

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 28, 2026**

**1:13 P.M.**

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The House will  
come to order.

Good afternoon, colleagues.

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 Hunter led visitors and  
members in the Pledge of Allegiance.)

A quorum being present, the Clerk will read the  
Journal of Tuesday, January 27th.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Madam Speaker, I move to dispense with the further reading of the Journal of Tuesday, January the 27th, and that the same stand approved.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Without objection, so ordered.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: I welcome colleagues to the Chambers today and the guests that are with us as well.

I have a quote we like to start out with. This one is from Alice Walker. Most of you probably know her. She's an African American woman, novelist and a short storyteller. Her words for us today: *The most common way people give up their power is by thinking they don't have it.* Again, these words are from the very esteemed Alice Walker.

Madam Speaker, colleagues have on their desk a main Calendar and before you do any housekeeping or introductions, we're going to be calling for the following committees off the floor: Today we're going to start with Ways and Means and immediately follow it with Rules. These committees are going to produce an A-Calendar, of which we will take up today.

After housekeeping and introductions, we will take up debate, Calendar No. 241 by Ms. Paulin. There may be a need for additional floor activity as we proceed, Madam Speaker. If that is the case, we will be happy to advise.

Majority Members should be aware that there will definitely be a need for a conference immediately following our work

on the floor and as always, we will check with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to determine what their needs, if any, may be. That's the general outline of where we're going today.

Madam Speaker, if you could begin by calling the Ways and Means Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, ma'am.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ways and Means Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room. Please make your way to Speaker's Conference Room, Ways and Means Committee members.

We do have a piece of housekeeping.

On a motion by Mr. Dinowitz, page 21, Calendar No. 92, Bill No. 2565, the amendments are received and adopted.

We have no introductions so we're going to go straight into our work.

Members, we're going to be on debate so take your seat, take your conversation outside.

Page 45, Calendar No. 241, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A09217, Calendar No. 241, Paulin, Seawright, Otis, Hevesi, Rosenthal. An act to amend the Penal Law, in relation to excluding certain medication from being deemed unlawful to prescribe or dispense; and to amend the Education Law, in relation to excluding certain medication from being deemed misbranded.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion Ms. Paulin, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced.

An explanation has been requested.

Ms. Paulin.

MS. PAULIN: Thank you, Miss Speaker. The bill would ensure that State law did not prohibit the prescribing or dispensing of Mifepristone, or any drug use for medication abortion, solely because it is no longer approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Walsh.

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

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the sponsor yield?

MS. PAULIN: I would be happy to.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The sponsor yields.

MS. WALSH: Thank you very much. So I guess the first thing I'd like to do is just to walk through the bill -- I appreciate your explanation, but to walk through the bill, the changes that it makes specifically to the Penal Law and to the Education Law and just kind of start from -- start from there if we could.

MS. PAULIN: Sure.

MS. WALSH: So first off, does this bill apply to both Mifepristone and Misoprostol? Am I saying that --

MS. PAULIN: (Cross-talk) I don't know, we need John. (Laughing) So it applies to any drug that is involved with medication abortion that there would be a -- a change in the Federal FDA approval for.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So -- and the reason I ask that is that it looks as though, as I've read accounts of what was going to be studied by the FDA, it was specifically talking about Mifepristone. But this bill is actually a little bit -- a little bit broader in the sense that it covers any medications used to perform a medication abortion, correct?

MS. PAULIN: I believe there's only two, so we just cover both just to ensure, you know, we don't exactly know. It's -- it hasn't been predictable, you know, what is coming out of the administration.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Yeah, I noticed that -- so in the reference I would just give for colleagues, is page 1, line 17 of the bill, it specifically names Mifepristone but then it says, "or any drug used for medication abortion." So that's what this bill is covering, correct?

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Very good. So the -- could you talk a little bit about the portion of this bill that specifically deals with changes to the Penal Law and the Criminal Diversion Act, more specifically --

MS. PAULIN: Right.

MS. WALSH: -- that's in Section 178?

MS. PAULIN: So the first two sections of the bill are really definitions and it's the change in Section 3 that is really the -- the heart of the bill.

MS. WALSH: Okay. And could -- could you -- could you summarize what the -- what that section does?

MS. PAULIN: Sure. So it -- it essentially allows for any existing drug in the same -- in the way we described, that's in on the shelf of the pharmacy already, so it already is there, but it's labeled *for use* because it's currently used for medication abortions. So if it's labeled for that use, it could still be used. You know, once the Federal Government changes it, then the labels would change. And that wouldn't really apply anymore.

MS. WALSH: So if it -- just to -- to recap what you just explained then, the way I understand it is, if -- if Mifepristone is on a pharmacy shelf, or is, you know, is already here ready to be prescribed and the -- the black box warning that's currently on that drug changes in any way, it -- it may still be prescribed without falling prey or -- or subject to the Criminal Diversion Act under the Penal Law, correct?

MS. PAULIN: So we protect our -- our professionals here in New York for the existing drugs that they currently are using.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So as far as -- I was looking at a 2023 press release from the Governor's Office and in it the Governor stated that New York was going to begin stockpiling up to five years of doses of Misopris -- Misoprostol.

MS. PAULIN: It's okay, we can call it some nickname.

MS. WALSH: Yeah. I -- I feel like I need to. But it was going -- so it -- it -- does the bill contemplate that anything that's been stockpiled -- I don't know if that actually happened or not --

MS. PAULIN: I don't know if it happened either.

MS. WALSH: Okay. But if it did happen and we do have some kind of a stockpile of one, or either, or any of those abortion producing medications for medication abortion --

MS. PAULIN: It would apply.

MS. WALSH: -- it would apply to that as well.

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Very good. So the section about the Education Law addresses something different and I'm looking at page 2 of the bill, Section 2. Could you just talk about the -- that portion of the bill, what that does?

MS. PAULIN: Sure. Let me just reread it.

(Pause)

(Cross-talk)

MS. WALSH: All right.

MS. PAULIN: Yeah. That's where I was really talking about --

(Cross-talk) (Indiscernible)

MS. WALSH: -- before.

MS. PAULIN: Yeah.

MS. WALSH: It'd be Section 3 I'm talking about.

MS. PAULIN: Yeah. Section...

MS. WALSH: I apologize, yeah.

MS. PAULIN: So which section? I'm sorry?

MS. WALSH: Section 3 which is -- talks about Section 6815 of the Education Law being amended.

MS. PAULIN: So that's the part of the bill that does essentially say that it's not deemed adulterated or misbranded. So that's really the part that protects, you know, the pharmacist from -- who would be dispensing the -- the drug from being -- you know, from doing anything inappropriate.

MS. WALSH: Like any kind of professional --

MS. PAULIN: Yeah.

MS. WALSH: -- licensure issue --

MS. PAULIN: Exactly.

MS. WALSH: -- or anything like that as a result?

MS. PAULIN: Yeah.

MS. WALSH: Okay. All right. So I -- I mentioned before, but the -- the Mifepristone already has a black box warning currently that talks about that serious and sometimes fatal infections and bleeding occur very rarely, is what the black box currently says, following spontaneous surgical and medical abortions. And it talks about very rarely deaths have been reported in patients who presented without fever, with or without abdominal pain, et cetera. So what -- what do you think -- I mean, the FDA is going to be studying this, we



know from the Health and Human Services Director, RFK Jr., that he -- he's going to take -- he's directed FDA to take a top to bottom review of the efficacy -- safety and efficacy of these drugs. What is the fear -- is there a fear that the FDA is going to come out in -- in a particular way --

MS. PAULIN: So there was --

MS. WALSH: -- because the study wasn't completed or anything right? The --

MS. PAULIN: Well, there -- there was one study that was done by a -- a group that has been labeled anti-choice whose done a study and that study's been refuted by, I'm going to say, legitimate scientists, Kaiser Foundation, as being, you know, a study that doesn't really follow scientific protocol. And so the concern is that that study is being used to -- and was cited as the basis for a continued review. So we don't know if there's going to be a real review, whether or not the FDA's going to look at real scientific studies, or not. The concern is not that. If they do that, we feel confident that just like all the other studies that have been done, it's going to show that it's less than one percent have serious impact. Unlike a drug like a Viagra, which also has the same kind of black box, which has a two percent serious rate. In fact, Viagra has -- can cause dangerous drops in blood pressure, sudden rare or serious reduction or loss of vision or hearing, heart attacks and strokes and you know, for the sake of this group, I'm not going to say what else it could cause because it might be embarrassing. So -- so I think that it's very common to have those

kinds of warnings on medications that are, you know, behind the counter dispensed. And I would argue, because I have another bill that does this, you know, that -- that -- the -- the safety measures and the -- and the use over time, it's -- it's -- it's, you know, Mifepristone is used in 100 countries. It's -- medication abortion is used in 100 countries, safely and affectively with such few instances of seriousness that, you know, so if those are the studies that are done, and I would say that a broader evidence is the fact that so many women have used it over time, then I would feel very confident. But I fear, having looked at the one study, which has been, again, debunked by many scientists, that -- that's what is the basis. We have -- we have to do this.

MS. WALSH: So that -- but that -- and I think you're referring to the Ethics and Public Policy Center study that looked at 865,000 cases between 2017 and 2023 and reported nearly 11% saw complications like sepsis, hemorrhaging, infection and ER visits and -- which would be 22 times higher than the current FDA label, which says .05% of complications. That study, which was not an FDA study though, correct?

MS. PAULIN: That was correct. It wasn't in -- all studies are really done by the FDA. Their -- the FDA looks at clinically-appropriate studies. So they could look at that one, but it wasn't sponsored or asked for by them.

MS. WALSH: That's right. So in RFK Jr.'s letter to senators, there were 22 senators from Republican states who were

asking for this review of these abortion medication drugs. Back in September of 2025, he stated that FDA's own data -- own data collected between 2000 to 2012, indicating 2,740 adverse events, including 416 events involving blood loss requiring transfusion. That appears to be distinct and different from that Ethics and Public Policy Center study that I know -- and I know you mentioned it in your memorandum of support of this legislation, saying that that was considered to be, you know, an unreliable or -- or --

MS. PAULIN: No, no, no. I'm not suggesting that --

MS. WALSH: Maybe not unreliable. I don't know what -- what adjective you'd want to use, but not -- not in line with other studies that have shown that since Mifepristone has been approved for this use in 2000 to the present time, it's -- that this -- that it's an outlier in terms of research.

MS. PAULIN: I think that all drugs, you know, that they keep a record on adverse effects so that they know whether or not to pull them. Absolutely.

MS. WALSH: Yeah.

MS. PAULIN: The data that they're citing, though and that they've cited, should, you know, aren't that serious comparative to other drugs. Again, like a Viagra, where the seriousness and the level of reporting is even higher, but yet we don't see that drug being pulled from the market or being reevaluated. So I do think that there's a political concern, you know, with -- or, you know, a legitimate concern here that we just want to make sure that

whatever we have, no one is being jeopardized by sending it out because it has been safe and effective.

MS. WALSH: So -- and also two other states have essentially done very similar legislation --

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MS. WALSH: -- to what this is proposing, right? California and Illinois, correct?

MS. PAULIN: Yes. I believe so, there might even be a third. I'm looking.

(Pause)

MS. WALSH: Those are the two that I was looking --

MS. PAULIN: Yeah. I, you know, I -- yeah. In this pile I have it so I'll look as I'm -- we're talking.

MS. WALSH: Yup. Yup. Okay. Well, I guess the last thing I kind of wanted to touch on was the fact that this legislation contemplates that moving forward, as long as the WHO, the World Health Organization, in its clinical guidance says that this is -- these medications are safe to prescribe, regardless of what the FDA may or may not say and that -- that we're going to just adopt what the WHO is saying.

MS. PAULIN: Similar to what we did in the Insurance Law, you know, for the same -- same drug, I think two years ago. So I -- I -- yeah. So that is the -- this is what the end -- what we're anticipating.

MS. WALSH: Okay.

MS. PAULIN: And you were right, California and Illinois and not a third one.

MS. WALSH: Okay.

MS. PAULIN: Yeah.

MS. WALSH: Do -- do we do that for -- have we done that for any other medication that you're aware of where we've --

MS. PAULIN: No. Not in New York State law.

MS. WALSH: Okay.

MS. PAULIN: Not that I'm aware.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Just -- just these drugs.

MS. PAULIN: Just this for reasons that I think we all know.

MS. WALSH: Yeah. Okay. Well, thank you very much for answering my questions.

Madam Speaker, I'll go on the bill and I do notice that I'm running short on my first 15 minutes and so I'm going to anticipate and say that I'm going to need a little bit longer than that to wrap up and I'd like to exercise my second 15 when the time is right.

(Pause)

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: One moment, Ms. Walsh.

Mr. Fall for an announcement.

MR. FALL: Yes, Madam Speaker. Would you please call the Rules Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you. Rules Committee Members to the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room.

Ms. Walsh, on --

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So I'll -- I will at this point go on the bill. Thank you.

So my colleagues, so this -- this bill today is interesting in the sense that we -- we don't do this for any other medication that I'm aware of, where we're basically saying that we're concerned that the FDA -- that -- will -- will study these abortion medication drugs and will somehow adversely affect our current method in New York of prescribing them either directly to a patient, or through mail or telehealth and all of the different ways that we allow these abortion medications to be distributed in New York currently.

So I -- I thought it would be interesting to just take a look at what's happened in New York State just since I've been elected. So in 20 -- in 2019, we had the Reproductive Health Act, allowing abortions after 24 weeks. Then in 2019, we had an expansion of providers that authorized nurse practitioners, PAs and midwives to perform abortions. In 2019, we also had the Comprehensive Contraception Coverage Act, mandated insurance coverage for contraception. In 2022 and 2023, we've had shield laws implemented, legal protections for providers and patients traveling to New York for abortion care and last year, we had a bill that passed

and is law now, shielding -- a shield law allowing for the prescriber name and address to be removed from labels.

So, it's been noted that in -- in the research that I've done that starting around 2023, even if you look nationwide, during -- during the Biden Administration there was an expansion to allowing more telehealth and more mail order prescriptions -- or not mail order prescriptions, but prescriptions sent by mail for abortion care. And perhaps because of that expansion, there were, as I mentioned prior, there were 22 senators that wrote a letter of concern to the HHS Director, Robert F. Kennedy Jr., asking for these abortion drugs to be reviewed, specifically Mifepristone, which is one part of the two part cocktail that results in abortion the way that it's, you know, it's dispensed, generally speaking. So that -- it did cite I believe that the senators did raise this research that I mentioned before, this Ethics and Public Policy Center study. I think that that study may have provided more of a -- I would describe it as more of a catalyst for asking for the examination into the efficacy and safety of these medications. But also in RFK Jr.'s letter of response to the senators, he states that the FDA's own data collected showed that between 20 -- 2000 to 2012, there were 2,740 adverse events, including 416 events involving blood loss requiring transfusions. So even if we say, as the sponsor I believe is saying, that the Ethics and Public Policy Center study is not to be completely credited because it's -- it's maybe over-amplifying the number of complications. Even if we think that it's greater than the .05% that's currently on the black box warning for this medication, I

would argue that there's nothing wrong with taking a look at what the data actually shows and doing a study, and that study has not been completed. We don't know what the study is going to say. I mean, I will -- I'll admit that sometimes it's exciting to hear what the HHS Director is saying, right. I mean he's coming out with statements about additives and -- and dyes and stuff in food, or the use of sugar, or the use of alcohol and some things that we would have general, you know, maybe agreement, maybe even an appreciation that he's taking the lead in talking about some of these things. But there is an uncertainty in knowing what this report and what this study is going to show, but I would just say that until we know what it shows, until we know what the recommendation would be, that it would be possibly changing the warning, which is I think what he stated -- RFK stated in his letter. He said maybe that there would a change in the black box warning that already exists on the Mifepristone. But regardless, we don't know what the study's going to show. I think we're kind of putting the cart before the horse here. I think this is -- we're engaging in a little bit of hypothetical FDA rescission, you know, hypothesis here of what's -- what FDA's going to come out with. And I think that until we do know what FDA is going to say, I think that we're kind of premature on this and I would -- I would say that we should probably -- it would be wiser to wait. Because if we're going to act now and say, maybe if, but if, I -- I just don't think that that's a great way to legislate. So I -- I can appreciate the -- the sponsor bringing this forward.



The other thing I'll say is that, using the World Health Organization's insight and clinical guidance over our own FDA just doesn't seem right to me. We don't do it for anything else, why are we doing it here?

So for all those reasons and some that I imagine will be mentioned by other colleagues, I'm planning on voting no on this piece of legislation and I would encourage my colleagues to also vote no. Thank you so much, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Durso.

MR. DURSO: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the sponsor yield for some questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the sponsor yield?

MS. PAULIN: Yes, I would. Of course.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The sponsor yields.

MR. DURSO: Thank you, Ms. Paulin. So just to continue what my colleague was saying, so -- and -- and I apologize. We may go into some of the same questions. What is the -- this is -- currently this bill would change the Penal Law and Education Law, correct? In regards to just this one specific medication.

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MR. DURSO: What -- what's the penalty now? In other words, as far as Education Law and Penal Law, if someone was to prescribe a medication that's not FDA approved now in New York

State?

MS. PAULIN: The penalty now. I'm going to turn to staff.

(Conferring)

So, if you commit -- there's different levels like there are, you know, right. So the -- if you commit a criminal diversion -- if -- if you -- if it -- let me state -- restate that. So if it's in the fourth degree, or committing a crime in the Criminal Diversion Act, it's a misdemeanor A. Third degree, which is commits the crime of diversion -- of criminal diversion and prescriptions in the fourth and has previously been convicted, so in other words, repeat offender, then it's an E felony --

MR. DURSO: So it starts and I'm -- I --

MS. PAULIN: Yes. It starts as a misdemeanor A, but --

MR. DURSO: -- don't make you go through the whole thing.

MS. PAULIN: -- that's still something that you don't want to necessarily have on a record of a pharmacist or a, you know, or a --

MR. DURSO: Doctor or --

MS. PAULIN: -- you know, doctor --

MR. DURSO: Sure.

MS. PAULIN: -- who is prescribing this kind of --

MR. DURSO: So it starts at misdemeanor, right and

then obviously --

MS. PAULIN: Yeah.

MR. DURSO: -- goes up to depending upon --

MS. PAULIN: It goes up to a C felony.

MR. DURSO: Right. So now, obviously that just changed New York State law, but Federal law still comes into effect, correct, when it comes to --

MS. PAULIN: Wait, these are State laws that are regulate --

MR. DURSO: Right.

MS. PAULIN: -- this type of thing. I don't think that there's Federal laws that are -- are used for the distribution of drugs.

MR. DURSO: Right, but the State is allowed to make its own laws --

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MR. DURSO: -- from -- from my understanding, right? But when it comes to the FDA and again, I'm -- I'm not 100 percent sure, but my understanding was that you can make stricter laws when it comes to the FDA, but not less strict.

MS. PAULIN: Well, that's why we're just saying for the existing drugs as opposed to going forward.

MR. DURSO: Okay. So -- and -- and I know my colleague had asked this; are there any other prescription drugs that's not FDA approved that New York State approves?

MS. PAULIN: Um, no. Um --

MR. DURSO: Or do we do this for any other prescription medications?

MS. PAULIN: But, you know, I would -- I would wonder if one of my male colleagues, if they decided to reevaluate Viagra, which by the way, has five -- ten times the number of serious adverse outcomes, you know, like death, for example, compared to Mifepristone, you know, and twice as many serious, you know, injuries that I might see a bill of that sort, because I think it is widely used. Also, widely used for telehealth.

MR. DURSO: I'm going to have to take your word for it. I'm not sure.

MS. PAULIN: Okay.

MR. DURSO: But -- so -- but -- but -- so what you're saying is that, that drug, something like Viagra, has been proven that there are worse side effects to it, correct, than --

MS. PAULIN: Than Mifepristone, and -- and is almost entirely prescribed by telehealth.

MR. DURSO: So why are we not banning Viagra right now?

MS. PAULIN: Well, they haven't threatened, you know, the -- they haven't said they're going to reevaluate that. So there's no concern on the part --

MR. DURSO: But -- but --

MS. PAULIN: -- there's no bills that I've seen.

MR. DURSO: No, I understand. But I'm saying that

you're saying that Viagra has numerous amounts of -- of issues with it, right, that could cause so many more issues for men. Correct?

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MR. DURSO: So if we -- who is -- who makes that statement? Who has done that study?

MS. PAULIN: The -- well, the FDA would look at the study --

MR. DURSO: Shouldn't New York lead the way then and ban Viagra right now? If we know it's that much worse --

MS. PAULIN: We -- we -- we don't have the authority to ban a drug that's approved by the FDA.

MR. DURSO: We -- we actually do. We -- we're allowed to, as a State, make things stricter, not take away. That's Federal law. So why aren't we banning a drug that you're saying is much worse for us, than a drug that we're going to allow?

MS. PAULIN: I'll think about it.

MR. DURSO: All right. It doesn't bother me personally, but I was just -- I just tried to use it as an example.

MS. PAULIN: Yeah.

MR. DURSO: But -- but that being said, and -- and that's really my point is -- okay. So, the FDA and listen, we -- we can say it without saying it, we understand the -- the reasoning behind this, a -- a -- a bill like this coming forward. But what if tomorrow the FDA was to say -- or -- or excuse me, the World Health Organization, was to say that a particular drug is bad, right? A prescription is bad.

Are we going to follow them on that and ban it also? Because --

MS. PAULIN: I guess, you know what, everything is an individual bill, an individual legislator and if something -- if something is going on like that, I guess we would think about it, yeah.

MR. DURSO: Well, I mean, some -- like a drug like Hydroxychloroquine, right, which obviously we used a lot during COVID, right, for those who have had COVID-19. The World Health Organization says it's in -- in their suggestion, would be that it's not allowed, that it wouldn't be FDA approved. And I -- I mean, I've taken it, I know plenty of people that have, but it's also used for other things like Lupus, Rheumatoid Arthritis, suppressing overactive immune systems, which cause other issues. So the World Health Organization saying that's bad, we have no problem allowing people to take that in New York State, so why are we just particularly doing -- I understand the political, you know, end of this, right? So don't get me wrong. I'm not -- I'm not silly in that way. I -- I get it. But I think that it's a -- it sets a dangerous precedent when we're telling the FDA, *we're not going to listen to you on this, we're going to listen to the WHO on this*, but not on other things and one that you've stated three times, being Viagra, being apparently extremely dangerous and I thank you for that -- that -- letting me know that. But we're not banning that, just like I'm sure the WHO and the FDA tell you that smoking is bad. No one here has a bill to outlaw cigarettes --

MS. PAULIN: We have some bills like that.

MR. DURSO: -- right. Alcohol -- well, what I'm

saying is and I -- and I get it and I understand. I'm just saying consistency wise, right?

MS. PAULIN: You know what, I -- I think we know

--

MR. DURSO: Millions of people die from lung cancer everyday. We're not sitting here banning tobacco. Why -- why not? Why just this one thing, which I get is political and I understand it, I'm just pointing out the inconsistency with it. And I understand and I -- and I sympathize with this specific thing, but it's just the inconsistency and I feel like it opened up a dangerous door. So with that being said, it is still going to be if -- if -- cause it's not even that the FDA has done this yet, right, we're just doing it preemptively. So if they do it and New York says -- State says, *the hell with the FDA, we're going to do what we want*, what then happens to those that are transporting and if we don't have this imaginary stockpile already, right? Like I -- I have -- I have a CDL. If I'm driving from let's say Pennsylvania or wherever they do -- they produce it and make it and they drive across state lines to deliver it, is New York State going to indemnify those people?

MS. PAULIN: So the -- the minute the FDA would change the label, then the manufacturers would change the label. So it's really anything that's currently outside of the manufacturers' hands

--

MR. DURSO: Okay.

MS. PAULIN: -- that we're -- we're talking about.

So it's limited. I -- you know, again, I don't know what New York did after the Governor had pronounced that we were going to stockpile. I don't know if we did or not. But there are, we know, existing Mifepristone on shelves in pharmacists [sic], that we just want to be able to say, *you can use that. The label says you can use it and you're not in harm's way if you dispense it.*

MR. DURSO: But so -- right. So it's really protecting the -- the dis -- dispensers, correct? I mean, it's -- it's not --

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MR. DURSO: -- it's not about protecting the people that take it, regardless what side you -- you -- you feel on that, right? I'm more concerned about the -- changing the Penal Law and the Education Law and also protecting those, and I agree with you, those that -- that are dispensing it. But we're protecting the people that are dispensing it, not the people that are taking it. So -- or those delivering it. Or -- so can the Federal Government then go after those that are delivering it across state lines, or is it just for prescribing it? I'm just -- and I'm trying to understand it because I really don't know.

MS. PAULIN: Okay. So I guess I'm just going to try to repeat the circumstance so I can --

MR. DURSO: I'm sorry.

MS. PAULIN: -- understand that I'm reacting to the right thing, right? So you're saying it's already been manufactured, so it already has the old label on it --

MR. DURSO: Sure.



MS. PAULIN: -- and somebody's bringing it across State lines --

MR. DURSO: Okay. Yup.

MS. PAULIN: -- to deliver to a person or -- or --

MR. DURSO: No, no. To -- to a, let's say a pharmacy. Let's say a -- a pharmacy that delivers, right? My pharmacy that -- that I -- in Massapequa Park delivers, right? It -- it allows the -- no. This bill would allow the protections for those that are filling it, prescribing it, right? But can the FDA and I'm -- I'm asking because I don't know --

MS. PAULIN: No, I get it.

MR. DURSO: -- and I'm -- I'm being serious.

MS. PAULIN: So I would say that from what I understand you're saying, that it would then protect any drug, or any dispenser, who even obtained a drug. So say there was a -- a truck coming to deliver, right --

MR. DURSO: Right.

MS. PAULIN: -- as -- as the FDA was making their pronouncement. So there's still existing drugs on some truck that is driving from Pennsylvania to New York to go to Spencer Pharmacy in my district --

MR. DURSO: Wherever, right.

MS. PAULIN: -- and they were receiving it unstbeknown [sic] that the FDA was about to make a label change, those would, in my view, be okay.

MR. DURSO: Okay. No, no, no, that's fine. I -- I appreciate that. So my last two questions and I apologize and I probably lost them. So that may be my last question. I apologize.

(Pause)

Nope. That will be it, Ms. Paulin. Thank you for your time.

MS. PAULIN: Thank you so much.

MR. DURSO: I appreciate it.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Smullen.

MR. SMULLEN: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Would the sponsor yield for some questions, please?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the sponsor yield?

MS. PAULIN: Happy to.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The sponsor yields.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, thank you. I just -- I just wanted to go over some of the constitutional provisions of this. Is this bill constitutional in your mind?

MS. PAULIN: As far as I know, yes.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, with that being the State Constitution, but is it also with the U.S. Constitution?

MS. PAULIN: I'm unaware of any provision in the -- in the U.S. Constitution that would preclude us from doing this.

MR. SMULLEN: And is there anything at the -- above the U.S. Constitution that would apply here from a sovereignty standpoint?

MS. PAULIN: Not that I'm aware.

MR. SMULLEN: Okay. So I just -- I just wanted to go back to a -- a previous line of questioning about the World Health Organization. Could you tell me who is the leader of the World Health Organization?

MS. PAULIN: I -- I can't without googling it.

MR. SMULLEN: Sure. It's Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus and he's from Ethiopia. He's the former Ethiopian Minister of Health, former Ethiopian Foreign Minister and he's been heading that organization since 2017. So what I wanted to -- what I wanted to ask you specifically is, if New York State is going to not follow FDA regulations in this case, regulations that are codified under U.S. law, why are we going to follow World Health Organization regulations from someone who is not elected by U.S. citizens?

MS. PAULIN: So I would say that what this bill is about is protecting those who are dispensing the same drugs they dispensed yesterday to be able to dispense them tomorrow. If, as one of our colleagues stated, that it's merely a label change, then they'll still be able to dispense them. But if we think, perhaps, that there's going to be added rems, you know, that -- that's also one of the things that might have -- could happen. And -- and make it very difficult

for -- for medication abortion to be used in New York State, then this bill protects that. So I -- I -- I, as a, you know -- you know, there was a lot of reference to other drugs that could be brought up by the FDA and there are. There always are. But I believe, as I think almost everyone here, regardless of your support or lack of support for choice, that Mifepristone is being targeted because of what its use is for. And -- and because of that and as a -- a woman who, I believe -- I'm -- women are being targeted because of what -- because of -- the -- they've -- and as abortion has always been targeted. I -- I believe strongly that this is merely to protect our professionals and to allow for something that has been safely used -- and by the way, it -- abortions in New York State primarily are -- yes, telehealth, but also primarily medication abortion. So we're telling women, you have to go back and you can only then have a -- you know, procedures that are more complicated. I -- I just don't want to go there, you know? I don't think that's fair or right. And I want to be able to protect the right of women to have medication abortion in New York because it's -- obviously, if in 100 countries and throughout the entire United States we've been using it for a long time and so many women are dependent on it, that this is merely a bill to protect their interest.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, certainly -- could you actually answer the question as to how many medication abortions happen in New York each year?

MS. PAULIN: I don't think I have that data. But I am going to call on all my helpers out in the world to maybe text me

and I'll look at my texts. But I -- I don't know that number.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, I mean, certainly it's a -- it's a deadly chemical, that's for sure. And the FDA has clear regulatory authority to regulate that chemical according to U.S. law, wouldn't you agree?

MS. PAULIN: Yes. That's -- I mean, the FDA has authority to regulate all drugs.

MR. SMULLEN: And -- and who's the head of the FDA currently?

MS. PAULIN: (Laughing). Um...

MR. SMULLEN: Is it a -- is it a U.S. medical doctor? Or is it a -- a PhD from Ethiopia?

MS. PAULIN: No. I understand what you're saying, but there's a lot of doctors with a lot of different perspectives.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, it's Marty Makary. He is trained from Johns Hopkins. He's a very proficient doctor and he's been appointed and -- and confirmed by the U.S. Senate to that role, to do, actually, to do this very thing for thing United States people. That's -- that's his job. That's what he's appointed to do in this administration.

So let's go back to the WHO. And you -- you -- you cite this in your sponsor's memo, that we're going to follow WHO protocols in this case. Is that -- is that true?

MS. PAULIN: Yes. But we're also suggesting by the way the bill is worded, that it's only for the existing drugs that are

currently out there that --

MR. SMULLEN: Yeah. But this -- this matters for this drug. And the reason is, is I ask you about the constitutionality of this, did you know that the United States has withdrawn from the World Health Organization?

MS. PAULIN: I -- I would imagine that, you know, we're going to see a lot of things that are upsetting over the next three years.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, let me -- let me just read something and this is a fact sheet from the U.S. Government: On January 20, 2025, President Trump signed Executive Order 14155, formerly initiating United States withdrawal from the World Health Organization. This decision was driven by profound failures in the WHO's handling of the COVID-19 Pandemic, originating in Wuhan, China. Its persistent refusal to implement necessary reforms, its lack of accountability, transparent independence and fulfillment of this directive and following the required one year notice period, the United States Government has formerly exit -- existed from the WHO on January 22, 2019. So one week ago, we are formerly no longer a member of the WHO because of the issues that the United States has had with that organization. Yet, here we are, in New York State, saying we're going to follow WHO things from -- from someone who's a head of an organization, who's not even a doctor and we're going to actually not do what our own FDA says. To me, that doesn't seem reasonable, but nor does it seem constitutional.

Do you know what the legal treaty requirements are for the United Nations agreements which the WHO is -- is actually part of?

MS. PAULIN: No, I don't.

MR. SMULLEN: So I'm -- I'm -- I'm here to say and make sure that everyone knows that I think this is unconstitutional. That we can't pass a bill in New York State saying we're going to rely on a super national -- international organization for technical advice on something that's already regulated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services --

MS. PAULIN: We -- we already have in New York done exactly the same thing in our Insurance Law.

MR. SMULLEN: What -- well, what is -- what in New York State, then, in -- who is New York State is going to sign off on this bill to say --

MS. PAULIN: No one's challenged --

MR. SMULLEN: -- that this is legal?

MS. PAULIN: -- those two provisions, you know, constitutionally or otherwise. So why would this provision be different if it's identical to the ones we've already adopted?

MR. SMULLEN: Well, it's because of politics and it's because we're passing a law, a preemptive law, for something that doesn't even exist on hypothetical. And I find that to be totally undramatic in so many ways.

Madam Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MS. PAULIN: I have the number, by the way, of abortions, if you want that before you --

MR. SMULLEN: Oh, what -- what? Yes. So -- so how many --

MS. PAULIN: Yes.

MR. SMULLEN: -- abortions were conducted in New York State by this medication cocktail?

MS. PAULIN: So. So there were 60 -- approximately 68,000 as of 2022, which is the last time we have that kind of data. Abortions, generally, 68,000 and about -- more than 60% were medication abortion.

MR. SMULLEN: So that's a -- that's a lot. That's a very toxic, very deadly chemical, wouldn't you say?

MS. PAULIN: I think there's -- you know, we want to give women choices, and the other choice might be one that a woman would not choose. We don't -- I don't believe that it's going to lessen the number of abortions. All it would do is steer women to a surgical abortion.

MR. SMULLEN: Well, thank you.

Madam Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. SMULLEN: What -- what we've got here is a very clear case of putting the cart before the horse. We've got a preemptive bill for something that doesn't even exist about an FDA



procedure that hasn't even been completed. And we know that this is a deadly chemical in all -- in all aspects. It's certainly dead -- it's certainly deadly for -- for the abortion that happens because of the chemical. And I think it's up to the FDA to decide, not the United Nations, not the World Health Organization, about what is safe and what isn't safe under U.S. law.

So I'm sticking with HHS and with the FDA and saying that what they do and what they say matters in the United States, that the sovereignty of the United States is very important and this bill we should vote against it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: A Party vote has been requested.

Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Minority Conference will, generally speaking, be in the negative on this piece of legislation. If there are members who wish to vote yes, they may do so now at their seats. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Majority Conference will be in the affirmative on this piece of legislation. For those that would like to vote in a different direction,

they can do so at their desk.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. DiPietro to explain his vote.

MR. DIPIETRO: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A couple of things on this bill. The sponsor made a comment that women are targeted, but I'm trying to figure that out because they're targeted from the Left when you're talking about men in women sports. That's totally targeting women. When you're talking about different issues, there's a lot of targeting of women. I don't think this one does because New York State is the number one abortion capital of the entire world. We have post-birth abortion now. I mean, how far does it have to go? You know, you've got -- feral cats are more protected than the baby in the womb. Horseshoe crabs are more protected. You know, sorry, but this bill bows to the alter of full term and post-birth baby killers, because that's what I call them, because I'm pro-life. And they believe abortion -- in New York State, it never goes far enough. How much farther do we have to go in New York State for abortion? How much farther do we have to go? Do we have to have the -- three days afterwards? This bill, without even knowing what the FDA is going to say, tries to preempt it, to prevent women's abortion. Makes no sense. I didn't see -- I didn't hear any cognitive argument supporting -- supporting this bill. It couldn't have been done until after the -- we get the report from the FDA. But this is what we

have in New York State.

I'll be voting no and I encourage all of my colleagues to vote no, also. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. DiPietro in the negative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Page 5 -- oh, excuse me.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, the members have on their desk the A-Calendar. I now move to advance the A-Calendar.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Mr. Fall, the A-Calendar is advanced.

Page 5, Rules Report No. 71, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A09516, Rules Report No. 71, Dilan. An act to amend the Correction Law and the Executive Law, in relation to the disclosure of video footage and audio recordings related to the death of an incarcerated individual involving certain correction officers or peace officers (Part A); to amend the Correction Law, in relation to establishing comprehensive camera coverage for covered facilities and covered vehicles; and to repeal certain provisions of the Correction Law relating to requiring institutions and local correctional facilities to adhere to certain camera footage, recording and investigation standards (Part B); to amend the

Correction Law, in relation to next of kin notifications where the death of an incarcerated individual occurs (Part C); to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2025 directing the State Commission of Correction to conduct a comprehensive study on deaths in state correctional facilities within New York State, as proposed in Legislative Bills numbers S08415 and A08871, in relation to the time within which the State Commission of Correction shall issue a report of the findings of such study (Part D); to amend the County Law, in relation to providing access to microscopic slides upon request for certain autopsies (Part E); intentionally omitted (Part F); to amend the Correction Law, in relation to data on substantiated, unfounded, and unsubstantiated allegations received by the Office of Special Investigations (Part G); to amend the Correction Law, in relation to membership of the State of the State Commission of Correction; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2025 amending the Correction Law relating to the membership of the State Commission of Correction, as proposed in Legislative Bill Numbers S08415 and A08871, in relation to the effectiveness thereof (Part H); to amend the Correction Law, in relation to correctional facility visits by the Correctional Association (Part I); and to amend the Civil Practice Law and Rules, the General Municipal Law and the Court of Claims Act, in relation to the tolling of Statute of Limitations for individuals in state custody; to amend Part J of a chapter of the Laws of 2025 amending the Civil Practice Law and Rules, the General Municipal Law and the Court of Claims Act relating to the tolling of Statute of Limitations for individuals in

state custody, as proposed in Legislative Bill numbers S08415 and A08871, in relation to the effectiveness thereof; and to repeal certain provisions of the General Municipal Law relating thereto (Part J).

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: An explanation has been requested.

Mr. Dilan.

MR. DILAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The bill enacts chapter amendments to the Corrections omnibus package that we passed last year.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. DiPietro.

MR. DIPIETRO: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the sponsor yield?

MR. DILAN: Absolutely, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The sponsor yields.

MR. DIPIETRO: Thank you, Mr. Dilan. Let's start with Part A. One of the -- the second chapter amendment requires a reasonable good faith effort to get the footage -- going to 72 hours additional footage within 24 hours. What is the time frame now? I understand it is -- they try to get that within 24, or is it not -- is it -- sometimes it's tough to get the 24 hours. But is this going to be a mandate that it has to be, or is it -- can you explain that a little bit?

MR. DILAN: So under the chapter amendment, footage must be disclosed to the Office of Special Investigations

within 72 hours under the chapter amendment of such death. And then post the 72 hours initially, if any additional information is found, then that additional information would have to be turned over within 24 hours.

MR. DIPIETRO: Okay. Is there --

MR. DILAN: Twenty-four hours, correct.

MR. DIPIETRO: Was that -- that's 72 hours. From what I understand, there -- there -- that's pretty standard. Has there been instances where there -- where for some reason it hasn't been? I'm sure there are, but is it -- has it been a problem?

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: Yeah. So not that we're aware of, but we -- we -- in the negotiations, because it's going to be more cameras coming online in the future, they wanted to give a cushion in light that the -- in -- in the near future that there will be too much footage available and give them an adequate amount of time to conduct a thorough view of the footage.

MR. DIPIETRO: Understood. On the next page, on the -- on the amendments, it says: An addition requires camera coverage of any vehicle used to transport incarcerated individuals. Is this -- are those in-car cameras, first off? Or are those cameras that look in the parking lot and follow them?

MR. DILAN: So when you say "next page", I'm assuming Part B? You're on to Part B now; is that correct?

MR. DIPIETRO: Yes. Yes.

MR. DILAN: Okay. So it's -- it's in -- in-car cameras, being that there will be, or currently is fixed and body-worn cameras inside of -- - of facilities. The obvious blind spot would be inside of vehicles while incarcerated individuals were being transported. That is something that is new to the bill that I believe made the -- the bill better and that was asked for by the Executive and we thought it was reasonable to add.

MR. DIPIETRO: So then those cameras would be on from the moment someone gets in the car, the entire trip to and from wherever they're going, those cameras would be on?

MR. DILAN: That is -- that's correct.

MR. DIPIETRO: Okay. And the footage then would be able to be retrieved, okay. On Part D --

MR. DILAN: And to answer the last part of your question, it does not include parking lot.

MR. DIPIETRO: Does not, okay. Part D has a -- to conduct a comprehensive study of ten years in-custody death reports recommendations?

MR. DILAN: Which -- which part? Part --

MR. DIPIETRO: Part D.

MR. DILAN: Part D?

MR. DIPIETRO: Yes. That's -- and then the -- it -- it -- it reports admission deadline from one year to 18 months. Has that been a -- a problem?

MR. DILAN: No. And just -- and -- and in part of

seeking a three-way agreement, the Executive had asked for the additional time. We thought it was reasonable to grant the additional time.

MR. DIPIETRO: Okay. Just wanted to clarify that.

Can we go down to Part H? Three members, Part H, says: The chapter amendment decreases the number from 9 to 5. Well, two -- two-part questions: First off, it says, was there any -- it says: Formerly incarcerated person, these are people on the membership, a public health professional, a behavior healthcare professional and an attorney with a background. Was any thought given to being to put on that committee a corrections officer or a warden or a law enforcement individual from DOCCS? Something of that nature, because I see there's nobody on there that has that experience.

MR. DILAN: So -- so as it stands now, as we discussed in Committee, it doesn't preclude the Governor from making any of -- any of the individuals who holds the titles that you cited, a member of the board. What we found is that, historically, incarcerated individuals have been excluded from SCOC and to add their voice to -- to this panel, we thought was valuable. The previous past Chair - I believe this past Chair resigned, I believe - has been a -- a county sheriff and there's been numerous heads of law enforcement that have been appointed by governors either to be a member of or to lead this panel, but we've never had the voices that we are adding to this bill be a -- a -- a member of this panel and I think it's a good step



forward.

MR. DIPIETRO: Gotcha. The second part to that question is, again, it's a -- this is another bill appointed by the Governor and with the consent of the Senate, it's going to be all Democrats again. Is there any way that a Republican can get put on that? Again, this is a --

MR. DILAN: Well, in -- in my view, this part is nonpartisan. I think the bill we passed last year did have appointments from the Legislature. That part in the discussions that were done to reach a three-way agreement were found to be unconstitutional. So the -- the appointments will remain with the Executive. Now it says Governor. It doesn't say Democratic Governor or Republican Governor. So to the extent that the governorship changes, then, you know, either a Democratic governor or a Republican governor would be responsible for making these appointments.

MR. DIPIETRO: Gotcha. I just wanted to clarify that.

MR. DILAN: Mm-hmm.

MR. DIPIETRO: And that's a -- and on Part J, you've -- you've provided an additional two-year window. Just explain that, because you moved the three year statute of limitations, provides an additional two-year window. Can you explain -- just explain that in general for us?

MR. DILAN: Yeah. That -- I -- I -- I want to make

sure that this part, you know, as being a non-attorney, I -- I get correct, so I'll lean on the attorneys around me. So the way -- the way I see it is normal law and normal statutes will apply. And they will expire as -- as they normally would whether you were incarcerated or -- or not incarcerated. I think the -- the difference here is post-incarceration, if those statutes have already expired post-incarceration, an incarcerated individual would get the benefit of a two year look-back to -- to start this case if that statute has already expired because they were under incarceration.

MR. DIPIETRO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dilan. No further questions. That -- that's my attorney speak. No further questions.

On the bill, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. DIPIETRO: On the bill. There's a -- there's a lot of merit in this bill but there are some things that are a concern. There are some things that I just -- I'm going to let my other colleagues expound on. We do have a few issues with this. And a lot of it is a -- is a redundancy. So I'm going to be voting no on this bill and urging my colleagues, but I know that there are some other questions that need to be answered. So thank you very much and I appreciate the speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Gandolfo.

MR. GANDOLFO: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Would the sponsor please yield for some questions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the sponsor yield?

MR. DILAN: Absolutely. It feels like a --

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The sponsor yields.

MR. DILAN: -- a moment between the three of us.

So --

MR. GANDOLFO: Well, thank you. So I have a few questions on the chapter amendment. And I'm going to focus in on Part I, specifically the provision providing for a hotline for those incarcerated in prisons to call the Corrections Association of New York.

So I know the original bill provided for a hotline and the chapter amendment actually removes language that allowed the incarcerated to e-mail the Corrections Association. Is there a reason why the ability to e-mail was removed from the language?

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: So, what -- what I'm told is that incarcerated individuals at the moment, if they were to send an e-mail of this nature to CANY, those e-mails would not be confidential --

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay.

MR. DILAN: -- so that's why it's being done in this manner.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. And the chapter amendment also specifies that CANY is the one that sets up and runs

the hotline. Was that the original intention of the bill and is this just a clarification?

MR. DILAN: Yes.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. Thank you. And now, the language in the chapter amendment also adds that the department shall not track or monitor such calls. So I guess my question is, how exactly do these calls work? Are they made from the regular phone that's in the prison?

MR. DILAN: They can be, but they can be made from the tablets as well.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. So there's no dedicated phone to be used to call --

MR. DILAN: There's no dedicated phone and I think that's by design, right? So --

MR. GANDOLFO: Right. Yeah, and then I understand the -- the goal is to keep it confidential --

MR. DILAN: Yes.

MR. GANDOLFO: -- so I guess functionally, how does it work if someone incarcerated -- is -- is there a limit to how many times they can call the hotline, and is there any way for the COs to verify that they're actually calling the hotline when they're using the phone?

MR. DILAN: So the first part is no --

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay.

MR. DILAN: -- and then the second part of the

question is there any way for the COs to verify?

MR. GANDOLFO: Right. If there's requests to use the phone to call the hotline that they're permitted to call, is there any way for the COs to actually verify that's the call they're making?

MR. DILAN: So the hotline number will be programmed on every tablet.

(Conferring)

So -- yeah. So the -- so it -- it makes it so that an incarcerated individual does not have to ask for that phone number to be on their call list on the tablet. They have access --

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay.

MR. DILAN: -- they have access to it.

MR. GANDOLFO: Is that -- and I'm -- this is ignorance on my part, is it a -- is there a set list of numbers that they're able to call or can they just dial out on the phone?

MR. DILAN: They get 15.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. Okay. There's no way for the COs to verify that they are calling that -- is that numbers they can call -- is there any limit on phone calls that the incarcerated can make per day? Is there --

MR. DILAN: No.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. So it's just in the course of their permitted calls, they can also dial the hotline?

MR. DILAN: If they feel the need to, yes.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. All right. Thank you for

that clarification.

Now, when a complaint comes into CANY through this hotline, what exactly -- what does CANY do with that complaint? Do they launch their own investigation?

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: So this is -- this part will be new for CANY --

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay.

MR. DILAN: -- but with CANY being, you know, one of the independent oversight entities that the State uses. You know, they certainly use it -- can use it to -- to track and to see if maybe more than one incarcerated individual was complaining, if one incarcerated individual was complaining several times. So they can, I -- I would imagine, use the data that comes in and warrant -- and -- and use that to make the determination if a visit or any other action is -- is warranted.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. So I guess they're kind of using that as a trend analysis rather than opening their own investigation into the specific complaint?

MR. DILAN: That's my thought, yeah.

MR. GANDOLFO: And would that still be handled by the Bureau of Internal Affairs [sic] within the prison?

MR. DILAN: Would what be handled?

MR. GANDOLFO: Like -- if it's a specific complaint coming from an incarcerated individual, that would be investigated by

CANY, but it would still go through the Internal Affairs Bureau?

MR. DILAN: This doesn't take any power away from OSI.

MR. GANDOLFO: Okay. And with regard to the -- the hotline to CANY, are there any repercussions to false allegations or erroneous allegations that might be being made to the hotline I guess to (indiscernible) up the numbers?

MR. DILAN: No, but I would think, you know, to the extent that you make several erroneous or false complaints to CANY, you run the risk of being ignored. I -- I would think you would want to use this when -- when you actually need it and if you're in trouble that someone's actually listening to it. But the answer is -- the short answer is no.

MR. GANDOLFO: All right. Those are all the questions I have. Thank you to the sponsor for answering them.

Madam Speaker, on the bill briefly.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. GANDOLFO: Again, I appreciate the sponsor clarifying some of these questions that were related to this chapter amendment. I'm -- I'm -- I know we have some changes to the makeup of the Commission, but I still think glaringly absent is the requirement that someone who is specifically looking out for the interests of the corrections officers and who can share their perspective. I think that needs to be a requirement on this commission to make sure that we can get the prisons in our State to a place that is

safe for both the corrections officers and those incarcerated in the prisons. So without that change, it is difficult for me to support this chapter amendment, but I do hope that we can continue to -- continue the conversation on some of these reforms, whether it's getting that representation on the Commission on Corrections, revisiting the HALT Act which has caused an exponential increase in assaults on our corrections officers, so hopefully we can continue progressing toward a place where the prisons are safe for everybody who is incarcerated there or has to work there.

So thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Molitor.

MR. MOLITOR: Thank you. Will the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Will the sponsor yield?

MR. DILAN: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The sponsor yields.

MR. MOLITOR: Thank you, Mr. Sponsor. I'd like to just go through a couple -- a few changes from last year's bill if I can with you.

MR. DILAN: Sure.

MR. MOLITOR: Looking at Part B, Section C, which is line 29, comprehensive camera coverage.

MR. DILAN: Could you -- could you speak a little



more directly into the mic?

MR. MOLITOR: Oh, yeah. Sorry.

MR. DILAN: I'm having a hard time.

MR. MOLITOR: Part B, Sub-Section C, line 29 on comprehensive camera coverage. Am I -- am I right in understanding that it's the Commissioner who will decide, you know, what kind of surveillance system is going to be used within the facility?

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: Yes, you're right.

MR. MOLITOR: So the -- the video -- the video quality and how the videos -- camera system is going to work and how it's going to be -- all that information is going to be stored is up to the Commissioner; is that correct?

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: So this part, if I understand correctly, is not new. This part already exists for storage. Was your question around storage?

MR. MOLITOR: It -- it's really about -- it's really about discretion. So I understand that this law requires surveillance video cameras and requires those -- the video from those cameras to be stored. But does the Commissioner have discretion as to what kind of system they're purchasing, what the quality of the video is going to be, you know, how it's going to be stored and archived, all of those things?

MR. DILAN: Yes. And it's also part of the

procurement process, so yes.

MR. MOLITOR: Okay. And do you know, is there a separate budget item coming to fund the -- the amount of surveillance cameras and retention facilities that are going to be needed for this amount of data?

MR. DILAN: So we passed -- we made a \$400 million appropriation in the current budget that the State is operating under. And I also believe that there was a previous \$400 million appropriation made in the budget prior to that. So everything that needs to be funded as it relates to cameras including the vehicles that we discussed early, the Executive and -- the Executive believes is -- is fully funded with that -- with those amounts we've already appropriated.

MR. MOLITOR: Okay. Thank you.

Going on to Sub-Section 3 -- sorry, 4D, in regards to the requirements, 4D.

MR. DILAN: Still Part -- still Part B?

MR. MOLITOR: Still Part B, yup. Regarding the requirements for -- for the data storage.

So the Commissioner, at a minimum, has to keep all videos stored for sixty days, right?

MR. DILAN: Yes.

MR. MOLITOR: And then if it's part of a special investigation or there's an allegation of staff misconduct or criminal activity, it must be preserved no less than five years or longer if

required by laws, rules and regulations; is that correct?

MR. DILAN: Yes.

MR. MOLITOR: Okay. So if it's not apparent within that 60 days, that, you know, a video that's been stored, belongs to an investigation, under -- under this law, the Commissioner could say, *we're not storing it any longer. It's gone.*

MR. DILAN: They're not legally required.

MR. MOLITOR: Okay. Now I'm going to go back to that in a little bit, but I want to -- I want to jump forward here to -- bear with me here. The statute of limitations section.

MR. DILAN: It's Part J?

MR. MOLITOR: Part J. Yes, thank you.

So I know you already explained it once, but can you explain it again for me? How does the statute of limitations work now under this law? Or --

MR. DILAN: Well, the statute of limitations as this intends to work, doesn't -- it -- so if -- if there's a current law that has a statute of limitations outside of a correctional facility, that law still applies inside a correctional facility. The difference being is that once an incarcerated individual is released, they have two years to look back and make a claim under an ex-statute that would've otherwise expired had they been in the free, you know, in -- free and -- and moving around about the State.

MR. MOLITOR: So what if they don't get -- like, what if they don't have a release date?

MR. DILAN: Then it doesn't -- it doesn't apply.

MR. MOLITOR: Okay. So just as an example, if you're suing a State entity, you have one year and 90 days to commence a lawsuit against that -- against the State. If you are incarcerated, you still have one year and 90 days to commence a lawsuit against the State. But if you're incarcerated under like a life sentence, you don't get the -- you don't get the benefit of having it -- the time tolled. Is that --

MR. DILAN: You don't get the benefit of the look-back period.

MR. MOLITOR: Okay. But let's say --

MR. DILAN: Woah, woah, woah.

(Conferring)

Well, no. But it -- I think. Give me one second.

(Conferring)

Yeah. It only applies post-release. So if you are serving -- if you're serving a life sentence and you -- you -- you don't get released, it does not apply.

MR. MOLITOR: Okay. So let's say, you know, someone gets convicted of Rape in the First Degree and they serve a 25 years sentence and after that 25 years sentence is served, they get released, they get a two year look-back to file a lawsuit against the State; is that right?

MR. DILAN: Yes. If the normal statute has expired, yes. The answer's yes.

MR. MOLITOR: But if they're -- let's say they're still -- let's say that same person is still in prison and the one year and 90 days go by, they -- they are tolled from file -- from filing the lawsuit? They're prevented from filing the lawsuit until they get released?

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: Can you just restate the question? I want to make sure my answer's correct.

MR. MOLITOR: Yeah. It's --

MR. DILAN: I think he's asking a different --

MR. MOLITOR: -- it's a little bit confusing. So -- at least I'm confused.

So someone gets charged -- someone's [sic] get -- gets convicted of Rape in the First Degree. You get sentenced for 25 years, right?

MR. DILAN: Mm-hmm.

MR. MOLITOR: Let's say within the first year that they're in prison, they slip and fall and they want to file a negligence lawsuit against the State. They have one year and 90 days to commence that lawsuit. After that one year and 90 days has passed, they cannot file that lawsuit unless and until they were released after that 25 year sentence?

MR. DILAN: That is correct.

MR. MOLITOR: And that -- so you could have a lawsuit that appears on the court's docket 27 years after an incident has occurred?

MR. DILAN: Well, yes, but they also do not have to wait. If they want to commence the action within the time that the normal statute of limitations allows, they can do that.

MR. MOLITOR: What if --

MR. DILAN: They can use this as a discretionary matter if they believe that their safety's at risk.

MR. MOLITOR: What if it was beneficial for them to wait? For example, after the 60 days when all the video has been destroyed.

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: It -- it will be -- I would think it would be more difficult for them to prove their claims, so it wouldn't be beneficial. Because if the camera footage is gone, they -- they still have to prove their claim. Just because they make an allegation doesn't mean that they get rewarded for their claims, so I would think that they would lose the benefit if the camera footage is -- is -- is not available. I would think it's something that they -- they would want to use.

MR. MOLITOR: Well, if their claim was true they certainly would -- would -- they'd certainly lose that benefit. But if they were making it up. You know, on a civil lawsuit, you only need to prove something by a preponderance of the evidence. So if you didn't have video to refute your claim, it would make it easier for you to file a summary judgment motion; would it not?

(Conferring)

MR. DILAN: Yeah, but it would be tough to succeed on a slip and fall claim 27 years after the fact. You know, I don't think they would, you know -- and the key word is *think*. I don't think they would wait that long on a -- on a slip and fall claim.

MR. MOLITOR: But it's not just -- it's not just limited to slip and falls, it could be any injury you suffer.

MR. DILAN: It could be anything. It could be anything.

MR. MOLITOR: Thank you, Mr. Dilan.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On the bill.

MR. MOLITOR: I -- I do think that there are a number of changes made in this bill and this chapter amendment that are beneficial. I think having video in correctional facilities and in the vehicles that are used for transport is a good idea and I'm glad to hear that it's properly -- it's being properly funded. I do have an issue with the statute of limitations extension. You know, a law-abiding citizen who is injured as a result of the State's negligence only gets one year and 90 days. There's no tolling for them. I don't think we should give -- we should toll the statute of limitations for individuals that have been convicted of felonies, some of which are very serious crimes.

I think this bill creates, this chapter amendment in particular, creates two different classes under the law. And I think they're all -- this bill -- I think the way this bill's structured and the way the retention language is for the videos is going to be detrimental.

You know, I think that you're going to see a lot of meritless claims filed in court and that's going to increase expenses for our State.

So for those reasons, I'll be voting no on this bill and I'd encourage my colleagues to do so as well.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: A Party vote has been requested.

Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Minority Conference will be in the negative on this piece of legislation, but if there are members who wish to vote yes, they may do so now at their seats.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Majority Conference is going to be in favor of this piece of legislation; however, there may be some that desire to be an exception. They should feel free to do so at their seats.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

The Clerk will record the vote.



(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Meeks to explain his vote.

MR. MEEKS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the amendments we're making here.

Many of us knew that when we passed the omnibus bill that it was truly a step in the right direction and recognizing the humanity of individuals who are currently incarcerated in the State of New York. And we didn't believe that we would get it 100% correct the first time and that's why we are here today making necessary amendments and we have a long way to go. But I do appreciate those who stand in support and those who have fought to recognize the humanity of our fellow brothers and sisters of the State of New York. They were -- some who have been convicted of crimes, have been sentenced to do time, which should not subject to them perpetual punishment.

So I just want to say thank you to the sponsors and let's continue to fight the good fight.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Mr. Meeks in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

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

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Madam

Speaker. It's an honor to introduce and ask for the cordialities of the House for our former Assemblymember, Jack McEneny who is here with the Massachusetts State Inspector General Jeffrey Shapiro. Mr. Shapiro is visiting the Capitol day [sic] and he's also joined by State -- New York State Inspector General Lucy Lang for a public program this evening in the museum.

So if you would please offer these esteemed guests to our Chambers, all the cordialities of the floor and give them your best greeting, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Yes, of course. On behalf of Mrs. Peoples-Stokes, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome our distinguished guests and our former colleague back to the Assembly Chamber and extending to you the privileges of the floor. We hope you enjoy the proceedings today. Thank you for joining us today. Sir, once a member, always a member. Welcome back. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Madam Speaker, if we can now go back to our A-Calendar and continue our work with page 3, Rules Report No. 60.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

On consent, page 3, Rules Report No. 60, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A09432, Rules Report

No. 60, Woerner. An act to amend the Racing, Pari-Mutuel Wagering and Breeding Law, in relation to welfare, medical, and retirement plans provided by a horsemen's organization in the absence of contractual obligations.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Ms. Woerner, 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 HUNTER: 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. A09433, Rules Report No. 61, Woerner. An act to amend the General Municipal Law, in relation to electronic bell jar games; to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2025 amending the General Municipal Law relating to electronic bell jar games, as proposed in Legislative Bills numbers S06351-B and A07475-B, in relation to the legislative finding and purpose and the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A09439, Rules Report

No. 62, McDonald. An act to amend the County Law, in relation to mandatory continuing education requirements for coroners and coroner's deputies; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2025, amending the County Law relating to mandatory continuing education requirements for coroners and coroner's deputies, as proposed in Legislative Bills number S03637 and A04014, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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. A09457, Rules Report No. 63, Rajkumar. An act to amend the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law, in relation to certain conditions for a grant of permission for access to adjoining property to make improvements or repairs.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Ms. Rajkumar, 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 HUNTER: 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. A09490, Rules Report  
No. 64, Stern. An act to amend the Veterans' Services Law, in  
relation to volunteer opportunities for veterans.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Mr.  
Stern, 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 HUNTER: 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. A09495, Rules Report  
No. 65, Griffin. An act to amend the Executive Law, in relation to  
providing confidentiality for communications arising out of law  
enforcement peer support counseling.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Ms. Griffin, 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 HUNTER: 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. A09496, Rules Report No. 66, Lavine. An act to amend the Domestic Relations Law, in relation to what qualifies as an applicable, timely and relevant economic issue for no fault separation.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Mr. Lavine, 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 HUNTER: 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. A09497, Rules Report No. 67, Lavine. An act to amend the Estates, Powers and Trusts Law, in relation to electronic wills; to amend the Judiciary Law, in relation to rules relating to electronic wills; and to amend a chapter of the Laws of 2025 amending the Estates, Powers and Trusts Law and the State Technology Law relating to electronic wills, as proposed in Legislative Bills numbers S07416-A and A07856-A, in relation to the effectiveness thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A09499, Rules Report No. 68, Steck. An act to amend the Real Property Law, in relation to requiring the modification of restrictive covenants prior to the sale of real property.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A09501, Rules Report No. 69, Bronson. An act to amend the Insurance Law and the General Business Law, in relation to procedures for protections of legally protected health activities.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On a motion by Mr. Bronson, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced.

This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A09513, Rules Report No. 70, Cashman. An act to amend the County Law, in relation to permitting local health officials to request copies of certain reports and records.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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.

Mr. Cashman, this is your very first bill.

Congratulations.

(Applause)

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Madam Speaker, can we move to consent on page 16, Calendar 70?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

On consent, page 16, Calendar No. 70, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01865-A, Calendar No. 70, Rosenthal, Burdick, Seawright, Lucas, Levenberg. An act to amend the Real Property Law, in relation to the installation of



appliances or fixtures by tenants.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01867-A, Calendar No. 71, Rosenthal, Bichotte Hermelyn, Burdick, Seawright, Colton, Lee. An act to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, in relation to the requirements for a building owner to refuse to renew a lease when the building is to be demolished.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01886, Calendar No. 72, Rosenthal, Raga, Taylor, Burdick. An act to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, the Emergency Tenant Act of nineteen seventy-four and the Emergency Housing Rent Control Law, in relation to inspection of major capital improvements for which rent increases are requested and in relation to extending the provisions of the Rent Stabilization Law.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01892, Calendar No. 73, Paulin, De Los Santos. An act to amend the Vehicle and Traffic Law, in relation to requiring rear occupant alert systems in certain vehicles; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid

aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01906, Calendar No. 74, Colton, Rosenthal, Walker, Cook, Seawright, Taylor, Glick, Williams, Rivera. An act to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to providing notification to customers of bed bug infestations on MTA subways, trains and buses.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01962-B, Calendar No. 75, Anderson, Seawright, Cunningham, Weprin, Cruz, Dinowitz, Schiavoni, González-Rojas, Lavine, Romero, Glick, Griffin, Burdick, Rosenthal, Lasher, Simon, Burroughs, Bichotte Hermelyn, Hevesi, Colton, Shimsky, Zaccaro, Solages, Jackson, Wieder, Zinerman, Tapia, Taylor, Simone, Chandler-Waterman, Kassay, Lunsford, Dais, Steck, Sayegh, Rozic, Stern, Paulin, Torres, Alvarez, Ramos, Gibbs, P. Carroll, Benedetto, Walker, Levenberg, Peoples-Stokes, Jacobson, Otis. An act to amend the Penal Law, in relation to enacting "Francesco's Law"; to amend the Executive Law, in relation to annual reports by the New York State Office of Gun Violence Prevention; and providing for the repeal of certain provisions of the Penal Law relating to safely storing rifles, shotguns, and firearms.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01967-B, Calendar No. 76, Paulin, Sayegh, Manktelow, Colton, Steck, Kay. An act to

amend the Public Health Law, in relation to the use of electronic monitoring devices in the rooms of residents in assisted living residences and patients in nursing homes.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01994, Calendar No. 77, Colton, Rivera, Cruz, DeStefano, Hyndman, Williams, Taylor, Jacobson, Seawright, Bendett. An act to amend the Vehicle and Traffic Law, in relation to parking infractions.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02093-C, Calendar No. 79, Fall, Cunningham, Bores, Santabarbara, Alvarez. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to enacting the "Consumer Protection and Automotive Transparency Act".

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02119-A, Calendar 80, Weprin, Shrestha, Anderson, Cook, Simone, Sayegh, Alvarez, Jacobson, Zaccaro, Steck, González-Rojas, Raga, Kelles, Simon, Bores, Meeks, Levenberg, Davila, Gibbs, Reyes, Tapia, Shimsky, Burdick, R. Carroll, Clark, Rivera, Gallagher, Burroughs, Colton, Benedetto, Seawright, Rosenthal, Lucas, Forrest. An act to amend the Correction Law, in relation to who may visit local correctional facilities.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02193-A, Calendar No. 81, Magnarelli, De Los Santos. An act to amend the Vehicle and Traffic Law, in relation to making technical corrections to the adjudication of certain traffic violations; and to repeal certain provisions of such law relating thereto.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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. A02212, Calendar No. 82, Braunstein, Woerner, Steck, Paulin, Brabenec, Stirpe, Jacobson. An act to amend the State Finance Law and the General Municipal Law, in relation to requiring full payment for delivered and accepted materials pertaining to public work projects; and to amend the General Business Law, in relation to prohibiting the retention of any payment due and owing a material supplier for a construction project.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02287, Calendar No. 83, Rosenthal. An act to amend the Administrative Code of the City of New York, in relation to including the illegal conversations of dwelling units in the definition of harassment.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02321, Calendar No. 84, McDonald, Simon, Kelles, McMahon, Simone, Burroughs, Cruz, Reyes. An act to amend the Public Officers Law, in relation to requiring agencies to report information about FOIL inquiries to the committee on open government.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02332-B, Calendar No. 85, Berger, Lee, Kay. An act to amend the Social Services Law, in relation to requiring any website or mobile application associated with an electronic benefit transfer system to be offered in the twelve most common non-English languages.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02384-A, Calendar No. 86, Eichenstein, Weprin, Gallagher, Reyes, Dilan, Rosenthal, Wieder, Steck, Alvarez, Kay, Lasher, Santabarbara, Torres, Tapia, Gallahan, Jacobson, Griffin, E. Brown, Otis, Colton, Blumencranz, Blankenbush, Buttenschon. An act to amend the Insurance Law and

the Public Health Law, in relation to providing insurance coverage for rare diseases, life-threatening conditions or diseases, degenerative and disabling conditions, or diagnoses involving medically fragile children.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02430, Calendar No. 87, Braunstein, Griffin. An act to amend the Public Service Law, in relation to requiring the Public Service Commission to develop a formula for the calculation of a residential water cost index; requiring each water-works cooperation and municipal water system serving one thousand customers or more to calculate and submit to the Public Service Commission its residential water cost index; and requiring the Public Service Commission to publish a report on the residential water cost index of each applicable water-works corporation and municipal water system.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02431, Calendar No. 88, Braunstein, Otis, Colton, P. Carroll. An act to amend the Public Service Law, in relation to clarifying how certain non-billing information regarding the delivery of water is disclosed to residents of cooperatives, condominiums or multi-family dwellings.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02441, Calendar No. 89, Hevesi, González-Rojas, Tapia, Rosenthal, Bichotte Hermelyn, Paulin, Clark, Gibbs, R. Carroll, Raga, Simone, Meeks, Simon, Forrest, Taylor, Seawright, Shrestha, Cruz, Gallagher, Walker, Burdick. An act to amend the Family Court Act, in relation to the confidentiality and expungement of records in juvenile delinquency cases in the family court.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02538-A, Calendar No. 90, Davila, Cunningham. An act to amend the Social Services Law, in relation to finger imaging for SNAP benefit recipients.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02539, Calendar No. 91, Dinowitz, Weprin, Williams, Colton, Seawright, Simon, Raga, Otis, Alvarez. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to requiring mandatory arbitration clauses in certain consumer contracts to be printed in large font type.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02565, Calendar No. 92, was previously amended on third reading.

Assembly No. A02573, Calendar No. 93, McDonald, Rozic, Otis, Sayegh. An act to amend the New York State Printing

and Public Documents Law, in relation to requiring state agencies to make available all public documents in a digital format on their website.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02589-A, Calendar No. 94, Kelles, Lupardo, Jacobson, Meeks, Santabarbara, Otis, Seawright, Simon, Steck, Davila, Reyes, Colton, Angelino, Burdick, Weprin, Shimsky, De Los Santos. An act to amend the Civil Rights Law, in relation to waiving the state's sovereign immunity to claims under the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, and the Family and Medical Leave Act.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02611, Calendar No. 95, Otis, Seawright, Simon, Stirpe, Sayegh. An act to amend the Real Property Law, in relation to requiring landlords to mitigate damages when commercial tenants vacate premises in violation of the terms of the lease.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02620-B, Calendar No. 97, Hevesi, Clark, Raga, Simon, Kelles, Dinowitz, Rosenthal, Zaccaro, R. Carroll, Lavine, Glick, González-Rojas, Bronson,



Cunningham, Meeks, Alvarez, Paulin, De Los Santos, Bores, Simone, Gallagher, Walker, Gibbs, Lunsford, Tapia, Woerner, Bichotte Hermelyn, Cruz, Shrestha, Seawright, Davila, Hyndman, Steck, Zinerman, Schiavoni, Levenberg, P. Carroll, Taylor, Burdick, Weprin, Otis, Forrest, Vanel, Lupardo, Reyes, Septimo, Mitaynes, Burroughs, Solages, Dais, Shimsky, Anderson, Kim, Valdez, McMahon, Lasher, Dilan, Wright, Hooks. An act to amend the Family Court Act and the Criminal Procedure Law, in relation to the custodial interrogation of juveniles by law enforcement.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02630-A, Calendar No. 98, Kelles, Kay. An act to amend the Criminal Procedure Law, in relation to the privacy and confidentiality of urine test results performed pursuant to a judicial diversion program.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02633, Calendar No. 99, Lunsford, Colton, Magnarelli, Griffin Taylor, Hyndman. An act in relation to directing the President of the State Civil Service Commission to conduct a study on job vacancies across state agencies.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02657-A, Calendar No. 100, Otis, Rosenthal, Simon, Lunsford, Shimsky, Simone,

McDonald, Griffin, Colton, Seawright, Levenberg, Reyes, Bronson, Burdick, Gallagher, Cunningham, McMahon, Schiavoni, Paulin, Shrestha, Clark, Braunstein, Kassay, Glick, Woerner, Stirpe. An act to amend the Public Authorities Law, in relation to establishing the Electric Landscaping Equipment Rebate Program; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03085-B, Calendar No. 101, R. Carroll, Gallagher, Levenberg, Hyndman, Reyes, Rosenthal, Santabarbara. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to promoting consumer choice by requiring manufacturers of digital electronic equipment to provide retail sellers with a one through ten repair score that will be displayed to consumers at point of sale.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03121, Calendar No. 102, Rosenthal, Taylor, Burdick, Otis. An act to amend the Real Property Law in relation to prohibiting residential landlords from charging tenants with fees for the payment of rent through an automated clearing house or online payment system.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03125-A, Calendar

No. 103, Rosenthal, Glick, Levenberg, Shimsky, Simon, Burdick, Jackson, Lucas, Otis. An act to amend the Real Property Law, in relation to the use of automated housing decision making tools to make housing decisions.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03126-A, Calendar No. 104, Lunsford, McDonald, P. Carroll, Glick, Griffin. An act to amend the Executive Law, in relation to requiring that when a complaint is made to local code enforcement of a violation of the uniform fire prevention and building code or local building codes which result in the issuance of a compliance order, the complainant shall also be provided a copy of such order.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03228-A, Calendar No. 105, Lavine, Santabarbara. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to providing for electronic notice for collateral loan brokers.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect on the 180th day.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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. A03318, Calendar No. 106, Dinowitz, Colton, Paulin, Seawright, Burdick. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to arbitration organizations.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03359, Calendar No. 107, Dinowitz, Colton, Shimsky, Glick, Simon, Tapia, Alvarez, Sayegh. An act to amend the Penal Law, in relation to the crime of computer tampering in the third degree.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03361, Calendar No. 108, Vanel, Santabarbara. An act creating a temporary state commission to study and investigate how to regulate artificial intelligence, robotics and automation; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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. A03369-A, Calendar No. 109, Dinowitz, Williams, Colton, Seawright, Reyes, Kelles. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to requiring notice of mandatory arbitration clauses in certain consumer contracts.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03411-B, Calendar No. 110, Vanel, Otis, Santabarbara. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to requiring notices on generative artificial intelligence systems.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect on the 90th day.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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. A03536, Calendar No.

111, Santabarbara, Schiavoni, Reyes, Destefano, Giglio, Levenberg, Sayegh, Walsh, Otis. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to requiring navigation systems utilizing GPS technology to identify the height of any bridge or overpass along a proposed route.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03549, Calendar No. 112, Santabarbara, Colton, Pheffer Amato, Buttenschon, DeStefano, Kay, Griffin. An act to amend the Civil Service Law, in relation to access to certain mental health care services for emergency dispatchers and correction officers.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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. A03595-A, Calendar No. 113, Bichotte Hermelyn, Alvarez, Eachus, Taylor. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study on the number of children who are caregivers and how being a caregiver impacts their education.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03681-A, Calendar No. 114, Woerner, Santabarbara, Sayegh. An act to amend the General Municipal Law, in relation to removing restrictions on the frequency certain authorized organizations may conduct bingo games.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect on the 90th day.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Reilly to explain his vote.

MR. REILLY: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I can't help but I'm looking at the board and just to break up a little bit of the monotony. My mom passed away on this date in 2004. And she was an avid bingo lover. And when I saw that up there, it really sparked a moment for me. So I -- I wanted to just stand here and just -- just tell you, sometimes you're sitting here and you're voting on things and all of a sudden it triggers a memory. So I'm hoping that this helped spark something in you. When you leave here, maybe you'll have a memory.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.

Mr. Reilly in the affirmative.

(Applause)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03682-A, Calendar No. 115, Peoples-Stokes, Schiavoni, Lasher, Colton, Torres, Lee, Otis. An act directing the Department of Environmental Conservation and Health to establish environmental standards for ambient lead and lead contamination in soils; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03687-B, Calendar No. 116, Weprin, Hevesi, Davila, Paulin, Brook-Krasny, Jacobson. An act to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to addressing non-covered dental services.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03849, Calendar No. 117, Weprin, Paulin, Dinowitz, Sayegh. An act to repeal Section 470 of the Judiciary Law, relating to allowing attorneys having offices in the State to reside in an adjoining state.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: This bill is laid aside.



THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03919-B, Calendar No. 118, Weprin, Hevesi, Taylor, Paulin, Brook-Krasny, Kay, Jacobson. An act to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to establishing a requirement for information related to specialized dental benefit plans.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: 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: Do you have any further housekeeping and/or resolutions?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: We have no housekeeping. We have a number of resolutions before the House.

Without objection, these resolutions will be taken up together.

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

(Whereupon, Assembly Resolution Nos. 884 through 897 were unanimously approved.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Madam Speaker, will you please call on Ms. Clark for the purpose of an announcement?

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Ms. Clark for the purpose of an announcement.

MS. CLARK: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm here to announce there will be a Majority Conference immediately following Session, Hearing Room C. Majority Conference immediately following Session. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: Thank you.  
Immediate Majority Conference at the conclusion of Session, Hearing Room C.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: I now move that the Assembly stand adjourned and that we reconvene at 10:00 a.m., Thursday, January the 29th, tomorrow being a Session day.

ACTING SPEAKER HUNTER: On Mrs. Peoples-Stokes' motion, the House stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3:55 p.m. the House stood adjourned until Thursday, January 29th at 10:00 a.m., that being a Session day.)