524, Mr.

Alvarez.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim June 25, 2023 as El Dia Del Bodeguero in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed? The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 525, Mr. Ramos.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim May 23, 2023 as Taiwan Heritage Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER RIVERA: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed? The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 526, Mr. Cunningham.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim July 23, 2023 as Bubbles and Icees Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed? The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 527, Mr. Conrad.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim May 2023 as Crossing Guard Appreciation Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 528, Mr. Zebrowski.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim June 12, 2023 as Philippine Independence Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 529, Mr. McDonald.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim May 2023 as Neurofibromatosis Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 530, Ms. Jean-Pierre.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor

Kathy Hochul to proclaim May 12, 2023 as Military Spouse Appreciation Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in favor signify -- I'm sorry.

Mr. -- Mr. -- Mr. -- Mr. -- he's arriving.

Mr. Lemondes on the resolution.

MR. LEMONDES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Pause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 531, Mr. Lemondes.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim October 6, 2023 as Coaches Day in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Lemondes on the resolution. On *this* resolution.

MR. LEMONDES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to recognize and pay tribute to the incredible role coaches play in youth development for the furtherance of our society. Not only do they do the things you'd commonly think of, like teaching the mechanics of their individual sports, sportsmanship itself, strategy, the importance of good grades, being a good person, a role model for younger kids, et cetera, but they are also instrumental in keeping kids

occupied positively and, therefore, out of trouble. It is perhaps this role that is paramount to all others. From personal experience, I can attest that I am fortunate to have had the benefit of incredibly dedicated teacher coaches that drove home excellence in everything they did, required adherence to the rules, taught constantly in all aspects of the word *thus*, transcending the role as athletic coach and really helping youth become better, all-around citizens. The wins, the losses, the grueling practices, fighting through injuries and setbacks all contribute to the growth of solid character traits that, again, help make good citizens that know how to function as part of a team, which is the foundational building block of nearly everything else that one does for the rest of their lives.

Last, in special tribute to the coaches I personally had, two of whom were Vietnam War combat veterans, gentlemen, thank you for giving me the discipline necessary to survive the deployments. I could have never imagined their difficulty. The intensity, attention to detail, necessity of hard and constant training, importance of looking beyond your own needs, in recognition of your role on the team were all things I got from your example. Thank you.

I present this resolution in honor of Coaches Buzz White and Jack Williams. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 532, Ms.

Shimsky.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim the month of May 2023 as Williams Syndrome Awareness Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolution is adopted.

Mr. Goodell for the purposes of a introduction.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Speaker. On behalf of Assemblyman Ra, please welcome Mazi Pilip. She is a Nassau County Legislator and an amazing background. She was born in Ethiopia, immigrated to Israel where she was a paratrooper in the Israeli Army before coming here to the United States. Was recently elected in the Nassau County Legislature. A phenomenal person and is doing an incredible job for her community.

Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Goodell, Mr. Ra, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We welcome you into the community of legislators here in New York. We know that you will serve with distinction and do well for your community. Thank you so very much. You have the privileges of the floor. And know that you always are welcome back. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: I believe we do have some housekeeping.

On a motion by Mr. -- Ms. Gallagher, page 17, Calendar No. 176, Bill A.4064, amendments are received and adopted.

On behalf of Ms. Paulin, Bill No. A.3596, Assembly bill recalled from the Senate. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

THE CLERK: An act to amend the Penal Law and the Civil Rights Law.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed the House, the Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

The Clerk will announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is before the House and the amendments are received and adopted.

On behalf of Mr. McGowan, Bill No. A.4793, Assembly bill recalled from the Senate, the Clerk will read the title of the bill.

THE CLERK: An act to amend the Highway Law.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed the House, the Clerk will record the

vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

The Clerk will announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is before the House and the amendments are received and adopted.

We do have a number of fine resolutions, Mrs. Peoples-Stokes, and we will take them up with one vote.

On the resolutions, all those in favor signify by saying aye; opposed, no. The resolutions are adopted.

(Whereupon, Assembly Resolution Nos. 533-545 were unanimously adopted.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: I now move that the Assembly stand adjourned, and that we will reconvene at 10:30 a.m., May the 24th, tomorrow being a Session day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Assembly will reconvene tomorrow at 10:30 a.m. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:57 p.m., the House stood adjourned until Wednesday, May 24th at 10:30 a.m., that being a Session day.)