

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 12, 2019

10:51 A.M.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The House will come to order.

The Reverend Elia will offer a prayer.

REVEREND DONNA ELIA: Let us pray.

Compassionate and Holy God, before You generations rise and fall. We are grateful for this moment when the work of serving with integrity, wisdom and compassion is ours to do. Thank You especially for the collective efforts of this Body, legislators and staff. As this Legislative Session nears its close, give them the resources and stamina they need, and thank You for their service. On this day, we remember those who have gone to their rest. Thank You for the relationships, the collegiality and the good work they did. May their memory be a blessing. And so teach us to count our days, that we may

gain a wise heart. God, healer of us all, to any who need healing this day, we pray that You will grant it. For any who need comfort or ease, we ask it. And for those who put their lives on the line for the sake of others, we ask for safety, for peace in our communities and our world, and healthy and vibrant lives for children everywhere.

We pray and we hope in Your Holy Name. Amen,

MEMBERS: Amen.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Visitors are invited to join the members in the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

A quorum being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of Tuesday, June 11th.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the read -- further reading of the Journal of Tuesday, June the 11th and ask that the same stand approved.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For our colleagues in -- in the Chambers [sic], staff and visitors and guests, it is my pleasure to offer a quote this morning from U.S. Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor. The Judge says to us this morning, Mr. Speaker, that, *It is important for all of us to*

appreciate where we come from and how our history has shaped us in ways that we may not still yet understand. Again, Mr. Speaker, this quote is from Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor.

Mr. Speaker, the members have on their desk a calendar. I have to say that we're going to be pretty busy today. There are quite a few things that we have to do before us. There is a main Calendar. There's also a debate list. And after any introductions and/or housekeeping, we will be taking up a privileged resolution honoring the memories of members who have passed this current year -- past year. After this important resolution, we will continue to consent on the main Calendar, beginning with Rules Report No. 91 on page 6. We will also work off the Calendar -- the -- the Calendar and the debate list, including taking up Rules Report No. 118 on page 12 of the main Calendar by Mr. Crespo. Members of the following committees should be prepared to be called off the floor for a meeting: Committees -- Local Governments, Real Property Taxation, Election Law, Ways and Means and Rules. Majority members should be aware that there will probably -- we probably will need to call on Mr. Otis at the close of Session.

That's the general outline, Mr. Speaker. If there are introductions and housekeeping, now would be a great time.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. Thank you. We do have at least one item of housekeeping.

On a motion by Mr. D'Urso, page 11, Rules Report No. 110, Bill No. 3199-B, amendments are received and adopted.

For the purposes of an introduction, Mrs.
Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.
Speaker. This is really an honor to have the opportunity to -- actually
to give the cordialities of the floor to our former colleague who spent a
-- a lot of years here, made a lot of friends, including myself. Did a lot
of great work, particularly in the disabilities community. We'll always
remember his great smile, his great opportunities to provide advice.

So on behalf of our colleagues, Ms. Miller and Ms.
Griffin, and all the other colleagues who are from the County -- great
County of Nassau, would you please extend the cordialities of our
House and welcome back our former colleague Harvey Weisenberg.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf
of Mrs. Peoples-Stokes, Ms. Miller, Ms. Griffin, the Speaker and all
the members, welcome back, Harvey. You are a former member, you
will always have the privileges of the floor. It's always so great to
have you here and to see you and to share with you again the
wonderful memories you have, and to salute the great work you did as
a Legislator. Thank you so very much. Please enjoy the day.

(Applause)

For the purposes of an introduction, Ms. Rozic.

ACTING SPEAKER ROZIC: Thank you, Mr.
Speaker and Madam Majority Leader. I have -- in advance of today's
resolution, I have the great honor today of introducing my dear friend,
Laura Kavanagh, the First Deputy Commissioner of FDNY, who's the

second-highest ranking civilian administrator in FDNY. Laura, you can stand up. Laura is responsible for managing the day-to-day operations and activities of the FDNY across all offices. She was first appointed to this position in January 2018. Commissioner Kavanagh first joined the Department senior staff in 2014 as Assistant Commissioner of External Affairs, and in 2016 she was promoted to Deputy Commissioner for Government Affairs and Special Projects. Commissioner Kavanagh oversaw the recent firefighter recruitment campaign, which resulted in the largest and most diverse applicant pool in Department history. She has secured funding for renovations to firehouses and EMS stations across the five boroughs.

It's my great honor today to ask if you can extend the cordialities of the floor and welcome First Deputy Commissioner Laura Kavanagh to the People's House. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. Rozic, Commissioner Kavanagh, welcome to the New York State Assembly. We -- the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Thank you for the great work that you're doing, helping our City, keeping it safe. Continue that great work and know that you are always welcome here. We will always be listening to you. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

For the purposes of an introduction, Mr. DenDekker.

MR. DENDEKKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great honor for me to introduce George Farinacci, who served for 33

years in the Fire Department of the City of New York. He's from Ladder 28 and Ladder 148, and he's currently the Vice President of the Uniformed Firefighters Association. And also joining him today is James McCarthy, 31 years with the Fire Department of the City of New York State. He was assigned to Ladder 25 and a former member of Ladder 55, and he's the Treasurer of the Uniformed Firefighters Officers [sic] Association.

So, I would also ask that you please give them the courtesies of the House and the privileges of the floor as you so eloquently always do, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. DenDekker, the Speaker and all the members, gentlemen, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. We thank you again for coming and sharing this day with us, but most of all for the tremendous years of service that you have provided the City of New York. Please know that we are forever grateful for that and always mindful of the work that you do. Thank you so very much, and continue to enjoy the day.

(Applause)

Ms. Pheffer Amato for the purposes of an introduction.

MS. PHEFFER AMATO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm honored today to introduce LeRoy McGinnis, who is Vice President of the Uniform -- Uniformed Firefighters Association. He also has served over 33 years in the Fire Department. But I'm most

proud of, he's from -- he served in Engine 266, which is located in Rockaway Beach. He was a Queens Trustee, Recording Secretary and now Vice President of the Union. And Mr. Speaker, I don't know if you know, but the U.F.A. Uniformed Firefighters Association, is a non-profit advocacy organization formed in 1917, representing the health, safety and interests of New York City's firefighters and its citizens that they are sworn to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if you can give LeRoy McGinnis the opportunity to be part of our proceedings today and for an introduction.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. Pheffer Amato, the Speaker and all the members, sir, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly and to extend the privileges of the floor. This is the People's House, and the work that you've done to take care of the people of the City of New York, you're right where you should be. Thank you so very much. Continue that great work.

(Applause)

Mr. Cusick for the purposes of an introduction

MR. CUSICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction. We are joined here today by the President of the Uniformed Firefighters, Mr. Gerard Fitzgerald. Gerard is a friend of many of us in this room. He is here with his colleagues who were introduced before, to advocate on behalf of the brave men and women of the FDNY, to advocate for their well-being

and their health here in the Legislature. So, Mr. Speaker, Gerard has been a member of the FDNY for 20 years. He is in Engine 318 in Brooklyn, and he serves as the President of the Uniformed Firefighters Association.

So Mr. Speaker, if you could give Gerard and the members of the U.F.A. the privileges of the House, I would duly appreciate that.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Cusick, also Mr. Benedetto, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here, sir, to the New York State Assembly, extend to you and the members of the U.F.A. the privileges of the floor. Thank all of you for the work that you do. Certainly with only 20 years, you're a rookie according to these other guys. But I hope that you will have a long and prosperous service, as you have. And, of course, the presidency has its own weight and responsibility. Hope that you bear well under that weight. Thank you so very much for being here.

(Applause)

For the purposes of an introduction, Ms. Paulin.

MS. PAULIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am very pleased today to welcome to the Assembly floor a group of distinguished middle school students from the 88th Assembly District and their families. With us today are two students from Pelham Middle School; Bates Bland and Bennett Wies. And Abigail Rittenberg from Albert Leonard Middle School in New Rochelle. These three students wrote winning essays for my fourth Annual

"There Ought To Be a Law" contest. The contest asks middle school students in my district to identify a problem impacting New Yorkers that could be solved by creating a new law, and to write a persuasive essay arguing for their solution. We had participation from five middle schools and 100 students. It was a tough competition, but the essays these bright young advocates wrote on topics including motor vehicle safety, reducing single-use plastic, and preventing young people from getting hooked on smoking or juuling were truly the best of the best.

I ask that you please join me in recognizing these young people for their achievements and extend them the cordialities of the House.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Ms. Paulin, the Speaker and all of the members, we welcome these extraordinary students here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Our congratulations on winning that contest, but also on putting in the work that caused you to write such interesting articles. Please continue that work. You are always welcome here. We also want to thank, I believe, the parents that have come. And we want to acknowledge them because children are raised by good parents, they produce good work. Thank you so very much. Congratulations on your work. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mr. Zebrowski for the purposes of an introduction.

MR. ZEBROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for

this opportunity to introduce two organizations and -- and four individuals from -- if they could stand, in the back. These organizations do awareness around wellness, around certain conditions and diseases and trying to make New Yorkers and, really around the nation, people healthier. From the Global Healthy Living Foundation, we have Corey Greenblatt and Hanne Genyn, who -- they do great work in terms of a whole bunch of treatments and -- and, you know, really making people around our districts in New York healthier. And specifically also from the Chronic Migraine Awareness Incorporated, we have Catherine Charrett-Dykes and Chris Charrett-Dykes.

Now, these two individuals, Mr. Speaker, are from Assemblymember DeStefano's district, so if you could offer a welcome from him as well. They're up here today specifically because in a little while we'll be doing a -- passing, hopefully, a Legislative Resolution related to Migraine and Headache Awareness Month in the State of New York related to that condition. So, I would appreciate it, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Assemblymember DeStefano, if you could welcome these individuals here today who are doing so much around our State to promote a healthy lifestyle. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Zebrowski, Mr. DeStefano, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. Thank you for the work that you're doing in helping individuals and people in our State stay healthy. Continue

that work. Very important for us as a State to be mindful of the health of our communities. Please continue that work. Thank you so very much, and you are welcome here again.

(Applause)

Mr. Brabenec for an introduction.

MR. BRABENEC: Top of the Morning, Mr.

Speaker. I have with us a very distinguished guest today, Mr. James W. Sturr, Jr. -- stand up, if you would. Mr. Jimmy Sturr is the world-renowned "Polka King," and he is a world-renowned American clarinetist, saxophonist and band leader. He has won 18 out of 25 Grammy Awards given out for the Best Polka Album. World record holder of the Top 10 Grammy Awards given out to one individual. He's played remarkable venues such as Lincoln Center, Carnegie Hall and the Palace of Culture in Warsaw, Poland. Sold-out crowds throughout the world, including 20,000-plus fans of New Braunfels, Texas, where I have happened to accompany him on many occasions. He has his own nationwide television show, has his own record label and show on worldwide satellite radio SiriusXM. The only band ever featured at the Grand Ole Opry with brass instruments -- that's the Jimmy Sturr and his Orchestra. He has received five gold albums, each representing \$5 million in sales, has been on almost every single television network, has been featured on "Who Wants to be a Millionaire", has played with major names such as Willie Nelson, the Oakridge Boys, Alison Krauss, Brenda Lee, Boots Randolph, Mel Tillis, Gary Puckett, Arlo Guthrie, Charlie Daniels and countless

others. I am proud to call him a friend and a constituent. He hails from my district in Florida, New York, and he was born and raised there. He's accompanied by Gus and Rose Zygmunt, Tim Blakiner, Barbara Jones -- or James, and John Bacon.

So, on behalf of the Orange County delegation, Ms. Gunther, Mr. Miller, Mr. Schmitt, Mr. Jacobson and also my colleague, Mr. Kevin Byrne, please welcome the famous Jimmy Sturr to the mighty City of Albany and thank you for being -- give him all the cordialities of the House, please.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Brabenec and the Orange County delegation, sir, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly and extend to you the privileges of the floor. Certainly congratulate you on a marvelously successful career. Continue that great work. Continue making the music that people love to dance to. And my colleague says we should say, "Roll out the Barrel." We'll be happy to have you. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

Mr. DiPietro.

MR. DIPIETRO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know how to top that, but I do have some very distinguished guests here I think you'll find very interesting. This is Santos Lopez and his daughter, Delia. What's awesome about this is Santos, his grandfather was the original signer and co-drafter of the Philippine Independence

in 1934. And his great-uncle is Dr. José Rizal, who is the father of Philippine Independence. Today is Filipino Day, which I'm hosting. It's on the third floor. Anyone who would like to go, we'll be bringing them down.

But if you could give them all the cordialities of the House for Filipino Day and on behalf of his family, that would be fantastic. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. DiPietro, the Speaker and all the members, sir, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. And what an historic family you're a part of. I'm sure you're proud of the work that they've done and they, in their way, must be proud of the work that you're doing. Thank you so very much. And to -- that's your daughter, I presume? Beautiful daughter that you have. You've done all the best work you have. Thank you again. Thank you for being here.

(Applause)

(Pause)

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

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What an honor and a pleasure I have to, on behalf of Member Jose Rivera, to introduce Marcia Cortez. Marcia is a student at York Preparatory School. She is 13 years old. And, Mr. Speaker, she's a champion soccer player. Would you please welcome her to our

Chambers [sic]?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Rivera, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. Certainly, our congratulations for your athletic achievements, but also for maintaining a great academic world. Please continue to do that work. Know that they are linked inevitably in your life. Thank you, and you are always welcome here.

(Applause)

(Pause)

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

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am honored to have this opportunity to request an introduction and a welcome to our Chambers [sic] for Mrs. Rosa Agudelo. She is a Head Start teacher. She works with three- and four-year-olds every day in Brooklyn, which you know, Mr. Speaker, is a challenge. She's an immigrant from Columbia where she was a nurse for more than a decade. She is -- came to the United States in 1992 with her daughter, who is now our colleague, Assemblywoman Catalina Cruz. She settled in Queens, where Rosa and Assemblymember Cruz lived as undocumented immigrants for ten years. She now currently lives in Ozone Park with her three other children, Laura, Monica and Hector, and her granddaughter.

Mr. Speaker, would you please welcome this

esteemed mother and grandmother to our Chambers [sic]?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mrs. Peoples-Stokes and your daughter, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. You are family, you always have that. We are so happy that you are able to come up. And, obviously, the joy that your daughter has in having you join us today. Congratulations to that great family that you are. And being from Queens, we know you're the best. Thank you so very much.

(Applause)

Shh. Shh. Shh. That is staff also, please. We are doing a presentation. You -- whatever those conversations are, they will wait until after the presentation. Members will take their seats, please, in respect.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, would you please ask the Clerk to call up the resolution honoring our deceased colleagues?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 544, Mr. Heastie.

Legislative Resolution honoring the memory of the deceased members of the New York State Assembly, in recognition of their careers in public service.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if you

could now please have a -- the remainder of the colleagues and/or guests that are in the Chambers [sic] have a seat.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Doors will be closed. No one will be let in or out until the presentation is finished. Members will stay in their seats.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Members and colleagues, this is a solemn opportunity to honor our previous colleagues who have transitioned. For those of us who believe in the Creator, we all know that as soon as we are born, we will someday die. Some of our colleagues have gone on, and we would like to honor them, Mr. Speaker. This is probably one of the first and most memorable opportunities I've ever had in this Chamber was this opportunity for silence. No walking, no running. People paying attention to the lives of those who have went before us. There are several this year, Mr. Speaker. And many of our colleagues who are in the Chambers [sic] now will share with us opportunities to honor their memories.

Seymour Boyers, who served the 21 -- served the 21st -- 24th Assembly District from 1967 to 1968; José Peralta, who served the 39th Assembly District from 2003 to 2010. In fact, José and I came in the same year. Mel Miller, who served the 44th Assembly District from 1971 to 1991; Guy Molinari, who served the 60th Assembly District from 1965 to 1980; James Tully, who served the 61st Assembly District from 1966 -- in 1966; Marie Runyon, who served the 70th Assembly District in 1975; Gregory Young, who

served the 88th Assembly District from 1983 to 1992. Chloe O'Neil, who served the 112th Assembly District from 1930 -- 1993 to 1998; Thomas Hanna, who served the 130th Assembly District from 1973 to 1982; and Daniel B. Walsh, who served the 149th Assembly District from 1973 until 1987.

With that, Mr. Speaker, you will hear from several of our colleagues as we honor the lives of these great not only just New York State citizens, but American citizens and honorable colleagues of this honorable House, the New York State Assembly.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, Mr. Lentol.

MR. LENTOL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Majority Leader is correct. This is a very solemn day, and one that we should all be celebrating the life of former colleagues who have come and gone. And many of you probably know the names and not the faces and not the people. Unfortunately -- or fortunately for me, I should say, I have had the opportunity to know many of the members who are on the list that we honor today. And I have to say that it was a very heartwarming experience this morning at mass to listen to the wonderful service that, by the way, used to be attended by almost everybody in this House when we had a memorial mass for deceased members. But now it's kind of sparsely attended. But I say that because I have fond memories of many of my colleagues who served us so well, each in their own way, who protected the people of the State of New York. I mean, you can look over the list to see if your

member or your previous member is on the list, even if you didn't know him, and learn about who he or she was. Because they all did what was right for the State of New York, protecting the needs of their constituents and the needs of the people of the State of New York.

I particularly remember one name that stands out on the list, and that's Speaker Mel Miller, who served this House -- served this House with great distinction. And before I got here to do criminal justice service as Chairman of the Codes Committee, he was working hard to protect the innocent while protecting the people of the State of New York, and also working hard to convict the guilty, I might say. Because he was truly a Speaker who was a man of the people. He came to an igno -- ignominious -- trying to get out those big words are hard, and when you're speaking about people who have died -- fate, because he was accused of a crime for which he was convicted and lost his speakership and his seat. But the Lord was good to him, because the Court reversed that case and gave him a new life. Of course he could never come back as Speaker because he had been convicted of a felony, but nonetheless, he continued to serve in a capacity -- in a different capacity as a lobbyist and as an advisor to many of us about bills before the Legislature. I know that I called upon him many times for advice on bills on Codes, and just in general, for his leadership so that we would move forward in a direction that this House needed.

Another name that stands out of course, Madam Majority Leader, is Dan Walsh, who was my classmate and sat in the

back with me, right next to me. And we talked for many years side by side, chairs right next to each other. But his service as Majority Leader stands out because Ms. Peoples, he was -- he was a guy who would look at you when things were going wrong and you got angry and he wouldn't say anything. He'd just kind of walk over to you and put his hand on your shoulder and say, *Calm down*. And you did, because that was the type of guy he was. And he served his constituents in Cattaraugus County. Any of you come from there, you may remember the name. He was the first Assemblymember, as I recall it, to walk the streets of his district from one end to the other, getting votes. And he was, I think, the first Democrat ever -- ever to be elected from Catta -- Cattaraugus County. Excuse me for saying it wrong.

Marie Runyon was a firebrand from Harlem. She was a white woman, who I think may have been the only white woman that I can remember until Danny O'Donnell was elected that ever represented Harlem or parts of Harlem. And she was an unusual -- an unusually great speaker, I thought, and one of the first women to make a significant difference just by her being here and teaching us what it was to represent a poor district and having us understand how to serve the poorest and the neediest among us.

Sy Boyers, unfortunately, I didn't know. He came before me.

José Peralta made a mistake in his career that probably cost him his Senate seat. But he served with distinction in

both the Assembly and the Senate. He was a -- a friend of mine, and he happened to be a Good Joe. And, of course, he was among a fraternity of us who happened to be Good Joes, like Joe Lentol. And I'm proud to call him my friend. And I was saddened, as I know many of you were, to hear of his passing. And of course, he was probably one of the youngest on this list who died way too soon.

Tom Hanna; a Republican from Monroe County. I remember very well. He was a -- a leading opponent -- or a leading proponent, I should say; I won't say anything negative about anybody today. He was a leading proponent for pension reform, and I never heard anybody so eloquent about why we should reform the pension systems of New York, especially since he was in it. But he understood that very well, as many of my colleagues do on the other side, the need for us to tackle reform issues even though they're difficult and we don't like to deal with them. He was somebody that I'll remember also with a great deal of memory, as -- as is the case of every member on this list. When you serve in this Body, people remember you. Your people remember you, and we remember you. Because in the end, we are a family when you are elected to the New York State Assembly or the New York State Senate. And we tend to remember our own, just like every other family. So Mr. Speaker, I commend to you the names of all of these individuals, especially the ones I've mentioned.

And the last one I'll talk about is Greg Young, who was from Westchester County, who was one of the nicest individuals and one of the beautiful people ever to serve in this House. And he

also died too young. And I'll remember him fondly, as I will remember all of the people I served with and try to think about them every time we do these memorials so that we never forget.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. DenDekker on the resolution.

MR. DENDEKKER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to speak on the resolution. Also, like my colleague just mentioned, I was at the Legislators Memorial Service this morning, and I would hope that more of you would take part in it next year. Because there will come a day when you, too, will not be here, and the Body that will be here will be remembering you and your work and your service to your constituents.

I was profoundly touched this morning to hear the name José Peralta mentioned. I know José for many, many years. He served in this House from 2003 to 2010, and then served in the Senate from 2010 to 2018. To those of you who had the pleasure of serving with José, I will tell you, he was a -- a -- a -- a bull when it came to legislation on things that were important to him. And we were lucky enough that he fought very hard for the DREAM Act, and this year it became a reality. That was his piece of legislation that he cared most about. I -- I -- I would disagree with whether or not he made a mistake in his career. It was politics, and I think he was trying to do whatever he could do to continue the work for his constituency in a manner that he thought was going to be helpful. He was not the type

of person who would do anything for a self-serving reason. He only cared about his constituents and to do the best he could for his community. And whether or not people agree with how he chose to do that, that's neither here nor there. But when you go to the service, you hear the -- the year that somebody was born and the year that they died. And in José's particular instance, 1971 to 2018. A very young man. Had just turned 47 years old. But we always listen to people who talk more spiritually, and -- and they talk about the dash between 1971 and 2018. And the dash is our life, and we're here for a limited amount of time. I don't care how important you think you may be to this world, we are all here for a limited amount of time. We just don't know how long the dash is going to be. In Jose's particular dash, the things that he did in his life were very beneficial to his constituency, as well as to me personally, as well as to his family, his wife, Evelyn, his two sons, Myles and Matthew. And I truly believe he would be very, very happy to know that the DREAM Act got passed. He probably looked down and went, *Really? You know, Now? We couldn't have done it the year before?* Because that's how much he cared about it, and that's how important it was to him. But at the same time, I think he'd also be very happy to know that this Body paused for a moment to actually look at his professional career, and hopefully all of you in this room will thank him for his service to this House, to the other House, to the constituency that he represented, as well as all of the residents of the State of New York. He was someone who served with dignity and respect, and will always have my utmost praise for all the work

that he did.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Thank you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. Many apologies, but we did leave off one very important colleague's name off the list. We will be adding that to the formal resolution, as it is appropriate to do. But I want to mention him now. He is James F. Nagle. He was the member for the 130 -- 40 -- no, 135th Assembly District, and he served from 1976 to 1991, Mr. Speaker. James F. Nagle.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Thank you, Mrs.

Peoples-Stokes.

Ms. Weinstein on the resolution.

MS. WEINSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Like so many other times that we've acted on these resolutions, I realize that with more years here in the Legislature, I know more and more of the people on the list who have passed that I've served with. And I just wanted to mention two of them that I was very happy to -- to serve with, from two different parts of the State. Mel Miller, Speaker, Chairman of the Codes Committee, was a -- a friend and a neighboring Assemblymember. In -- some people only saw him here, but back in Brooklyn, he was one of the strongest advocates for pre-K education funding. And our local school district had school -- had pre-K in every school because of Mel Miller long before it became a -- a

popular idea to -- to do. And I think because of that we were able to provide the evidence to allow that to go beyond just Brooklyn and our local community, but throughout the -- the State. But I -- and I could probably tell a number of stories about Mel. They'd be very animated because he always liked to use his hands when he spoke, and I don't think I could do those -- some of those justice. But one of the things I did want to -- to mention is -- Assemblyman Lentol mentioned that Joe -- that Mel was Chair of the Codes Committee. So in the mid-80's - actually, it was 1984 - the Post was really going after him and the Assembly for what they called "criminal justice reform," but we were standing up for the principles here of democracy in the Assembly. So there was an editorial after we had a vote where a number of us stood with Mel and rejected the Post's pushing us, and the headline of the editorial was, *To reform the courts, let's forget Miller time*. And they -- their idea of reform was not our idea of criminal justice reform. Then they listed the good guys which was some Dems, some Republicans, and then there was a list of "The Miller Gang." So the only ones left -- the only ones still serving in the Assembly of the Miller Gang is Assemblyman Lentol, myself, and actually John Flanagan in the Senate. And after the vote and after the editorial, Mel printed up these editorials - probably Joanie up there did it for him - and he gave to all of the Miller Gang a signed copy of the editorial that says "Thanks for everything. Mel. June, 1984." Well, I've had that behind my desk in the various offices that I've been in, just to remind me that it's important to stand up for principle and for what's right.

And every so often, I'd look at it and think of Mel. Also, he gave out -- there was a -- obviously, a very humorous side to Mel. He gave all the members of the Codes Committee T-shirts that had tombstones on it with bill numbers that said, "The Codes Committee: Where bills goes to die." So, it was a -- a pleasure serving with Mel, and many of the issues that he worked on formed a foundation of some of the criminal justice work that Joe Lentol and others have -- have continued.

I also wanted to just say something about Danny Walsh. He was a Majority Leader when I was a relatively new member, though -- and he had to suffer some of the -- some of the women members complaining about the fact that the restroom that's outside that we now have was only for the men. And the women members would sort of have a tag team. Because we didn't have electronic voting, we'd have to let another colleague know that we were going to the restroom. And we really wanted to have the women's -- the restroom be adjusted so that -- to recognize that there were women here. So at one point, we gave Danny a pink -- Eileen Dugan and I, who served in the '80s -- gave Danny a pink toilet seat. We presented him with a pink toilet seat. And it was shortly afterwards that, along with Speaker Fink, that we, in fact, had the -- the restroom adjusted to suit both men and -- and -- and women. And I thought -- when I heard that Danny had passed away, I thought to myself that -- as people are -- as the family was going through his belongings and through the various things in his room and his garage,

that I wondered if they found that pink toilet seat and wondered, *What the hell is this doing here and why does this man have this?* We had actually signed it.

So, it -- it was a pleasure to -- to serve with him, and he -- he really did have a -- a good sense of humor, and wanted to just pay my respects both to Dan -- Dan and Mel and -- and the other members, both those that I served with and those that I came to know after I became a member of the Legislature.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Gottfried, who I think has served with every member in the history of the Assembly, next on the resolution.

(Laughter)

MR. GOTTFRIED: Actually, just -- Mr. Boyers served before I was elected, which means he must have lived a long life. But I want to talk about Mel Miller. Mel was elected in 1970, the same day I was. He was by far, in my estimation, one of the most brilliant people that I've known, not only serving in this Body, but just of all the people I've known. He somehow seemed to read everything and know just about everything. I and a lot of other members would have the experience of sending him a memo --in those days it would've been handing it to his office, not e-mailing it -- you know, like on a Monday, and the next morning he would pass you in the hall and talk to you about, you know, some point on page 3 of your memo. As Chair of the Codes Committee, he was, first of all, extraordinarily deli -- devoted to civil liberties and justice. But also understood that

sometimes you can get an awful lot more done as the saying goes, *If you don't care, who gets the credit*. You know, years ago when we, quote, "repealed the Rockefeller Drug Laws," it was a big deal. It was a major achievement. Mr. Speaker, you played a -- no, Jeff -- where's Mr. Aubry -- played a -- a key role in making that happen. What almost nobody knows is that in the '80s when Mel chaired the Codes Committee, he and Ralph Marino, the Republican Chair of the Senate Codes Committee, very quietly, year after year, would repeal one piece or another of the Rockefeller Drug Laws. And so by the time we did the big repeal of the Rockefeller Drug Laws, the job had been about half done in the '80s, very quietly, by Mel Miller. Because he knew that doing it a little bit at a time without making any noise about it was the way to get it done. Ironically, perhaps, he was taken from the Assembly by a criminal conviction that I and I think a lot of people and I think ultimately an Appellate Court agreed was an inappropriate, shall we say, prosecution. But after he left the Assembly, he -- it turned out he couldn't stay away, and came back for many, many years as a very decent and very effective lobbyist who continued -- I mean, he occasionally would lobby me as Chair of the Health Committee, and it always astonished me the level of detail that he knew about what we were doing in the Health Committee, including things that had happened the day before. So, I missed him when he was taken from the Assembly, I missed him when he was taken from us finally.

I just want to say something very brief about Jim Nagle. Jim Nagle was, early on in my chairmanship of the Health

Committee, I think our -- my first Ranking Minority member on the Health Committee, a decent, smart, concerned, level-headed legislator. A pleasure to work with as -- as Ranking Minority member. And I just want to note that, you know, he -- he was not an exception among our Ranking Minority members to -- to have those qualities. We've really been blessed with a series of Ranking Minority members, up to and including Andy Raia, with those really important and useful criteria.

So, I miss Mel Miller, I miss Jim Nagle, and let's try to remember them and live in ways that honor them.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Ms. Glick on the resolution.

MS. GLICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I first arrived here, Mel Miller was the -- was the Speaker. And our -- our Body was somewhat less diverse. And I arrived as the first out member of the Legislature. And Speaker Miller was very helpful and supportive in deflecting some of the questions from the press. So I will always think of him fondly for his deafness, his wit, and his support. It was a very different time, and not necessarily one in which one felt a tremendous amount of support. But having the Speaker be supportive was a very important start to my career here, and I will always think of him fondly.

I also want to speak about José Peralta. We worked on the DREAM Act together for a number of years, and it was, for him, just a matter of simple justice, which I think he conveyed to other members very effectively, even though it took a long time for us to

come to an appropriate conclusion on that matter. But I also worked with him on another issue that was equally important to him, and that was protecting the lives of school children on their way to school. And he really did everything he possibly could to move the Senate to support speed cameras in school zones. It seems like a very simple thing. Why could anyone find that objectionable? And it got caught up in politics in the -- in the Senate, and I know it pained him. It pained him tremendously that he was not able to convince people of the very simple justice of ensuring that school children, staff at the schools, the grandparents who were taking their grandchildren to school, all of the people who would be -- have reason to go either to drop a child off or pick up a child, were not given the -- the support of the society to say cars should not be speeding in and around our schools. And we were, again, successful too late for him. And I just want to say that he was always a gentleman, but he also enjoyed life tremendously and he had a great smile and a twinkle in his eye. And he was a -- a lovely man, and a great loss. And to the family, we are so very sorry for his loss, and he will be remembered here for many years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Cahill on the resolution.

MR. CAHILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will start very briefly with sort of a post-service recollection about Mel Miller. To those of you who don't know who Mel Miller is or don't remember ever seeing him in the halls, almost on a very regular basis until last

year, he was the man, when he walked into a room or walked into a hall, there was no room for anybody else in that room. He elbows that could stretch from wall to wall. He's a person who when he spoke, he spoke authoritatively, and he if he spoke against you, while you were a little troubled by the fact that you were about to lose a -- a point with him, you went home and you bragged about the fact that it was Mel Miller who took you on. He was a giant. One of the two people with Stanley Fink, who I think will go down in history as the creators of the modern New York State Assembly. Those two individuals transformed this institution from -- from what was actually a citizen Legislature to one that we see today where we have staffs, where we have a great working knowledge of the legislation that we deal with. We owe a debt to Melvin Miller for the transformation of the New York State Legislature, and I -- I do hope that his -- his family accepts our condolences and he rests in peace.

José Peralta was one of the young Latino members of this House who came in with a group of others who also transformed this place in a very significant and a very positive way. Deborah announced a few of the issues that he was concerned with. And we all mourned his passing at such a young age and so suddenly. But I can't help but wonder if he is not one of the reasons why we have had such a successful year. I can't help but wonder if his spirit is not a part of all of us now. Will his spirit be a part of us when we protect tenants later this week? Was his spirit a part of us when we transformed the criminal justice system? Is his spirit with us as we

invite a generation of young people to experience higher education because they are capable, not just because they are of means or they were born in the right place? We owe a great debt to José. We miss him greatly. And I wish he were here with us to enjoy some of his victories that we are participating in.

But, Mr. Speaker, I rise today for someone who you probably don't know, and who did serve before Dick Gottfried was here, so that means that he was also here before the advent of the automobile and, perhaps, when the alphabet only had 23 letters and numbers were not yet infinite.

(Laughter)

I speak of James Tully, who served for a single year in 1966, and then served as a delegate to the New York State Constitutional Convention in 1967. Who had his first taste of Statewide politics when he chaired the campaign of Governor Hugh Carey in 1982, and -- and -- in 1975, I take it back. And when Governor Carey became Governor, Jim Tully was appointed the Commissioner of Taxation and Finance, where he did serve with distinction until 1982. Jim was a remarkable man. Let me tell you a little bit about how things have changed in the Executive Branch. As the Commissioner of Taxation and Finance, Jim conducted an audit of a man who was using a government vehicle to transport his children. Jim determined that to be income, and then sent a bill to then-Governor Carey for \$972.

(Laughter)

That wasn't enough for Jim. He kept on going from there. A few years later it was determined that a relative of the Governor had been doing a few things that maybe where the books weren't kept quite so well, and he started an investigation and prosecuted the Governor's brother while the Governor was still sitting and was his boss. Just imagine today.

(Laughter)

Okay. If you don't have an imagine -- an imagination great enough to think about how that could be accomplished today, but that's what it was like under Governor Hugh Carey and when Jim Tully ran the Department of Taxation and Finance.

But let me tell you a couple of reasons why he's important to you: During his tenure as Commissioner of Taxation and Finance, New York City went bankrupt. And when New York City went bankrupt, the way that New York City was bailed out was here in this room, by the imposition of a number of taxes for which the Commissioner of Taxation and Finance and the person of Jim Tully became, for all intents and purposes, the sole trustee. Unlike other taxes that we levy in legislative branches of government and executive branches of government get to determine what to do, as the Trustee, Jim Tully singularly decided what bills got paid in New York City and what bills didn't get paid in New York City. And one of the taxes that was imposed back then - and maybe it's familiar to some of you who have been here for awhile - was a commuter tax on people from New Jersey. And New Jersey brought Jim to court, and he sued them --

they sued him and he won. And the result was that New York City - which was not on the verge of collapse, but had collapsed - was able to come through the worst fiscal crisis any major city on the globe has ever faced. And it was largely because of the good work of Jim Tully.

When he left the Department of Taxation and Finance, he came back to the private sector and he was an attorney who represented people who had problems with the Department of Taxation and Finance. And I will tell you in a moment how I know about that, but we'll get back to that. Later on in life, Jim Tully became counsel to the New York State Comptroller. That was an office that Jim sought in the early 1980's. He ran in the Democratic primary and was summarily defeated. But then he became friends with the Comptroller and soon was an invaluable counsel to that Office. Later on, at a time that most of us are looking forward to - except for Dick, who's looking at back at it - in our 70s, our late 70s when we're thinking about retirement, Jim was asked by the Governor to step up for service again, and in his late 70s again became a Commissioner in our tax system in New York State, becoming a member of the New York State Tax Appeals Tribunal, retiring just two years ago at the age of 85.

So, let me tell you what I know about Jim Tully personally. I will tell you that in the many, many conversations that I had with him, almost always, his very brief tenure here in this House came up. Although when I pressed him for details about what happened that year, we quickly moved on to other subjects because it

was a different Legislature then. It was a pre-Mel Miller, pre-Stanley Fink Legislature then. But one thing he did was he loved this State dearly. And I know that because he gave me my first legal job after law school. I became a tax litigator because of Jim Tully, and he supported me in that role. And when it came time for him to run for State office, I supported him in that role. And when he became a tax advocate, he became my adversary - and a very worthy one - in tax litigation in the State of New York. And later on in life, I came to know Jim a couple of others ways, not the least of which is the fact that his family is from my community. And that came home very clearly about ten years ago when I was looking to buy a house, and I saw a cute little brick house with a "For Sale" sign outside and I called up the realtor. And the next thing you know, it was Jim Tully on the other end of the phone. And he owned the house that I actually live in today.

(Laughter)

My colleagues, many, many people pass through these doors, and many people have an impact in this room, and you've heard about a few of them already, and you will probably hear more about each of them very soon. But each person who serves here serves with distinction and has a life that is separate and apart from this place and that makes them great unto themselves. So, I would just ask that you share with me our condolences to the family of Jim Tully; Eileen, his daughters, Ann, Lauren, Susan, Kathleen and his son, James; his brother, Marty and his sister, Dr. Mary Louise Johnson.

And may he rest in peace.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Ms. Dickens on the resolution.

MS. DICKENS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to talk about Herman "Denny" Farrell, whom I served with. Herman represented the northern part of Harlem and Washington Heights. Lovingly called "Denny," he chaired Ways and Means before our now Helene Weinstein. Denny was tall, slender, with a commanding spirit that made you listen. I want to also mention, since our Assemblymember Joe Lentol mentioned Marie Runyon - as the fierce fighter that she was - I want to mention the first black woman who walked these halls, Betsy Buchanan. I want to mention Percy Ellis Sutton, who served in the '60s after my father, Lloyd E. Dickens. Percy went on to become an entrepreneur that brought the revitalization of 125th Street that everybody else is now taking credit for.

I want to talk about Basil Patterson, who served in the Senate and later went on to become our lieutenant governor. There was Mark Sellfall (phonetic). There was Thomas K. Dickens, who served in the '40s here in this -- this renowned hall of legislation. And since we're talking about Speaker Mel Miller, there was Geraldine L. Daniels, who served as Speaker Pro Tem in the 1970's and '80s.

We have a renowned and rich history on whose shoulder that today we all stand on, for all that they brought to this House, to this State and to this country. So these were just a few of

the names that I wanted to -- to mention and talk about because they represented my Harlem. My West Harlem, my East Harlem. These are people whom I did not serve with other than Denny, but whom I was able to walk the streets of Harlem with, who I grew up knowing. Who God gave me the privilege of being able to learn from them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me the time to mention them.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Aubry on the resolution.

MR. AUBRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity to speak on the resolution. When -- particularly about José, because he was both my colleague in the Assembly and my Senator when he moved on. And I, quite frankly, haven't talked much about it because his passing was a great shock to me. For a lot of difference reasons; one, of course, because he was younger, and you know, we were diametrically opposed in height. Mr. Speaker, you know something about that.

(Laughter)

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Thanks.

(Laughter)

MR. AUBRY: So when we would take pictures together, as often would happen, I would have to either sit down or he'd have to stand on a chair next to me.

(Laughter)

But we had kindred spirits because of how he saw his community, our community together. And the Speaker often does the

same thing with me.

The fall -- that tragic fall when José passed, why -- in part why it was such a shock is because I had health problems at that time and, quite frankly, wasn't sure that I was going to be able to get through them. And I did. And in my recovery, José was there for me. We would go to events together, and I was still a little weak so I'd have to sit down and he could stand over me, which he was very happy to do. His love for his community and his people was paramount. His love for his family and his children was outstanding. No matter what the political structure he faced, he chose them over everything else. So I'm -- now that we are at the end of this Session, there are a couple of things that are going to happen that remind me, as we talked about the DREAM Act and how fervent an advocate he was for it and passing it on to -- to Francisco Moya to take on that battle in the Assembly. We had some last bills together that went unfinished. A pre-K program that would be attached to our Hall of Science, which is a bill that we're going to have to do. That was a favorite for both of us, had a lot of controversy in the local community. But he stood up to that controversy as we moved together because we saw that was an investment in our children, which is what he was about. He loved the children of his community, he loved his own children. We took on even more controversy when we decided to take on the expansion of LaGuardia Airport, for which I'm getting beat up. He left me to take it all by myself. But José believed in standing for what he thought was right. Many of the folks that we honor today, some of whom I either

served with or knew in their capacities, that was a common theme of who they are. And I think that it is the meat of what binds us together as colleagues, is because we come to understand that we stand for what we believe, even if we disagree. Even if there's a fight amongst us. Even if we get angry at each other. We understand in our essence, when you're in this Body, you're here because you stand for what you believe. And I was always told when I got here - sometimes by Mel, sometimes by some of the other longer-serving colleagues - that votes of conscience are supposed to be respected. There are a lot of things -- if you're not invested you may be moved left and right. You may have to make new information. But where your conscience stands is where you must stand, and it must be respected. And each of the members that we honor today that I knew, that was a hallmark of their strength and why they were here.

So, I'm just pleased to pause at this moment to remember that, and to remember the lessons that they have taught us, and the essential strength that this Body possesses.

May they all rest in peace.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Crespo on the resolution.

MR. CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's an interesting opportunity to be reminded, as some others have mentioned, the fragility of life and the shortness of it. Oftentimes, especially when someone is lost at a young age and -- and just to think about what it means for all of us to be colleagues, to serve, what leadership is about and what a legacy means in regards to the work

that we do and what it means for New Yorkers that -- many of whom will never know our names, but will be impacted by our decisions and our advocacy. And I remember coming here as intern in 2003 oblivious to what the work that happened in this room really meant to me and my life. I was a young kid who had gone through a lot, and I -- there were things in my life that mattered to me. And there was a group of young men that I met here, a group of friends -- and there's a photo that we've been sharing that took place right behind me. It was a young Ruben Diaz, Jr., my predecessor. There was a young Carl Heastie, who wasn't that much taller then, he was shorter.

(Laughter)

There was a young José Peralta. There were a couple of other colleagues; Luis Diaz was in that photo and few others. And I always kind of look back to that photo to remind me of how I started here. And what was really impressive is that not only did those fellows, when we would hang out and spend some time together, talk about issues. They really showed me that their work was driven by the issues that mattered to them and the communities that they would impact. And I remember José -- you know, we often talk about José the activist and the legislator who fought for the DREAM Act, but remember, he came out of the labor movement also, working for the Central Labor Counsel and was committed to the needs and the fight of working men and women. He was a champion on the minimum wage fight for many years. And -- and there are a number of other issues that he was devoted to and committed to. And as the Labor

Chair now, I oftentimes reference José and his work and the things that I aspire to do as Labor Chair. But José also impacted me in a -- in way -- in a very personal way. I'm a proud father. José always talked about his kids. Every day he talked about his family and his children. I remember watching Ruben Diaz, Jr. would sit -- this was before Facetime -- would sit in his office, would not leave until he had gone and helped his kids with homework over the phone. José would oftentimes talk about doing the same thing, and he would share stories about being criticized in the district because he chose to spend time with his children instead of going to every single event that the Speaker and I had talked about; the sacrifices we make for our children to be here, to fight for these issues.

So, José, I just want you to know that I thank you for showing what it is to be a father, what it can be to balance work and personal life. I remember that call when you made that decision that's been referenced here more than once. And I remember having a conversation with José prior to that political decision that he made, and I can tell you, in that conversation he proved to me something that I already knew, but that I think maybe some folks have lost sight of, and it is -- certainly was lost in that last campaign. José was never driven by his own ambition. It wasn't about him. It wasn't about him achieving something nobody else achieved, even though he did that in his life as the first Latino elected in Queens County to the New York State Assembly. And somebody who grew up in Jose's district -- I grew up in Queens before I moved to the Bronx, and that was home.

And he made me proud for what -- how he fought, because I was -- I felt really reflected in Jose's body of work. But José shaped me as a legislator to be proud and unapologetic about fighting for the people I believe in. I -- I try to do that in anything I'll do with regards to labor, as the Committee Chair. But certainly, also I'll fight for immigrant rights. And it wasn't just the DREAM Act. There were so many things that José fought for. I remember watching him and Adriano Espaillat lead the fight for translation services in hospitals; something that would seem so simple, yet turned into a lengthy debate and discussion of whether spending those resources was actually in the best interests of the State. It was talking about saving somebody's life in an emergency room. Well, yes, it was. And they led that fight like so many others. But as we vote today also on other issues, I can't help but contemplate that later today when a bill comes up with me as the Assembly sponsor, that had he still been here and were he still leading the way, I have no doubt that it would be Jose's name as my counterpart carrying additional opportunities for our immigrant families in this State. I know for a fact that it would be him leading the way, because this is what he stood for. All of us in this room, he would often wear that shirt, "I am an immigrant." I -- I took a photo with that shirt today in reference to something we'll deal with later today. But I learned to be a better legislator, a better advocate, and certainly, a better father and a better husband because of the example that somebody like José Peralta was able to give. And so I want his family to know that we do love them, that we will be there for them

and that we support them and all of the families of the deceased members. That they should count on us moving forward. And whether I knew any of those members or not, there is a certain respect and brotherhood, sisterhood, comradery that -- that exists within this Chamber in all of us. Despite our disagreements, we are a family that has the opportunity to leave a legacy.

José Peralta is among those that left an invaluable one for our neighborhoods that continues to shape the work that we do. And I hope that later today, José, I can make you proud.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Thank you.

Mr. Weprin on the resolution.

MR. WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to talk about two former members; one who actually also preceded Dick Gottfried. He only served for one term in the Assembly, I'm talking about Seymour -- or as everybody referred to him, Sy -- Boyers, who served for one term in 1967 and 1968. He then went on to a career in the City Council, and then a very distinguished judicial career. Sy and his wife, Joan, were very close personal friends of my parents, Saul and Sylvia, and they would often socialize together. But he was probably more well-known for his judicial career, where he served on the Civil Court, on the Supreme Court, and had a distinguished career on the Appellate Division, the Second Department. He was also very involved with my father in founding CUNY Law School as a law school for public service, and I will remember him for that as well.

I'd also like talk about our former Speaker, Mel

Miller, who was very close to my late father. My father always referred to his becoming Speaker as bittersweet because in some ways it was at Mel Miller's expense. As you know, he had a conviction unrelated to his public office which was overturned. My father always felt bittersweet about becoming Speaker at that time because he was so close to Mel. Mel gave him the opportunity to serve as Ways and Means Chair. And they were really partners in -- in so many new things that they did in -- when he became Speaker in 1987. And -- and they were very close. And my mother and father would socialize with -- with Liz and -- and Mel very often. But I'll never forget, and my family will never forget, the opportunity that Mel gave to my late father to become Ways and Means Chair and to really be a partner in so many things that he did as Speaker. And I do remember very well, because I knew Mel as a young -- as a young legislator, as a young Assemblymember, and also socializing with -- with them with my parents, that he was really the same person he was before he became an Assemblymember, when he was a junior Assemblymember, and when he was Speaker. He always treated people with respect, with dignity. He didn't have any airs about him. In a lot of ways, my father modeled himself after that as well, because he was the same person. But I really want to pay my tribute to Mel, who left us too early. May he -- may you rest in peace.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Rivera on the resolution.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Speaker, listening to how we are -- remembering the good work of so many who are no longer with us,

very quickly, I will try to say that I remember Denny Farrell as a gentleman. But I also remember him as a tough county leader for Manhattan. I should know, because when we attempted to run candidates there, he made it clear to us in the Bronx that we had to talk. And we did. And that's how we got José Marcos Serrano. That's a lot of good story behind that.

I want to concentrate on Mel Miller. What we have here today is because -- and I hope among the people watching us, some can recall that when we were approached to change or to elect a new Speaker, there were two Latinos that stood with the idea of change. I was one of them, and I asked, *Can we wait after the budget process, because Bronx County is not with you, Mr. Norman Adler*, Political Director at that time of DC 37. So, use my name after the budget process. Some of you might get an idea why. Joseph Iskowitz came to us, to both of us and -- and asked us for support for Mel Miller. And I say that the reason many of us are here today is because when Mel Miller became Speaker, he worked very closely with the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus. And I can tell you that before we voted on him, we asked him for one thing: To create a task force for Latino issues. That's how we got today what is called the Puerto Rican Hispanic Task Force today, and as a result, most of the members that are here today can hear that it was Mel Miller that made so many things possible. He helped empower our community. He helped empower African-American and Latino.

Now, in conclusion, it is sad that after we leave this

today, remembering José Peralta -- my Speaker can share with you guys privately -- he would come to the Bronx and say some 15 years ago, *I'm about to propose and take a position on a couple of issues that my borough would not look favorable to.* One of those, DREAM Act. Guess what? Driver's licenses. So I'll make an appeal because I've been hearing things that I refuse to believe, that people in a high-powered position are asking conservative Democrats - I hope I'm wrong because I read it - conservative Democrats to vote no on the driver's license. Shame on you if that is the truth, if that is happening. Governor, lend your voice. Give us the support for thousands of undocumented workers who are all over the State, and they want an opportunity to be able to openly earn a decent salary --

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Rivera, can you please keep --

MR. RIVERA: -- for the people and for their families.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Rivera -- Mr. Rivera, can you please keep the comments to the resolution.

MR. RIVERA: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's it.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mrs. Galef on the resolution.

MRS. GALEF: Thank you. Although I remember coming up here to lobby Mel Miller and Dan Walsh when I was involved with county government a long time ago, I had great respect for what they did in the New York State Assembly. But I'm here to

speaking about Greg Young. And Greg Young, I worked with on the Westchester County Board of Legislators for approximately three years while my husband worked with him prior to that. And, you know, there were significant issues that he dealt with at the County level. We were trying to create a solid waste system in -- in the County of Westchester. We had no place to put our garbage. He was very much involved in that issue. We had sewer issue problems, how to protect our Hudson River and our Sound. And, of course, he was from Mount Vernon, trying to protect that side of the County, the Sound. Working on homeless issues that were starting to develop in our County and our State. And, of course, working on health care institutions, which we had a discussion about the other night. But very involved in issues that were really important to Westchester. And then he came to the New York State Assembly, working on other issues that were going on up here. And we, as legislators, many of us would come up to lobby Greg Young and have him come down to Westchester County to talk about what was happening here in Albany. He was a very, very calm man. So well-respected, as Mr. Lentol has said. People really enjoyed being with Greg Young. He was a representative that I think we can all relate to and say he was a good man, served his government so well and his community so well and he will be missed. And as you know -- you may not know, John McDonald, who is the New York State Transportation Commissioner, who is now Chief of Staff to County Executive George Latimer, was his wife and wonderful partner, and the two of them have done a lot

for us all of us.

So, on behalf of those who worked with him, I offer my respect and condolences to the family. Thank you.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Cusick on the resolution.

MR. CUSICK: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This proceeding today is an example of the great traditions of this great House and what makes us unique to other state legislatures throughout the country. And what also is an example of this House is that we are a family. And part of that family is the staff that makes the everyday events in this House move and make us look good. And today we also recognize staff who passed in the last year, and I take this moment to recognize the staff from the Assembly who passed in the last year. Mary Ann Drago, Ruth Harbeck, Geneva Farmer, Christine Morse-Sicko, Sandra Shapard, Patrick McGuire, Brendan William Fitzgerald, Kathleen Wise, Esther Mary Forbes Twentyman, Elaine Blyden, Peter Martin, Alexander Rem, Jr., Kimberly McCaffrey, Frank Kennedy, Maureen Larkin McNamara.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we are a big family here in the Assembly, and an integral part of that is our staff. Being a former staffer, I understand and we all understand the sacrifices that our staff make to make this Body look great, and they don't always get the recognition they deserve. And that's why today it's important that we recognize those who passed, and may they rest in peace.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Mr. Otis on the resolution.

MR. OTIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise with the remembrance of Assemblyman Greg Young, who Assemblywoman Galef just mentioned. Greg Young served in the Assembly from 1983 to 1992, and during those years overlapped, and I got to know him as a staff member in the New York State Senate. And what I will tell you, and I think we should remember Greg Young for today, is that he was a good colleague. A good colleague to his Senator that he served with, a good colleague to his colleagues here in this House. And so when we would go -- we overlapped Mount Vernon and -- and Greg represented Mount Vernon and part of Yonkers -- when you'd go to Greg Young's office to talk about an issue that we shared jointly, he had a smile on his face, total teamwork, a total attitude of *How are we going to solve this problem together?* And that is a model, I think, to all of us. He died too young. He was a public servant. Beyond his time here, he started as Corporation Counsel of the City of Mount Vernon, and served on the County Board of Legislators and did ten good years here. And he is missed by many and missed by this House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER HEASTIE: Thank you, Mr. Otis.

And to conclude, I want to give my condolences and -- and my prayers to the families of all of the members that we lost in the last year. And as I've always said, that it is an honor and a privilege to serve in this House. But I want to speak particularly of two of the deceased members who I had pretty close relationships with. One is Mel Miller, and many people mentioned him. But I'm a

member who never served with Mel Miller, but I do remember, you know, when I got elected Speaker, everybody in the world wanted to give me advice. And I thought that the first time that Mel Miller asked me for a meeting that he, again, would be one of these people to offer me advice. But Mel did not do that. The first thing he said to me was, *How are you doing?* And, *How is the job treating you?* And he and I became quick friends after that. And we would laugh, and he would know during tough times, whether it was budget time or end of Session time, he would always know something to say because he knew from experience that he sat in the very same place that I sat. But never one time did Mel Miller ever give me a suggestion or told me what to do, when you would expect someone who had had that job would be the first person to want to offer advice. All Mel ever did was always offer me his friendship, and I thought that was very, very important, and it showed what kind of human being that Mel Miller was. And Mel could have decided once -- when he was wrongly taken from being a member of the Legislature, he could have said, you know, "To the heck with this business", but he felt advocating and being a part of this process was still so important to him, which again, I think showed a lot about Mel Miller's character.

And then I want to get to my friend, José Peralta, who was elected here to the Assembly I think two years after I was elected, and as Assemblyman Crespo mentioned, we were part of a crew that would hang out with each other. And I know that many people believe that the -- the choice that José made, the political choice that

José made was a -- was a wrongful choice, and politically, it turned out to be that way. But I know in the conversations that I had with José, as Assemblyman Crespo mentioned, he never did it for the trappings of except that he thought that being in leadership would help him represent his constituents better than being in the Minority. That was his only reason for doing it. And choosing to do that probably cost him his seat. But even being in that position, he still stood for very two very important things that meant a lot to so many young people, including fighting for the -- for the DREAM Act. And I think it -- it was aptly that we named the DREAM Act after him. And he also cosponsored the bill with -- with our wonderful member, Assemblymember Deborah Glick, on the -- on the cameras around -- the speed cameras around the schools. So for whatever people think about Jose's political choices, I know as a human being, he is someone who deeply cared about his community, his family. And it is very tough, and every time I think about him -- and I even recently went to his -- his wife had a birthday party. And it was just -- I just went there to -- to wish her well. And I saw Jose's mother, and I saw his brother. And it just still is a shock to me to see them without seeing José there. And someone who was taken so young -- taken so young and -- and too quickly. And he deeply, deeply cared about his constituents. And as I said, even after he lost, José was still doing a turkey drive for his constituents when most people who may have lost the race may have said, *Well, they didn't want me. I'm going to move on with my life.* But he still was representing his community, even though he knew he

had lost his primary and he was going to be out of office in two months. That shows the character of José Peralta.

So, on the resolution honoring the members of our deceased colleagues, all those members who are in favor shall rise and stand quietly in their place.

(Whereupon, members rose.)

Thank you. The resolution is adopted.

(Pause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if we could now go to resolutions on page 3. On Assembly No. 442, we will expect comments from Member Rozic, and on 538 we will expect comments from Member Hyndman.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 442, Ms. Rozic.

Legislative Resolution urging the New York State Congressional delegation to support H.R.7062 and S.3592, relating to the Never Forget the Heroes: Permanent Authorization of the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund Act.

(Pause)

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

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 537, Mr.

Perry.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim June 2019, as Caribbean American Heritage Month in the State of New York.

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

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 538, Ms. Hyndman.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim June 12-19, 2019, as Sickle Cell Disease Awareness Week in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Hyndman on the resolution.

MS. HYNDMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to speak on this resolution. The United Nations and the World Health Organization have recognized that sickle cell is a global public health priority. Sickle cell disease is a chronic heredity blood disorder that it turns your blood cells into the shape of a sickle, and can cause devastation to -- to individuals with this disease. It causes frequent pain that can result in necrosis of the hips, knees, ankles and shoulders. It can cause severe anemia, acute lung complications and difficulty for women who are pregnant or are in the childbearing age. It can develop rapidly in the blood -- in your blood, causing sepsis, meningitis, stroke, and can affect children, some as young as 18

months old. And a lot of these children are going to what we call crises if they're not taking care of their health and being fully hydrated at all times. Sickle cell disease is common in most African-Americans, but the disease can be found in other demographics also: In the Caribbean, in South and Central America, in the Medit -- in the Mediterranean and in India.

It is currently estimated that 100,000 Americans are living with the disease across the United States, and ten percent of those patients reside in New York State. The actual sickle cell day is June 19th, but because of the nature of this Body, I wanted to make sure that we talk about it now.

I do want to thank the Health Committee Chair in the Assembly and the Senate for allocating more dollars towards eradication of this disease. I want New York State to be a leader when it comes to making sure that we're providing treatment for those who have sickle cell disease across this State. I want us to lead Texas and North Carolina and South Carolina and the monies we appropriate towards the eradication of this disease.

So I -- I thank you for allowing me to speak on the resolution, and I look forward to making sure we do much better as a State in next year's budget.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Barron on the resolution.

MR. BARRON: I want to thank the sponsor for this

resolution. A lot of people didn't pay a lot of attention to a very serious disease that was particular to people of African ancestry. But the Black Panther Party in the 1960's made this a very popular, popular issue, and they had health clinics across the nation, about 40 health clinics in 40 states across the nation. And there was a lot of focus on sickle cell anemia.

So I just want to commend the sponsor so that we can always remember that these kinds of illnesses that particularly affect people of African ancestry should get more money and more attention, because as the sponsor clearly outlined, it is very, very serious. For that, I highly commend her and I suggest that all of us support this resolution. Very timely and needed.

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

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 539, Mr. Zebrowski.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim June 2019, as Migraine and Headache Awareness Month in the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Zebrowski on the resolution.

MR. ZEBROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As we pass thi -- hopefully pass this resolution to bring some awareness to this -- to this process. Migraines are a neurological disease, one

that can incapacitate individuals. Just a few details and statistics that I think would be important to my colleagues and to people around the State or anyone that's listening: Migraines are an illness that affects approximately 39 million people in the US and one billion people worldwide. There is approximately 1.2 million ER visits each year for acute migraine attacks. There's over four million people that have chronic daily migraines, and American employers lose approximately \$13 billion each year due to the 113 million lost workdays. And then most importantly, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there -- in 2017 there were just 500 certified headache specialists nationwide. Obviously, this is something that affects a lot of New Yorkers, a lot of people in our district. And we hope by passing this resolution that we can bring some awareness and possibly get some advancements in the treatment of this disease.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

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

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 540, Ms. Solages.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim July 2019, as Fibroid Awareness Month in the State of New York.

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

adopted.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 541, Mr. DenDekker.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim June 2019, as Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Month, and June 27, 2019, as Post-Traumatic Stress Injury Awareness Day in the State of New York.

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

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 542, Mr. Brabenec.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim October 2019, as Czech-American Heritage Month in the State of New York.

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

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me to interrupt our proceedings as I -- on behalf of our colleague, Phil Ramos, we welcome some guests who came all the way from Long Island today. They are here from the Peruvian Gastronomy Re -- Gastronomy Organization. They are William Diaz, Vicki Diaz, Cynthia Diaz, Marina Rosella Clark, Adlina Montinez,

Romi M. Zonron, José Peretes, Norma Peretes, Blanca Garcia Diaz, Chef Dago Sanchez, Alexandra Jillian, Chris Sanchez, Maria P. Lloyd, Joseph Lloyd, Alejandro Roman, Chef Izekial Valencia, and Hugo Delzella.

Mr. Speaker, these are honorable folks who have joined us from -- not just from Long Island, but from around the world. Would you please welcome them to our Chambers [sic] and offer them the full cordialities of the House.

And be aware, members and colleagues, that these members -- these folks will be honored in a privileged resolution that we will pass at the end of our Session today. And so, on behalf of Mr. Ramos and the Peruvian Food Festival, please welcome these wonderful folks to our Chambers [sic].

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Ramos, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly, we extend to you the privileges of the floor. This is the People's House, you are always welcome here. And we look forward to enjoying some very delicious food that you will provide for us later in the day. Lots of appetites in this House. Thank you so very much. Buenos dias.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if we could now go to page 6, Rules Report No. 91 by Mr. Bronson.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00648-A, Rules Report No. 91, Bronson, Barron, Abinanti, D'Urso, Weprin, Wallace, Buttenschon, Rozic, Santabarbara, Fahy, Lupardo, Ryan, Hunter, Steck, Gunther, Lifton, Stirpe, Romeo, Jones, McDonald, Magnarelli, Burke, McMahon, Barrett, Woerner, Colton. An act to amend the Social Services Law, in relation to making care and services provided by licensed mental health practitioners eligible for coverage under the Medicaid programs.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A00972-A, Rules Report No. 92, L. Rosenthal, Jacobson, DenDekker. An act to amend the Insurance Law, in relation to prohibiting co-payments for treatment at an opioid treatment program.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, it did take a while, but this is our first vote of today. So if we could please -- if you're in and around the Chambers [sic], come in, cast your vote. In the Chambers [sic], cast your vote. First vote of today. Thank you

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: First vote of the day, members. If you are in your seats, please vote now. If you're in the

sound of our voice, please come into the Chamber and cast your vote.

Quickly. We have lots of work today, ladies and gentlemen. Let's go.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if you could please call the Real Property and [sic] Taxation Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room. Mrs. Galef is on her way.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Real Property Tax in the Speaker's Conference [sic]. Mrs. Galef is on her way. Please follow quickly.

The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01151, Rules Report No. 93, Gottfried, Dinowitz, Paulin, Schimminger, Ortiz, Jaffee, D'Urso, Abinanti, Sayegh, DeStefano, Salka, Barron. An act to amend the Public Health Law, in relation to authorizing the Commissioner of Health to make grants to be used for the costs of conducting a local blood donation drive.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

If you're in the Chamber, this is the second vote. The

quicker you vote, the more business we will get done. Members are reminded, vote now, please.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01307-A, Rules Report No. 94, L. Rosenthal, Steck, D'Urso, Arroyo, Stern, Brabenec, Lavine, Magnarelli, Barron, Reyes. An act to amend the Public Health Law, in relation to food allergy awareness in food service establishments and online food ordering services.

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

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01320-A, Rules Report No. 95, Cahill, Jacobson, D'Urso. An act to amend the Election Law, in relation to canvass of ballots cast by certain voters.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

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

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Local Governments Committee in the Speaker's Conference Room. Please, and thank you.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01772-A, Rules Report No. 96, Peoples-Stokes, Crespo, Rodriguez, Weprin, Perry, Dickens. An act to amend the Banking Law, in relation to assessment of the record of performance of banking institutions in helping to meet the credit needs of local communities.

ACTING SPEAKER FERNANDEZ: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01801-A, Rules Report No. 97, Pheffer Amato, D'Urso, Ortiz, Cook, Colton, Jones, Nolan, Griffin, DenDekker. An act to amend the Education Law, relation to providing for the observance of September 11th Remembrance Day and providing for the observance of a brief period of silence in public school classrooms at the opening of such day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02037-A, Rules Report No. 98, Gunther. An act directing the Department of Public

Service to study the feasibility of a municipal broadband program within the State.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The bill is -- excuse me.

On a motion by Mrs. Gunther, the Senate bill is before the House. The Senate bill is advanced. The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02226-A, Rules Report No. 99, Cahill. An act to amend the Highway Law, in relation to designating a portion of the State highway system the "John 'Jody' Rossitz Memorial Bridge."

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02284, Rules Report No. 100, Gunther. An act to amend the Tax Law, in relation to authorizing the Town of Wallkill to adopt a hotel or motel tax of up to 5 percent; and providing for the repeal of such provisions upon expiration thereof.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Home rule message is at the desk. The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02468-C, Rules Report No. 101, Wallace, DenDekker. An act to amend the General Business Law, in relation to requiring that a homeowner be provided a cost estimate for installation of a fire sprinkler system.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The bill is laid aside.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A02559, Rules Report No. 102, Glick, L. Rosenthal, M.G. Miller, Seawright, Otis. An act to amend the Tax Law and the State Finance Law, in relation to providing a tax check-off box on personal income tax and corporate franchise tax returns for gifts to the New York State Horse Retirement and Rescue Fund; and directing the Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets to compile a list of approved horse retirement and rescue programs.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect January 1st, 2021.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if you could please call the Election Law Committee to the Speaker's

Conference Room. I believe Mr. Lavine is already there.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Election Law Committee, Speaker's Conference Room, please, immediately.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: And, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleagues Nick Perry, Diana Richardson and Maritza Davila, we would like to welcome to our Chambers [sic] some very special guests from literally all over the world. Mr. Speaker, we have His Excellency Juan Avila Cabellos. He is the Ambassador to the United Nations for the Dominican Republic. We have the Consul General Barbara Atherly from Guyana. We have the Consul General Lisa Bryan-Smart from Jamaica. We have the Consul General Howie Prince, Saint Vincent and Grenadines. And we have the Consul General Olson Dallaway, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Vice Consul, Investment and Trade Promotions, Bernadette Ambrose Black, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. And Consul General Andre Laveau from Trinidad and Tobago.

Mr. Speaker, the West Indian American Day Carnival Association is here as well. We have the President, Jean Josephs; the Vice President, Angela Seeley; the official DJ for Labor Day, DJ Red Man; and Jonathan DJ Naji Jaheen.

Mr. Speaker, would you please welcome these awesome, outstanding guests to our Chambers [sic], give them the courtesies of the floor and extend your welcome.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf

of Members Perry, Raynor, Richardson and Romero [sic], we welcome you here to the New York State Assembly. We extend to you the privileges of the floor. On behalf of the Speaker and all the members, we are pleased to share this time with you. You have graced us with your presence. To those Consul Generals from all of those countries, thank you for the service that you provide your country and the relationships that you have created with ours. Thank you so very much. You are always welcome here.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of our colleague, Mr. Eichenstein, we have members of the Metropolitan Council on Jewish Poverty. They are in the Chambers [sic]. The Metropolitan Council, as you know, Mr. Speaker, serves over 200,000 clients throughout the 16 Community Jewish Councils in each of the five boroughs of the great City of New York. They work on affordable housing, crisis intervention, family violence services and immigration services, as well as a food distribution.

Mr. Speaker, if you could welcome Alex Wo, Michael Davis, David Lazarus, Willie Pinko and David Schwartz to our Chambers [sic] on behalf of our member Eichenstein.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Eichenstein, Ms. Richardson, I think, who is back there with you, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome this distinguished group here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the

privileges of the floor. Thank you for the services that you provide the many communities in New York City and the State. Again, continue your great work. You are always welcome here. Thank you.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by some young people. This is a group of students from the public school in Mr. Dilan's district. In fact, his own son is one of the students in this fifth-grade class, Daniel Dilan. So, Mr. Speaker, they're joined -- or chaperoned, I should say, by Mr. Galassi, Mr. Healey, Mr. Tabbita, and Mr. Grossarth, who are the teachers. And these are students at Public School Number 65. Fifth graders, that's the best grade ever, Mr. Speaker.

If you would welcome them to our Chambers [sic].

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Certainly. On behalf of Mr. Dilan, the Speaker and all the members, we welcome this great fifth grade here to the New York State Assembly, extend to you the privileges of the floor. This is the People's House. You are always welcome here. We're so proud to have you. Hope that you have had a great academic year and will have even better a summer. And to the young Mr. Dilan, you're family. You're always here. I see you hiding in the back there. Make your father very proud. Thank you so very much. And to those who have supervised you, thank you.

(Applause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if we could continue our work on page 12, Rules Report No. 118 by Mr. Crespo on debate.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A03675-B, Rules Report No. 118, Crespo, Nolan, Glick, Dinowitz, L. Rosenthal, Abinanti, Simotas, Quart, Seawright, Simon, Gottfried, Peoples-Stokes, Weprin, Mosley, De La Rosa, Hyndman, Perry, Jaffee, Dilan, Walker, Dickens, Ortiz, Bronson, Epstein, Sayegh, Ramos, Pichardo, Buchwald, Thiele, Cruz, Otis, Magnarelli, Jacobson, Carroll, Reyes, Niou, Paulin, Fernandez, Benedetto, Taylor, Raynor, Arroyo, Rodriguez, Hevesi, Pretlow, DenDekker, Lifton, D. Rosenthal, Rivera, Cahill, Blake, Jean-Pierre, Kim, Hunter, Davila, Steck, Richardson, Galef, Joyner, Fall, Lavine, Frontus, Barron, O'Donnell, Wright, Solages, Fahy, Gantt. An act to amend the Vehicle and Traffic Law, in relation to the issuance of non-commercial drivers' licenses and learners' permits; and to repeal certain provisions of such law relating to driver's license applications.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: An explanation is requested, Mr. Crespo. But before we begin that, ladies and gentlemen, we are on debate. Please, members who are in the Chamber, please take your seat. Conversations that are being had in the Chamber should be taken outside or ceased. Thank you very much.

Proceed, Mr. Crespo.

MR. CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Driver's License Access and Privacy Act, aka 3675-B or otherwise known as the "Green Light New York" bill, would do a number of things: This bill expands the proofs of identity to apply for a standard driver's license, which is a non-commercial driver's license and does not meet Federal standards for identification. And applicants who lack a Social Security number may instead submit a signed affidavit that they have not been issued a Social Security number. The proofs under this bill that would be acceptable to DMV in lieu of that Social Security number would be a valid unexpired foreign passport issued by the applicant's country of citizenship; a valid, unexpired consulate identification document issued by a consulate from the applicant's country of citizenship; a valid foreign driver's license that includes the applicant's photo image and which is either unexpired or has expired for less than 24 months from its date of expiration. The bill restricts the disclosure of personal information from standard driver's license applications, the source documents submitted with applications and whether or not a driver's license or learner's permit meets or does not meet Federal standards for identification. However, disclosure would be permitted to the individual who is the subject of the records where required under the National Driver Register or to comply with a lawful court order or judicial warrant signed by a Federal judge, or subpoena issued under State law. The bill also restricts the release of DMV records to agencies primarily enforcing immigration law. However, disclosure would be permitted where necessary for the Commissioner

to issue enhanced and real ID driver's licenses, and pursuant to cooperative city, State, Federal arrangements that is not enforcing immigration law, and the disclosure is limited to the specific records sought under the arrangement. There are a few other provisions that I'm sure we'll discuss as the questions come up, but I do want as part of the explanation to clarify also that -- what this bill does not do. This bill does not provide a pathway to citizenship. This bill does not extend voting rights to noncitizens. This bill does nothing more than reauthorize what had been allowed under State law and DMV regulations for decades, which is the opportunity to secure a driver's license without a Social Security number. It is a bill that will have economic -- positive economic benefits for the State of New York. It is a bill that will help address the rising insurance premiums across this State, and will, in our opinion, lead to a reduction in insurance costs for all drivers. And more than anything else, it is a bill that enhances the public safety of our roadways for all New Yorkers. And -- and that is known through the experience of those states that have already authorized these provisions and the reduction in hit-and-runs and other accidents that have occurred in their roadways.

And so, I hope that gives a broad explanation, but I'm sure we'll discuss it further.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ra.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Will you yield, Mr.

Crespo?

MR. CRESPO: Certainly.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MR. RA: Thank you very much. And I know a number of my colleagues have questions, but I'm going to try to just go through some of the basics and then I'll -- I'll leave it to -- to some of them. So you talked about, first and foremost, the proof of identity that has to be submitted under this bill. And in particular, you know, the changing of -- of the requirement in terms of what needs to be submitted. Part of which is, you know, this list of documents, and I -- and I -- I assume or I believe in the text of the bill, the Commissioner might be able to determine in the future that other documents might be capable of being used?

MR. CRESPO: Yes.

MR. RA: Okay. And then there's this piece for a [sic] affidavit by the applicant that they've been issued a Social -- that they have not been issued a Social Security number. Would that be, you know, a form that would be provided by the DMV or would that be on a form?

MR. CRESPO: It could be on the application itself or it could be requested as a separate document to be submitted alongside the application.

MR. RA: Okay. And my understanding is, you know, for -- for different types of -- of identifications and driver's licenses and even how some other states have gone about this that

there -- there might be an opportunity where somebody submits -- actually has to submit and get, you know, a letter from Social Security saying you're not eligible for -- for a driver's license. That would not be this, though. This would just be an affidavit that the person would sign.

MR. CRESPO: This would be an affidavit, as there are other affidavits as part of the application already, that would signal that that individual affirms that they have not been issued a Social Security number.

MR. RA: Okay. Is there any requirement as the person is applying that they do any type of affidavit or representation that they intend to file for citizenship should they become eligible, like we did with the DREAM Act?

MR. CRESPO: No, that is not a part of this bill.

MR. RA: Okay. And with regard to these records, once they're given to the DMV, I know my, you know, my experience going there last fall when my license expired, you know, they scanned some documentation that I gave them. Of course, I -- I was applying for, I guess, the Enhanced at the time. But what -- what type of record retention would be done here on these type of proofs that are being submitted?

MR. CRESPO: Well, a couple of things to -- to point out. In the instance you -- you suggested, Federal law requires for the Enhanced or -- or those licenses that meet Federal requirements or Federal identification, there is a mandate that certain documents be

kept as part of that process and that application. That is not being changed here. What is not currently in regulation is any requirement for DMV to maintain source documents, and there's even a -- an understanding, they don't even have to keep the application itself currently for standard driver's licenses. And so to answer your question, in your instance, they were keeping those documents and scanned them because Federal law mandates it. That has not been the practice by DMV for standard licenses in the past. I don't believe they're doing that today, and under this bill it would be made clear that the documents are only to be kept until they are verified. It's not that different than when I applied for my license the first time. One of the things I gave them was my birth certificate. They took a glance at it, verified that it was a legitimate birth certificate and handed it right back to me. It never went in a file. Not that dissimilar.

MR. RA: Okay. But under current law, you're saying they don't keep it. Is there any direction in current law that says they can't keep it or they shouldn't keep it, the documents?

MR. CRESPO: No. There is no regulation that states that they must maintain those records or keep those records. It -- it is in law for Federal-compliant identification.

MR. RA: Which would be either the -- the real ID --

MR. CRESPO: Real ID or Enhanced.

MR. RA: -- or Enhanced. Correct. So under this, though, it -- it -- it would be explicit that they are not to retain the documents, correct?

MR. CRESPO: Under this bill, we simply state that source documents should only be retained for the time necessary to prove their validity.

MR. RA: Okay. And, you know, in terms of documents that may have been issued by, you know, a foreign government or other entity, what is that verification process? I mean, it might be -- does it really depend on where it's coming from in terms of -- or the Department's experience with those type of documents in terms of how they will actually verify them?

MR. CRESPO: A little bit of both, actually. And it's important to point out, the Department is not -- it is not unknown to them how to handle this process. Currently, there are a number of foreign documents, passports in particular, and others, that they will accept. And they have -- have had for -- for decades or years a list of well over 200 countries with whom they are able to verify those foreign documents. So this is not an unknown practice, it's not unique. There are markers that are known. There are other design features and safety features that are built into a number of these, and it would still be up to the Department to determine which -- which foreign country-issued documents they are able to process. And there are a number of ways they can do that. There's technology that allows them to scan and to verify those documents. There are systems that I'm sure they can tap into to -- to do that. And there are oftentimes even just books, literally a book that will sit at the counter that if you look up a particular document from a particular country, it will

identify which markers to look for to -- to verify their authenticity. It's important to note also, we're only asking them to accept those that are unexpired, unless it's in the instance of a driver's license that has been expired less than 24 months.

MR. RA: Okay. And with regard to -- you know, if there's an unexpired valid driver's license from -- from another, you know, jurisdiction, currently, you know, a foreign driver's license, say, does New York State law currently allow that individual to drive in New York State?

MR. CRESPO: Yes.

MR. RA: The last question I have with regards to just the -- the identification itself. It states in here that we may indicate on the license that this document is not for Federal purposes. So I -- so I guess -- under current law, does it require us to -- to have that indication?

MR. CRESPO: Yes, it requires that it have that statement.

MR. RA: Okay. So what -- I'm just wondering -- and I -- and I know there was recently an amendment made with regard to this piece of the bill, you know, in terms of font and font size in terms of indicating this on the -- on the license, which I think is -- it no longer indicates how it -- how it should be indicated, it just says it may state *Not for Federal purposes*, correct?

MR. CRESPO: Yeah, and I appreciate you mentioning that point. I mean, all along we have made amendments to

address concerns that have been raised from -- from a number of individuals and leaders, and that particular concern was raised by your colleague, the Ranker on the Transportation Committee. It was brought up a good point in regards to the unnecessary regulation of the font, we took that language out and leave that up to the Department.

MR. RA: Okay.

MR. CRESPO: It's important to note, by the way, Mr. Ra, on that point. I believe that driver's licenses, standard licenses currently issued or as of October, September of 2017 already have the statement of *Not for Federal purposes*. Keep in mind that that -- it's important for folks to know, these standard licenses would be for everyone who is not seeking one of the Enhanced and/or Real ID. So, you know, it could be you or I carrying that same license and would have the option to stick with the standard driver's license which would have that notification on it.

MR. RA: And I believe our -- our standard license currently in New York State is not Federal compliant, and I think, right, there's an up -- upcoming deadline by which if we don't make changes to that process, a standard driver's license will not be sufficient identification to board a plane for anybody in New York State that has one. Is that correct?

MR. CRESPO: Right. New York is fully compliant with Federal Real ID provisions.

MR. RA: Okay. So one -- one of the concerns that has also been raised with regard to this -- and -- and I certainly, you

know, appreciate that there have been different entities who have weighed in in support of this. But, you know, ordinarily, you know, an employer or -- or -- or someone else who, you know, sees an ID presented to them, you know, they make certain assumptions about, you know, that individual and their status. And in particular, in the employment realm, whether they are somebody that they can validly hire. If -- if this, you know, passes, you know -- we all know any of us when we've -- we've hired somebody in our office, we have to, you know, fill out that form that -- that requires certain identification. How will that be impacted by this?

MR. CRESPO: So, I'm not sure that -- that -- that it would be. There is a provision within the language of this in terms of the license not being used to determine somebody's status. But if you are an employer, there are a number of other requirements that a potential employee must meet, and those are not changed in this bill. We are simply returning to the old practice of allowing for alternatives to Social Security numbers. I don't believe it'll impact that employment process.

MR. RA: Okay. And you -- you said about going back, because I know that many years ago, you know, the State added this requirement of having a Social Security number. And this is, you know, giving an alternative path to getting a driver's license if you don't have or you're not eligible for a Social Security number. Do you know what -- what was required prior to that change in New York State to get a driver's license, what type of identification if you did not

have a Social Security number?

MR. CRESPO: I believe -- I believe if you were issued a letter from the Department of Social Security stating that you had not been issued a Social Security, they -- they had regulations pertaining to what else you could submit. I don't have in front of me exactly what they allow for, but there was -- that changed over time, but there has been multiple pathways and documents that individuals were able to submit. I've often referenced my own father, who at one point lived here as an undocumented immigrant, and he's always, during his tenure here, had access to a driver's license. So, it was a very accessible privilege for all.

MR. RA: Okay. My understanding just in looking at, you know -- and I'm aware there's a number of states who make undocumented individuals eligible for driver's licenses and, you know, some have different criteria. But it looks like one of the most common things I -- I've seen in the other states from -- from my research, you know, was the providing of -- of some type of Tax Identification Number. And as you stated, I think in order to get one of those, you would need that -- that type of letter from -- from the Social Security Administration saying you are not eligible for a Social Security number. So, is that -- is that something that was -- was looked at in the developing of this legislation?

MR. CRESPO: We looked at -- certainly looked at all of the approaches that other states have taken. I would always argue New York State is better than every other state at what we do,

especially on policy. And we feel that we have constructed a process that is both efficient, fair, accessible, but yet strong in terms of determining the validity of documents used to prove someone's identity, and we feel comfortable with what was included. So, no, that provision or the request for that provision was not included in our draft.

MR. RA: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Crespo.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Reilly.

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

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

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MR. REILLY: Thank you, Mr. Crespo. I just have a couple of questions. Actually, one in particular that I wanted to try and get some clarification on. I know that we went through some of the documents that are needed in order for -- to get this license if -- if it passes today and the Governor signs it. Is there -- when it comes to law enforcement, when they're doing a vehicle stop and they are running a driver's license through NYSPIN, which is the New York State Information where we can see if someone is wanted for a crime, maybe their license is suspended. Whether they are -- should be arrested based on a vehicle stop. And we also use NCIC, which is the National Crime Information Center database. Would this legislation

prevent DMV from cooperating with law enforcement agencies to issue an alert which possibly could be for a crime that would be -- that would subject the -- the operator who now has this driver's license, to arrest because it may trigger a [sic] ICE enforcement event?

MR. CRESPO: So it's important to note, we have -- in the process of -- of the changes that have occurred, been in constant communication with law enforcement agencies. It was never the intention of any draft of this bill to deny or change or limit local law enforcement from its regular duties of enforcing motor vehicle law or any other investigatory access that they've had. And -- and one of the most significant changes we've done to the bill is the way in which we have addressed that language. There was a concern that the way that we had originally drafted it was extremely restrictive and could have impacted that process. So what we have done is change the language to be explicit in that local law enforcement continues to have all of its current access. None of that is impacted or changed. Any example you may come up with of what a police officer does today will continue to take place once this bill becomes law, except in the instance of requests for information regarding Federal immigration agencies and/or ensuring that the license that would be issued or the databases that DMV maintains does not explicitly separate those that applied with the Social Security from those that applied without.

MR. REILLY: So if -- if the crime -- say the wanted person alert is put out, and it's -- and it's for a crime that was committed and they're wanted by Federal authorities and it's on the

NCIC, would it be attached to the driver's license number for these -- these individuals?

MR. CRESPO: If I -- if I understand the question, no. I don't -- any alert by law enforcement would not be stopped or impacted by this. Any issues or violations committed by a driver, a licensed driver, would be a part of the National Driver Registry which New York State submits information to. And -- and if you happen to be a now-undocumented driver or licensed driver in the State of New York and you are involved in any criminal activity pertaining to your driving or anything related to your license or the use of a vehicle, you would still be referred to that Registry and those records would still be maintained.

MR. REILLY: So if US Customs Enforcement or ICE issue a warrant for the person and they put it in the NCIC system and it's attached to that driver's license, they would still be subject to apprehension?

MR. CRESPO: Traditional warrants, yes.

MR. REILLY: Traditional warrants. What about warrants that --

MR. CRESPO: I'm sorry, judicial.

MR. REILLY: Oh, judicial.

MR. CRESPO: Judicial.

MR. REILLY: Oh, okay. Okay. All right.

MR. CRESPO: Or a lawful -- I'm sorry, or a lawful court order.

MR. REILLY: Okay. So if there's -- so in other words, if there's an alert that comes from a Federal agency that would be on NCIC, that would prohibit them from -- from attaching it to that driver's license because it's not -- it wouldn't be a judicial warrant. So we -- we would actually be deterring law enforcement on the field -- in the field performing car stops.

MR. CRESPO: The language that we have restricts DMV's ability to share certain data that they collect as part of the licensing process with those agencies. We don't speak to those agencies providing the Department relevant information about a driver and that the DMV may, in fact, attach that information to their record. If there's currently a provision that would -- or process where they would do that, I don't believe that the language of our bill would restrict that.

MR. REILLY: So that -- that's something that I think we need to clarify, because if -- if the language in the current bill is prohibiting DMV from sharing the information unless they have a judicial warrant, that will deter officers from the field from being able to get that information attached to the driver's license. Because if you look at it in layman's terms, if DMV cannot attach it to this new driver's license number, then they would be prohibited from sharing it with law enforcement. And then we are now potentially endangering public safety, officer safety, and we're stopping the -- the criminal justice procedures from moving forward.

MR. CRESPO: This is I think the -- the -- I disagree

that that would occur. Understand that we're restricting DMV's databases, and we're not restricting other databases, we're not restricting the Federal agencies from providing information relevant to DMV. The sharing that is restricted here is where documents are requested pertaining to a driving record by a Federal immigration agency - except under those number of categories that we outlined - what we share, what DMV puts out to those agencies regarding that -- that applicant's information or any source documents that would be relevant, that is where the -- the limitation takes place. But the idea that Federal law enforcement could not communicate to DMV relevant information pertaining to a particular driver in their database and that that information be attached to the driver record where appropriate, I don't believe that any of the provisions would restrict that from taking place.

MR. REILLY: Okay. So when DMV -- will -- will DMV -- is there anything in the bill that would prohibit DMV from actively sharing that information? Say that they had a -- they had the information of the person they identified, and now they ask DMV, *Can you run the name and see if you have a driver's license under this person's name? Because if they do have a New York State driver's license, we would like to attach it to the NCIC, NYSPIN database.* Because what I understand is then now that would prohibit DMV from -- from actively engaging with the Federal law enforcement agencies, which again, in my opinion, would endanger public safety.

MR. CRESPO: In your scenario, is the -- is the

investigation related to criminal activity?

MR. REILLY: Every investigation that a police officer does would be involved --

MR. CRESPO: Well, it's an invitation --

MR. REILLY: If you do a car stop -- if you do a car stop --

MR. CRESPO: Uh-huh.

MR. REILLY: -- and you are running a driver's license, the idea of the whole NYSPIN and NCIC system is to alert police officers around the State and the nation to let them know that there is someone wanted for a crime, or an active investigation and we're looking to deter -- we're look -- looking to apprehend or detain that person for further investigation. Now, if we don't provide that information, then we're now setting it up where police officers doing car stops and they're walking up to a vehicle and then they're talking to the person and they go to take -- and they ask them for a driver's license and say they don't give them one, right? So now you're only running a name. But if they have a driver's license number and it's attached to that driver's license number, it makes law enforcement's ability to do a search on that person as they stopped them, easier. Now, the issue -- the issue that I think is -- is in question here is if DMV will cooperate with Federal law enforcement - and actually all of law enforcement agencies - to ensure that if they can identify the person, they asked DMV, they put a request in and say, *Can you do a check and see if you have a driver's license number for this person? If*

they do, I need you to attach it to their driver's license number so that when we -- when they get pulled over, when they get stopped and it's -- and their license number is ran, it would pop as an alert?

MR. CRESPO: There's a couple -- couple of things. I -- I -- I'm a little conflicted on this notion of attaching certain documents to the DMV database. And again, nothing in our bill changes local law enforcement access for the information that they would be preview to currently, and we clarify that in -- in the language of the bill. The only restriction is sharing data with agencies that primarily enforce immigration laws for immigration-related violations. We're not -- if there is a criminal investigation, if there is a warrant, if there is a cooperation with local agencies, that -- none of that is impacted by our bill.

MR. REILLY: That -- that's where I was getting at, that if it is a crime that would trigger an ICE enforcement action, and now ICE or US Customs --

MR. CRESPO: Can you give me an example of such a crime?

MR. REILLY: There's 176 --

MR. CRESPO: (Inaudible)

MR. REILLY: -- listed that New York City has to mandate report to ICE. So we're talking serious crimes. We're talking maybe Robbery in the First Degree, maybe Rape in the First Degree. Maybe, you know, murder, manslaughter. All those serious crimes -- Burglary in the First Degree. So the -- the point that I'm trying to

make is, if it -- if it's known that the person is undocumented but now has a driver's license, under the bill it's saying that they will not share documentation with Federal agencies that --

MR. CRESPO: Immigration agencies.

MR. REILLY: -- that -- I was going -- I was going to get to that -- that primarily enforce immigration laws. Now, if ICE knows that there's an active investigation for that person for a serious crime that should be reported to them, they should be able to see that information and be able to have it on a driver's license number, so then if they come in contact with them or any law enforcement that is -- has to report it because it's one of those 176 crimes - especially in New York City- that have to be reported to ICE or US Customs Enforcement, I -- I want to make sure that we're not precluding that from happening.

MR. CRESPO: So, a couple -- a couple of things, because I'm -- I'm really struggling to apply your scenario to real life encounters and/or how these databases work. I'll give you an example, in my opinion.

MR. REILLY: Okay.

MR. CRESPO: If I was accused of a crime and I am a citizen of the United States, I'm accused of a crime that has -- or may have a number of implications, felony, you name it. Unless the court determines that my punishment involves losing my driving privileges or something specifically related to my license or my ability to drive, that wouldn't be impacted in those scenarios. DMV wouldn't keep a

database of every misdemeanor I was charged with. So this idea that somehow we are creating a loophole, I think, is -- is somewhat exaggerated. In regards to enforcement, one example: We have ensured in the language that the task forces that New York City and New York State have with Federal agencies, some of whom involve members of immigration-related agencies, they will continue to have access because their primary responsibility is to enforce or -- or investigate criminal activity. The only restriction we're making is the -- is sharing information with agencies whose primary goal is to enforce civil immigration-related matters. If you commit -- if you're undocumented and you have a license and you violate a provision that would have to be referred to ICE, the court is mandated to report that and other agencies would be aware of that through other procedures that have nothing to do with DMV's responsibilities.

MR. REILLY: But we were -- I wasn't talking about convicted. I was talking about if the person is wanted, there's probable cause. That's what NYSPIN and NCIC is used for, to alert law enforcement that the person is wanted for that crime. And the only thing that I was trying to clarify is that since one of those underlying crimes may be a mandated report to ICE, would that prevent it from being attached to this driver's license number? That's the -- that's the clarification I was looking for. And is there anywhere -- anywhere in the bill that would outline that and state that all information that relates to law enforcement alerts via NYSPIN and NCIC, are they in the bill?

MR. CRESPO: We don't have any reference in the language to alerts. But I will reiterate, Mr. Reilly, with all due respect, I still cannot understand the scenario you're presenting. I don't believe that the language of the bill -- and we've had conversations with sheriffs, we've had conversations with police departments, we've had conversations with district attorneys and other agencies involved in law enforcement in our State, and we have addressed their concerns with regards to access and the continuation of their requirements for -- you know, to ensure our public safety. It is my understanding that none of the restrictions in the language have to do with those criminal investigations. We are limiting information with Federal agencies that primarily enforce immigration law for the enforcement of such immigration-related matters. If there was a reasonable or probable cause for some activity, there would be an appropriate court order issued, and that would be acceptable under our regulations.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Reilly, your time has expired.

MR. REILLY: Thank you, Mr. Crespo.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

MR. REILLY: Thank you.

Mr. Smith.

Excuse me, Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could you please call the Cities Committee to the Speaker's Conference Room?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Cities Committee, Speaker's Conference Room immediately.

Mr. Smith.

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

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

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Crespo yields.

MR. SMITH: I think this question was answered, but I didn't see it in the bill. The individuals under this bill, will they be issued a DMV identification number, a nine digit...

MR. CRESPO: Yes. A driver's license number. Yes.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And will there be -- and I, again, didn't see this issue addressed in the bill. Will there be any way to distinguish from that identification number that the person is not a citizen versus any citizen?

MR. CRESPO: No.

MR. SMITH: Okay. In this bill, is there anything that changes the way that we currently register to vote? And the reason for my question is, currently to put in a voter registration it requires either the DMV number or the last four digits of the Social Security number, not both.

MR. CRESPO: I'm glad you brought that up, and --

and it's come up a lot in discussions with folks and there's been a lot of misconceptions about that. So, no. Nothing in this bill qualifies a [sic] undocumented resident of our State to -- to register to vote or to cast a vote. And as a matter of fact, it is federal law that requires that an application for a driver's license include an application for a voter registration. And -- and you should note there's, I believe, three sections where you are reminded that only citizens are given the privilege or the right to vote and can sign that section. There is a sort of a statement by -- added by DMV, and then again, it's the very first question you're asked on your voter application. *Are you a citizen? Yes or no?* If no, you are not allowed to submit. If you can't provide -- if you're not a citizen, you would not qualify to vote. If a -- somebody answered that question, *No, I am not a citizen*, but then provided the last four of that driver number, the Board of Elections would -- would capture that that application is not valid and not register that person. It is a Federal crime to -- for somebody to cast a vote who is not allowed to. I assure you, there is not a single individual in the immigrant community who wants to put themselves at risk of deportation and would not seek to do that.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you very much. And I appreciate Mr. Crespo's response on that. However, unfortunately, I actually have a number of examples from the Suffolk County Board of

Elections of cases where individuals with DMV numbers that are not citizens have actually registered to vote with that number, checked the box that they were a citizen or the box was checked on the application that they signed and they actually did vote. And in order -- the only reason that the Board of Elections was notified about this -- because, you know, we talked about a number of things with agencies not being able to verify whether a person is a citizen or not -- is because these individuals have come to the Board of Elections, and in the course of them getting their citizenship have had to remove themselves from the rolls. So I have a number of examples. I'm not going to state the last name, but, *I, Melissa, wish to be removed from the Suffolk County voter rolls effective immediately. I am not a citizen, and my application for citizenship requires proof that I am no longer on the voter rolls.* She voted in East Hampton in 2008, 2010, 2012. *I, Marvin, wish to be removed from the Suffolk County voter rolls effective immediately. I am not a citizen, and my application for citizenship requires proof that I am no longer on the voter rolls.* Marvin voted in 20 -- in the Presidential Primary in 2016, the General in 2016 and the General in 2017 in the Town of Islip. *I, Gleaton, am applying for my citizenship and need to be taken off the list to vote. I need confirmation that I have been removed from the list sent to me, my return address.* He voted in the Town of Brookhaven in 2008. Another example, Tina. *My application will be -- she's applying for citizenship status -- My application will be denied unless I submit proof that my name has been removed from the voter registration*

rolls. She voted in 2004 and 2008. Marcell: *I have voted in 2006, 2007, 2008 Presidential Primary, 2008 General, 2009 General Election*. So these are just some of the examples that I have from the Suffolk County Board of Elections of individuals who reached out to the Board of Elections to remove themselves on the course of becoming a citizen that were able to register to vote with that DMV identification number. And I'm concerned of unintended consequences. I think the intentions of this bill are good, and I think that this is something that we should really take pause on, solving this issue before we move forward. It's very concerning. I -- I've researched it, I can't find any other place on earth that allows citizens of another country to vote in the election. And while this bill does not intend to do that, one of the unintended consequences that has been brought to my attention by the Board of Elections are that this practice happens, and this will further exacerbate the scenario.

So for that reason, I'll be voting no and encouraging my colleagues in the Assembly and the Senate to also vote no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Montesano.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Will you yield, Mr. Crespo?

MR. CRESPO: Sure.

MR. MONTESANO: Mr. Crespo, I just basically have one question. In the -- in the bill, I know we're adding some subdivisions to -- to Section 201 of the Vehicle and Traffic Law, and one of them is Subdivision 12. And it provides that if the Department of Motor Vehicles gets an inquiry from a Federal agency, that they have to -- prior to disclosing the information within three days, they have to notify the motorist who is the subject of the inquiry under this bill. What's the reason for that?

MR. CRESPO: A couple. We are ensuring that DMV maintains its responsibility to regulate driving privileges in the State and to make clear that they should not be an extended agency of immigration and -- Federal immigration enforcement agencies. But I'll add that we're actually remaining consistent with the Federal Driver Privacy Protection Act. In the language of the Federal Act, it authorizes -- allows DMV to notify an individual of any requests for information from a source or an agency that is not one of the exempted acceptable agencies for sharing of information. In other words, DMV currently has the ability to make that notification under Federal Driver Privacy Protection Act. We maintain a very similar standard applied to this provision.

MR. MONTESANO: But currently, for the average motorist who currently has a driver's license, if a Federal law enforcement agency or any law enforcement agency, for that fact, makes an inquiry to the Department of Motor Vehicles about that person's driving record, abstract, documentation or how they got their

driver's license, do they have to now notify that motorist that an inquiry's been made?

MR. CRESPO: No. And the bill would not require all those agencies -- all those notifications to go out on every instance. Only in instances where Federal agencies that primarily enforces immigration law, which is not one of the exempted agencies for access, and in those circumstances that notification will now take place, which again, is a practice consistent with what the Federal Driver -- Driver Privacy Protection Act allows for non-exempted sources.

MR. MONTESANO: So -- so you used the phrase, you know, a Federal agency that's primarily involved in the investigation of immigration laws. So, the FBI, while it doesn't do it in the ordinary -- you know, it doesn't do it every day. They have some hand in investigating immigration violations in connection with criminal activity, whether it be drug transportation, sex trafficking matters or whatever. So it's your position under this bill that they're not entitled to get information from the Department of Motor Vehicles?

MR. CRESPO: I would not consider that agency one that primarily enforces immigration law. And actually in the bill we give examples of the agencies that we are referring to, and we define them as United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement, United States Customs and Border Protection and any successor agencies having similar duties.

MR. MONTESANO: Okay. And with regard to the -- the types of subpoenas that could be issued, so many agencies have the ability to issue a subpoena, whether commissioners or directors of certain agencies. In fact, the Police Commissioner of the City of New York has subpoena power. Does the Department now have the ability to disregard those subpoenas and only honor a judicial court order?

MR. CRESPO: We, as a matter of practice in State Law, do not codify local jurisdiction subpoena powers. That has not been the practice in other bills, and certainly not the practice here. I would argue that -- and we've had excessive conversations with the Police Commissioner's office, his team and the City of New York. It is unclear to me any information that -- that would be available in -- in DMV records that is not already available to those agencies, and the fact is that if -- if they needed any additional information, they could request it through a court order. So they could just as easily get a court-issued request for that same information. So, no, I don't believe that anything we're doing today would limit that practice from continuing. It may require them to do so slightly differently than they currently do it. But anyway, they -- they're not losing the -- the ability to investigate.

MR. MONTESANO: Thank you, Mr. Crespo.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.
Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield

for a question?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Will you yield -- Mr. Crespo, do you yield?

MR. CRESPO: Yes, I do.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Crespo yields.

MR. RAMOS: Mr. Crespo, just for a little clarification on the line of questioning that -- that I heard before. What's -- what's -- the information that's limited is the underlying supporting documents, right?

MR. CRESPO: Correct.

MR. RAMOS: So, police agencies have access to the actual information given from those documents, right? Their name, address...

MR. CRESPO: Correct.

MR. RAMOS: All the background information. So the only thing they're not getting is the original document which, under this bill, the -- Motor Vehicles does not keep those original documents anyway.

MR. CRESPO: Correct.

MR. RAMOS: That whole line of questioning really is moot. It -- it doesn't --

MR. CRESPO: Well, the idea that there would be -- we are somehow creating a secret list of documents or anybody who's under that impression, you're right. It would be wrong. We are clarifying that source documents would not be maintained. All other

relevant information, once you've been licensed and approved and extended that privilege or any driver-related records, all of that becomes part of your record and all of that is accessible to law enforcement.

MR. RAMOS: So, a police officer would be able to access that information upon a criminal investigation?

MR. CRESPO: Yes.

MR. RAMOS: You're not limiting anything as far as law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. RAMOS: I'd like to commend the sponsor of this bill. Something that is very important to many. And, you know, we -- we all know the benefits of this through the immigrant community. We all know what this does to allow somebody to drive, to be able to have a better quality of life, to less -- you know, it -- it really hurts me inside when on a January or a February night, I see a parade of people walking to work in the snow, just trying to make ends meet and who have done nothing other than wanting to have a better life for themselves and for their family. And to hear a lot of the rhetoric that we hear in this country, demonizing those people and then, you know, long debates as we're having now, of people trying to posture and slice and dice and find a reason why we shouldn't do this. There are -- you know, let's -- let's talk about the benefits to American citizens. Giving a license to people means that they have to qualify to

drive. That means they have to prove to Motor Vehicles that they can drive. Doing that makes our streets safer. Would we rather people drive -- take a risk and drive without a license and have an unsafe situation? If a -- that benefits US citizens by making the streets safer. If a US citizen has an accident with somebody who doesn't have any documents, doesn't have a license, doesn't have insurance, that falls on their insurance. And there is no option to sue. What are you going to sue? What are you going to get? All you have is what your insurance -- that benefits US citizens. Millions in revenues. When somebody gets a license and they pay the fee to get a license to Motor Vehicles, that comes into the State. The first year, it's over \$50 million coming back. That comes back to US citizens in the form of revenues that help with infrastructure and other benefits that US citizens get as a result of allowing immigrants to have these licenses, and now all these new revenues are going to be coming in. The economic development in the auto industry where thousands of people now will be able to purchase -- purchase cars. The millions in extra dollars to the insurance indust -- industry that are -- that's important to many of our colleagues. That adds to the economic development. We all know how insurance works. The bigger the pool of insurance, the lower the rates go. This benefits US citizens. Adding thousands of new people on the insurance rolls helps US citizens. In -- the driver's license -- you know, and I keep hearing the issue of this impeding law enforcement. I was a cop for 20 years. There is nothing in the world that would help me better than to have somebody have a license. That

gives me their name, their address, where they were when they had a ticket, where they've gotten a ticket, their driving record. What other cars they own, what other cars are registered in their home. You want us to believe that law enforcement would rather have a person be anonymous? That somehow giving them a license is hurting law enforcement? Come on now. This is like -- you know, it's grasping for straws to find a reason not to do this; twisting themselves into a pretzel to find one reason so they can say, *I gotcha*. Mobility. The fact that somebody can now drive and is not limited to in-town means they can move -- they -- they can go to other parts of where -- you know, wherever their vicinity is, they can go where they spend money in other areas. That adds to economic development. In other states that have passed this law, there has been a dramatic decrease in hit-and-run accidents. In the first year after having passed this and a direct nexus has been proven in other states between that law and the reduction of hit-and-run accidents. It benefits US citizens.

Employers. Employers and small businesses that are very important to many of our colleagues here, their employees can now get to work on time, on a timely basis. They can count on them. There's more regularity for their businesses. These are all reasons that affect US citizens. Benefits. And, you know, when -- when we -- the practice of this, you know, the trying -- analyzing, slice and dice and find some reason to say no. You know -- I mean, the biggest debate they can come out with is the size of the font on the -- on the advisement that says, *This can't be used for Federal purposes*. There's been a gazillion

amendments made by the sponsor to this bill about things as frivolous as that, as the font used on -- on the license. Let's really talk about what this is really about. We know why the resistance. We know what it's about. It's about the people who we are giving licenses to. Just say it. I would respect more if it's just said. Some people don't want immigrants to get licenses. They don't want anything given to immigrants to benefit this segment of the community because that segment of the community has been demonized and used politically as a weapon to -- to garner votes. So the more you punish this group, the more you make another group happy. That, in the end, is what it is about. I just listed a whole bunch of reasons why we should do this. And I hope that all my colleagues here look at the facts. And I know the facts don't mean much to have -- to those who have those negative emotions against this segment of the community, but I -- this is a -- a bill that makes sense for US citizens. This is a bill about humanity. I hope that our colleagues in the Senate garner the courage to make this vote about what's right, not what's popular. About what's right. If -- if leaders in this country went by what's popular, they would've never freed the slaves at the time. There were people who stood up on principle and said, *Look, this is the right thing to do, regardless of the negative emotions that we see around us.*

So I ask my colleagues to please stand up on principle and do what's right and pass the Green Light Bill.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ashby.

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

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

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

MR. ASHBY: Thank you, Mr. Crespo. I had a couple questions regarding Section 5 in this bill. Could you explain the changes that are being made to the automatic registration for Selective Service?

MR. CRESPO: Selective Service?

MR. ASHBY: Yes.

MR. CRESPO: Okay. A couple of things. Yes. We have in New York State allowed individuals to, and requested that individuals register for Selective Service as part of the application. To be clear, again, it's an example of something that has been implemented here. I'm aware -- unaware of any other state that currently uses their local DMVs for this purpose. But -- and not only would you currently be forced to register, but that information would be sent to those agencies. We're not -- we're not eliminating that process, we're simply clarifying that it is an optional process within that application. So, somebody may still choose to register for Selective Service with their local application. We're not preventing that, but we're not making it a mandated process. It's -- I -- I would -- I would make akin to the donor registration, the organ donor registration portion of the application. Again, it's an option you have

to use this opportunity to register for that, but we're simply changing the fact that you do not have to as a condition to securing a driver's license.

MR. ASHBY: Isn't it -- isn't it Federal law that mandates every -- every male ages 18 to 25 within the United States, documented or undocumented, register for Selective Service?

MR. CRESPO: Yes, but it's not Federal law that you do so as a condition to accept -- to securing a driving privilege. That is something we at some point added to the process for DMV, and we're simply now making it so that it's not a condition, a mandated condition as part of securing a driving privilege.

MR. ASHBY: Well, of the other states that have implemented similar legislation, including Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, New Mexico and Utah, it's all automatic. So, what's the policy rationale behind -- behind this?

MR. CRESPO: DMV should be primarily concerned with identifying, training, educating drivers, ensuring that they are properly trained to operate a motor vehicle and regulating the time and the manner in which they do so. Their primary responsibilities do not involve Federal requirements for Selective Service or a number of other things, and we feel that it's unnecessary to make that a condition to identify who is eligible to drive and do so safely.

MR. ASHBY: What alternative means to register for Selective Service are available to those who are required to register?

MR. CRESPO: There may be multiple pathways. I

would not be able to tell you all of them. And again, not every DMV, not every state -- it's not Federally mandated that that be a part of this application, the way that the voter registration is mandated to be a part of the application.

MR. ASHBY: Based on that response, I -- I don't think --

MR. CRESPO: I'm sorry?

MR. ASHBY: -- would you know -- based on that -- based on your response to that, I doubt you would know the percentage of people who've taken those alternative means to register for Selective Service that way.

MR. CRESPO: No. I don't -- I wouldn't know that. I also wouldn't know the number of undocumented Americans serving in our military today. I know there are many, and I have referenced their names in the past. But no, I don't have those numbers off the top of my head.

MR. ASHBY: Just for clarification, could you explain who is required to register?

MR. CRESPO: I'm sorry?

MR. ASHBY: Just for clarification, can you explain who is required to register for Selective Service?

MR. CRESPO: To register for what?

MR. ASHBY: Selective Service.

MR. CRESPO: No, I -- I don't know. And again, it's just not relative to our bill nor the research that I've done pertaining to

this bill.

MR. ASHBY: Well, I -- I think it is pertinent to the bill because it's requiring an option that's kind of going against the grade with a lot of legislation that we've seen put forth that's similar across the country. And with very few exceptions, all males between the ages of 18 and 25 must register with Selective Service within 30 days of arriving in the United States. This includes US born and naturalized citizens, parolees, undocumented immigrants, legal permanent residents, asylum seekers, refugees and all males with Visas of any kind which expired more than 30 days ago. Can you tell us what the penalties are for failing to register?

MR. CRESPO: Not relative to this bill. I could not tell you.

MR. ASHBY: Well, it's a felony punishable by a fine up to \$250,000, for a prison term of up to five years, loss of access to citizenship, access to Federal jobs and student aid and Federal job training.

MR. CRESPO: Mr. Ashby, I -- I -- I understand -- I guess I understand what you're -- what the point you're making in regards to those regulations and who's mandated. But none of that is changed by this bill. We're not suggesting that the State of New York - and I have not suggested as the sponsor of this bill - that DMV simply not address the issue of Selective Service at all. But rather, it is not the mandated pathway for that Selective Service to be applied for. There are multiple pathways. There may be other agencies where it's

more appropriate. There may be other opportunities. And we're not certainly changing the requirements for who must and when register for Selective Service. We're simply saying that from a precondition of securing a driving privilege, it will now be -- not unlike the organ and tissue donation, it would be an option for an applicant for a driving privilege. DMV is -- exists to regulate those who are driving, who can drive, when and how. We're not changing any of the other provisions of what you're referring to.

MR. ASHBY: Well, I can appreciate the analogy to organ donation. There is a subtle difference there, in that it's under Federal law that this is a requirement.

MR. CRESPO: Under Federal law it's required what? I'm sorry.

MR. ASHBY: That it's -- that it's Federal law that all male -- males ages 18 to 25 register for Selective Service.

MR. CRESPO: Correct. And we're not changing that, as I said. But it's not -- is it Federal law that it be a part of your DMV -- local DMV application?

MR. ASHBY: Wouldn't you want to increase access for that?

MR. CRESPO: That's a laudable goal, but it's not the responsibility of DMV, and it's not the only avenue for them to do so. And the Federal law does not require that to be a part of your driving application. I think the -- what I'm trying to just sort of reconfirm, Mr. Ashby, I am not in any way trying to interfere with encouraging

individuals to -- to meet that Federal mandate or to apply for Selective Service. Simply saying it is not pertinent to your ability to drive a motor vehicle. It doesn't address the workers, the families that need to get around in our State. It doesn't address the public safety issues of individuals who are forced to drive unlicensed or uninsured and -- and, therefore, it is not a primary responsibility of the DMV. There are others ways that folks can do that. We're not changing who is eligible or must register for Selective Service. We're simply saying that moving forward, DMV would make that opportunity available in your application, but it's not a mandated condition for securing driving privileges.

MR. ASHBY: I can appreciate that, and I appreciate the intent of the legislation and wanting to help people who are here and helping them access programs. But I feel like by not making this is an automatic registration like several other states are, you're opening up the possibility for access to be hindered because of these penalties. Do you recognize that?

MR. CRESPO: No. I -- I'm not sure what access we're denying, I'm sorry.

MR. ASHBY: So under the penalty for not registering, you have up to a \$250,000 fine, a prison term of up to five -- five years, a loss of access to citizenship, Federal jobs, Federal student aid and job training. Putting all of those things at risk because you're not registered

MR. CRESPO: Well, and -- and actually in our

language we also state that DMV has to put on the application what those consequences are for failing to register. So, we are taking the opportunity to remind people of the very concern you have, what it means not to meet that obligation. But again, whether you meet that obligation or not and whether or not you are somebody who has been trained and properly vetted in order to operate a motor vehicle, they're two different things, and one is relative to the primary responsibility of the DMV, the other is not.

MR. ASHBY: Thank you, Mr. Crespo.

On the bill, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, Mr. Ashby.

MR. ASHBY: The bill before us removes the automatic registration that Assembly Majority fought for back in 2002. This bill makes it more difficult for applicable New Yorkers to comply with Federal law, a law that applies to both citizens and undocumented immigrants alike. The penalty for failing to register with Selective Service is a felony, and could include a fine up to \$250,000, a prison term up to five years, and could prevent access to benefits like citizenship, Federal jobs and a Federal student loan -- or Federal student financial aid. What's more, choosing an opt-in mechanism unnecessarily puts New Yorkers at risk of permanently losing access for the aforementioned benefits. By providing an opt-in mechanism on this bill, applicants could be considered to be knowingly and willfully failing to register, barring them from citizenship, financial

aid and from joining the Federal workforce. Finally, the Selective Service specifically states that they have not now or in the past collected or shared any information which would indicate a man's immigration status, either documented or undocumented. Civil Service has no authority to collect such information, has no use for it, and it is irrelevant to the registration requirement. Consequently, there is no immigration data to share with anyone. Eleven other states, including New York, that allow some type of driving privilege to undocumented immigrants have enacted legislation that provides automatic registration with the Selective Service on DMV forms. Only Washington, D.C. as of right now has an opt-in policy.

This bill is flawed in many ways, not least of them the head-scratching public policy decision to remove automatic registration with the Selective Service on DMV forms. While we should be looking for ways to make registering for the Selective Service easier for New Yorkers, like the Assembly Majority did back in 2002, this bill undoes that good work and needlessly puts young men of all citizenship statuses in jeopardy by making it more difficult to comply with Federal law.

I will vote -- be voting no on this and I encourage my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

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

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

Ms. Cruz.

MS. CRUZ: Will the sponsor yield?

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

MR. CRESPO: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MS. CRUZ: Mr. Crespo, first, thank you for your
sponsorship and your work on behalf of our community. I have a few
questions that I hope will dispel some of the misinformation
promulgated out there about this legislation. Are undocumented
people currently driving in our State?

MR. CRESPO: Driving? Yes.

MS. CRUZ: What happens when an undocumented
person who is uninsured gets into a car accident with a person who is
licensed and insured?

MR. CRESPO: Unfortunately, in many instances that
person will flee the scene out of fear of other consequences pertaining
to that. It also impacts all the rest of us as insured motorists with
regards to the risk pool that exists in the market.

MS. CRUZ: If your proposed legislation fails to
become law, will undocumented immigrants continue to drive in our
State's roads?

MR. CRESPO: Yes.

MS. CRUZ: Does the implementation of this law carry any financial burden on our State? In other words, is there a fiscal impact?

MR. CRESPO: Only where it would raise significant revenues. Twenty -- there are Fiscal Policy Institute numbers somewhere in first-time fees of \$20-plus million. In annualized revenue to the State, somewhere between \$50- to \$60 million.

MS. CRUZ: Will an undocumented person be able to use this piece of identification to fly in and out of the country?

MR. CRESPO: No.

MS. CRUZ: What about to another state?

MR. CRESPO: No.

MS. CRUZ: Can an undocumented person vote with this piece of identification?

MR. CRESPO: No.

MS. CRUZ: Has the sky fallen on California or New Mexico where this already law?

MR. CRESPO: The only thing that's fallen is the number of motor vehicle-related accidents and hit-and-runs.

MS. CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Crespo.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill.

MS. CRUZ: I want to thank the sponsor for his political courage in carrying this bill. I also want to thank the original Dreamers -- our parents -- and the Green Light Coalition and the New

York Immigration Coalition and Make the Road, and all the other community organizations who have been fighting for decades to bring back the right to drive. I know firsthand what anti-immigrant sentiment looks like, and can speak from the heart about the amount of hate mail and death threats that I have received simply because I've been wanting to tell the story of what it means to grow up undocumented and without a driver's license and how that changes a family's life. I also want to commend my colleagues who today will vote in favor of this bill despite the backlash that I know many of them will receive back home, because in their hearts they understand that this is the right thing to do. The safety and socioeconomic impact that this bill will have on all the people of our State is clear. It is well-documented. And so I'm left to wonder if those voting against it are simply placing their animus toward a certain group over the clear merits of this bill and the benefits that it will have across communities in our State.

As many of you know, I grew up undocumented and can tell you how this will change the life of a family. Being denied the right to drive, to a driver's license, merely because you lack immigration status alone creates unnecessary boundaries for families to thrive. For undocumented immigrants, it makes an already difficult life much more difficult. This is an issue of sheer humanity. Not having a driver's license outside of the five boroughs of New York City where there is little to no public transportation can be an ultimate death sentence for thousands of families. They can't travel to their

children's school. They can't travel to a doctor's appointment. They can't travel to work. I fled violence and poverty in Columbia when I was nine years old, with my mother, who is here with us today. We settled in Queens and worked to survive to earn the opportunity for a better life. I watched as my mother cleaned offices, sold tamales, and took on any job so that she could put food on the table and I would have a chance to do well in school. But although her perseverance was limitless, our ability to succeed was limited by our immigration status. At first, not having a driver's license was only an inconvenience. My mother's long train rides home after work, after an overnight shift, or having to take three trains just to get my sister to the doctor. But later, as I got older and realized the subtle ways that lack of a driver's license can entire -- can impact an entire family, I began to plan -- to emergency plan when I was 13 years old. My mother could be picked up by ICE at any given moment - back then it was called INS - and I would be left to care for my sisters and be separated from the only home I ever knew, all because my mother wanted to make sure that she could go to work and I would get a chance to live. A 13 year-old should not be worried about emergency planning. A 13 year-old should be worried about what high school she's going to go to. I grew up in parts of Queens that have transit deserts. Often, the nearest subway station was a 20-minute bus ride away. This meant that my education and my employment choices were limited by my commute. I couldn't consider colleges further away than Manhattan. And even then, I'd have to travel hours on the train to get to my classes

at John Jay College. Two trains and a bus. That's what I would have to take every morning to get to school, just so that I had a shot at an education. Similarly, my mother was forced to turn down jobs to earn more money because she had no way to get to them. She could only take a work that was accessible by public transportation, pushing our family deeper into poverty. Mommy is now a Head Start teacher, but for years she struggled by taking care of other people's children and cleaning other people's homes. Her inability to drive also meant that she couldn't always be there to witness her hard work come to fruition. When I was in college, I was inducted into the Honor Society, and I stood on stage alone because my mother couldn't attend the ceremony. She wouldn't be able to make it to the ceremony after work using the subway. But our story is not unique. Hundreds of thousands of New Yorkers across the State still live the way we did. We simply want an opportunity. We want to be able to drive to our jobs, pick up our kids from school, go to the doctor in an emergency. To do the everyday things that the rest of us get to do. (Speaking foreign language)

And so we're being denied this opportunity. We're not looking for a free pass. We just want the same ability to apply for a license provided to any other eligible person who has passed a road safety and a proficiency exam to qualify. Twelve states, including California, and even more politically-conservative places like Utah have passed similar legislation, and more states like Wisconsin and New Jersey are on their way to that. It's shameful that New York, which is supposedly a beacon of justice and the gateway to

opportunity, has fallen so hard behind. States that allow driver's licenses for all have seen their numbers of uninsured motorists drop, while ensuring that drivers are properly registered and regulated. And importantly, the sky has not fallen on them. Having a greater number of licensed and insured drivers on the road will guarantee safer streets for everyone, and they will open the door to employment opportunities and economic activity as a new population of workers and customers can actually spend money.

Lastly, the fiscal impacts of the bill are outstanding. According to a report by the New York City Comptroller, legally licensing undocumented immigrants to drive will generate \$9.6 million in driver's license fees to New York State. An additional \$1.3 million would go to the met -- the MTA - and we're always complaining that the MTA doesn't have enough money - a boost in sales to the auto industry to the tune of almost 3 percent, generating \$4.2 million in registration and title fees and annual revenues of about \$730,000. Another almost \$1 million in vehicle use taxes will go to New York City, and \$1.4- additional to the MTA. Vehicle and gasoline taxes related to the auto industry would increase by \$10.3 million. Another \$11 million will go to the City, and yet another \$1 million to the MTA. All and all, we're looking at more than \$50 million in money that can come to the State. Every year our Legislature complains that we don't have enough money for all the work that needs to be done in our communities, and this is a clear way to get that money. Yet we stand here with the evidence and want to

vote no. That can't be the kind of state that we are. As legislators, we know there are times that we must lead our communities down the path of historical change. That is how women got the right to vote. And that is how recently we got bail reform and GENDA.

Our vote in favor of this bill today can begin to right this wrong, and expand access to driver's licenses for all New Yorkers. Today we show the world that New York is a true beacon of immigrant hope. And to my colleagues on the other side of our amazing Legislature, do not let history repeat itself. Garnish the political courage over at the Senate and do the right thing by voting yes. Today we get to see who truly stands with immigrants and who uses our families' pain for political pandering.

I will vote in the affirmative, and I urge my colleagues to do the same and stand in the right side of history.

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Quiet, please. Members, please be reminded we're on debate. And also, when on debate please address your comments to the Chair.

Mr. Epstein.

MR. EPSTEIN: Will the sponsor yield?

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Do you yield, Mr. Crespo?

MR. CRESPO: Eh, sure.

(Laughter)

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: The sponsor

yields.

MR. EPSTEIN: Not sure.

MR. CRESPO: Eh....

(Laughter)

MR. EPSTEIN: So you mentioned earlier about insurance rates. What information do you have -- how this might have an impact on insurance rates?

MR. CRESPO: Well, we do have some memos of support from the industry, but essentially, a couple of things: Number one, clearly, as was stated in a previous line of question, there are a number of people forced to drive today without insurance. They want to be insured, they don't have the option to. This bill would ensure that -- that they have access to that. The -- the consequences of that is that all of us, as insurance holders, are paying into premiums for the Uninsured Motorist Fund, and -- and -- and that protection costs us as -- as taxpayers, as insured drivers. By expanding the list or the number of insured drivers on the road, you are really sort of spreading out the risk, which lowers overall premiums and -- or other ways in which the insurance industry is best served. And more importantly, all of us, as insurance holders, are served well by this bill. And I -- just to clarify, the memo is from the American Property Casualty and Insurance Association that explains the public safety matters as well.

MR. EPSTEIN: So they're saying that with more people insured, it will affect the insurance pool in total and help all insured drivers?

MR. CRESPO: Correct.

MR. EPSTEIN: And so how many people are we talking about who might get these driver's licenses?

MR. CRESPO: Depending on the reports you read, anywhere between -- we believe there are somewhere between 700- to 800,000, maybe slightly more individuals, non-citizens residing in the State. Of those, it is expected that 200- to 300,000 may ultimately apply, so -- and again, it's important to note, we are being very clear about the types of documents you would need in order to secure a driver's -- a driver's license under this provision. So, the vast majority of the undocumented community still would have a hard time achieving this goal or this privilege. And we should also keep in mind that currently, everyone enrolled in the DACA program does have access to a driver's license today.

MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you for clarifying that. And just on -- so you're saying with the potential 200,000 new people entering the pool, rates going potentially down for the rest of the drivers because we'll have less uninsured motorists on the -- on the streets?

MR. CRESPO: Yeah. Yes, and very specifically, those that are paying premiums to that -- which I believe is everyone -- to that Uninsured Motorist Fund will see a reduction in those premiums.

MR. EPSTEIN: And so -- so this license we're talking about is a driver's license. Is that going to be eligible for

everyone, or just undocumented New Yorkers?

MR. CRESPO: The standard license we're referring to is exactly that, a standard driver's license. It is open to anyone who chooses not to seek a Federally-compliant, Real ID compliant license like the Enhanced license or the Real ID license. And it's -- and -- and -- a non -- and also, it's a distinction from commercial driver's licenses. This is just a standard driver's license which would be open to every one of the -- you know, who can meet the criteria we set forward. So I will be one of those individuals who would get a standard driver's license that will say, *Not for Federal ID purposes*.

MR. EPSTEIN: So, someone like you or myself could get that license and still travel around the country using other forms of ID as well as our State license?

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

MR. EPSTEIN: That's good to know. And you know, there's a conversation we've been having about fraud. People committing fraud on voting records or other fraud. I wanted to hear -- you know, obviously, fraud is something we're all deeply concerned about. How do you think this attacks the issue of fraud or people committing fraud on voting or other issues that came up earlier?

MR. CRESPO: I don't believe it will have an impact. First of all, I would love to have the proper debate at the right time around the issue of whether voter fraud exists as is sometimes presented by leaders across this country. But look, nothing in this bill changes the fact that if you are not a citizen of the United States, you

do not have the right to vote. There were instances that were shared with us earlier where individuals applied. My understanding, if they -- if under the scenario that was presented prior, it was an individual who used a driver's license number, that must have been because at the time they were issued that driver's license number, they were a qualified applicant because they were here on a Visa or some other process that would have authored them a driver's license or that number or Social Security number, for that matter. It is possible that that individual at that time was under the impression erroneously that that alone qualified them to vote. And, yes, there were examples mentioned, but it would have been interesting to also know what the total number of votes cast in that community. While reading off a list of a handful of -- of names is certainly not symbolic of a common practice. And there's been a lot of debates in this country around voter fraud and whether the immigrant community is involved in it, and none of that has ever been substantiated and is not relevant, I believe, to -- or we're not impacting that in any negative way.

MR. EPSTEIN: Yeah, so just to be clear. It's your assertion, I think, and the documents and the information supports that, that we haven't seen any abnormal voter fraud in the immigrant community, and this would not change that dynamic.

MR. CRESPO: No. And again, the application is very specific. It -- it states in multiple spaces who is eligible to register to vote and who is not and what the consequences are for doing so, what the penalties are. And so, you know, can individuals

make a mistake? Yes. We've also seen examples of citizens who have cast more than one vote because they've made a mistake. I mean, mistakes will happen, and -- and there's no law under the sun that can prevent those from taking place. But the idea that this is a gateway to voter fraud is a complete exaggeration of the truth, and there's been no documentation to show a relevant connection to the two issues.

MR. EPSTEIN: I do want to spend a little more time about crimes in general. I mean, hit-and-run, that's currently a crime in New York, right? So -- so are you arguing that this would overall reduce the amount of crimes that are happening in our State if people had licenses?

MR. CRESPO: What we've seen in data is that states that authorize undocumented residents to achieve a driver's license have seen a significant reduction in the number of accidents because just by the fact that you are now ensuring that those individuals are properly trained to operate a motor vehicle will result in that consequence. The fact that folks will have proper insurance. The fact that there is a greater pool of -- of prepared and trained and educated drivers is going to have an impact. And in terms of law enforcement, it is important to note that in any scenario where individuals who are on our roadways can be -- feel comfortable and safe identifying themselves to local law enforcement is, I believe, a big boom to enhance public safety across the State of New York.

MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you.

On -- on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill, Mr. Epstein.

MR. EPSTEIN: I just wanted to also thank Mr. Crespo for your leadership on this issue. And this is pretty clear and evident to me that what we're talking about is improving public safety across our State. This bill allows that to happen. It makes drivers more -- drivers more accountable, more qualified to be on our roads. Second, it creates equity for all New Yorkers. So many people have been pushed into the shadows because of this system that's unfair. This is a commonsense piece of legislation that would bring equity to our State. All New Yorkers will have the ability to be safely -- and drive safely and legally throughout our State; get to work, pick up their kids from school, going to doctor's appointments. You know, I'm fortunate to live in a city -- a part of the City that has subway access, where folks all over the State -- you can't do day-to-day activities without a car. Passing this measure is a matter of race and economic justice, and creating economic benefits for our State. This facilitates commuters all over New York to be able to move around and live their lives.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill. I want to thank the sponsor, and when it comes to that point I'll be voting in the affirmative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Thank you, Mr. Epstein.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

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

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Rules Committee, Speaker's Conference Room. Members of the Rules Committee start making your way to the Speaker's Conference Room.

Mr. Smullen.

MR. SMULLEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield for a few questions, please?

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Crespo, do you yield?

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: The sponsor yields.

MR. SMULLEN: So, thank you for your contributions, Mr. Crespo. On a couple issues at the Federal level dealing with national security issues, I wanted to ask a few more questions in that regard.

MR. CRESPO: Sure.

MR. SMULLEN: So, you mentioned that you'd made some coordination with Federal agencies. Can you let us know which agencies you had contacted or had experts testify from?

MR. CRESPO: No, my -- my conversations have been with local law enforcement, State agencies, the district attorneys, the Troopers, the police department and a number of other individuals within the law enforcement community at the local level.

MR. SMULLEN: And -- and you mentioned specifically in the language of the bill, immigration-centric agencies, ICE and CBP. Have you -- have you had testimony from any current or former ICE or CBP officials?

MR. CRESPO: No. The only time I've interacted with them is when they've been making unconscionable arrests in public spaces of immigrant families. But, no, I've never had the opportunity to really sit and discuss the policy behind their actions.

MR. SMULLEN: And regarding any other Federal agencies that work in the counter-terrorism area and national security, have you discussed this and -- and the bill's effect on this with any of those organizations?

MR. CRESPO: To an extent, yes, in that the NYPD, which plays a pivotal role in the task force that -- Anti-Terrorism Task Force put forward some -- some recommendations. We actually took those recommendations, included them in the bill to ensure that their current process and access of information is not impeded by the actions of this bill. And we've, I believe, satisfied that concern. So to that extent, yes. In terms of terrorism-related investigations, we do nothing to impede that.

MR. SMULLEN: And -- and could you tell me, I noted from many of the other states which enacted similar legislation that they had included fingerprints or some other sorts of biometrical, you know, person-specific identifying data. Why that wasn't included in New York's bill?

MR. CRESPO: I don't know that many states that use biometrics currently. I don't believe DMV is using biometrics currently for standard licenses. Certainly not --

MR. SMULLEN: Certainly, fingerprints or biometrics. Something that could be uniquely specific to an individual and then could be used in a database.

MR. CRESPO: No. It was never brought up as a consideration, not considered by us.

MR. SMULLEN: And the reason --

MR. CRESPO: Not for this type of license.

MR. SMULLEN: -- I say that is is that the large states that have implemented this have actually used either fingerprints or some sort of other sort of biometric data that would allow people to be individually identified as whom they are. And there's -- certainly, everyone can see the national security concern of someone not being identifiable if their documentation came from sources that couldn't be verified by US persons. That's the concern.

Now, we mentioned a couple things about these things. Is -- is driving -- is this driving license, is it a right or a privilege under New York State law?

MR. CRESPO: It's a privilege.

MR. SMULLEN: So it -- it being a privilege, it's not subject to, say, for instance, U.S. constitutional rights that are -- that are held at the Federal level for adjudication. It's -- instead, it's at the New York State level where we have our Constitution and laws that

are -- are in effect.

MR. CRESPO: Yes.

MR. SMULLEN: So, could you see in -- in this case that this license is conditional, then, at this point?

MR. CRESPO: I'm sorry, repeat that.

MR. SMULLEN: Is this license conditional to all of these applicants, these new applicants, that are undocumented immigrants?

MR. CRESPO: As long as the individuals are fit, they meet the standards, they go through the training and are approved by that training and meet all the other required identifiable information, they would qualify. In terms of conditions, it's no different than the conditions you and I get in our license. There's an expiration date, we have to meet certain standards and criteria. So that all would remain the same.

MR. SMULLEN: So there are no specific conditions to -- to any of these. They're just the general ones that fall under everyone in New York State at this point?

MR. CRESPO: Yeah, I would say so. I mean, again, the real substantive change in terms of what you are presenting is simply that you would have an alternative to a Social Security number in the case if you need to provide a foreign document as the ones we've listed here.

MR. SMULLEN: Certainly. So, what is the renewal period for these -- these driver's licenses that will then be granted

going forward? Is there any shorter period to allow for sufficient documentation to be provided, or additional documentation at a -- at a further point when people want to upgrade these licenses and perhaps after they go through other processes towards the -- the goal and the path of citizenship?

MR. CRESPO: No. We don't address the question. It remains the same. The five years for an original license and renewals are eight years. That would remain in place. There were examples that were brought up in other conversations where even today, if you have a student with a Student Visa who uses -- who has access to a driver's license that maybe at some point they overstay their Visa, there's a scenario where their license is still issued or eligible for privileges, but their Visa has since expired. So there are real-life scenarios affecting even individuals who are here and secured it under current existing law where those discrepancies may take place. But in terms of what this bill does, it does not change -- we don't speak to the length of time or criteria for the timeline from the -- for the original or the reissued -- or renewed license.

MR. SMULLEN: So, for instance, a county clerk, what -- what sort of procedures or training are they going to be given or allowed or additional resources to be able to implement this law?

MR. CRESPO: Well, a couple of things on that. With -- with regards to training, my -- my understanding is that Federal law requires training for all DMV or any office that issues a Real ID-compliant license, like DMV and the county clerks currently

offer. Part of the training issued to all employees who are part of that process include training related to the identification of foreign documents. Whatever technology is necessary is something they currently have in place, and if there were additional things necessary then that's something the Department would have to adjust to. But it is my understanding, by and large, the current training that DMV and county clerk office officials or -- or staff who are a part of the processing or verification of documents currently get training that would be equal to or necessary for implementation of these rights. So I don't believe that there -- the theory that this is going to require extensive additional resources necessarily holds true.

MR. SMULLEN: So, as a -- as someone from my background who's deeply involved in national security, I'm always worried about people slipping through the cracks. And we have, you know, 62 counties in New York State that are very diverse and they're geographically separated, so they get a lot of different -- people coming from different areas. And I'm -- I'm a bit concerned about bad people with bad intent, terrorists, slipping through those cracks because of a hole in the law.

So, thank you very much for answering my questions, Mr. Crespo.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: On the bill, sir.

MR. SMULLEN: So I am deeply concerned. I -- I'm in favor of bringing people out of the shadows because I think the

shadows are where terrorists hide best. And I -- and I first and foremost want everyone to know that when I served in the military that I was sworn to uphold the Constitution under Federal law. And it's a good benchmark in which to compare things. Now I stand here in the Assembly before you, and think about our State and its Constitution and State law. And I do not want to put our county clerks or anyone in a position where they have to violate Federal law, especially if there's a potential of any sort of national security threat that's involved. After speaking to multiple local officials in my district who will be impacted by this, I still don't see how the bill as it's currently written will help our DMVs verify these foreign documents, and will only slow down an already inefficient bureaucracy.

Now, I understand that the chances of a terrorist evading our security --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Blake, why do you rise, sir?

MR. BLAKE: I -- I was just hoping if I could just ask one question for clarity.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Smullen, will you yield to Mr. Blake's question?

MR. SMULLEN: Upon completion of my comments on the bill, sir

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: He will not yield at this time, sir.

MR. BLAKE: Certainly.

MR. SMULLEN: So, I understand that the terrorist -- the chances of a terrorist invading our security measures are slim, and we would desirably want them to be so to not have a repeat of September 11th. But I'm really concerned that we're going to create a -- a new avenue for someone to evade the law and obtain other legal documents.

As I said before, immigration is very important for our country and has always been. But I want to make sure that the Federal and the State level that we are in-synchronized to be able to keep our security sure so those who are here to pursue the American Dream can do so, but to keep out those whose intentions are to sow violence. So let's work to fix our immigration system and let's work hard, allowing our individual -- working individuals so they can get government documents to help them live their lives better.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'm standing by.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Blake, why do you rise?

MR. BLAKE: On the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: You can't. There's -- we're on his time --

MR. BLAKE: (Inaudible) Is he open to --

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: No, he's not done. You can go on the list, Mr. Blake. But we're on -- still on Mr. Smullen's time, but he did yield to you.

MR. BLAKE: He did yield? I just wanted clarity on

a question. I just wanted clarify.

MR. SMULLEN: Certainly.

MR. BLAKE: I -- I did not recall the sponsor of the bill at all saying that this would permit terrorist access. I was just trying to get an understanding on where did the terrorist claim just come in?

MR. SMULLEN: I -- I thought I explained it quite thoroughly. It's the slipping through the cracks phenomenon. It's happened before, and we don't want it to happen again.

MR. BLAKE: But just for clarity, I'm just trying to understand. The bill itself is to provide access for driver's licenses. I'm just trying to understand the connection of how permitting people of color, particularly Latino and other immigrants, is connected to terrorism. I'm just asking for clarity. It was referenced at least three times.

MR. SMULLEN: I made no mention of -- of that. I -- I spoke generically about the national security threats that our country has faced.

MR. BLAKE: So, it is fair to say as it relates to this specific bill, as it relates to the individuals that would be benefit, you do or do not believe that the individuals that would benefit from this bill are terrorists?

MR. SMULLEN: No. What I spoke to Mr. Crespo in our questioning was the national security implications and the agencies which had been contacted for coordination in regards to the

language of the bill.

MR. BLAKE: Understood. So, just for clarity, you do not believe this bill is going to provide access to terrorists?

MR. SMULLEN: No. I don't -- I'm not really sure what -- what you're getting at --

MR. BLAKE: Understood.

MR. SMULLEN: -- but thank you.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you very much.

MR. SMULLEN: You bet.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Reilly, why do you rise?

MR. REILLY: I don't know if I'm allowed to do this, though, but I wanted to know if I can -- does Mr. Smullen still have time? Would Mr. Smullen yield? Would you yield on your time or is he done?

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Smullen has yielded the floor, but if you are interested, Mr. Reilly, you can come on to the list for a second opportunity. Mr. Smullen has yielded the rest of his time, so he cannot -- he cannot yield his time. But if you are interested in speaking on the bill, you're more than welcome to come back on the list, sir.

MR. REILLY: Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Palumbo.

MR. PALUMBO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the sponsor yield, please, for a few questions?

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: Mr. Crespo, do you yield?

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER PICHARDO: The sponsor yields.

MR. PALUMBO: Thank you, Mr. Crespo. Just a few questions. These were gleaned over somewhat, but regarding the verification of the documents that would now be required for someone to obtain a driver's license, is there any sort of a database that can be accessed, for example, for passports? I know you said that there may even be a book, I think, about when you're in another state and someone's trying to verify a driver's license. They have a book that shows the general layout and watermarks and so forth of a particular document, and as a result they can verify whether or not it looks accurate. But there is no specific way to verify whether or not it is actually a valid document. Do we have anything of -- of that sort regarding consumer documents or passports or anything of the like?

MR. CRESPO: There is software and technology that allows those markers to be identified, and there is a methodology that DMV has implemented in the past to learn about and/or verify what those markers are and keep that up to date so that local offices would know what to look for and how to verify it. So my understanding is that there is a very thorough technology software related to and necessary for that verification to take place.

MR. PALUMBO: So in the event someone were to

actually produce - and this is a concern - someone, say, were to produce a Yemenese passport that would be -- bear all the appropriate markings, there would be no way to specifically confirm that that's a valid document, right?

MR. CRESPO: I -- I wouldn't suggest that. I mean I think -- look, under current regulations, put aside foreign documents, it's -- you know, we know that technology has advanced. 3D printers allow people to come up with all sorts of things or other ways that folks can attempt to falsify. I think that's a challenge for a number of agencies, including DMV, to always update their security measures. And -- and -- and relative to the discussion that was most recently had for national security measures, it is important, and it's something that I think is constantly being upgraded. DMV would be a part of that process as well, and keep track of -- of that ability and have that -- nothing prevents them from having thorough communications with some of these other foreign countries or their agencies to keep that updated. So while it is a challenge, I mean, the notion that somebody could attempt to circumvent, it's not that different from somebody maybe printing up a falsified birth certificate or some other document currently available to individuals. That would be a concern. I mean, in the case of terrorism, there is a -- you know, if you think about it from that perspective, I would be just as concerned about domestic terrorists who would move from State X into New York with ill intentions and falsify a driver's license from another state. But again, the point is there is technology available. There are ways to verify it.

None of this is necessarily foreign to the work of DMV in the past or what it currently does for Real ID-compliant licenses. So, I -- I understand the -- the principle you're bringing up, but I think that they will easily meet that end to have in place measures to ensure the ver -- verification of documents presented to them.

MR. PALUMBO: Understood. And it's an evolving process. I think now we check with reciprocity with other states. And in that regard, as far as suspensions are concerned. Since someone hasn't been licensed, they certainly would -- they may even have suspensions or have been -- have other offenses from other licenses. But DMV doesn't -- doesn't conduct a criminal background check at all of any kind, right? So, regardless to say, New Jersey, if someone has numerous offenses still pending, they could come in as a non-resident with the appropriate documentation and still ultimately get a license in New York.

MR. CRESPO: Well, we -- we treat the process no different than what we do now for individuals who are applying for a first-time license. If -- and again, you have the three documents; the passport, a foreign driver -- a foreign ID, a driver's ID and/or the Consul ID are -- are recognizable documents used in a number of industries. The process for verification, again, exists. The driving record is not something currently necessarily considered unless they've been authorized to drive in a place that participates within the National Driver Registry and the information that's provided there. But again, it's not that dissimilar from individuals who apply for a license for the

first time that is not looked at.

MR. PALUMBO: Understood.

MR. CRESPO: Or -- or for -- or for those that are authorized because of a Visa or something else, to apply for a license. That information wouldn't be obtained either, currently.

MR. PALUMBO: Understood. So in the event -- so really, even under the current process, resident or not, you'd be able to obtain a license and, say, go to Virginia and be able to buy a gun with the -- with the production of that license. That would not change at all. This bill doesn't really affect that. Although, again, it's an evolving process. I understand that. But that's something of concern, and I have gotten some -- some input in that regard, that there were issues that hopefully we can rectify that as best we can in all instances.

MR. CRESPO: Yeah. No, and I -- and I think that's fair, except just to point out again, there are a number of instances where today for certain licenses or certain immigrant New Yorkers qualify for driver's licenses, and so that risk exists even now. It's not -- and -- and I think that while that's a laudable concern to be discussed, I don't believe that this bill is going to necessarily make that condition or -- or potential impact worse in any way, rather -- again, I'm always going to come back to this question of safety, and that the more people that come forward, the better it is for public safety reasons. The idea of anybody being encouraged or allowed to or forced into driving or being involved in the State in some ways without proper identification does not help public safety. I think this

enhances it.

MR. PALUMBO: Understood. Now, just two other fairly quick points. Regarding the three-day notice, my concern was that in the event one of these, say we have from one of those immigration enforcement agencies, ICE issues a so-ordered grand jury subpoena from a Federal magistrate or judge. It's a court order now. It's a secret proceeding. Under the language of this bill, the way I understand it, is that DMV will still be required to notify the individual that they are, in fact -- someone is seeking that information, before they release it. So just in that very rare circumstance - and I understand it's rare - but in the event one of these agencies that are -- the flag ones that are charged with immigration enforcement, if they issue a lawful order to -- to DMV that they still have an obligation to disclose what otherwise would be a violation of law in the event that they do disclose in a grand jury investigation. So how can we get around that, or if you could just please describe your intent in that regard.-

MR. CRESPO: My understanding is if there is a grand jury subpoena presented by a Federal agency, that law would supercede anything we propose in this bill. I think it's the -- the notion of routine civil immigration-related enforcement actions and/or the information, what is provided and when it's provided, that is what we're looking to -- to limit as unnecessary to the obligations or responsibilities of the Department of Motor Vehicles. But all the other law enforcement criminal investigations and access remain in place.

MR. PALUMBO: So in that situation, I would assume, then, the US attorneys could obviously pass that off to a sister agency; maybe the FBI or some -- another agency and have them issue the subpoena and then it would be otherwise okay?

MR. CRESPO: I -- not sure how that scenario would play out. But let -- again, the limitation of sharing of DMV documents and data is limited to the -- to the agencies that we list whose primary purpose is the enforcement of civil immigration matters.

MR. PALUMBO: Now, on somewhat of a similar note regarding the sharing of information. It's my understanding that there's -- some bills have gained some traction regarding automatic -- and I believe some other states may have done it -- regarding automatic registry to vote in the event you obtain a driver's license. How would this impact that? Now, would there be any carve-outs, particularly for these types of applicants, or would they automatically be registered to vote and then they would have to affirmatively taken it -- take the step to remove themselves because they're not technically a citizen at that point?

MR. CRESPO: I appreciate that. I think it's a matter for Election Law to -- to address. None -- nothing in this bill authorizes or qualifies someone who is not eligible to vote to have eligibility to vote. So, we're not changing that. We're not encouraging this behavior. We're not making it more accessible for -- for any of -- misbehavior regards to that to take place. And if there was to be an automatic voter registration process -- and that's something that

Election Law and policy would have to address to ensure that only those that are eligible to vote are registered to vote. But this bill does not impact that.

MR. PALUMBO: Very good. Thank you, Mr. Crespo. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Malliotakis.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Will the sponsor yield, please?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Will you yield, Mr. Crespo?

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: I actually want to pick up where my colleague left off, because I also was concerned about potential for auto -- automatic voter registration in the future, because this year there were groups advocating that we do that. There's been colleagues of ours that have also been very vocal about the need for us to move in that direction of automatic voter registration. There was an article in February of this year in NPR that stated that in Pennsylvania there were noncitizens that were accidentally registered to vote. Not due to automatic voter registration, but do more towards the driver's licenses being given to noncitizens. And so I just wanted to -- to -- is there nothing in this bill that actually would differentiate someone -- someone's license -- a license for someone who is undocumented and someone who is a citizen, just for the matter of ensuring that there's no

mixup in records between the DMV and the -- and the Board of Elections in the future, should this State go forward with automatic voter registration?

MR. CRESPO: So, in a very technical sense, the answer is no. We don't address that because it's not a current concern. If we were to endeavor into drafting legislation to create that immediate registration, we would have to find a way around that concern and -- and implement what would be automatic voter registration. But again, I think it's important to note, nothing that we're doing here gives voting rights to anyone who is not currently eligible to vote, and that's only citizens. So we're not -- we're not changing that. And so if we expand eligible -- I mean, the process for registering someone, we would take into account what DMV's database has or doesn't have and how it would meet or comply with whatever goals we would have in those election policy proposals.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: And I -- and I understand that this legislation is not looking to give voting rights. However, the House of Representatives just passed legislation that would allow for automatic voter registration. So, I mean, it would make sense that while we're crafting this bill, that we have anticipi -- we should be anticipating that automatic voter registration will be coming down the pipe. I mean, what happens if we -- we issue, let's say, half a million driver's licenses and learner's permits, and then later on down the line we see that automatic voter registration? How will you be able to differentiate at that point between those who are citizens eligible to

vote and those who are noncitizens?

MR. CRESPO: No. In -- and in -- Nicole, I think it's important also to note, that concern is actually already in place whether or not we pass this. There are legal residents, noncitizens, who currently have driver's licenses, and they're in the database. And so if we all -- if we did not pass this but yet implemented automatic voter registration, that's a concern we would still have to take into account in terms of how we implement that new policy. But I'm sure there are a number of future policies that may or may not be impacted directly or indirectly by what we do here, but simply, that does not change the fact that our State is better served, our economy and our public safety is better served by ensuring that more people are on the road licensed and insured.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. With regards to the -- the individuals who qualify for a license. I mean, is there any -- are we looking at all if they have driven unlicensed, if they've -- are convicted of a driving while intoxicated or under the influence? Would that prevent anyone from being able to now apply for a license?

MR. CRESPO: There's no database now for people getting licenses in regards to any prior history. So if -- if it's -- right, in the case of a foreign license. But. Look. If I understood the question correctly, no. The answer is no.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. Moving to Section 2, paragraph 12 where -- where you discuss the -- the requirement that

the Commissioner, no later than three days after such a request for information comes from an immigration agency, they have to notify the licensed individual about whom such information was requested, and so -- and that they -- that this existing -- this agency has requested their -- their documentation and background information. So, I assume that's in there because you have an interest in protecting individuals who are here undocumented from -- from deportation. Now, what if -- what if the situation was that an individual was here and they had committed a crime that may be protected under -- maybe a sanctuary policy or now law enforcement is forced to find that person on their own and they're -- they're utilizing this database to do so. Can you just talk a little bit about that? Like, what is the purpose of putting in that protection there if an individual -- I mean, because clearly, there's -- well, why don't you talk a little bit about why you put that provision in there.

MR. CRESPO: As I mentioned earlier this afternoon, the -- two reasons: Number one, we are consistent in terms of the privacy protections that we are looking to afford within the bill. And while we exempt a number of agencies or clarify the limited agencies that would not have direct access, there are a number of exemptions of those that do. This notification would only apply to those Federal agencies that -- that enforce civil immigration matters. And again, that's not the responsibility of DMV. And when appropriate under the provisions that we would put forward, they would -- they would let that individual know that their information was requested. It is not

that dissimilar from the existing provision in the Federal Driver Privacy Protection Act that talks about exempted access, and then states that if a non-exempted entity or agency were to request information, the -- the driver would receive a notification that that information was requested pertaining to their records. So in a sense, we're remaining consistent with how the Federal policy addresses notifications in some instances.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. But if an individual committed a crime and now there's a detainer request for this individual to be removed from the country, this would actually require the Commissioner to notify the perpetrator that an agency, a law enforcement agency, is seeking them?

MR. CRESPO: It -- I'm a little confused about the question, because we're only limiting the information when it's related to immigration-specific. If there was a criminal act committed, an investigation pertaining to criminal acts, that would -- that is not, in my opinion, being impacted, those investigations.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Well, what I'm saying is, if there is a detainer request for an individual who is -- who is -- who has committed a crime in the United States and now their -- their law enforcement is seeking to have them removed from the country permanently, my question would be, would this require the -- the Commissioner of the Department of Motor Vehicles to notify the licensed individual which is being -- who is being sought, that there is a law enforcement entity that is seeking them?

MR. CRESPO: The notification would be that a request was made and for which documents, not the intent of that agency's --

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay.

MR. CRESPO: -- the reasons why they're requesting that information. Also, if there -- as was stated earlier, there are scenarios where certain Federal warrants or court orders would -- would still allow access to certain information, but it's -- I -- I don't see how that scenario really plays out in practice.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Well, I -- I think it's important because first of all, you know, U.S. Code 1324 prohibits individuals from aiding and abetting individuals who are here unlawfully. And if you have a Federal agency who is -- has a detainer request for someone's removal and you're directing now the Commissioner or the individuals who report to the Commissioner to now notify this individual that they're being sought by a law enforcement agency, you know, you're -- you're asking -- you're asking an employee of the DMV to commit a crime against U.S. Code 1324.

MR. CRESPO: No --

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: I mean, I don't think we should be putting legislation forward --

MR. CRESPO: We're not asking them to commit a crime. DMV's responsibilities pertain to the regulation of individuals who are within our State who can operate a motor vehicle, under what conditions and what manner they can do so, ensuring that they are able

to do so. And that's the responsibility of DMV. It is Federal agencies' responsibility to go about their investigations to detain the individuals they are seeking. And I understand that underlying this question is this broader discussion around the role of local agencies or support for Federal efforts in regards to immigration law. And yes, there will be some of those points that we will simply not agree on. But I -- I -- I think that our efforts here speak more to public safety for our roadways, for our local law enforcement, for road safety, for a number -- local investigations, local interactions by police and individuals in our State. Making sure that people are able to operate within our State, not having to live under the shadows. I think all of those things far outweigh public safety in a positive way than the DMV itself being one of the entities that would help facilitate or be involved in helping or assisting or providing information to immigration offices for their purposes. I -- I can understand the philosophical difference we'll have on that, but I think there's a clear argument that there are much more public safety measures being achieved in this than not.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. Look, obviously, we're not going to agree on this particular point. And I do see some of the merit that you're -- you're saying this bill carries. But what I -- what I do want to go back into -- in the public safety aspect is on a much more global scale. Did you -- have you had conversations with the New York State Association of County Clerks?

MR. CRESPO: No.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. So they -- I mean,

because they publicly have said that they will have difficulty verifying whether these documents that are provided, that are foreign documents that they're not familiar with, are genuine and whether they are authentic or not.

MR. CRESPO: I -- I -- I've heard those concerns. They have not reached out either to express those concerns to me as the sponsor. I've only heard their concerns through their press conferences and some editorials that they put out. But I can tell you, I don't see how that is in fact or in truth. The fact is local DMV personnel, as well as county clerk personnel that issue -- and I believe they all do -- the Federal -- the standard licenses or the Real ID-compliant licenses already have a method -- a method of training and a process to verify foreign documents. Yes, this will maybe add two others -- or one other, really, document that they would have to verify. But there are extensive technology software and other processes that are used widely in banking and other industries that do this. We are limiting it to those three and -- identifications which are, you know, not easily accessible. Not everybody has one. They are coming from legitimate agencies, from countries that DMV has had an understanding of what the protocols are. So this -- again, I strongly believe that based on the training that staff already gets, they are familiar with this process. They know what they're doing. Could it -- is it possible that they'll need a person or two extra that they may need additional revenues? That's -- if for the technology of software needs to be provided to them, that's something the Department would have to

adjust to. And I will argue that the revenues raised will more than enough cover those expenses, and local county clerks will see also tremendous financial benefits for their local jurisdictions through the implementation of this bill.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: You know, I -- I share a concern that was brought up by -- by one of my colleagues, and it is a very legitimate concern. And I believe that the majority of individuals who will be -- who will be seeking these licenses are good people. They're here, they want to work hard, they want to achieve the American Dream like my parents, like your family. And I have -- you know, I'm -- I'm supportive of -- of actually lobbying Washington, so that way they can come out of the shadows and become -- become productive members of our -- of our society. But there is -- there is really a security issue here as well. And, you know, when you -- when you look at our history as a nation, you know, we have to be mindful of those who also want to do us harm. All right. And that is something I don't think that this bill takes into account. You know, there's one thing that we want to fight for those individuals who are here, they want to work hard, they want to achieve the American Dream. But those that slip through the cracks that are here to try to do us harm, I don't think this bill does enough. And the fact that the New York State Association of County Clerks is saying that they can't verify the authenticity of documents -- I mean, they're saying it. I understand that you're saying that they have some tools to do so, but if the Association itself is saying that they can't do it, I mean, isn't that

something that concerns you in a post-9/11 world?

MR. CRESPO: Certainly. And -- and again, I think it's important -- I -- I don't want anybody in any district to misinterpret our efforts to ensure public safety. I think public safety is paramount in what we're trying to achieve here. And I understand that there will always be scenarios and, you know, examples where something can slip through the cracks, as was mentioned earlier. But make no mistake about it. We are enhancing public safety through this process. Even -- in fact, Ms. Malliotakis, and I look forward to the day that I can join you in that lobbying effort in DC for -- for immigration reform in this country -- but the fact is, if you look at the 9/11 terrorists --

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Yup.

MR. CRESPO: The fact that all of them had been issued licenses and pilot licenses in some instances actually helped law enforcement to better investigate and more rapidly investigate where those individuals lived, who was associated with --

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: But you're trying to block access to that information.

MR. CRESPO: -- information that today is oftentimes not accessible to law -- law enforcement agencies because those individuals are forced to live in the shadows and don't share information where necessary. So I -- I would argue, we are making our public safety goals much clearer to achieve by improving the number of people that -- enhancing the number of people that can be a

part of our licensing and our -- and our system, rather than the opposite, keeping the current structure makes this more dangerous in our communities.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: All right. But you're -- you're not sharing -- you're blocking those information from being shared --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Malliotakis, your time has elapsed.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: It was up when you let him keep going.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Well, unfortunately, you asked him the question at the appropriate time.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Walczyk.

MR. WALCZYK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the sponsor would be so kind as to yield another time.

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Crespo yields.

MR. WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the sponsor would enlighten us as to the origin of the -- the idea of this bill, where it came from and who wrote the legislation.

MR. CRESPO: Wait. You want the history of this concept, or this bill?

MR. WALCZYK: This bill.

MR. CRESPO: So, there had been a number of proposals over the years or since the regulations were changed in the

early 2000's to ensure that those individuals that had been licensed prior but then lost it when the regulations were changed continued to have access to their driving privileges. That has come in a number of forms. I -- I know a couple of colleagues of mine who are sitting in this Chamber today have carried at one point or another a version of this bill. This bill most closely resembles a bill by former colleague, Francisco Moya, who had a similar draft. But a coalition of advocates and community-based organizations recommended additional changes which I introduced and is the current form you see before you which has been amended more than once to address many of the concerns raised by law enforcement, as well as members on your side of the aisle.

MR. WALCZYK: I appreciate that answer. And through you, Mr. Speaker, you've been carrying this bill for roughly a year. Is that about right?

MR. CRESPO: That's right.

MR. WALCZYK: Okay. Excellent. So, over the past year, what conversations have you had with the State Board of Elections or with local Board of Elections across New York State as to how this will impact and how they'll be able to deal with motor voter registrate -- registrants when it comes to registered voters?

MR. CRESPO: So, I can't say that specific to this bill I've had those conversations, but you may not know, in another capacity I served as the Party Chair in my county to my party. And in that, I have consistent interactions with the Board of Elections, and

understand and I have seen firsthand the concerns as they play out on Election Day in our local communities. And have obviously stayed, you know, up-to-date on the narratives and the discussions that have happened nationally, really, around those concerns. But none of that necessarily is relevant to what we are changing here today. If it has an unintended consequence down the line because of potential policies, we will see. We'll address them at the right time.

MR. WALCZYK: And through you, Mr. Speaker, if the sponsor would continue to yield, would you enlighten us as to who your local Board of Elections Commissioners are and you, Chairman, about your conversations with them about this bill?

MR. CRESPO: So, you know, it's been a long debate, and giving you specific names, and I'm not sure that they want to share the conversations we've had that have been some in public forums, some have been in private forums. But I guess it would be more relevant to this discussion if you maybe clarify in your question what is the concern that you want me to address. If you're asking me about if I had conversations, yes. Do I -- have I had numerous conversations regarding the impact of this bill and potential voter fraud, what the application will look like, how it will affect, you know, voting processes, yes, I've had a number of those. And I'm not sure how they're relevant because we do nothing in this bill to change who has a right to vote and how they do so today. And if there's a separate conversation to be had about the Board of Elections needing to enhance their efforts, that's for a different debate, different time,

different proposal.

MR. WALCZYK: I'd be happy to answer that question through you, Mr. Speaker. What I'm trying to get at, Mr. Sponsor, or Mr. Chairman, is that I've heard from my elections commissioners and they have some concerns with how they will vet motor voter registrants. They're concerned that they don't have the ability, the staff. And the way that this information will come to them through DMV, they don't have the ability to purge those records of noncitizens who may have accidentally just pressed yes on a consumer-forward device, or may have checked yes as they're quickly filling out an application, signed the bottom and now they're registered to vote in the United States of America. And maybe that wasn't even their intent, but now everyone in this Chamber is working very hard to show -- to get them to show up on Election Day, and this is -- this is a right of United States citizens that we're now pushing maybe someone that's not a citizen of the United States who accidentally, in this shuffle of paperwork, through legislation that wasn't properly vetted through a Board of Elections in your area or in mine, we haven't created a process that would allow them to vet those records.

MR. CRESPO: I -- I appreciate that. I -- I mean, your -- your suggestions are based on a number of hypotheticals. But keep in mind, that is currently a concern for the Board of Elections and their process because there are documented individuals, noncitizens, who have driver's licenses issued today. So, yes. If there is a strengthening of the way or the manner in which the Board of

Elections ensures that the right people are registered, it's an affidavit in your application, you should know what you're signing. And I assure you, the immigrant community is extremely cautious of what they sign to, what they agree to, because they have consequences that neither you or I have to be concerned about. But I assure you, if you or I were threatened with making a mistake like checking off a box without -- without looking at it, and it could mean that you will never see your children again, I assure you, you'd be very careful to check that box or not.

MR. WALCZYK: Well, I -- I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, and I'll -- I'll respond very quickly before my next question if you'll allow. Our -- our demographics in our districts are obviously very different. I shake hands with many Canadians who are noncitizens of the United States who tell me on a regular basis, *I would love to vote for you, but I can't because I'm a citizen in Canada.* My concern a little bit and my -- my -- the concern of my Board of Elections commissioners is that if we're easing this process, some of those folks might be caught in the shuffle. And while I would accidentally love to have them vote for me, I think this is a right that United States citizens earned. And if you would continue to yield.

MR. CRESPO: Yeah. But just to respond to that. We do not change that. I agree with you, the voting rights are extended to citizens. That is the law. That remains the law. Nothing in this bill allows or authorizes someone new the privilege to vote. We can say that in 20 different ways, but it's just a fact. We do

nothing to change who has access or the ability to vote. There are efforts to expand access to voter applications not just with DMV, but with a number of other agencies. We want online registration. We have other efforts to make it more accessible for people to register. None of that changes what qualifies you to vote. So I think the idea, the hypothetical you present, is not, in fact, going to be a great concern. It's not in practice going to materialize in that manner. And where it occurs, it'll be rooted. Mistakes will happen, with this bill or not this bill. And DMV already -- motor voter issues may already be relevant given that there are a number of noncitizens who are issued driver's licenses. So I don't think that -- that this expansion is going to exacerbate that, but rather, that's a conversation to be had in regards to Election Law policy.

MR. WALCZYK: Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor continues.

MR. WALCZYK: I'm going to shift --

MR. CRESPO: Indefinitely, by the way, I continue to yield.

MR. WALCZYK: I appreciate that. I -- I'm going to shift gears a little bit here. And in the last 14 months that you've sponsored this legislation - or maybe before when you were planning to put it in and working on a bill draft - what conversations did you have with other states or provinces of Canada that have reciprocal

agreements through our Department of Motor Vehicles that share licensing information, about the impact of this legislation? What conversations have you had?

MR. CRESPO: We haven't had direct conversations. We've obviously done research on what other jurisdictions have done in and around these -- these proposals or this policy. But other than verifying a question we may have had when thinking through, no, I haven't had direct conversations. I could assure you, though, many of the coalition members and advocates who have helped shape the language or the suggestions of what should be included have been a part of efforts to draft similar legislation elsewhere, and they're very familiar with what the impacts would be. And actually during the Caucus weekend earlier this year, we talked at length around the possibilities where somebody was issued this license, what would it mean if they're driving in another state, and those types of questions were addressed. There is -- the State participates in that National Registry of driver information. So as it relates -- and actually, Canada does as well. So any driver-related information or records would be available to all those agencies, to all those states, and to Canada as well.

MR. WALCZYK: That's great, and will save me a couple of questions. We have agreements with 45 different states and a -- a number of provident -- provinces of Canada. The reciprocal agreement, will this impact information that we share over the -- over any of those agreements?

MR. CRESPO: No.

MR. WALCZYK: Do we currently share driver's license photos?

MR. CRESPO: I don't think we do.

MR. WALCZYK: Do we share addresses?

MR. CRESPO: I will -- I'll say that the current information being shared in those registries does not change with this bill.

MR. WALCZYK: Okay. So, no --

MR. CRESPO: And -- and to be clear, if it's allowed under the Federal Driver Privacy Protection Act, that also remains consistent.

MR. WALCZYK: Okay. So are you -- are you aware of some of the offenses that would -- would trigger some of the sharing agreements with other states?

MR. CRESPO: Clarify the question for me, please.

MR. WALCZYK: Yeah sure -- well, maybe I -- maybe I could just enlighten a little bit.

MR. CRESPO: Thank you.

MR. WALCZYK: Manslaughter is one of them. Any felony -- felony in the commission of which a motor vehicle is used. Any speeding offense, any offense consisting of disobeying a traffic control device. Any offense involving failure to yield to a right-of-way. Any offense involving direction of traffic, overtaking or passing. Any offense involving failure to use a safety belt or a child

restraint device. Reckless driving, passing a stopped school bus. Those are just some of the examples of information that trigger us sharing with one of those reciprocal agreements with provinces in Canada or 45 of those states in the United States.

MR. CRESPO: And that does not change.

MR. WALCZYK: Ok. So in -- in the instance where one of those violations happens with a New Yorker under this new license agreement, we'll still share their name and their address, we'll share information that could be linked to their legal address --

MR. CRESPO: Whatever -- whatever is currently shared. The same subset of data currently shared for all drivers in the current registry and -- and open database remains the same.

MR. WALCZYK: Okay. Well, I couldn't -- I couldn't help but notice the -- the title of this act is the "Driver's License Access and Privacy Act." So you could see how some concerns about sharing data would certainly come to the forefront for me. Do you see any of that data that we share in our reciprocal agreement currently as showing the legal status if -- if these new undoc --

MR. CRESPO: No, that -- no. We -- we -- the way in which DMV would be instructed to maintain this database will not identify legal status, lawful presence in the United States because that's not pertinent to what DMV responsibilities are. It's not related to their jurisdiction or -- or necessary to evaluate whether you are an individual who has passed the road test, can operate a motor vehicle,

and/or would be issued that privilege to drive. So -- but to be clear, we're not addressing or changing the data points that are shared in that national registry or access to that registry. So, it remains consistent in terms of any data shared currently under those provisions.

MR. WALCZYK: The -- the individual -- the rest of New Yorkers that plan to travel internationally will have to get Real ID in October 2020. So I anticipate a number of constituents from my district will go through the process to that upgrade. And I could easily see the -- the provinces of Canada or other states and New York seeing their -- their license, the status of their license, the type of license that they have within New York State and doing some of the vetting on their own to separate the two groups. My concern, and maybe -- maybe you could help me out here, is that if we have two different licenses in New York State starting in 2020, are you concerned that individuals who have the -- the non-Real ID driver's license in New York State will be more likely to hit and run because they're concerned that in another state, name your reciprocity state, in South Carolina they get pulled over, they know that that state will nail them for not having a Real ID?

MR. CRESPO: No, I don't have that concern.

MR. WALCZYK: Would your concern be the -- be the case in Canada in that case?

MR. CRESPO: No.

MR. WALCZYK: Okay.

On the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. WALCZYK: I do have a concern, and I plan to vote no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Blankenbush.

MR. BLANKENBUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to give the sponsor a break and he could sit down because I'm going to speak on the bill, Marcos. Sitting here listening to one of my colleagues talk a while ago about some economic benefits and automobile sales and so forth and drivers, I -- I got to put my... I guess my insurance hat on. I've been in the insurance business longer than I'm going to tell you. So, one of the problems I see that's happening with the passing of this bill, which is going to be for all of the -- all of our individuals who are going to be licensing for the first time, many of them, I would imagine, would be interested in buying automobiles for their own. Now, the one caution I -- I have about this, is that anyone who is going to be licensed immediately, they're all going to be considered inexperienced operators because there's no three-year setback data an insurance company could look at to -- to see what kind of a driver they are. And they're probably a lot of good drivers. But in the insurance companies, under the underwriting procedures, they need three years experience. Anyone here who has a child that they put on their insurance policy at 16 years old understands that those 16-year-olds are considered inexperienced operators. And you could -- you all know what happens to your premiums. This is going to be a little bit different because, you know, there's a lot of adults that are

individuals who are going to be applying for a -- a license, and many of them are going to be out looking to buy automobiles for their registration and licensing of their automobile. What I think that everyone should realize that when that happens, the insurance companies are not going to write them under standard insurance policies. Most of them, or probably all of them, are going to have to be in the assigned risk pool. In my area, which I don't have as many -- in the North Country, I don't have as many drivers as New York City and Long Island and in areas down there, and our premiums are something like anywhere between \$2,500 and \$3,000 for minimum coverage. And the concern is -- and I'll give you another example. A lot of times in my area, young guys come in and they -- from the Fort Drum, they've never been licensed in New York, they've never had insurance. They go out and they buy a car, and then they come in and they find out that their premiums are more than what their car is worth. So the concern I have is when -- and by the way, we don't write the assigned risk anymore. I know Mr. Hawley's agency doesn't write the assigned risk anymore, it's just a pain in the neck. And so what'll happen is when they go into the assigned risk, they're going to look at those premiums. Many of them might not be able to afford the premiums on that -- on their car insurance. So what could happen, and which in my experience happens all the time -- not all the time, 60, 70 percent of the time -- when someone gets a policy in the assigned risk pool, they take that policy, they apply for it, they get their insurance cards. They now go in and they register their vehicle, they drive the

vehicle, and when the second premium comes due, they let it lapse because they just can't afford it. So, sometimes, and a lot of times, it's because either they're -- they're youthful operators or they're just inexperienced operators. So, I don't know what the premiums in the assigned risk is in New York City or Long Island. I do know what they would be facing up here, and I -- I think that -- I think that that's a concern. So, will it eventually -- once they eventually get three years driving experience and they can prove that, that's a different -- that's a different story. But I'm concerned that what's going to happen is that many more drivers are going -- and by the way, I think it's one out of seven drivers in the State of New York right now drive without -- without insurance. So is that going to increase? I don't know. But when you put so many drivers in that -- in -- in that pool, you're really looking at maybe not really helping the matter about safety, about numbers that are driving with insurance or without insurance. It's just reality that when they -- when they see that insurance bill, that many of them might not be able to afford it. So the -- the problem that all my colleagues have been speaking about is one thing. But I look at it a little bit differently because I'm in that business. I've been in that business for years, and I think that for those that have never tried to get insurance as -- as inexperienced operators are going to be shocked when they see the type of premiums that they're going to pay. So, does it help the economy like my colleague said? Does it help the automobile -- automobile insure -- automobile business? Does it help driver safety? Maybe not, if, in fact, there's not a way that they can

afford the policies and they basically are driving uninsured -- they're uninsured. Now maybe, but maybe they're still going to be uninsured because of the way the assigned risk is and the premiums are. And I'm concerned that that's going to happen. And it's not going to be an economic benefit to the car insurance business.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just think that when we -- we when -- when we approve a bill or vote a bill, put a bill in -- in place, we're causing some other problems that we're not thinking about down the road. And it's a concern of mine, and I think for those people who are going to go light, please go find out what your insurance coverage is going to cost you before you buy the automobile. Because there are certain automobiles that -- that are higher-rated and will cost you more. And I'm just saying to you, if the bill passes and it goes in -- in effect, go ask the insurance company what -- if you have X car, go ask them and say, *Give me a quote on my insurance before I buy this car.* Because you don't want to buy a car and then realize the -- the cost of that insurance is going to choke you.

So I just wanted to bring that out. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, sponsor of the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Byrnes.

Ms. Byrnes, I'm sorry.

MS. BYRNES: Thank you. I thought I was a little farther down the line than that, but...

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Well, we can come

back.

MS. BYRNES: No, no, no. Thank you.

Will the sponsor yield?

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

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The sponsor yields.

MS. BYRNES: The good news is a lot of my questions have been asked. But I -- the bad news is I still have a couple more.

MR. CRESPO: Sure.

MS. BYRNES: I want to go back to the issue of reciprocity.

MR. CRESPO: Okay.

MS. BYRNES: If somebody has one of these new licenses issued by New York State, is it still illegal for them to drive in another state? Pennsylvania or another state because it's not good for Federal purposes?

MR. CRESPO: No. It's... standard licenses in reciprocity -- where reciprocity exists -- my opinion should be honored nonetheless. There may be other risks in terms of the intentions or the approaches to local law enforcement, and with their cooperation with federal agents. But if you're referring to whether somebody who is undocumented would have this license and is now driving past -- through a state where there is reciprocity but then -- you know, I --

there may be an impact, but it's not related to the reciprocity itself. That would remain for standard licenses.

MS. BYRNES: According to this bill, you're still considering that -- that licenses issued in New York State would be valid in any other state in the Union.

MR. CRESPO: My understanding, it would remain the way it is now. My standard license allows me to drive in Florida and other places, and that would remain the case.

MS. BYRNES: Even though those states do not allow for those types of licenses?

MR. CRESPO: But those states allow -- they may not allow it for the issuance of their license, but they allow reciprocity for New York State-issued licenses, and so long as it's a valid license issued by the State of New York, I believe that would allow that individual to drive in that area.

MS. BYRNES: So, basically, by voting on this bill today we actually are changing the entire law of the United States of America.

MR. CRESPO: Not at all. Not at all.

MS. BYRNES: You get a driver -- or you get a license and you fail to pay child support. Your license will, of whatever version, will still be suspended or revoked?

MR. CRESPO: Yes.

MS. BYRNES: Or if you have a license for a certain profession and it's suspended or revoked, that will revoke your driver's

license on this new license the same as it would a regular license?

MR. CRESPO: Those licenses are not connected.

MS. BYRNES: But, for an example, let's go with the child support.

MR. CRESPO: Okay.

MS. BYRNES: If -- if you fail to pay child support, and I fail to pay child support, my driver's license can be suspended.

MR. CRESPO: That remains consistent.

MS. BYRNES: And I could be arrested and brought into court.

MR. CRESPO: That -- that remain -- that remains consistent. We're not addressing or changing those regulations.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. And that's the case even though that would be a civil arrest, not a criminal arrest. So you can still be arrested for a civil matter and brought before a judge.

MR. CRESPO: Correct.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. Going to the Social Security cards. Obviously, we're not requiring that anymore, correct? You no longer have to show a Social Security card or have a Social Security number to get a driver's license, correct?

MR. CRESPO: Well, you could still choose that option and supply it if you have one. It's just creating a process for someone who has not been issued a Social Security to provide certain foreign documents as alternative proof. As well as the affidavit -- or the statement that they have not been issued a Social Security number.

MS. BYRNES: What type of valid explanations would be allowed for failure to have a Social Security number?

MR. CRESPO: DMV would not ask that question. Simply, they would ask if you are choosing to provide an alternative foreign document, you would first attest that you have not been issued a Social Security number and then meet whatever other criterias would be set under this bill or whatever DMV would otherwise regulate with regards to proof of identity.

MS. BYRNES: You go in, you do the DMV online. All there is is a box to hit if you want to sign up to vote, correct?

MR. CRESPO: Wait. I'm sorry, say that again.

MS. BYRNES: If you go in to get your driver's license, there -- there -- on the form there is a box that you can check to be enrolled to vote, correct?

MR. CRESPO: There is a section, a voter application section included in the -- page three, I believe, of the driver's license or driver's permit application, by Federal law that is in place, yes. That remains.

MS. BYRNES: Okay. And all anybody has to do is check that box, correct?

MR. CRESPO: Well, which -- no, they -- first of all, the application is made available to you, the voter application within your DMV application is made available, but you do not have to choose that route in order to register. I don't believe it's a condition to fill that. But more importantly, there is a statement that clarifies who

is eligible, and it -- and it reminds you of what the consequences are if you are not eligible and -- and still register. And it also, in the first very first question of the voter application portion itself, is a question is, *Are you a citizen? Yes or no.* So there are more than one step where you would be confronted with a reminder and/or acknowledge that you have to be a citizen.

MS. BYRNES: Are the DMV records set up such that if you do check no as being a citizen, then the other part, even if you check yes and sign up to vote, is automatically not done? Is there a stopgap measure--

MR. CRESPO: DMV --

MS. BYRNES: -- to ensure that doesn't happen?

MR. CRESPO: DMV provides you the application. If the applicant fills out that section, that information is shared with the Board of Elections who would then verify the information and ensure that it is appropriately filled and that it qualifies for registration. If -- if you don't -- if you check no, they would issue you the -- there would be the Board of Elections that would issue you a letter stating that they've received your application and they have determined you're ineligible to vote.

MS. BYRNES: A lot of this relies on the trust of the person filling out the documents, correct?

MR. CRESPO: It's not trust, it's an affirmative statement by the applicant whether or not they know that they are filling that out, that they know the consequence that they are stating

affirmatively that they are a citizen or not. So, no, I think -- just to be clear, there are many ways in which an individual today can have access to a voter application. And we're actually looking to expand the accessibility of those applications.

MS. BYRNES: Right.

MR. CRESPO: Federal law requires that a voter application be included in your DMV application. We don't change that. We have to meet Federal law. But this idea that this bill will somehow encourage or facilitate a -- noncitizens from registering to vote is based on an assumption that they would seek to do that -- are interested in doing that or would want to risk -- as I mentioned earlier in a scenario -- the possibility of never seeing their children again because they are then deported for committing a separate crime for registering or for voting when they are ineligible. And the answer is that is not the place --

MS. BYRNES: No, but that's --

MR. CRESPO: -- that would not play out.

MS. BYRNES: -- we've already this afternoon heard numerous examples where that, in fact, has occurred. And those --

MR. CRESPO: It's --

MS. BYRNES: -- were the people who called up one Board of Elections and admitted they had done it.

MR. CRESPO: So -- so, if you --

MS. BYRNES: So how many are out there that --

MR. CRESPO: But that's a different --

MS. BYRNES: -- haven't admitted it?

MR. CRESPO: All right, but that's a different issue. I think there are -- yes, there are instances where, by mistake, in some rare instances, maybe somebody on purpose. And yes, there are -- people violate the law. American citizens violate the law on a regular basis --

MS. BYRNES: No question.

MR. CRESPO: -- and we have rules and regulations to deal with that. But look, this notion again that this is making that any easier is not the case. Those instances occur under current practice. Because there are noncitizens who are issued driver's licenses --

MS. BYRNES: And you will --

MR. CRESPO: -- who have access -- let me just complete the answer -- who have access to driver's licenses, and would confront that application, that portion of the application. And in those instances where they made the mistake --

MS. BYRNES: And with the deepest respect, sir --

MR. CRESPO -- they would try to correct it --

MS. BYRNES: -- you only want to make it easier for that to happen, not harder.

MR. CRESPO: No, I don't. Not at all. I simply want --

MS. BYRNES: Thank you, sir. I'm done.

MR. CRESPO: -- more individuals in this State to

have access to the privilege to drive, which enhances public safety, economic benefits and everything else we've discussed. The intention is not at all related to voter registration or voter laws. As a matter of fact, if it was completely up to me, I would like to streamline and leave DMV solely with the responsibility to deal with regulating drivers in the State. But we provide for them and meet Federal law, and we want to create access for applicants to register to vote. Keep in mind that the standard license application is also open to you or I as citizens if we choose to keep a standard license. So, it is important that that form be there. There are multiple ways in which somebody would be rooted out who's not eligible to vote and -- and we would keep that in place and those protections remain.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The member yielded, and so it's Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Thank you. Will the sponsor yield?

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

MR. CRESPO: Certainly.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Crespo yields.

MS. WALSH: I do just want to make sure that I'm understanding exactly how this works. As a result of some of the earlier debate, I did pull up the driver's license application and I reviewed it. And I do see what you mentioned earlier about the box that needs to be checked first saying are you -- are you a citizen. I can't remember exactly how that's -- I think it is on page 3 of the

application.

MR. CRESPO: Yup.

MS. WALSH: But through whatever mistake, perhaps language barrier, inadvertence, you know, or -- or purposefulness, you know, that box could get checked by somebody who's not, in fact, a citizen and who would not be eligible to vote. But it could happen, and we've heard some -- some debate today talking about that. At that point, that application is then referred directly to the Boards of Elections. Is that correct?

MR. CRESPO: Yes.

MS. WALSH: All right. And then the Board of Elections reviews the application on its face. And is there any way for the Board of Elections officials to look at the four corners of that document and determine whether or not that person is actually eligible to vote?

MR. CRESPO: The Board of Elections will implement the same process and criteria they currently utilize for applications they receive today. This -- the fact that the driver's license or DMV's application will now be accessible to individuals who are noncitizens or who have not been issued a Social Security number does not change that. Those same individuals who participate in everyday life in the State of New York, who are working in the State of New York, who have children who go to school in the State of New York come across accessible voter applications. They choose not to fill those out, they know the consequences of doing so. So I

think in a technical sense, if -- if the question is will that possibility exist? Well, my answer is it exists today. I don't believe that it's necessarily going to make it easier at all. The assumption that I assure you you can take to the bank with you is that undocumented immigrants are extremely careful not to make those mistakes, not to apply for things they're not qualified. As a matter of fact, they tend not to apply for things they are qualified for under fear of consequences that the information they shared. So the consequences they face are something extremely foreign to you or I as citizens. They understand those consequences, they don't play games with those consequences. That assumption you can take to the bank with you.

MS. WALSH: But Mr. Crespo, with all due respect, the question I asked you was, is there any way for the Board of Elections officials to look strictly at the four corners of that document and determine whether or not that person is truly eligible to vote? And then you gave me a different -- you know, if I were in court I would say it was nonresponsive. But I do appreciate your answer.

MR. CRESPO: Well, let me -- let me try to be more specific. Again, the answer -- I -- I believe the answer is yes, they can. They do so now. We -- our voter applications are open. Anybody can sign the questions, submit the -- the number, the driver ID number, your Social Security number. You answer all of the questions. DMV -- the Board of Elections has methods to verify or match that data. But it is also -- if I'm not mistaken, these -- these are affidavits where you swear and affirm that this information is correct, it's accurate. And --

and there are a number of instances where there are individuals who register using erroneous information or lie about the address that they reside in. Or there are a number of things that -- that may -- a person may affirm that not to -- that is ultimately found out to be true. And the Board of Elections has the challenge to consistently review that information, update that information and maintain accurate voter records. None of that changes with regards to this. If somebody fills out an application to vote as part of their DMV application, the Board of Elections would have the same, and implement the same process that they currently do to root out or -- or confirm the information that's provided to the extent that they can. A large portion of this is always an affirmation or an affidavit by the individual who signs that form. And they would face the consequences if they are swearing to something not to be true.

MS. WALSH: In -- in actual fact, the way it really works is that an individual has to either provide the last four of their Social Security number, or they have to provide a driver's license number. Either/or. They don't need to provide both, they need to just provide one.

MR. CRESPO: Correct.

MS. WALSH: So, therefore, if the -- the form is being referred over to the Board of Elections with a driver's license number on it, the inquiry ends there. There is no other mechanism at the Board of Elections, in fact, to determine -- they go by the number that's on the driver's -- the driver's license number that's provided.

And to follow up on a comment that you made earlier in debate with another Assemblymember, you had said that there was -- there was no way that this -- that this was -- this was unavoidable. There was no way of correcting this. But, in fact, what do you think about the concept of making the driver's license number issued to an individual under this bill to be coded or in some way different from that issued to people who are not here in an undocumented way? Wouldn't --

MR. CRESPO: So --

MS. WALSH: Wouldn't that be a wise amendment that would allow Board of Elections to intelligently decide who was qualified to vote based on the four corners of the application?

MR. CRESPO: So again, let's stay within the four corners of the application. The -- there are currently individuals issued driver's licenses and driver ID numbers that are noncitizens. So already, that potential, that -- that possibility could exist. In regards to -- before you even get to the question of whether you're going to provide your Social or your four digits of your driver ID or the full driver ID number, you first have to answer the very first question on the form, *Are you a citizen of the United States?*

MS. WALSH: Understood. Yes.

MR. CRESPO: That is a very clear question, that is a very direct question. Any individual who answers yes knowing that they are not and then signs at the bottom, irregardless of what number they gave, if the Board of Elections verifies yes, that number belongs

to that individual but they have answered in the first part they are not a citizen, then that application would not be validated. That person would not be enrolled.

MS. WALSH: Correct.

MR. CRESPO: So there are in the four corners ways for DM -- for the Board of Elections to verify based on the information provided.

MS. WALSH: Correct. But as I think you know, my question is really directed to the individual who either innocently or not checks the box that they are a citizen, full -- puts in their -- their new driver's license number, that application goes to the Board of Elections, and that Board of Elections official is unable, based on the four corners of that document, to determine whether or not that person is truly eligible to vote. That person is placed on the voter rolls. And Assemblymember Smith mentioned earlier with some examples out of Suffolk County, there are people who got put on the rolls and who, in fact, went in and voted. And to your point that you made earlier about that this doesn't -- this bill doesn't really change that, this is -- it isn't going to increase it or make it any easier, I would dispute that, sir. Because I would say that this bill is going to lead to a lot of people who previously would not have walked into a DMV office who will now walk into a DMV office and be confronted with this form and the boxes to check and the things to fill out. And so, the volume of individuals and, therefore, the -- the greater likelihood of mistakes, innocent or not, to end up on the voter rolls will increase.

So -- but at that point if I could just -- I'm going to jump to another topic, although if you wanted to respond to that I --

MR. CRESPO: Just -- just very briefly.

MS. WALSH: Welcome that.

MR. CRESPO: I -- I -- I understand, and I don't dispute that those possibilities if expanding the access to this application by individuals who are otherwise not eligible to vote will -- will more of those individuals have access to voter application very directly as part of this process? Yes, they will. Are -- is it more likely that they will make that mistake? I don't believe that to be true, because they are extremely cautious around the answers they provide and what they subject themselves to. Because they have -- they face penalties that you or I do not, and those penalties are severe and -- and lengthy. So, again, it's important to note when I say that it is not going to lead to more of it, not only is it not a -- a very common issue, there are those instances, there are going to be mistakes made, with this bill or not. But they do not outweigh the many benefits that I believe this bill provides, and I think it's a matter for the Board of Elections to continue to always upgrade their policies and procedures to ensure that the rent -- the voter rolls are accurate and up-to-date.

MS. WALSH: And -- and just as a final comment before I move on to the next topic. I did reach out to one of my Board of Elections officials following Assemblymember Smith's comments in -- in debate with you, and asked him whether there were any examples that he could recall and he said that, yes, there -- there were.

They were not -- because where I -- where I represent we have a -- we have a racetrack. We have a lot of seasonal employees coming in from really all over the world, so you can imagine that our -- our DMV does have instances where we might run into this. He did recall one instance where an immigration attorney contacted him and said, *Could we please get my client off the voter rolls because he -- I'm in the process of trying to have him apply and complete his citizenship and he needs to come off the voter rolls.* So, I know that some examples were given out of Suffolk County, I'm raising my hand and saying also out of Saratoga County we do have some -- some anecdotal evidence, anyway. And in terms of hard numbers throughout the State, I couldn't say.

But the next thing I'd like to kind of talk about a little bit is you -- we had some discussion earlier in debate about how the members of DMV were supposed to be analyzing some of these foreign documents. And so I reached out to my County Clerk. And one of -- one of the big concerns that they have is that under this bill, it really would force DMV employees and county clerks to be, in essence, immigration authorities. Now, what they're saying specifically is that foreign documents that come in currently into the -- into the DMV are accompanied by paperwork from the Federal government verifying the -- verifying the documents. So, in fact, under our current setup, the -- the clerk's -- I'm sorry, I'm just bringing this up -- the clerk's office does not vet these documents themselves. And (reviewing) just getting to this for a second, I'm sorry. It says

they -- they don't have training in foreign documents. They send scans to the State, and the clerks only look at the Federal stamp or information. It is the Federal government that vets the person, not DMV clerks. And when I asked what -- what training or -- or mechanisms they would need to put in place at the DMV level, I got a very, very long response. But it would -- basically said that it would be an enormous task. We see foreign documents, but they have to be accompanied by paperwork from the Federal agencies that the applicant brings in with them. So, I do believe that it would probably be a -- a pretty heavy lift on the part of our local county clerks to be able to try to vet and understand the documentation that was being presented by the individuals that would be responding to this legislation if it passes.

MR. CRESPO: So, we've heard those concerns and

--

MS. WALSH: Yeah.

MR. CRESPO: But again, there is training, there is procedures where they are accepting documents. They already have a process to verify those documents. There are clear markers to determine -- and they're different country to country, and there are methods currently used in a number of industries, including in DMV currently, and is part of the training if your local -- does your local Clerk provide applications for Real ID or Enhanced Driver's License?

MS. WALSH: Yes.

MR. CRESPO: So, they -- so they do that. They will

have been and must have been trained, if they follow Federal law, in the procedures to utilize the existing technologies to verify certain foreign documents. And the documents that we are suggesting are documents that are routinely verified in a number of other industries. So, this, again, yes, the Department would issue the regulations how to implement this, make those resources available where needed, and there is more than enough new revenue coming in from this to meet those needs if that's the case. But the fact still remains, they currently do that now. They would -- and they currently have the training now, or at least they should have had it if they are providing those existing applications. So I -- I would dispute the notion that this would be a -- a tremendous burden or new foreign concept that --that they've never come across. That just doesn't -- doesn't seem to match the information we have from DMV or what we know about the training they get for the applications they currently provide.

MS. WALSH: And -- and I respectfully disagree. We probably won't agree on that. But I appreciate your advocacy and the amount of time you've spent on your feet debating this bill.

And, Mr. Speaker. On the bill.

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

MS. WALSH: So, for many of the reasons stated because of the -- the debate that we've had this afternoon, I'm only sad that we don't have more members in their seats really listening to it. I think it's been very interesting from the point of view of the -- the -- the different members that we have in this Chamber and the different

walks of life that brought them here. You know, we really -- when you think about it, we have a very -- a --a group of individuals here who have diverse backgrounds. We have people who are retired from the military. We have people who have run or do run insurance agencies. We have attorneys. We have people who -- really coming from different perspectives, and have what I believe are significant concerns as -- as I have with this legislation. I am -- I am concerned about voter fraud issues. And I -- I believe that -- I believe that there are ways to amend this bill to make it far less likely, if there was some way that we could code the driver's license number in a way that would alert the Boards of Elections when they do receive these applications, I think that that would go a long way to reducing the chance of having some of these slip through the cracks. And I'm -- I'm even more uncomfortable when I think about the bills that are likely to come next. We have several bills which would be addressing automatic voter registration.

And with that, I'll -- I'll close. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you so much.

Mr. Manktelow.

MR. MANKTELOW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?

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

MR. CRESPO: Absolutely.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Crespo is

resoulient [sic] and holding tight. He will yield.

MR. MANKTELOW: Thank you, sir. You're doing good. Just to -- just to piggyback a little bit on what Assemblywoman Walsh had talked about. Has there ever been any consideration of possibly when someone goes in to get an undocumented driver's license, at that point in time DMV takes that license number, sends that driver's license number to the State DMV, and in turn, the State DMV turns that number over to every single Board of Elections in New York State so it takes out the -- the guesswork of whether this person is or is not a citizen?

MR. CRESPO: I'm sorry, are you describing what you believe to be the process now? Are you -- are you asking if that's what we should --

MR. MANKTELOW: No. No. I'm asking, would you -- would you consider doing something like that?

MR. CRESPO: No. And certainly not in regards to this bill. You're -- you're -- I think that suggestion is something for the Election Law folks to -- to consider as to what process the Board of Elections could undertake in terms of enhancing some of those measures. But no, it wasn't a consideration, nor do I think it's relevant to what DMV responsibilities are.

MR. MANKTELOW: Well, having the same concerns from some of our local county clerks back home, that whole guesswork of doing that, and then, you know, doing the documents, anything that we can do as a State legislator entity to ease up the -- the

work -- at the -- at the DMVs as -- as well as the Board of Elections would be greatly -- probably greatly appreciated back home.

MR. CRESPO: And now, and -- and I appreciate that, and will always look at improving things and a possibility we could always revisit this bill and address certain issues. But it's important also to point out in regards to that line of thinking, if I am an undocumented applicant for a driver's license under the provisions of this bill, the protections we have built in in terms of sharing of data are limited to DMV. I don't believe that the Board of Elections has those same standards for sharing of documents or whether they are a -- a law enforcement -- immigration law enforcement agency could attempt to subpoena. I'm not sure how that works. It's not related here. There are other ways in which somebody would put themselves in that position and danger or have their privacy not protected the same way we're attempting to do with this bill. I guess what I'm getting at is, I appreciate and -- and understand the sensitivity of ensuring accurate voter data. Nothing in this bill -- and -- and I assure you from every conversation I've had with advocates and immigrant families, including my own family members, no one wants to put themselves in that position. They realize the dangers they -- they do, especially sharing data with agencies that don't have or wouldn't have the same levels of -- of protection here. So, it would be themselves putting them -- it would be those individuals putting themselves in that risk. Not -- so, I just want to be clear about that.

MR. MANKTELOW: All right. I appreciate that

answer. So -- so, maybe another option would be when an undocumented individual get a driver's license, we color code that document, or that driver's license, so when that individual shows up to DMV -- I'm sorry, to the Board of Elections, they can -- he or she could do that. No?

MR. CRESPO: Well, you're not -- you don't -- under State law you don't have to provide identification to go vote. So, the answer is no. As a matter of fact -- and we -- we make it very clear, we -- our intention is to have one standard license for anyone who does not apply for a Federal Real ID-compliant license. It'll be a standard license, it's not limited to individuals -- it wouldn't be limited to individuals who are undocumented. And the whole point is to have a standard uniform license that does not make those distinctions, as those distinctions are irrelevant to driver eligibility or privileges.

MR. MANKTELOW: Okay. We'll probably disagree on that, but I -- I understand your position on it.

Also, my other concern is, once these individuals accidentally get on the voting rolls, that means they're going to vote in school board votes, town votes, village votes. Is that correct?

MR. CRESPO: Whatever -- you -- you keep alluding to, and a lot of these questions pertain to Board of Elections issues that are not relevant to DMV nor what this bill actually does. But even in that scenario, I -- if somebody is registered to vote, and somebody who is -- should not have been eligible is -- is by mistake, by whatever consequence, made eligible to vote, I'm assuming they would vote in

anything that that registration makes them eligible to vote for. But, it's -- it's an issue for the Board of Elections to address. It's an issue for future other policy proposals to seek to remedy. But, again, not -- not -- not only not related to what we're trying to address. But even in that scenario where some instances may occur, where some mistakes may happen, I think the argument or the suggestion that those outweigh -- that that is sufficient to deny this privilege because they outweigh everything else that we have talked about, would come to the State; the economic benefits, the public safety benefits, the insurance issues, the road safety issues. Those issues, in my mind, far outweigh the minute number of instances where somebody may inadvertently register themselves for a privilege they should -- they're not eligible for.

MR. MANKTELOW: Okay. Well, I -- I'm not sure it's -- I'm not sure it would be a minute amount of numbers. I don't know that, but just hearing quickly today on how many people are doing it accidentally, or maybe not accidentally, we don't know. Just -- just grave concern to that, as well as one of my fellow Assemblymembers bringing up the -- the terrorist issue. I had that same thought as well. You know, anything that we can do to make it easier for a terrorist to function in New York State is not a good thing. I just have grave concern about that as well.

MR. CRESPO: Yeah. And I want to -- I want to be explicit about that: Neither do I. There is no argument where I would defend, support or promote a terrorist or terrorist acts. That is -- but

-- but bringing that issue up related to what this bill does, I believe makes an erroneous connection. And I'll be clear again: If you're talking about enforcement protections of -- in our country, if you look at terrorism, it has been domestic terrorism that has mostly affected the lives of American citizens in not only New York State, but across this country. In the instance of 9/11 involving foreign terrorists, all of those individuals, it was -- it actually helped law enforcement to identify them, to investigate them, to find other links and connections and networks within their lives because we had this information. And I will reiterate again that allowing people to live outside of the shadows, even those that are undocumented, recognizing their many contributions to our economy, to our workforce, to -- to business development, to so many aspects of life in our State is much more beneficial. It far outweighs the couple of instances or the handful of instances compared to the overall number of voter registrations of voters in the State. There is no comparison in the benefits versus those limited concerns. No bill is perfect. Every bill, everything we do may have those unintended consequences. The reason we continue to have work to do, because there's always something to correct, some loophole to close. And we can certainly have that conversation moving forward. But it's certainly in the best interests of public safety and our State, and for law enforcement in particular, for terrorism in particular, that we have more individuals' information accessible.

MR. MANKTELOW: Well, I -- I appreciate your comments on that, on the minute number of instances, and we'll debate

that on another day. I want to stick to the bill. But I appreciate that. Thank you for your time.

And on the bill, Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, sir.

MR. MANKTELOW: So again today we've -- we've listened to a lot of different speakers here, understanding what's going on, their concerns, where we're really at. And we've talked about immigrants, we've talked about undocumented individuals. But really, we're spending a lot of time, taxpayers' dollars, bringing this bill forward again. And again, we have many, many undocumented immigrants in this country, in this State. My grandfather was an immigrant, came over on the ship at three years old. Came in New York State through Staten Island and did it the right way. So what we need to do as a State and as a country, we have undocumented workers, undocumented people. We should be taking everything we can do to help these individuals become legal citizens of New York State. Instead -- instead of spending all this time on getting -- going around the way to get them a driver's license, why don't we work with these individuals to get them to be citizens of this State? We have a great State. We have a great country. And like it or not, most of us came from immigrants in this State. So hopefully down the road we can do something here at the State level to help make that happen. Anything that we can do to make them legal citizens of the United States, legal citizens of our State, would be a great thing.

So again, thank you for your time, Mr. Sponsor.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Malliotakis for a second.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Thank you. Will the sponsor yield? I just -- you know, I wasn't going to speak again, but I heard a -- because you -- you're not --

MR. CRESPO: I'm having a hard time hearing you, Nicole, I'm sorry.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: During our conversation previously, you had brought up the terrorists of 9/11 and -- and then I heard it being brought up against here -- again with my colleague. And you say that it would actually make us more safe because they will have information on the individuals. However, the bill specifically restricts that information not be shared with other -- other agencies, and so -- and it particularly also requires that agencies notify the license holder if they are seeking any information on that individual.

MR. CRESPO: That limitation is for immigration enforcement. There is specific language in this bill that would authorize the Joint Task Force on Terrorism to do and continue to have access. They're one of the exempted categories to continue to have access and to request data. So as it pertains to investigations related to terrorism, we have been very explicit in allowing those investigations to continue. So, again, I -- the notion that we are making it harder for those investigations to take place is just not

rooted in fact.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. So, I mean, there -- there wouldn't be a situation where an immigration enforcement agency then would be seeking documentation as it relates to terrorism? You're saying -- you're saying that would be handled by a different agency, it would never be handled by immigration enforcement?

MR. CRESPO: They could be participating in these joint task forces. There are -- if there is reasonable doubt that somebody's involved in a terrorist act, I assure you, nothing in this bill will prevent those agencies from getting the appropriate information necessary to conduct their investigations. And so, we can sort of rephrase that a -- a number of ways, but it's not limited to that. A number of local agencies are part of a joint effort in regards to terrorist investigations. They share data. A lot of that data is collected by those outside agencies. So none of that is affected by this, and so I'm going to repeat again: It is my clear understanding that this bill does not impede one iota the efforts to root out and investigate terrorist acts or people may -- who may be involved in terrorism.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. But it doesn't specifically address it, either. You said that it specifically gives authority to share information when necessary?

MR. CRESPO: I'm sorry, repeat the question.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: It doesn't specifically mention anything -- you mentioned something that it specifically addresses cooperation with anything that's related to a terrorist task force. Could

you just point that out?

MR. CRESPO: Sure. It is the -- page 3, look at line 4, *agency -- unless such disclosure is pursuant to a cooperative arrangement between city, State and Federal agencies which arrangement does not enforce immigration law and which disclosure is limited to specific records or information being sought pursuant to such arrangement.* And actually, just so you know, that -- that was one of the suggestions by the NYPD, which participates in those joint task forces, and -- and brought up that very concern. And we ensured that that language was in so that those task forces were not impeded and were explicitly listed as agencies that would continue to have access to data.

MS. MALLIOTAKIS: Okay. Great. All right.
Well, thank you very much for clarifying.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Crespo to explain his vote.

MR. CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just -- I'm going to try to get through this very quickly. There were a lot of things that have been brought up, and I appreciate the concerns that were raised. But I want to make sure people understand in this State,

this legislation is in the best interest of the entire State of New York. It is more beneficial to communities outside of the City of New York, where transportation is fully accessible in our neighborhoods, as opposed to little communities on Long Island and Upstate. There are clear economic gains for the State of New York. There are great revenues coming to rural communities. There are sponsors and support from the business community, to our agricultural community. There are clear indications by the insurance industry about the benefits that will be extended to all drivers in our State. There -- and for public safety reasons, we have addressed the local law enforcement needs. This bill is common sense. It is in the best interest of the entire State of New York, and it responds to the contributions of our immigrant families who make our State run. And we -- and yes, I would love to join all of my colleagues in addressing the need for Federal immigration reform. But as a State, we can continue to do what's in our best interest and our best economic interest and in the best social interest of our State, and allowing a worker to get to work. And allowing a mother to drive her son to school or to a doctor's appointment is in the best interest of the State of New York. And we can make our roads safer by doing this.

I want to thank the Speaker. I want to thank the Chair of the Transportation, Bill Magnarelli; Emma, Zach, Yaritza, Javier, Steve, Carlene. All of the advocates, NYCLU, Make the Road, Immigration Coalition. Our team, Julie, David, Jonathan. My staff, Kathryn and Steisy, my intern who debated this bill in the Mock

Session. To Francisco Moya, to Felix Ortiz, to prior sponsors of variations to this bill, thank you for your leadership to get us to this day. I encourage all my colleagues to vote in the affirmative. This is a bill that would enhance the quality of life and the safety and the protections of all New Yorkers, and would raise revenues that I hope we can reinvest into the transportation needs of rural communities. It'll help our agriculture community and their vital workforce. It is commonsense, good policy. The right thing to do.

Restoring driver's licenses to all New Yorkers is the best thing we can do -- one of the best things we can do to improve the quality of life for all New Yorkers in the State, and I encourage all my colleagues to vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Crespo in the affirmative.

Mrs. Arroyo.

MRS. ARROYO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the young people that are here today are learning history in the State of New York. The rhetoric against this bill has been very extensive, and we learned from it. But nobody mentioned -- it was mentioned, but not in the ways that contribution that these people that obtain these license, man and woman, that can work and have a permanent job, the contribution that they are going to make to our society. Because they're already making a contribution, but it's not recognized.

And we have to also obtain the proper information of

our licenses. Because -- and when I went to change my license, I had to pay more than \$100 to obtain my new license. These people are not going to have a free service. Taxpayers doesn't pay that. That comes from their pockets. Because to obtain the license, they have to pay for it.

I think that as a representative of a poor community in this Assembly, as a Puerto Rican descendant that had lived with so many people that have come here undocumented, but have been an asset to our society, I'm proud to vote yes in this bill. And remember this: The lesson that we are getting today is the one that our parents and our -- the parents and the grandparents that came here undocumented years ago went through.

It's a pleasure for me, I thank the Speaker and the sponsor for the bill. And we have to look at it and look at it carefully and with intelligence, because these people are not going to get --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Arroyo --

MRS. ARROYO: -- anything free from this government. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: How do you vote?

MRS. ARROYO: I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you so very much.

Mr. Ortiz.

MR. ORTIZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to explain my vote. I, too, would like to commend the Speaker for

really taking the stand on bringing this bill finally to the floor. I've been here a little bit, I've been here since 1995. In 1987, the State of Michigan was the first state in the country to allow undocumented people to use their Social Security number, what they call the ITIN number, to have driver licensing. People from New York will go to Michigan to get driver licensing. When I got elected in 1995, I got involved in the crusade to ensure that we can have driver license for all. In 2001, unfortunately when 9/11 happened, therefore, the driver's license was taken away and was a lot of restrictions. 2003, I decided to introduce the same-as bill that was in 1987 passed by the State Legislators in Michigan. We had (inaudible) due to the politics of the individual and the people by putting politics first rather than putting people first.

Lastly, we -- this is a great day. This is a great day not only for the people of the State of New York, not only for public safety, not only for the quality of life, but for all those immigrant working-class family who are standing over there in -- in the -- on top of you, Mr. Speaker, right on the -- on the podium. And these individuals will have the opportunity to have a driver's license in 2019.

And I would like to thank the sponsor. I would like to thank the Chair of the -- of the Transportation Committee. And when you say so many red, they will become to be green because we can begin to see some yellow. And those yellow want to become green, and the green light won. Thank you very much to all the advocate. (Speaking foreign language).

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ortiz in the affirmative.

(Applause)

Please, please. Thank you.

Mr. Pichardo.

MR. PICHARDO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to explain -- abstain and explain my vote.

First of all, we -- in this Chamber, we've heard conversations in the past, in debates in the past and around this country, in State Legislatures and in Congress talking about the dignity of work and the ability of individuals to earn a living and not depend on antipoverty measures and food stamps and other SNAP benefits in order to sustain their families. There are immigrants right now in this country for in order for them around this State to get a job, they need to drive. So, not only will this have a direct economic impact on getting folks registered and -- and insured to drive, but also give them the ability to earn a living, which means that they will be off of any antipoverty measure rolls. These folks deserve to earn a living. They want to earn a living. They want to take their kids to school. And on top of all of this, immigrants across this State, barring 20 years ago, were allowed to do this regardless.

I want to thank the sponsor for making sure that we clarify this issue in the law. I want to thank the Speaker, the advocates and everyone that was able to push to make sure that this legislation made it to the floor.

I'm voting in the affirmative, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same because it is the right thing to do for all New Yorkers.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Pichardo in the affirmative.

Mr. Cahill.

MR. CAHILL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This legislation is supported by the American Property Casualty Insurance Association, by the New York Insurance Association. The New York Business Council has come out in favor of this legislation. Law enforcement, including the Chief of Police and the Sheriff from the City and County where I live support it. Dozens of elected officials across the State; NYSUT, religious organizations, agricultural organizations, humanitarian coalitions and numerous other groups and individuals have registered in favor of this legislation. The public is divided. But colleagues, I suggest that if they had the same information available to them that we have available to us, it's clear that they, too, would overwhelmingly support this measure. *It will save lives*, said -- says a study from Stanford University. *It will make our drivers safer*, says the Pew Charitable Trusts. It will save every single driver money on their insurance premiums, say a number of objective, carefully vetted studies, some of which are summarized in the *Southern Economic Journal* in a 2015 report by professors from Columbia University and the University of Utah. How? It reduces uninsured motorists. It saves every single registered driver in this

State who receives insurance \$17 per person by cutting their un -- their uninsured motorist insurance coverage by cutting their personal injury protection coverage. It will save literally millions, probably hundreds of thousands, at least, for your constituents in each one of our districts, and maybe as much as \$1 million. We don't have a moral litmus test when it comes to the issuance of driver's licenses. Convicted bank robbers are allowed to get driver's licenses. Corrupt politicians can get driver's licenses. Even people involved in serious and numerous car accidents can get or keep their driver's licenses. We use our cars to get people to go to school. We use them to go to the doctor. We use them to go to work and to take care of business --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. CAHILL: It was the law of the land--

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cahill --

MR. CAHILL: -- in 48 states --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: How do you vote?

MR. CAHILL: And it should be the law of the land

--

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cahill --

MR. CAHILL: -- in New York State again. I withdraw my request and vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Cahill in the affirmative.

My friends and guests up -- in the balcony, we do ask that you be seated and not stand. We do ask that you be seated and not

stand. Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Ms. Cruz.

We have, Members, two minutes, please. It's been a long day. We don't need to be reminding you of that.

MS. CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be very brief. We've heard over and over again that our State stands to make more than \$50 million in yearly revenue. That having licensed, tested, insured drivers will help protect our roads. We have seen families like mine whose lives would be changed forever with this piece of paper. A no vote is clearly not based on the merits, but rather, in a deep-rooted fear of backlash from constituents who may harbor anti-immigrant sentiments. Today, on behalf of my mother, who endured humiliation and stolen wages, on behalf of Alfredo Flores, my constituent who was arrested and could be deported simply because he was trying to get to work. On behalf of thousands of 13-year-olds who today are emergency planning in case mom or dad is picked up by ICE and never comes home, I vote yes, proudly yes, to give immigrants an opportunity at survival.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Cruz in the affirmative.

Ms. De La Rosa.

MS. DE LA ROSA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the sponsor of this legislation, the former sponsors and the coalition of advocates who are here today. Today we've heard arguments in favor and against this important piece of legislation. But

what's abundantly clear to me is that this legislation makes sense. It makes sense to our State financially. As we've heard over and over again, \$57 million per year in revenue. It also makes sense in regard to public safety. An insured driver, a driver who can pass a road test, a driver who can reach an emergency situation, a hospital or a doctor. That is public safety. Until 2013, all New Yorkers, regardless of immigration status, were able to receive a driver's license. I believe that morally it is our responsibility to make sure that we are making sure that immigrants are not separated from their families due to simple traffic infractions. I visited Orange County Correctional Facility with some of my colleagues here today. And I can tell you that a lot of the people who are detained were picked up for traffic infractions. In a moment where we have a crisis, a humanitarian crisis at the border, we must ensure that where the Federal government fails to stand up, we have the political and moral courage to say that immigrants are New Yorkers and that they deserve this privilege. Let's not divide our states into the haves and the have-nots.

This is about dignity for immigrant New Yorkers.
And today I'm proud to vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. De La Rosa in the affirmative.

Mr. Weprin.

MR. WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be excused from voting to explain my vote. My Assembly District has close to 60 percent first-generation immigrants. And I'm very proud

of that constituents. Many are documented, many are not, among those constituents. My mother immigrated here from Cuba in 1938, and I've been a strong supporter of immigrants who have made this State and country great. This, for all the reasons were mentioned by so many people, will be -- will ensure safety on our roads. It will save money. It will help the economy. And it will give undocumented immigrants the ability to support their family and to continue to be productive members of our society.

I withdraw my vote and proudly vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Weprin in the affirmative.

Ms. Fernandez.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to explain my vote. I don't think this bill should have been as controversial as it has -- as it has been, but we saw that it was. But this is a good bill that would allow for undocumented residents that are already driving to drive safely and insured. That means that a little fender-bender will not put lives in danger through threats of deportation. No one should feel the urge to ditch the -- the scene of an accident because of their lack of insurance. And this is just a plus for everyone for that, pedestrians as drivers alike. Not only that, but it opens up more economic avenues, as we've heard, for undocumented residents. Those financial gains then come back to the community in taxes and sales. Further, we, as a State, would gain from license fees,

insurances and so on. The financial aspect of this is not a problem. The problem is that there are individuals who believe that driving should be a privilege and that it is kept from a large population of New Yorkers who work and contribute to what makes the State great. It is our job as legislators to serve everyone who live in the State. We don't draw lines or borders or put up walls or who we choose to represent. If we're here to start doing that now, there's no telling what we could do later. And there are so many daily activities, as we said, doctor appointments and taking your kids to school, which are very important, obviously, to us all. But even the ability and the leisure to go to the beach, to take your family out to the park, that shouldn't be -- put fear on any family just to spend time in this world. With or without a license, people will keep driving, and we know that. So, this is important to just keep making the streets more safer. So, we, as legislators, if we didn't use this time to put the safety of constituents of New Yorkers first, then we're not doing our job. But, I'm very happy that this has come to the floor. I strongly commend the sponsor for this and for the supporters and activists that have made it loud and clear that -- is my time up?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Yes.

MS. FERNANDEZ: -- that all New Yorkers deserve this privilege.

So, thank you. I vote yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Fernandez in the affirmative.

Mr. Ramos.

MR. RAMOS: Mr. Speaker, I -- I rise to explain my vote. In this debate we heard a lot of re -- reoccurring things. We heard a lot about voter fraud, people speaking about voter fraud. This -- there are over a million voters in Suffolk County, and somebody brought up about four cases. But are -- are we -- you know, a lot of these reoccurring themes are just -- they get to the point of ridiculous. Are we to believe that a person who's living in the shadows, somebody who is undocumented, who has come here, who's happy with this privilege to be able to provide even with meager means for his family, is going to sign something that says, *Under penalty of law, a felony, if you sign this, it's a lie, you're going to go to jail?* It just goes against logic to even bring up the issue of -- of voter fraud. The issue of possibly that somebody, if they check the wrong box, and -- if they check the wrong box and then they -- they become a registered voter -- or right now, first off, Motor Vehicle is only offering the registration. It's offering it. If any one of you, as Assemblypersons, had an event and you had a pile of registration there, somebody could easily pick that up and also fill it out falsely. The fact that it's attached to the license in -- to give that argument, is to assume that immigrants would have a predisposition to commit this crime of -- of voter fraud. We've heard yesterday in Committee somebody bring up, does anything -- anything in this bill prevent somebody with a criminal record from applying and getting a license. Well, a US citizen who has a criminal record can apply and get a license. It has no relevance on whether the

person can -- can drive or not. Another reoccurring theme is terrorists. Are we to believe that the police, that the FBI would rather have a terrorist be anonymous, or have a tool to be able to -- to catch that person? But the real underlying question is, why are all these theme -- themes coming up? And the reason --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. RAMOS: -- I'm ending now.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. RAMOS: The reason is --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: -- Ramos --

MR. RAMOS: -- because it's to give the impression that immigrants have a predisposition --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Sir, how do you vote?

MR. RAMOS: -- to be voter fraud, criminal records and terrorists --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ramos, please --

MR. RAMOS: -- in repetition.

I proudly vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Ramos in the affirmative.

Mr. Fall.

MR. FALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, as the first-generation African-American that comes from an immigrant family and that also represents a great deal of immigrant communities

in my district, this bill is near and dear to our hearts. And, you know, I also wanted to really give a big shout-out and thank the sponsor for his leadership for helping turn this vision into a reality. There are many people that come to this wonderful country through the legal routes that are, you know -- they have their working papers and they were just only looking for an opportunity to have a driver's license that can help them economically and for a number of other reasons.

Almost two decades ago when undocumented immigrants were no longer permitted to obtain a driver license in our State, I believe that was a policy at the time that could arguably be considered shortsighted because it made our streets less safe. You know, because folks were driving without licenses, and they were also driving without insurance. And so, with this bill, our streets will be more safe, immigrant communities will have more opportunities to thrive, and our State will generate millions of dollars in revenue. While we are not the first State to introduce or vote on such a bill, I believe this is a step in the right direction.

I withdraw my request and will be voting in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Fall in the affirmative.

Ms. Glick.

MS. GLICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my request so I can explain my vote. It's a great country. And people come here from all over the world. And as I look around, those of you

-- all of us, I think, if we were not native born -- or if we were native born, rather, our antecedents were not. And they came here and they frequently were not welcome. And we are faced with an appalling situation in the country today that somehow -- a country that has always said how it welcomes immigrants, has somehow been turned into a country afraid of immigrants. This country's strength is our diversity. People come here because they want a better life. They come here and make our country better. Giving undocumented immigrants the opportunity to get a driver's license is just the most small step we can take towards making their ability to provide for their family and to use our roads safely, is just the smallest step. And to have such a long debate is sort of surprising, and maybe a little disappointing.

But I do want to thank the sponsor. I want to thank the Speaker, and I want to thank all the advocates who have worked so long and hard to bring us to this point today.

I withdraw my request and proudly vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Glick in the affirmative.

Mr. Barron.

MR. BARRON: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The word "terrorist" was used frequently in this discussion. I just want to inform people that from 2008 to 2016, there were 201 acts of plots and attacks regarding to terrorism. Of that, 115 of those acts

were white male, right-wing extremists. Timothy McVeigh, in 1995, blew up a building in Oklahoma that killed 168 people and injured over 600-and-some-odd people in the process. I don't want us to leave here, when we're always associating the word "terrorism" with immigration that has a face of black and brown. No form of terrorism is good and should be accepted by any human being concerned about life. But we should not allow people to always associate that with the face of immigration and the face of black and brown people.

So, I want to commend the sponsor on this bill. It would help the economy. It would help those who are contributing culturally, intellectually and economically to this country. Good job.

I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Barron in the affirmative.

Ms. Hyndman.

MS. HYNDMAN: Thank you for allowing me to explain my vote. I want to thank the sponsor for your undying passion and stamina to withstand all of the questions you received this afternoon. I remember as a -- as a child watching my parents and -- my mother a nurse and my father a carpenter, were able to leave home, undocumented, but had licenses before the change was made. And I feel that we have to remember that we have faith in the people that work in the DMV. We have employees right now in the State Education Department that evaluate foreign documents for doctors, for surgeons, for dentists, so that when you go under the knife, you hope

that the person that's been -- that's do -- performing the procedure on you has been evaluated. So why wouldn't we have the same faith in those employees of the DMV? We're talking about people who -- who cut our grass, fix our hair, babysit our children, take care of our sick and our elderly, build our homes, prepare our meals in the thousands of restaurants that take -- that are in the State of New York. We want to make sure that they can get to and from work and not have to take time away from their families. Because no one comes here to flout the system, they come here for a better life. And that's what these immigrants or undocumented will be doing. Making sure they can get to work. Take care of us and our families. Making sure there's a process that we will put in place that we have the power to do in this Assembly to make sure that they go through the necessary requirements to operate a vehicle in the State of New York. That's what we're asking for. And I just hope our colleagues on the other side, in the other House, will be able to make sure that they have the strength to do this heavy lift and make sure that they're licensed in the State of New York.

And with that, I withdraw my request and vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Hyndman in the affirmative.

Mr. Buchwald.

MR. BUCHWALD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there's been a lot of discussion during this debate about the

connection between driver's licenses and voting, and so I wanted to put forward what I think is a demonstrable fact that maybe will help clarify things. I believe there are hundreds of thousands of residents in the State of New York who are legal immigrants, not US citizens, would have driver's licenses in our State. And I've heard nothing about how that facilitated their ability to vote, because, of course, it doesn't. You cannot vote if you are not a US citizen. That -- there are hundreds of thousands of examples, therefore, of situations in which having a driver's license is not connected to the right to vote.

So, since I've heard nothing in this debate to dissuade me from the notion that there is no connection between the two, I proudly thank the sponsor for his putting forth this legislation and cast my vote in the affirmative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Buchwald in the affirmative.

Mr. Mosley.

MR. MOSLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. I want to first and foremost thank our colleague, our bill sponsor both -- in both Chambers. I want to thank our Speaker, and I want to thank all colleagues, both past and present, who have worked on this important piece of legislation. Dr. King so noted that, *The arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice*. But the one thing that he does not distinguish is that how does it bend? It bends through the conscience -- the good conscience of men and women to do what is right. You know, we often throw around the monicker that

this Legislative Body is the People's House. And often we tend to forget that it's the people whom we represent, regardless of their point of destination, regardless of their status. And ultimately, we understand that these are individuals who are a part of our economy. They are on our farms. They are in our homes. They are in our schools. But yet, we don't want to give them the privilege that any New Yorker so rightfully deserves and needs in an effort to matriculate through this economy and through our society. You know, these are men who fight in our battlefields, lose their lives for this country in an effort to preserve our principles. These are men and women who have -- some have made the ultimate sacrifice, but yet, we can't give them the privilege to drive in New York State. We understand the benefits, the economic benefits, the social benefits, the safety benefits. But if we're truly about being -- about being the people's business, let us speak to our conscience. Let us adhere to our conscience to do what is right. Because if that's not the case, why are we here, colleagues? Why are we here proclaiming to be about the people and yet not doing the people's business?

So I stand proudly in support of this piece of this legislation. (Speaking foreign language)

(Applause)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. -- Mr. Mosley in the affirmative.

Ms. Fahy.

MS. FAHY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing

me to rise to explain my vote. This debate has been certainly a difficult one and it's been quite a long road. And I know the one thing that both sides have agreed on, and I fully agree with, is that part of the reason we're in this -- this -- we're faced with this is because we desperately need immigration reform right across the board. But we have a Congress and a -- and a Federal government that is completely paralyzed, and in the meantime we need to -- to keep moving forward. I tend to take a very broad lens of -- or careful lens to bills such as this, and I've worked closely with the sponsor and appreciate his responsiveness. I'm first generation, I'm the daughter of immigrants and I always remind myself, *There, but for the grace of God, go I*. I do believe that this bill, in the end, really does assist us with road safety, which is a big issue in Upstate in particular. It also allows -- it allows for better insurance coverage, which is critically important on Upstate roads. I talk a lot about impaired driving and my concerns, and we want to do all we can to have safer roads, safer drivers, as well as better insured drivers. And we have more farm workers up here who need access and don't have that type of access to public transit. There are other states that have done this. There is a precedence for this prior to 9/11. I also believe -- I had a number of concerns where the sponsor was very responsive to -- to those concerns. And some of those were on law enforcement access to -- to records, as well as stronger documentation. And I have been very concerned about some of the tactics of ICE in Upstate New York, let alone throughout the State. So while we need access for law enforcement, I also understand

the need for protections, given the overreach of ICE in some rather horrific incidences in recent times. I also appreciate the font change, and commend the sponsor and the Speaker --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Fahy --

MS. FAHY: -- and I vote in the affirmative. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Fahy in the affirmative.

Mr. Rivera.

MR. RIVERA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I spoke earlier - and I want to be as quick as possible - when I spoke earlier, there's hundreds of thousands of people watching what's going on here today, thanks to transparency. Because years ago, we made sure that we have transparency because we got four TV camera aimed at each and every one of us. So, people out there know where we stand. Mr. Speaker, but at this moment, very quickly, I want to express my gratitude to our leader, Marcos Crespo. (Speaking foreign language) Translation: I just spoke in the first European language spoken in the United States of America. And when those people travel from New York with their family out west looking for a better opportunity on covered wagons, the Mexican made a mistake: They didn't ask them, *Where is your driver's license?* They didn't ask them, *Do you speak Spanish?* All right? Neither did the American -- Native Americans in this country.

So, I congratulate my Speaker, looking at us in

action. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Marcos Crespo. Thanks all of you for making it clear that this Body -- and what got me angry, and I'm still angry, is because when I spoke -- when I spoke, I saw this: Jay Jacobs to Senate Democrats: *Don't vote on driver licenses and marihuana this year.* That is not acceptable. This was sent to me by Luis Mendez, from (inaudible), who's watching us from Hempstead, Long Island. Hundreds of thousand of Latino --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. RIVERA: -- Hempstead, Long Island area --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. RIVERA: -- are watching us.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Rivera, how do you vote, sir?

MR. RIVERA: How do I vote? Oh. Oh.

(Laughter)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course I'm going to vote yes. (Speaking foreign language) --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

(Applause - cheers)

Mr. Rivera in the affirmative.

Mr. Otis.

MR. OTIS: Thank you -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to congratulate Mr. Crespo for hours of answers that he gave with great ease. He was not stumped once. He has researched the issue completely. And so it points up the fact that this is something

that should have been done years ago. This is a simple matter of public safety. People that drive in this State should be -- have a license, should be trained, should take the test. And we're here today -- a long debate -- but years too late. It also speaks to human dignity. Because the reason why this didn't happen sooner is confusion over human dignity, and the fact that we owe that to everybody who is a resident of this State. And this is one way we can communicate that.

I want to thank the Speaker. I want to thank Francisco Moya, the previous sponsor of this bill. But I especially want to thank the advocates who have gone from town to town across this State, actively speaking to police departments, speaking to educators, speaking to communities all over this State to explain why this is needed. Thank you for your advocacy, because your advocacy is what brings us here today with this successful vote.

I vote aye.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Otis in the affirmative.

Mr. Gottfried.

MR. GOTTFRIED: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, today's debate was enormously enriched by the personal family stories of so many of our colleagues. If we had had this debate a dozen years ago when this concept was first advanced in New York, we would not have had that debate, because our membership today is so much more diverse than it was just 10 or 12 years ago. And I think today's debate is a fine example of why we need to be pleased and to

celebrate that growth in the diversity of our membership.

And I'm delighted to join with all the rest of my colleagues in voting yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Gottfried in the affirmative.

Mr. Perry.

MR. PERRY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to explain my vote. The people send us here, Mr. Speaker, to make commonsense decisions. To make decisions based on facts and reason, and not to allow our prejudices and our affairs of each other to cloud our reasoning. Fear of people who don't look exactly like us and fear of just letting go and giving poor people who need a chance just a little help to achieve their dreams. People seeking freedom and opportunity should not always have to climb over a wall to realize their dream. This bill is aptly called the "Green Light Bill", because the current policy seems to be nothing more than just a big stop sign in their road to a better life. When we vote yes today, Mr. Speaker, we will open that road. We will remove that wall that stands in their way.

I vote yes for the Green Light Bill. I congratulate the sponsor who worked so hard, all those who have worked so hard over the years to bring attention to this matter and to get this bill to the floor. I thank the Speaker for allowing us to vote on it today, and I thank all of my colleagues who are making the right decision to vote yes, and I very proudly cast my vote yes. Let's move that red light --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. --

MR. PERRY: -- out of the way and go green for those people. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Perry in the affirmative.

Mr. Blake.

MR. BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First to commend the sponsor for his leadership and endurance, not just today, but consistently among, clearly, a flurry of language that was discriminatory. Mr. Speaker, we come here at this moment as a son of immigrant, which I remind all of us, unless we are Native American, we should recognize the importance of that. A traffic stop should not be the reason why your life is at risk. And for those that have been talking about justice, I would remind us to look that in 2015 there was a Supreme Court ruling in Rodriguez v. The United States, in which by a six to three margin, the Supreme Court ruled that a traffic stop should not be extended just for unreasonable cause, which, quite frankly, happens repeatedly for people that are trying to come out of shadows and live out their promise in life. Immigrants are not terrorists, they scholars. Immigrants are not here committing voter fraud, they are leaders. We look forward to becoming the 13th State to make this a reality, Mr. Speaker. And I always want to remind all those that are in opposition whenever we talk about this from a faith perspective, never forget that Jesus was an immigrant who had to travel, and never forget the reality at Romans 13:10, Steerlick (phonetic) says: *Love does no harm to the labor -- to the neighbor,*

love is the fulfillment of the law.

I am proud to stand and vote aye for this legislation for us to make sure that we give access for driver's licenses and provide Green Light opportunities for our sisters and brothers that are coming out of the shadows. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Blake in the affirmative.

Mr. Dinowitz.

MR. DINOWITZ: Thank you. I know for some people this is a -- a tough bill. I'm actually not sure why, because to me it's a no-brainer. There are people driving, and I would think we would want people who are driving to get a license, to take a test, to pass a test and to drive safely. To get insurance and to -- and to be able to drive safely with that insurance. I would think we would want people who work to be able to get to work, we would want people who need to go to the doctor to get to the doctor, and to take their kids to school. This bill improves safety. I'll be honest. I actually think it's mean not to -- not to allow undocumented immigrants the ability to attempt to get a license. And from what I've seen on the road -- and we all drive, or most of us drive -- there are a whole lot of people on the road right now who have licenses who don't belong there. That's the reality. I didn't get my license until I was 30. Not everybody gets licenses so quickly. But if people want to live a decent life and be able to go to the doctor and go to work and take their kids to school, we want them to be able to pass a test and to be able to drive safely.

And I have to agree with one of my colleagues who's not sitting there at the moment, we know what the face of terrorism in this country is, and it's not the face of an undocumented immigrant. And we all know that to be a reality. So, let's be honest about it. And I've never seen the slightest evidence of voter fraud by immigrants who were either noncitizens or undocumented at all. It just doesn't exist. It's a red herring, it's just not true.

So, I think that voting for this bill is the right thing to do. And I just want to say thank you to the sponsor who lasted to, I would say, Denny Farrell lengths today, in standing up and debating and explaining. He did a great job. And thank you to the Speaker, and I proudly cast my vote yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Dinowitz in the affirmative.

Mr. Jacobson.

MR. JACOBSON: Thank you for the opportunity to explain my vote. To me, this was a very simple issue of safety. I want everybody licensed and everybody insured. The district I represent does not have subways. We have limited buses. And people who -- that will get the licenses, most of them are already driving. But I want people to be licensed and insured, and I think it's as simple as that.

I want to commend the sponsor for working so hard and doing so well in the debate. And for those that have concerns, remember, 12 years ago, compared to then, we have different licenses now. You have the standard license, what this bill is about. You

cannot use it to get on a plane. You need the enhanced license. And -- and the people getting -- that will be benefitting from this bill cannot get the enhanced license.

So, to me, it's a matter of safety. I want everybody insured. And I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Jacobson in the affirmative.

Mr. Lavine.

MR. LAVINE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We cannot live in the world of alternative reality and hope to be effective legislators. And this is reality. The Pew Research Center tells us that New York State is home to three-quarters of a million, 750,000 people without documentation. Of that number, 250,000 live in the suburbs which I represent and the exurbs of our metropolitan regions. They are a large part of our New York economy, and of that there is no doubt and can be no doubt. I've listened to the debate and I worry. I worry when the symbolism surrounding a challenge begins to take on more significance than the challenge itself. And I also worry because to deny that many of our neighbors the opportunity to drive does nothing more than to enable an underground economy and to demean 750,000 people. Great nations fail when they deny reality. America is a great nation, and New York is a great State.

I'm going to vote yes, and I want to thank the Speaker. And to the sponsor - and I say this as someone who grew up in an immigrant home, an immigrant home that was not always valued

by all of our neighbors - so to the sponsor, Muchas gracias, caballero.

My vote is yes.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Lavine in the affirmative.

Mrs. Galef.

MRS. GALEF: My Spanish isn't so good.

(Laughter)

Anyway, I'd like to commend the sponsor of this legislation. You did a fantastic job of debating it. I actually learned more about immigration law than I had before. I'd just like to say that I was an individual legislator that did not support this a number of years ago. I opposed the legislation, and I believe that my constituents did, also. But over time, the bill has changed and we made sure that in the legislation people are going to take a written test and a road test, and that really is important for the people that are going to be on our highways driving cars. Although I believe that they -- many people are there right now and we need to be sure everybody is safe.

But I want to say within my own community of Ossining, they -- the Village of Ossining passed a resolution very much in favor of this. The Ossining Police Chief came out in favor of this because it is a safety issue. And they have actually been spokespeople throughout Westchester County on the position. I've had a lot of people in my office on this issue, probably more than some other issues. At my town meetings, people have spoken out very much in favor of the legislation. And as a conclusion to it, I actually,

in my last newsletter did -- or my next to the last, I asked people in my district -- I do a questionnaire. And I asked people how they felt about this legislation. And frankly, I was surprised. Fifty-eight percent of the people who responded to my questionnaire - which was about 1,000 people - said yes, they support it. And I think over time, people have just changed, they recognize that there is a changing world. We need to get on with those changes and -- and be sure that everybody that is on a road is driving safely. And, in fact, I think we also need --

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. --

MRS. GALEF: -- to take tests periodically, so we do the same. I will be voting yes. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mrs. Galef in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

(Applause/Cheers).

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker.

(Chanting/Cheers)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Gracias. Thank you. Thank you. Silenciar.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, let me take this opportunity to congratulate all of my colleagues, the sponsor of

the legislation, as well as my colleagues on the other side who had questions and all of those who voted in support of this issue. Today we have made some really great history, as we have in the past, and I'm really very proud of everybody in the Chambers [sic]. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, we need to advance our A-Calendar.

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

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you. If you could call on Mr. Otis for an announcement.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Otis for the purposes of an announcement.

MR. OTIS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There will be an immediate meeting of the Democratic Conference in the Speaker's Conference Room immediately following the closure of Session momentarily.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Democratic Conference, Speaker's Conference Room following Session.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes, we do have some --

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, we have one more person you need to call on, Mr. Crouch.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Shh, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. Crouch.

MR. CROUCH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There will

be an immediate Republican Conference in the Parlor.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Immediate
Republican Conference in the Parlor.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Yes, we do. And I
will go through them.

On the main Calendar, on a motion by Mr. Dinowitz,
page 36, Calendar No. 252, Bill No. 5776-A, amendments are
received and adopted.

On a motion by Ms. Solages, on the main Calendar,
page 34, Calendar No. 228, Bill No. 2317, amendments are received
and adopted.

On a motion by Mr. Zebrowski, page 38, Calendar
No. 282, Bill No. 1881, amendments are received and adopted.

Also, on the main Calendar, Ms. McMahon, page 23,
Rules Report No. 166, Bill No. 7432-A, amendments are received and
adopted.

On the A-Calendar, on a motion by Ms. Walker, page
10, Rules Report No. 208, Bill No. 7981, amendments are received
and adopted.

On behalf of Ms. Pheffer Amato, Bill No. 1801-A,
Assembly bill recalled from the Senate. The Clerk will read the title
of the bill.

THE CLERK: An act to amend the Education Law.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will read -- the Clerk will -- motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed the House.

The Clerk will record the vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

The Clerk will announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

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

We have numerous fine resolutions. We will take them up with one vote.

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

(Whereupon, Assembly Resolution Nos. 544-551 were unanimously adopted.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the Assembly stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m., Thursday June the 13th, tomorrow being a Session day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Assembly stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 5:40 p.m., the House stood adjourned until Thursday, June 13th at 10:00 a.m., that being a Session day.)