

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 2021

10:55 A.M.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The House will come to order.

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

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was observed.)

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

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

A quorum being present, the Clerk will read the Journal of Wednesday, March 24th.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I move

that we dispense with the further reading of the Journal of Wednesday March the 24th and ask that the same stands approved.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Without objection, so ordered.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. I want to welcome colleagues to the Chambers, both those here with us and those who are here remotely. I do have a quote I'd like to share today. This one comes from Harriet Beecher Stowe, who was an American abolitionist and an author. She came from the Beecher family, a famous religious family, and is well known for her novel *Uncle Tom's Cabin* which depicts the harsh conditions of enslaved African-Americans. Ms. Beecher Stowe is sharing with us today that, *When you're in a tight place and everything goes against you, till it seems as though you cannot hang on a minute longer, never give up then, for that is just the place and the time when the tide will turn.* Again, we want to thank Ms. Beecher Stowe for those words.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to colleagues that you do have on your desk the main Calendar. And after there's housekeeping -- any housekeeping we will take up resolutions on page 3, and then we will take up the following bills on debate: We're going to start with Calendar No. 52 by Mr. Dinowitz, followed by Calendar No. 61 with Mr. Gottfried, Calendar No. 110 by Mr. Epstein and Calendar No. 116 by Mr. Abinanti. Mr. Speaker, there definitely will be a need for a Majority Conference following our floor work today,

and as always we will consult with our colleagues to determine what their needs may be.

That's the general outline. If there is any housekeeping, now would be a great time.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: We do have housekeeping, Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

On a motion by Ms. Paulin, page 10, Calendar No. 94, Bill No. A.528, the amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion by Ms. Linda Rosenthal, page 14, Calendar No. 157, Bill No. A.518, the amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion by Ms. Rajkumar, page 17, Calendar No. 188, Bill No. 6077, the amendments are received and adopted.

On a motion -- without objection, on a motion by Mr. Gottfried to reconsider the substitution of Senate bill 1451 for Assembly Bill 761, said Senate bill is recommitted to the Committee on Health and said Assembly bill is restored to its place on Third Reading. On a motion by Mr. Gottfried, the amendments are received and adopted.

Resolutions on page 3, Assembly No. 140, Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 140, Ms. Joyner.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim March 2, 2021 as Read Across

America 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. 141, Ms. Rosenthal.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim 8:30 p.m. through 9:30 p.m. on Saturday, March 27th, 2021 as Earth Hour 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. 142, Mrs. Barrett.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim March 29, 2021 as Vietnam Veterans Day in the State of New York in conjunction with the observance of National Vietnam Veterans Day.

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. 143, Ms. Jean-Pierre.

Legislative Resolution memorializing Governor Andrew M. Cuomo to proclaim April 4-10, 2021 as Library Week in

the State of New York.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Jean-Pierre on the resolution.

MS. JEAN-PIERRE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to speak on this resolution. The week of April 4th through the 10th is an extremely important week in the State of New York as we recognize Library Week in conjunction with National Library Week. I would like first to give some background into Library Week. It originated because in 1958 studies showed that in the mid-1950s that Americans were reading less. The American Library Association created a National Book Committee in order to encourage Americans to read more and show the benefits of reading. This Committee developed a plan for National Library Week to bring awareness to the issue and motivate people to read in turn -- in turn, hoping that Americans would read more, often use their libraries as a resource to receive reading materials. And now this week marks the 63rd Anniversary of National Library Week. Especially during this week and all other weeks we recognize the importance of libraries, librarians and library workers in our communities. Libraries and staff have worked very hard to deliver resources during this difficult time to our constituents and deserve recognition for all their hard work. Libraries have made the tough transition to moving a lot of their resources online and have made -- even made wi-fi hot spots in parking lots and other to help our local communities.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and all of my colleagues for

continuing to prioritize libraries in the Budget process so libraries can continue to deliver their excellent resources to our communities. I'm a -- I am a little early, but as the Chair of the Libraries and Education Technology Committee, I would like to wish everyone Happy Library Week in the State of New York. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Jensen.

MR. JENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the resolution.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the resolution, sir.

MR. JENSEN: I just want to thank the Chair of the Libraries and Education Technology Committee for sponsoring this resolution. And as the Ranking Member on that Committee, I could not be more proud to -- to join her in supporting this resolution. Certainly, a 21st Century library is so much more than just stacks and rows of books. But libraries truly serve as community centers where they call home. Oftentimes having active and diverse programing, electronic resource and serving as career centers, and are really in non-COVID times the center of a community. But it's important during Library Week not just to recognize those libraries that serve our communities, but also our school libraries for the important educational resources they provide students in the school districts they call home.

So, I want to thank the Chair of the Committee for

sponsoring this. And as she said, that not just the week of the 4th through the 10th in April is Library Week, but really every week is Library Week for the members of the Education -- or the Library and Education Technology Committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

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

Page 5, Calendar No. 52, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly No. A01877, Calendar No. 52, Dinowitz, Carroll, Barron. An act to amend the General Obligations Law, in relation to prepayment penalties for mortgages secured by real property owned in a cooperative form of ownership.

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

MR. DINOWITZ: Thank you. This bill would prohibit prepayment penalties in co-op buildings for the underlying mortgage when more than 50 percent of the units are shareholder-occupied.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Dinowitz. Am I correct that under current law a cooperative can go with a mortgage that doesn't have prepayment penalty clauses or it can go with a mortgage that does. It's the option right now and this would only make that option, correct?

MR. DINOWITZ: Yes.

MR. GOODELL: Am I also correct that prohibiting any prepayment penalty would prevent co-ops from any access to mortgages that are guaranteed or processed by Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac or the Federal Housing Administration?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, some people have said that.

MR. GOODELL: Well, it's my understanding that all those entities require prepayment penalties, is that correct?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, there are many sources for getting mortgages. So, I -- I mean, we had this discussion last year when the bill passed by a very wide margin. And the purpose of the bill is so that those who live in co-ops -- I -- I don't know that you have co-ops in your district, maybe you do, but I don't know that -- what are you, 150? I don't know that they have co-ops. People pay significant amounts of money as a result of the excess that is being charged to co-ops because they don't have the ability to refinance at a lower rate even if interest rates have gone down substantially. So we want to protect -- we want to protect co-op shareholders here.

MR. GOODELL: Well, isn't it true that in any commercial negotiation, including a co-op mortgage, for example, there's a tradeoff between prepayment penalties and interest rates?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, everything's a tradeoff. But sometimes what we have to do is do what's best for the greatest number of people. I mean, we're -- we're doing a lot of things now because of -- of COVID where things that were previously negotiated are, in essence, being sort of renegotiated to help people out, including

many businesses, many property owners and so on. And what -- what this bill tries to do - and this bill's been around before COVID, obviously - is to eliminate what -- what I believe is an unfair charge to -- to co-ops simply because they're co-ops. Because under the law they're essentially considered commercial properties, and that's absurd. I live in a co-op, for example, and many of my neighbors around the district do. And I don't think there's a single person who considers themselves living in a commercial property. We live in an apartment building.

MR. GOODELL: Would this -- Mr. Dinowitz, I apologize. I -- I lost track of what question you were answering but maybe you could help me out. Would this bill --

MR. DINOWITZ: Apology accepted.

MR. GOODELL: -- apply to accepting prepayment penalties or only prepayment penalties in the future?

MR. DINOWITZ: Say it again. I'm sorry, Mr. Goodell. Would you repeat that? I --

MR. GOODELL: Certainly. Would this bill apply to existing prepayment penalties or only to prepayment penalties in the future? That is, new mortgages with prepayment penalties.

MR. DINOWITZ: I believe it applies to everything.

MR. GOODELL: So it would apply retroactively to existing mortgages that have a prepayment penalty?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, I don't know that I'd use the word "retroactive." It would apply to co-op buildings that currently

exist.

MR. GOODELL: And how is that consistent with the State -- the Federal constitutional contract clause which says the Legislature cannot pass legislation that impairs the exist -- the validity of an existing contract? If we pass legislation that invalidates a prepayment penalty on an existing mortgage, aren't we violating the Federal constitutional restrictions?

MR. DINOWITZ: Well, I mean, I'm not a Federal judge, so I would hate to pass judgment on that. I know you often make reference to that particular provision but I would say the answer is that it does not violate that.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Dinowitz.

On the bill, sir.

MR. DINOWITZ: You're very welcome, Mr. --

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

MR. GOODELL: Thank you very much. Right now cooperatives have multiple options available to them when they want to finance their operations or the acquisition. One option is to have a Federally-guaranteed loan that goes through Fannie -- Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac or the Federal Housing Administration. That's one option they have, and it's often very attractive because it affects the underwriting standards and the interest rates. But all those Federal programs require a prepayment penalty in the mortgage. So if we

enact this legislation we eliminate the ability of a co-op to access any of that financing. Now, under current law a co-op has the option of paying more upfront closing costs in return for not having a prepayment penalty. Or they can pay lower closing costs up front and take a mortgage with a prepayment penalty. And it's really very simple. A bank incurs a lot of expense when they do a mortgage, a commercial mortgage, on a large co-op. A lot of title work, a lot of legal work. Leases, subordination agreements, term limit agreements, non-disturbance agreements. I mean the list goes on and on. So what a bank will typically do is they'll say to a commercial borrower like a co-op, You have two options: Option one, you can pay a loan processing fee that covers our out-of-pocket expenses, and it can be tens of thousands of dollars. Or option two, we can have a mortgage with a slightly higher interest rate and a prepayment penalty. The slightly higher interest rate effectively repays the bank for their upfront closing costs. And for some cooperatives, having a slightly higher interest rate and no upfront costs is much more attractive from a cash flow perspective. This bill eliminates options. It eliminates the choice of a consumer to decide what is in their best interest. And it takes a very narrow view in time, a snapshot, if you will, and they say, *Hey, wait a minute. This mortgage with a prepayment penalty has a slightly higher interest rate.* Yeah, that's because you didn't have all those upfront closing costs. For those of us who want to give consumers the most options to develop a mortgage and a financing plan that best meets their needs, that gives them the option of paying

more up front and having a lower interest rate or paying less up front and having a slightly higher rate. For those companies that want to access Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac or the Federal Housing Administration because of their underwriting standards and because of the interest rates and the other criteria, this bill eliminates borrower options and ultimately restricts what borrowers with co-ops can do. Which is why last year at least 39 members voted against it and I anticipate that many will this year as well.

One last point I would note. The Council of New York Cooperatives and Condos has actually written on this and they noted that historically when lenders stop making co-op mortgage loans, as would result in this legislation by eliminating Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac and FHA, it goes on, the values of apartments go down because of the fear of default when a co-op's mortgage matures. So let's not create a situation where we eliminate options to the customer, eliminate their ability to structure a mortgage that best meets their needs, eliminates their ability to access all these extraordinarily important Federal programs and results in a situation where it may actually adversely impact the value of those units.

Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

THE CLERK: This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote on Assembly print 1877. This is a Party vote. Any member who wishes to be recorded as an exception to their

Conference position is reminded to contact the Majority or Minority Leader at the numbers previously provided.

Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir. The Republican Conference will be generally opposed to this legislation. If there are members that would like to support it, they are encouraged to call the Minority Leader's Office so we can properly record their vote. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Majority members will generally be in the affirmative on this one. Should there be members desiring to be an exception, they should feel free to contact the Majority Leader's Office and we will properly record your vote.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Dinowitz to explain his vote.

MR. DINOWITZ: Thank you. To explain my vote. First, let me just correct something. The quote that was just given a minute or two ago was actually not, as far as I understand it, from the New York Council of Co-ops and Condos but, in fact, from one individual who is associated with them. The vast majority of co-op advocates support this legislation. And I -- I would say that the talk that -- that's been put forth regarding the ramifications of this bill, to

me, is -- is kind of scare tactics from the industry. I would just urge -- for once I -- I would ask that our friends on the other side of the aisle take the side of individuals, the average person, rather than the lenders and the banks in this case. It's not an us versus them thing. But I will say that the people who will benefit from this bill are people in our communities, average people who live in co-ops, and this would be largely -- a huge benefit to so many people. Maybe the banks don't like it, but, you know, most other people would like it.

So, I urge everybody to vote in the affirmative.

Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Dinowitz in the affirmative.

And this is the first vote of the day.

Are there --

(Pause)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, would you please call our colleague Ms. Buttenschon's vote in the negative on this one.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: So noted. Thank you.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly Bill No. A00297, Calendar

No. 61, Gottfried, Dinowitz, Colton, Cahill, Weprin, Otis, Gallagher, Sayegh, Barron. An act to amend the Uniform City Court Act, the Uniform District Court Act, the Uniform Justice Court Act and the New York City Civil Court Act, in relation to obtaining jurisdiction over certain defendants.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir.

On the bill.

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

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir. This bill would amend the Uniform City Court Act and the Uniform District Court Act, the Uniform Justice Court Act, and the New York City Civil Court Act to give Small Claims courts jurisdiction over any action by a tenant to recover money from a landlord even though the landlord has no place of business, no residence and does not conduct business in that particular Small Claims jurisdiction. So, for those who aren't familiar with Small Claims, it's a very fast, easy mechanism to address small claims. Rules of evidence are waived. The procedures are all very simplified. But in order to bring an action in Small Claims, the defendant has to have a residence in the city or a place of business within the city or regularly conduct business in the city. And this bill would say that we will ignore all those jurisdictional limitations and give a Small Claims Court the same jurisdiction as a New York State Supreme Court would have, without restrictions, if the apartment

happens to be within the city. And that creates a real problem for landlords who have multiple apartments, who may have apartments in different cities or snowbirds, for example, that might rent their house while they go to Florida in the summer. All of a sudden they're liable for a Small Claims action even though they're not even in the city, not even in the State. This gives long-arm jurisdiction to the Small Claims Court. It also would violate any venue clause that's in the lease. A lot of leases will say, you know, you couldn't even bring that action for any damages in this jurisdiction. This says we don't care what the contract says, we're just going to override contracts because we not only don't care about what contracts say, but apparently we don't care about the U.S. Constitution which limits our power to override contracts.

There's one other aspect of this bill that is extraordinarily problematic. And that is, it says that if you can't serve the landlord directly or by mail, you can begin the Small Claims action by sending your Small Claims notice to where you pay the rent. Even though there's no assurance whatsoever the landlord will even find out about the action. I had several landlords in my district, and I'm sure you do in yours, where the tenants make the rent payment directly to the bank or to a rental agent and not to the landlord. So it violates fundamental due process. It gives Small Claims court long-arm jurisdiction which was never intended and is fundamentally unfair to the parties.

One thing I would -- one last thing I would mention,

we made a number of changes to the rental law including the obligations of landlords to refund security deposits and things of that nature, rendering, I think, a lot of this no longer necessary. And then finally, we've just finished over a year of saying to landlords, *You can't collect any rent. You can't get access to the courts.* And so at a time when our landlords are struggling just to pay their own mortgage and pay the taxes that are outstanding on all their apartments without any ability to collect, we turn around and consider this legislation to make it even more unfair. And for that reason I and many of my colleagues will be opposed to it.

Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: Mr. Gottfried.

MR. GOTTFRIED: Yes. Mr. Speaker, people might get the impression that this bill somehow says that a landlord that has absolutely no connection to the jurisdiction can be sued in Small Claims Court or that somehow Small Claims Court would now have the jurisdiction that the State Supreme Court would have. Fortunately, neither of those things bears any relation to the bill. You know, you can sue someone in Small Claims Court if they have a place of business in the jurisdiction of the court. Some people might think that having rental property in the district where you -- where you have tenants, where you collect rent, et cetera, might be thought of as having a place of business in the district except the courts have said no, it doesn't apply. And so tenants who often -- their landlord -- like if you're in New York City the landlord might live and have -- have its

office in Westchester. Well, can't use the Small Claims Court. And yet Small Claims Court is often a very useful and easy to use and inexpensive way for a tenant to deal with a problem in the property. And let me point out that not only does the property have to be located in the jurisdiction, but the claim has to be directly related to the property. So if you have some other claim against your landlord, this bill won't apply. But if you've been damaged by some problem with the property, then you would be able to sue where it makes sense to sue in the local Small Claims Court. And, you know, sometimes we have to pick whose side we're on. And it seems to me if -- if you think this bill constitutes taking sides, taking the side of a tenant who almost always has much less in the way of financial and legal resources than the landlord, and who is unfortunately often the victim of landlord neglect or misconduct, making it a little easier for the tenant to get their -- to get their day in court, to me, is the right thing to do.

So I hope we will pass this bill today.

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: Read the last section.

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

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: The Clerk will record the vote. This is Party -- on Calendar No. 61, A.297. This is a Party vote. Any member who wishes to be recorded as an exception to their Conference position is reminded to contact the Majority or Minority Leader at the numbers previously provided.

Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republican Conference is generally opposed to this legislation. For those who would like to vote in favor should can contact the Minority Leader's Office. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Colleagues are -- generally, the Majority vote is voting in the affirmative for this one. Those desiring to be an exception should feel free to contact the Majority Leader's Office and we will properly record your vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: Mr. Steck to explain his vote.

MR. STECK: Very briefly. I just want to remind my colleagues that there's no constitutional bar to the regulation of contracts. The reference to the constitutional provision in the United States Constitution is the so-called impairment of the obligation of contracts which prevents government from entering into a contract with a private party and then, say, by legislative action abrogating that contract. That is unconstitutional. But there is nothing in the United States constitutional -- in the United States Constitution that prevents regulation of private contracts. There was a period in our history, very unfortunate, where the so-called four horsemen of the Supreme Court invented a concept called freedom of contract, which is nowhere found in the Constitution, and used it to invalidate things like a

prohibition on child labor which was being passed by the Roosevelt Administration and other similar laws. Fortunately, we moved past that type of jurisprudence, and I just want to remind my colleagues that there's nothing in the United States Constitution that prohibits in any way legislation of this nature.

And with that I vote in the affirmative.

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: Mr. Steck in the affirmative.

Ms. Gallagher to explain her vote.

MS. GALLAGHER: Hi. To explain my vote. I am very eager to support this bill. I am a cosponsor of this bill. I think that Small Claims Court is an important safety net for contracts that have been broken or have been unfaithfully pursued, and it is really important that all tenants are able to use Small Claims Court regardless of where their landlord is residing at the time or where the focus of the business is. And this is going to take an important step. And it is not making an assumption that all landlords are going to be taken to Small Claims Court. Hopefully this will be incentive to follow the rules of the lease and to follow the rules of our -- our rent laws and to actually provide tenants with the -- the safety deposits and other -- other services that -- that they're required to give as landlords.

So I'm very eager for this bill to go into effect, and I thank the sponsor for bringing it forward.

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: Ms. Gallagher in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Assembly Bill No. A03298, Calendar No. 110, Epstein, Seawright, Sayegh, McDonough, Ashby, Gottfried, L. Rosenthal, McDonald, Sillitti, Barron, Durso, Zinerman. An act to amend the Public Health Law, in relation to information provided to patients regarding sudden unexpected death in epilepsy.

ACTING SPEAKER FALL: An explanation is requested, Mr. Epstein.

MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill would require healthcare practitioners to provide patients with epilepsy and their families current evidence-based information about Sudden Unexpected Death in Epilepsy, or called SUDEP, the risk factor and conditions as well as other non-profit organizations that could provide support to people with epilepsy.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Walsh.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Will you yield --

MR. EPSTEIN: Happy to yield.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: -- Mr. Epstein?

MR. EPSTEIN: Happy to yield.

MS. WALSH: Thank you very much.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Epstein yields.

MS. WALSH: So, just a couple of questions about this. So exact -- under this bill, exactly what kind of practitioners must provide this notice about SUDEP, the Sudden Unexpected Death in Epilepsy?

MR. EPSTEIN: Any practitioner who has a patient with epilepsy. So, a doctor who deals with them on a regular basis is a prime example.

MS. WALSH: All right. So if you are, for example, a pediatrician but you don't have any children with epilepsy in your practice, you're not required to provide this information, for example. Correct?

MR. EPSTEIN: This is for patients who have epilepsy, and so it's important information for the family if they are young people or for themselves if they're adults to have information about SUDEP. So, if the pediatrician has no patients with epilepsy, they're not providing it generally to the public, just the families with epilepsy.

MS. WALSH: Very good. Yeah, I think that's an important point to make as far as what it's limited to. What happens if a practitioner fails to provide this information to an existing patient with epilepsy? What are the potential consequences to that physician or that practice?

MR. EPSTEIN: More my concern would be the potential conflict to the family because, as you know, 190,000 people with epilepsy live in New York State. Unfortunately, we've had too

many deaths from SUDEP in New York. And their obligation is like any other obligation under law, to ensure that they provide adequate medical information. Whether they're -- some determining Body will determine if they fail to live up to their Hippocratic Oath is not for our decision, but it's their obligation as a practitioner to provide that information.

MS. WALSH: Okay. So as far as a specific disciplinary consequence, loss of license or a fine, there's nothing in this bill that speaks to that directly, correct?

MR. EPSTEIN: That is correct.

MS. WALSH: Okay. Because the -- the Medical Society of the State of New York has indicated opposition to this bill. Basically, what they're saying is that the measure puts a physician's license at risk for failing to give a form to a patient. So what -- what is your response to that?

MR. EPSTEIN: My response would be there are 190,000 people in New York State who have epilepsy. Potentially, thousands are dying from SUDEP every year. I have a constituent whose daughter passed away from this, and if that physician had provided information that person might be alive today. So I understand the physicians' concern that they may be set at risk for not providing the information, but the only person who has the information is the physician. They are the ones with all the information in their holding, and it's their obligation to share it like they would with any other patient on any other health issue, and it

gives people information so they can protect themselves and their loved ones from sudden death. Do I think that a physician will have their license removed from this? I have no idea. But it depends on how egregious the behavior is, like any action that a physician might engage in.

MS. WALSH: Very good. Thank you so much.

Mr. Speaker, on the bill.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: On the bill, Ms. Walsh.

MS. WALSH: So, I -- I actually want to thank the sponsor for bringing this forward. I -- I think that this is an important -- it's important for physicians who are working with patients who have epilepsy to provide information across the -- the board. Even though SUDEP is really pretty uncommon, thank God, it's 1 in 1,000 patients with epilepsy die each year from it. It's Sudden Unexplained Death in Epilepsy, and it -- it's thought to occur during or following a seizure. So it's important to let patients with epilepsy know that if they -- if their seizures are uncontrolled or poorly controlled they're at an increased risk for this sudden death. And it's important to reduce the risk by taking your medications as prescribed and taking them consistently, keeping a diary of when your seizures happen so that you can show a pattern of when they happen. And getting adequate sleep and installing alarms if you do have problems with sleep. These are all things that the patients need to be aware of and make -- have a good conversation with their -- with their doctors about it. I'm sure

that the vast, vast majority of -- of physicians that are already providing care to patients with epilepsy do talk to their patients about this, and a pamphlet is not a cure-all in any -- in any respect. But I do think that it is a step towards making sure that this information is out there because, you know, one -- as -- as the sponsor pointed out, if -- if a pamphlet and this kind of conversation starter with a physician would save one life, it -- it is -- it's an important thing to do. So I would also just note that March 26th, tomorrow, is Worldwide Awareness About Epilepsy Day, so we should all wear purple. And I want to just commend the Epilepsy Society of Northeastern New York and Jeannine Garab and the wonderful people that work there for all the work that they do educating people about epilepsy, going into the schools. Just all the great work that they do and that's being done throughout our State to just make sure that people with epilepsy get the absolute best education and treatment that's available.

So as you can probably tell, I will be supporting this bill and I -- I do encourage my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Read the last section.

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

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Clerk will record the vote on Assembly print 3298. This is a fast roll call. Any member who wishes to be recorded in the negative is reminded to contact the Majority or Minority Leader at the numbers previously provided.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Epstein to explain his vote.

MR. EPSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to explain my vote. I just want to thank Tim and Alexis Gembka. Their daughter, unfortunately, Natasha, died from SUDEP. And Natasha was a really active young person, you know, in my district. She loved going to the park and hanging out with friends. She had epilepsy and wasn't made aware of SUDEP from her physician, and unfortunately, she was taken from us way too early. Her parents were not aware of SUDEP and only became more aware of SUDEP after her death. This is an opportunity that we have to do something very easy, to require doctors to give out information that is the best information that a technician of health will help them provide. We can then share that with people so they can do things to protect their loved ones from dying. This is a loss for their family, but hopefully with this information requirement to the 190,000 people with epilepsy we will lose less New Yorkers.

I want to thank the family and I hope to encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. I know I will be. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Epstein in the affirmative.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

THE CLERK: Senate No. S01465, Calendar No. 163, Senator Breslin (A01073, Abinanti, Jean-Pierre). An act to amend the Banking Law, in relation to the order in which a payor bank shall pay checks.

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

MR. ABINANTI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill does two things: First of all, it requires banks to pay checks on consumer checking accounts in the order in which they're received or from the smallest amount to the largest amount if several checks arrive at the same time. Secondly, it requires that banks honor a subsequent check after the first check has bounced if there is sufficient money in the account to do so. Basically, this sets up a uniform policy among State banks that have consumer checking accounts so that consumers know what to expect in case they overdraft their accounts.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir.

On the bill.

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

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir. And thank you to my colleague for that explanation. Under current law, consumers and banks, State-chartered banks, have several different options: They can pay the largest checks first. They can pay the smallest checks first. They can make payments based on the check number, paying the

lowest check number first before they pay a higher check number. Or the last option, the fourth option, is they can pay the checks in the order received. Under current law, which option the bank uses is a matter of discussion between the bank customer and the bank. And particularly for commercial customers, which process is often negotiated. So this bill eliminates all customer choice and says instead that those of us in this room or on Zoom know more about what's best for every single banking customer for a State-chartered bank, and we're going to have your checks processed in a certain way regardless of how you want to choose it yourself. So this bank -- this sub bill says first come, first served. So if you happen to give a check to someone who's close to the bank and they run it over to the bank they would get a preference, regardless of what your preference as the customer might -- might have been. It says you pay the smallest ones first, regardless of your preference. Now, why would you might want to have the large one paid first? Because the large ones are usually the most important ones for you to pay. This says that if a larger check bounces we'll pay all the small ones and clean out your account. That may be exactly the opposite of what a consumer wants. Because the largest check might be for their residence, for their mortgage or their car payment. And they might prefer to bounce a small check and just know that, *Oh, my -- my big check didn't clear, but I just need to bring in, you know, another 20 or 30 bucks and I can make sure my house payment is made or my car payment is made.* But under this bill, that option to the consumer is eliminated and the bank is processing all of

those smaller checks and clearing out their account. It's important to note that in addition to eliminating consumer choice, this bill only applies to State-chartered banks. Now, you may not know the difference but I can help you out a little bit. Your biggest banks, like M&T, Key Bank, HSBC, most of your biggest banks are not State-chartered banks, they're Federally-chartered. If they have an NA after their name, that means National Association, Federally-chartered. So we create an unlevel playing field. We say to State-chartered banks, *Your customers have no choice*. And if you're a customer that wants choice, your only choice is to go to a Federally-chartered bank. Let's let our customers have as many options as they want. Let's recognize that they know better than we do what they need. And let's allow our State-chartered banks to compete with national-chartered banks on a level playing field.

That's why I and many of my colleagues will be opposed to this, as we have been in the past. Thank you, sir.

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 on Senate print 1465. This is a Party vote. Any member who wishes to be recorded as an exception to their Conference position is reminded to contact the Majority or Minority Leader at the number previously provided.

Mr. Goodell.

MR. GOODELL: Thank you, sir. The Republican

Conference is generally opposed to this legislation. If there are members that support it, they should call the Minority Leader's Office so that we can record their vote. Thank you, sir.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you. So noted.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Majority Conference is generally going to be voting in the affirmative on this one. Colleagues deciding to be an exception should contact the Majority Leader's Office and your vote will be so recorded.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, Mrs. Peoples-Stokes. So noted.

(The Clerk recorded the vote.)

Mr. Abinanti to explain his vote.

MR. ABINANTI: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill does several important things. The most important aspect of it is that it sets up a uniform policy among State banks as to how checks are going to be cleared. Secondly, it requires that the Superintendent of Financial Services set up regulations. And lastly, it requires that consumers be notified in writing of the policy of the bank on clearing checks. Now with respect to clearing checks, what it says is, that there has to be a standard policy, which is already quite common among Federal and State banks. And it limits the bank's options for the benefit of the consumer. What it requires is that the

banks pay checks in the order received or from the smallest to the largest on a day's transactions. The reason for that is we are trying to limit the number of bounced checks. If the bank takes the largest one first and several smaller ones come in and there's not enough to cover the larger one, the bank may charge the customer several times for bounced checks. This bill requires that if a check is bounced and there's enough money to cover the additional checks that come in, the bank must clear those other ones and not charge a fee, a bounced check fee. So this is a -- a plan that is set up to help consumers and limit the amount of bounced checks that they may have and the bounced checks fees.

Now, we've heard the concern that this will prevent commercial customers from determining -- negotiating with the bank. Well, first of all, as we know, when you walk into the bank, the bank hands you a preprinted form. And any commercial customer that's big enough can negotiate an overdraft.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill which we've passed in the past. It has already passed in the Senate. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you. Mr. Abinanti in the affirmative.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, if you could please record our colleagues Ms. Woerner and Ms. Buttenschon in the negative on this one.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: So noted.

Are there any other votes? Announce the results.

(The Clerk announced the results.)

The bill is passed.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do you have any further housekeeping or resolutions?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: We have no housekeeping, but we do have resolutions. No. 133 --

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: And I believe we have three colleagues that would like to speak on them.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Yes, we do. 0133, the Clerk will read.

THE CLERK: Assembly Resolution No. 133, Ms. Rajkumar.

Legislative Resolution recognizing March 26, 2021 as Bangladesh Independence Day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Rajkumar on the resolution.

(Pause)

We're having trouble getting her.

Ms. Reyes on --

MS. RAJKUMAR: Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: -- on the resolution.

No, Ms. Rajkumar is there. How are you?

MS. RAJKUMAR: Hello. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased to introduce this resolution recognizing March 26, 2021 as Bangladesh Independence Day. As the first South Asian-American woman ever elected to the Legislature in our great State, I introduce this resolution with enormous pride. I wish to thank my colleagues, Karines Reyes and Alicia Hyndman who carried the torch for this resolution before there were any South Asians yet elected to this Body. Now we are here. We have arrived at the table of government in New York State. Bangladeshi Americans themselves first arrived in the United States in the 1880s. Then in the 1970s they started arriving in large numbers, becoming among the fastest-growing ethnic communities. I am proud to report that New York City is home to a remarkable two-thirds of the entire Bangladeshi population in the United States. Today we commemorate the 50th anniversary of Bangladesh's independence, the 50th Golden Jubilee. This is an occasion of great historic as well as emotional importance to Bangladeshi Americans. Many of them had taken part in Bangladesh's hard-fought liberation war for independence either on the battlefield or through other activities while living in the United States. During the Bangladesh Liberation War, many Bangladeshi people were the victims of genocide. Fifty years later, their memory still inspires the people of Bangladesh to build a peaceful nation and Bangladeshi Americans to advocate for global peace. Today the U.S. Department of State cites Bangladesh as a global example of a democratic, tolerant, pluralistic and modern nation. Like my own parents when

they immigrated from South Asia, Bangladeshi Americans are hardworking, working 25 hours a day to achieve the American Dream for themselves and their children. Bangladeshi Americans are thriving in the fields of medicine, engineering, business, finance and information technology. They also -- also are our ride-share and taxi drivers, construction workers, small business owners and service industry employees upon which our economy depends. And most of all, they are proud Americans with high aspirations. Bangladeshi Americans in my district in South Queens move me every day with their sincerity and commitment to the greater good. This year, Bangladeshi leaders were notable for stepping up during the COVID-19 crisis, often at great risk to themselves, to help their neighbors of all backgrounds.

As the first South Asian American woman to join this Legislative Body, but certainly not the last one, I am so proud to sponsor this resolution commemorating Bangladesh Independence Day. Today the State Assembly will join tens of thousands of Bangladeshi Americans in our State to recognize March 26, 2021 as Bangladesh Independence Day and to commemorate the Mujib Year. Thank you so much.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you so much.

Ms. Reyes on the resolution.

MS. REYES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the sponsor of this legislation. As she mentioned, I have carried it for the past three years. For me, it's an honor to carry -- to be a

sponsor of this legislation. The 87th Assembly District is actually home to the second-largest concentration of Bangladeshi Americans, and they add such a vibrancy to the fabric of our community. I am called Karina Apa in my -- in my neighborhood and for me it's an honor. I am an adopted daughter of the Bangladeshi community, and I am so proud of their achievements and their accomplishments and their contributions not just to the community that we live in, but to our society and our City as a whole.

So, thank you again for the -- the sponsor and Happy Bangladeshi Independence Day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Weprin.

MR. WEPRIN: I'm trying to unmute myself. Hold on.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: You are unmuted, sir.

MR. WEPRIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great pleasure to join my neighboring colleagues -- colleague Jenifer Rajkumar in supporting this resolution, as well as Karines Reyes, a former sponsor of this resolution. I have one of the largest Bangladeshi populations in my Assembly District, and it's home to the largest mosque in New York City, the Jamaica Muslim Center, very close to where I live. And that mosque is -- is mostly a Bangladeshi mosque. And I've been so proud to work with that mosque and the Bangladeshi community in Queens during this pandemic with

numerous food distributions and PPP drives in -- in the dozens, and they've really stepped to the front lines. And then of course they're the heart - as was mentioned by the sponsor of this resolution - the heart of the small business community, the heart of the medical community. So many different successes in the -- in the business community, and I am -- and they were also instrumental in supporting my religious garb bill because that obviously was an important bill to the -- to the Bangladeshi and Muslim community.

So I'm very proud to recognize the 50th Anniversary of their independence. They've been wonderful constituents, they're a wonderful constituency in New York City, and I strongly support this resolution. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Thank you, Mr.

Speaker. I -- I'd like to thank my colleagues for introducing this -- this resolution which I think is critically important not just to the Bangladesh community, but, honestly, Mr. Speaker, to our -- our entire State. Because as my colleagues have mentioned, they have large numbers of the Bangladesh American community in their districts. In my district this is a community that is growing. And not only are they growing, but they're contributing members. They're transforming communities, they're opening business and they're very much welcome.

And so it is my pleasure to rise and support my

colleagues in this resolution and to support with the new citizens that are entering my community which we are pleased, very pleased to have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Ms. González-Rojas.

MS. GONZÁLEZ-ROJAS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to thank the sponsor of this resolution. New York City is the home to the largest Bangladeshi immigrant population, and my district, the 34th Assembly District, has one of the most vibrant Bangladeshi communities in the State and in the country. They are our business owners, they are our neighbors, they are the children in my son's school. They have contributed deeply to the fabric of our community and our society, and they have been on the front lines during this pandemic in serving the community, doing food distribution, helping out our neighbors.

I am so proud to support this resolution and I thank the cosponsors -- the sponsor and the cosponsors for taking this forward. So, Happy Bangladeshi Independence Day.

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. 134, Ms. Joyner.

Legislative Resolution commemorating the 110th anniversary of the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory Fire on March 25,

2021.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Joyner on the resolution.

MS. JOYNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to speak on this very important resolution. Today we remember an event which became a turning point in our history that led to sweeping workplace safety reforms in New York State and across the country. Today marks the 110th anniversary of the tragedy that occurred at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory in New York City on March 25, 1911. History has it recorded as being the deadliest industrial fires known to us during this lifetime. This preventable incident claimed the lives of 146 garment workers, mostly young women and girls. For years workers at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory unsuccessfully fought for enhanced labor rights and protections. In 1909, discontent over working conditions at this location and around the City led to thousands of workers to go on strike in demand of safer working conditions and higher wages. And just one day before the fire, the New York State Court of Appeals struck down a new Workman's [sic] Compensation Law as unconstitutional. Sadly, none of these important worker protections would be taken seriously until too late. The fire that broke out on Saturday afternoon was caused by dangerous and deplorable conditions in the factory. Cramped spaces at the sewing machines, non-working fire extinguishers and elevators, narrow fire escapes and even locked doors. It was a common practice to lock the stairways and the exits to prevent workers from taking

breaks which led to many of the workers being trapped inside the burning building. In less than 18 minutes the small fire that had started on the eighth floor had completely engulfed the entire building. The events of that day shocked the conscience of New Yorkers and helped unite organized labor in a way that has never been seen before. A week after the fire, the Ladies Garment Workers Union set up a march with over 80,000 protesters demanding higher wages, shorter work hours and overtime pay. They called for increased accountability and better safety conditions like sprinkler systems and adequate fire ext -- fire escapes. With public outrage growing, the New York State Legislature established the Factory Investigating Commission. This Body had the ability to investigate labor conditions and sparked a much-needed change for enhanced workplace safety regulations and stronger enforcement efforts. The inability of the victims' family members to receive compensation for their loved ones' death led to New York State Constitutional amendments and also the enactment -- enactment of a Workers' Compensation Law in 1913. This tragedy serves as the moral foundation of our fundamental labor laws and our moral compass in the fight for stronger protections and rights for all workers.

Today we bring this resolution to the floor to honor their lives and recognize their indispensable contributions to who we are as New York State today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me this opportunity to speak on the floor about this very important incident. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Ms. Glick.

MS. GLICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the sponsor for bringing forward this resolution. The Triangle Shirtwaist Factory site is in my district, and there are annual commemorations which have been somewhat impaired by this pandemic. But aside from the fact that it was horrific and provided a springboard for worker safety activities and changes in law, we have to remember that these young women trapped in a fire, many escaped only to die as they jumped from the windows of this factory. It is a chilling reminder of those who leaped to their deaths at the Trade Center. The -- the struggle for women to have their pay, their work respected continues today, and as we commemorate those who died in the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire and those who fought the good fight for better work -- working conditions, we realize that during this Women's History Month we have still not achieved full equality for women in the workplace.

But again, I want to thank the sponsor for bringing this forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Ms. Lunsford.

MS. LUNSFORD: Thank you very much. I want to commend the sponsor of this bill -- this resolution. As an attorney who practiced Workers' Compensation Law for a decade, this tragedy was always front of mind for us. A lot of times, particularly here in

the Legislature, when we discuss Workers' Compensation we talk about it as a burden on businesses. We talk about the rates. We talk about the way the -- the court system operates. And I think we sometimes forget why we have a Workers' Compensation system, and the moral obligation that we have to protect workers and to ensure that our workplaces are safe.

So I just wanted to take a moment to acknowledge the importance of this event in our State's history, but also in our country's history and the continued fight to ensure that our workers are taken care of. Thank you.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Ms. Gallagher.

MS. GALLAGHER: Thank you. And I would like to thank the -- my colleague for bringing this resolution forward. The Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire was a tinderbox that brought attention to the long struggle of these women workers who were mostly immigrant teenagers, to have their work respected. And it was because of this moment that they were able to get wider support for their mission, which had been going on strike for a long time. And it should be noted also that these women were often not allowed to join men's unions because they were women workers. And in that we saw incredible perseverance, incredible boldness and bravery to stand up to the entire system, and often to their families who often did not support them going on strike or unionizing. And it reminds me so much that we have so much work to do today to protect our immigrant workers

and to protect workers in general. In the last six months I have heard from gig workers who are seeking the opportunity to be respected as employees and protected. I've heard from home care health aides fighting against a 24-hour workday, and I've heard from nurses fighting for safe staffing. I think we should consider this to all be a part of the same long struggle, and I am proud that I am now in the legislator -- in the Legislature to help fight and continue this movement of workers in America across time.

So thank you very much, and I'm really looking forward to the work that we will do in our generation to protect workers going forward.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Mr. Jacobson.

MR. JACOBSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a former Workers' Compensation Judge and practitioner of Workers' Compensation Law representing claimants for over 20 years, I wish to thank the sponsor for bringing this resolution. I urge to the current Workers' Compensation Board to remember the history and legacy of the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire as it makes its decisions and promulgates rules. We, as a Legislature, should also remember this history as we debate Workers' Compensation laws in the future and remember why they're still important and still necessary in the year 2021.

Thank you. I will -- thank you for bringing this and I will be wholeheartedly supporting this resolution.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you, sir.

Ms. Reyes.

MS. REYES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank the sponsor for bringing forth this -- this resolution. And like so many of my colleagues mentioned before, the plight of workers, particularly immigrant workers many years ago, but that is still not -- hasn't changed. And we've seen during this COVID pandemic how the health and safety of workers is still an issue that we have to contend with.

So, I -- I am happy to -- to support this resolution with the understanding that there is still a lot of work to be done to make sure that we are protecting all our workers and the people that make sure our City continues to run every day. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

Ms. Simon.

(Pause)

MS. SIMON: Got it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to commend the -- the sponsor of this resolution and -- and also just to add my -- my voice to the call for the improvement of working conditions if -- for all workers, but particularly for women. As we know, women still are paid less. They suffer under worse conditions. They often are required to use equipment, for example, on job sites that are actually the dimensions that are ideal for men but, in fact, harm women's bodies. And so there are so many ways in which

women are disadvantaged in the workplace. And the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire really started the ball rolling. It was a tragedy. And I think because so many young women were lost in that -- in that fire it touched the hearts of many people. But it has been too long and many hearts are no longer touched by those kinds of circumstances and think that, in fact, everything is better now. And the reality is it still isn't, and we need to be there for our workers and for women and for immigrants who are often subjected to unsafe work conditions.

And so I thank the sponsor for this resolution.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Thank you.

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

We have other fine resolutions which we will take up with one vote.

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

(Whereupon, Assembly Resolution No. 139 was unanimously adopted.)

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, could you call on Ms. Hunter for the purposes of an announcement?

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Ms. Hunter for the purposes of an announcement.

MS. HUNTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. There will be a need for an immediate Majority Conference at the conclusion

of our Session today.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: Immediate Majority conference at the conclusion of Session.

Mrs. Peoples-Stokes.

MRS. PEOPLES-STOKES: Mr. Speaker, I now move that the Assembly stand adjourned until Friday, March the 26th, tomorrow being a Legislative day, and that we reconvene at 2:00 p.m. on Monday, March the 30th -- I'm actually sorry. It's Tuesday, March the 30th being -- Tuesday being a Session day.

ACTING SPEAKER AUBRY: The Assembly stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the Assembly stood adjourned until Friday, March 26th, that being a Legislative day, and to reconvene on Tuesday, March 30th at 2:00 p.m., that being a Session day.)