NEW YORK STATE SENATE

THE STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

ALBANY, NEW YORK
April 20, 2026
11:13 a.m.

REGULAR SESSION

SENATOR JAMAAL T. BAILEY, Acting President
ALEJANDRA N. PAULINO, ESQ., Secretary

P R O C E E D I N G S

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Senate will come to order.

I ask everyone present to please rise and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the assemblage recited the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: In the absence of clergy, let us bow our heads in a moment of silent reflection or prayer.

(Whereupon, the assemblage respected a moment of silence.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Reading of the Journal.

THE SECRETARY: In Senate, Sunday, April 19, 2026, the Senate met pursuant to adjournment. The Journal of Saturday, April 18, 2026, was read and approved. On motion, the Senate adjourned.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Without objection, the Journal stands approved as read.

Presentation of petitions.

Messages from the Assembly.

Messages from the Governor.

Reports of standing committees.

Reports of select committees.

Communications and reports from state officers.

Motions and resolutions.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Good morning, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Good morning.

SENATOR GIANARIS: On behalf of Senator Martinez, I wish to call up Senate Print 194B, recalled from the Assembly, which is now at the desk.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 181, Senate Print 194B, by Senator Martinez, an act to amend the General Business Law.

SENATOR GIANARIS: I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll on reconsideration.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

THE SECRETARY: Ayes, 52.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill

is restored to its place on the Third Reading Calendar.

SENATOR GIANARIS: I offer the following amendments.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The amendments are received.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Also amendments are offered to the following Third Reading Calendar bills:

By Senator Scarcella-Spanton, page 6, Calendar 225, Senate Print 8968;

And by Senator Gianaris, page 12, Calendar 410, Senate Print 363A.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The amendments on those bills are received, and the bills will retain their place on the Third Reading Calendar.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Please call on Senator Cooney for a very quick introduction.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Cooney for an introduction.

SENATOR COONEY: Thank you, Mr. President.

Good morning, everyone. I'm proud

to be joined with students from SkillsUSA, a nationally recognized career and technical student organization serving students in high school and college postsecondary programs across this country.

I'd like to start by recognizing some of the representatives who are joining us here in the chamber: Genevieve, Ava, Brianna, as well as leaders Jennifer and Theresa.

We're proud to welcome this all-woman representative team. Of course we're very familiar with that here in this chamber, being led by our historic first woman Majority Leader, Andrea Stewart-Cousins. Thank you all for being here today.

We recently celebrated SkillsUSA Week, a time dedicated to uplifting 475,000 students nationwide -- including thousands right here in New York -- who are committed to mastering the skilled trades and preparing for real-world careers.

It's also a time to highlight the vital role that skilled trades play in our economy and the impressive work these students and students across our state do each day to develop personal, workplace and technical skills grounded in academics.

As the United States faces a projected talent shortage, widening the skills gap that could result in the loss of trillions of dollars by 2030, supporting programs like SkillsUSA is vital to ensuring our economic strength and sustaining a skilled workforce.

The students before us today represent exactly what SkillsUSA stands for: Champions of their own futures, a workforce that is our future that New Yorkers can rely on.

It is an honor to recognize the entire SkillsUSA community not just during this special week, and not just today, but each and every day as they lead the way for collaboration and innovation of our skilled trades.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Cooney.

To our guests, I welcome you on behalf of the Senate. Thank you for all that you do. Please remain -- I extend to you all of the privileges and courtesies of this house. Please remain standing and be recognized.

(Standing ovation.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Mr. President, there will be an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in Room 332.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: An immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in Room 332.

SENATOR GIANARIS: The Senate stands at ease.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Senate will stand at ease.

(Whereupon, the Senate stood at ease at 11:17 a.m.)

(Whereupon, the Senate reconvened at 11:21 a.m.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Senate will return to order.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Mr. President, there's a report of the Rules Committee at the desk.

Can we take that up, please.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The

Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Senator Stewart-Cousins, from the Committee on Rules, reports the following bills:

Senate Print 6570A, by Senator Harckham, an act to amend the Environmental Conservation Law;

Senate Print 8512B, by Senator Krueger, an act to amend the Public Service Law;

Senate Print 9963, by Senator Serrano, an act making appropriations for the support of government.

All bills reported direct to third reading.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Move to accept the report of the Rules Committee.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: All those in favor of accepting the report of the Rules Committee, please signify by saying aye.

(Response of "Aye.")

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Opposed, nay.

(Response of "Nay.")

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The

report of the Rules Committee is accepted.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Please take up the supplemental calendar.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 699, Senate Print 9963, by Senator Serrano, an act making appropriations for the support of government.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Is there a message of necessity and appropriation at the desk?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: There is a message of necessity and appropriation at the desk.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Move to accept the message.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: All those in favor of accepting the message please signify by saying aye.

(Response of "Aye.")

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Opposed, nay.

(Response of "Nay.")

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The message is accepted, and the bill is before the house.

SENATOR LANZA: Lay it aside.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Lay it aside.

Senator Gianaris, that completes the reading of today's supplemental calendar.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Let's take up the controversial supplemental calendar, please.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Secretary will ring the bell.

The Secretary will read.

Calendar Number 699, Senate Print 9963, by Senator Serrano, an act making appropriations for the support of government.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator O'Mara, why do you rise?

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Mr. President. If the sponsor would yield for a couple of questions on this budget extender.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Sure.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The

sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Good morning --

SENATOR SERRANO: Good morning.

SENATOR O'MARA: -- Senator.

Here we are on our fifth budget extender, three weeks late on the budget now.

Can you tell us at least initially what -- what is included in this extender, how much does it total, and what period of time is it covering?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President. This extender, this budget extender legislation has $12.7 billion total, which includes 5.1 billion in new funding.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Does the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: What date does this extender go through?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President, this extender will bring us through Wednesday, April 22nd.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: So we're adding an additional $5.1 billion in this extender. Being three weeks late, that's an extra $5 billion to get us through the next two days.

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President. Different extenders, because of different timetables for payment, have different amounts in them.

So there is an increase in this one over previous, but not necessarily because of the length of time, but more because certain payments are due.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the

sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Can you outline for us, then, what the 5.1 billion in spending authorization covers?

(Pause.)

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President. The three main issues that this additional funding covers are Medicaid, payroll, and school funding.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Can you tell us the amount of education funding that's being authorized here to go to our local school districts?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you,

Mr. President, this extender includes about $2.3 billion for schools.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you.

Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Senator, we're now three weeks late on this budget. We're at April 20th, our schools have to put their budgets to a vote before their voters in about a month's time, or less, and they have to have their budgets actually finalized before they go to a vote.

So what can we tell our school districts, while this budget is late, what to expect in school funding? Has there been any type of agreement between the three sides on what school funding is going to be or what a minimum amount is going to be so they can properly formulate their budgets?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you,

Mr. President.

Well, certainly, as you mentioned, there is a sense of urgency, especially when it comes to this topic of school aid. However, we do have a little bit more time before that issue arises.

And I feel pretty confident that we will complete this budget in time so that school districts can be able to manage appropriately. As in years past, even with late budgets, we've been able to get it done before that critical moment.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Does the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: So do we have any basis that we can at least signal to our school districts what -- the base level of increase we'd be looking at?

The Governor came out with a 1 percent base, which is pretty anemic, and I think the one-houses came up with 2 percent. What can we assure them at this point?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President. While it is difficult to give assurances until the budget is done, if the past is any indication, we usually build upon what was in the Executive Budget.

So I would presume that that would be a base and that we would hopefully go up from there.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Senator, there's been four or five major issues, at least in the media, that are holding up this budget process. Since the last extender last Thursday, can you inform us of any progress that's been made on any of the major open issues?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President.

I wish I could give you some more, but I do feel that, you know, as negotiations are ongoing, and that -- the overall sense of urgency, I think things are moving in the right direction. There have been productive conversations with all parties engaged.

And, you know, budgets -- as you know, all of these budgets are a lot of work, they're hard work, and they certainly require a lot of negotiation and time. And this budget is no exception, so -- but I do feel -- I feel good that things are moving in the right direction, and hopefully we can land this plane sooner rather than later.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yup.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: One of the major issues, to my understanding, has been alterations to the CLCPA and the timelines on that for feasibleness -- for it to be feasible and affordable.

The Governor stated last week that language had been provided to both houses' majorities on proposed changes to that. Can you tell us what those proposals are?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President, I have no additional information on that.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: One of the other major issues is the automobile liability insurance, changes that the Governor has proposed and the Senate and Assembly majorities have had some responses to.

Can you tell us where we are on specific language on that issue?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President. No, I'm sorry, I don't have any additional information on that.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. President, will the Senator continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Last week it was indicated in the discussion on the floor here of this extender last Thursday that both sides wanted SEQR reforms, which has been discussed a lot in the press, and that it was felt to be close on agreement on the SEQR issues now.

Can you tell us, is SEQR locked down at this point, that issue? And where are we, what are the changes being proposed to SEQR?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President. I really cannot. I really don't have any additional information to add to that.

And again, as this negotiation continues, all of these things I'm hoping will fall into place in due time, sooner rather than later.

But you are correct that these are some of the many issues that have -- we continue to grapple with as we attempt to finalize this budget.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: We have nine budget bills that we have to get through that are outstanding. Have any one of those nine been finalized to this point?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President, no.

SENATOR O'MARA: Through you, Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Does the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yup.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: What is your prognosis on when we will be nailing down these final nine budget bills so we can at least let the public know what's being discussed and we can start debate on those bills?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President.

As I mentioned in my earlier comments, that I feel that things are moving in the right direction. I think discussions are ongoing. All parties involved are working very hard to try to come to agreement and come up with bills that we can bring to a vote that the public can be proud of.

It takes time to come up with a

budget that speaks to all of the different needs of the people of New York. And we are certainly being very methodical in our approach here, as we can see.

However, I do sense a -- there is a sense of urgency to get moving on this, and I think things are coming together. But no, to directly answer your question, I am unable to provide any dates or prognosis beyond that.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you.

Mr. President, if the Senator will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR SERRANO: Yup.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR O'MARA: Would you expect us to have budget bills to be actually working on by the end of next week?

SENATOR SERRANO: Through you, Mr. President. Again, it's difficult to say. I would hope so, but it's -- unfortunately, I cannot answer.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you,

Senator.

On the bill, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator O'Mara on the bill.

SENATOR O'MARA: Here we are on our fifth budget extender, three weeks late on the budget to date, with -- as we can see -- little to no information being shared by the majorities with us in the minority or, more importantly, with New Yorkers.

You know, this is probably the most important thing that we do each year in Albany, is set the State Budget. We need to do it in a timely manner, as I have said, so our school districts can set their budgets so that they can reliably have a figure of state aid coming so they can set their budgets and not have to perhaps set property taxes higher than they would need to be if they knew what was coming in state aid.

So it is just still very concerning to me and to our side of the aisle that we have little to no information to be discussing on this. It seems that the rank-and-file members of the Majority don't have any information either.

And that's concerning, that everything still continues to be three people in a room behind closed doors with no discussion or detail on what the hangups are, what's actually being considered from one side or the other, which would be helpful in informing the public of where this budget is headed.

And the major policy issues that are outstanding, the five or six issues that are out there, are significant issues and should involve public input, public response to what's being proposed so that we can more accurately debate these issues, know where our constituents stand on these issues and, more importantly, have an informed vote on the budget itself.

But thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator O'Mara.

Are there any other Senators wishing to be heard?

Seeing and hearing none, debate is closed.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Mr. President, let's restore this to the noncontroversial calendar, please.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: On consent, the bill is restored to the noncontroversial calendar.

There is a substitution at the desk.

The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Senator Serrano moves to discharge, from the Committee on Rules, Assembly Bill Number 11010 and substitute it for the identical Senate Bill Number 9963, Third Reading Calendar 699.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Substitution so ordered.

Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Weik to explain her vote.

SENATOR WEIK: Thank you, Mr. President.

Today is April 20th. The budget was due on April 1st. So as my colleagues have said, three weeks late for a budget. Still no table targets, which really just once again showcases how inefficient having one party running our state has been.

And for that, I'll be voting in the negative.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Weik to be recorded in the negative.

Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 699, voting in the negative: Senator Weik.

Ayes, 57. Nays, 1.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

Senator Gianaris, that completes the reading of the controversial supplemental calendar.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Thank you, Mr. President.

Going to more routine business now, there's a privileged resolution at the desk. Please take that up, read its title, and recognize Senator Brisport on the resolution.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The

Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Senate Resolution 1887, by Senator Brisport, memorializing Governor Kathy Hochul to proclaim April 2026 as Arab American Heritage Month in the State of New York.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Brisport on the resolution.

SENATOR BRISPORT: Thank you, Mr. President.

The great Palestinian poet Mosab Abu Toha, whom we are honored to have with us today, wrote these words:

"What is home?

"It is the shade of trees on my way to school before they were uprooted.

"It is my grandparents' black and white wedding photo before the walls crumbled.

"It is my uncle's prayer rug, where dozens of ants slept on wintry nights before it was looted and put in a museum.

"It is the oven my mother used to bake bread and roast chicken before a bomb reduced our house to ashes.

"It is the cafe where I watched

football matches and played --

"My child stops me: Can a four-letter world hold all of these?"

When I think about this poem, I think not only about the limitations of words to adequately hold on to a legacy, but also about their tremendous importance in the attempt to do so.

That is precisely what makes erasure such a powerful and common tool of oppression. Sometimes erasure happens when a bomb strikes a library, like the Edward Said Public Library, founded by Mr. Abu Toha himself, and now reduced to ash.

Sometimes it happens when a gang of ICE agents snatch a young Palestinian man, like Mahmoud Khalil, away from his family for speaking truths our government did not want heard.

Sometimes it happens as simply as a publisher choosing to omit mention of Arab American contributions from our students' textbooks.

To erase the arts, the voices, the history of a people makes it that much easier to erase the people themselves. We are seeing that playbook used again in realtime.

Today, as we recognize Arab American Heritage Month in New York, I hope we will all take the occasion to commit ourselves to fighting that erasure, to seeking out, listening to and amplifying the Arab voices being silenced.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Brisport.

Senator Fahy on the resolution.

SENATOR FAHY: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President.

I'd like to commend the sponsor for offering this resolution and to also speak on it to say that this is a wonderful opportunity to commend all Arab Americans and recognize the heritage month.

Right here in the Capital Region we have one of the largest and faster-growing Arab American communities in the country. Many are incredible entrepreneurs, educators, healthcare workers, engineers, and public servants, and they have strengthened the Capital Region in multiple, multiple ways.

That entrepreneurial spirit, the

cultural tradition -- my children went to the Albany schools, and they have just enriched the incredible diversity of those schools. We have seen an explosive growth here in Arab American residents, especially in the last few years, which has been stunning.

And I think it makes this resolution more important than ever because on the other -- the flip side of this, we've also seen a truly unfortunate rise in hate and bias and certainly in harmful rhetoric.

So I think it's more important now that we stand firm against any forms of discrimination and talk about the positive and extraordinary contributions.

We have seen, again, an exponential rate of complaints, particularly in our Muslim community, with anti-Muslim and anti-Arab incidents.

So I think it's a good reminder that New York and this country are best when we focus on dignity, on respect, inclusion and the incredible value that the diversity and inclusion brings to our community, and the commitment that we have in this state and in this country on advancing opportunities for all and reminding each of us that hate should have absolutely no home here or anywhere else.

So I am so proud to join my colleagues and join all my community members in recognizing Arab American Heritage Month and celebrate those extraordinary contributions of so many here in our community and in New York as a whole.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Fahy.

Senator Salazar on the resolution.

SENATOR SALAZAR: Thank you, Mr. President.

New York is home to over 300,000 Arab Americans. It's the third-largest population of Arab Americans in the United States.

From Astoria, in Queens, to Bay Ridge, we can see clearly that entire neighborhoods have developed and flourished because of the contributions of Arab American immigrants and their generations who have built their lives here in New York.

Thought leaders like Edward Said, who Senator Brisport mentioned, the Palestinian American scholar and author of Orientalism and The Question of Palestine, have played a major part in New York's global academic and literary influence.

The Yemeni small business owners who run thriving restaurants and convenience stores in my district, and across the city and state, make our local economies diverse and resilient and community-oriented.

Arab American hospitality, literature, cuisine -- they've enriched our lives for the better even as Arab American communities have faced immense challenges. Many of our Arab American neighbors were forced to leave their homelands due to war, occupation, oppression and systemic violence, sometimes as a result of U.S. foreign policy.

Far too often we have seen elected officials at various levels of government perpetuate bigoted tropes and inflammatory language about our Arab American neighbors. It makes it all the more important that we celebrate Arab Americans through resolutions like this one.

Even today, Arab New Yorkers are still disproportionately surveilled and discriminated against simply because of their heritage.

And yet their communities have persevered and given back to our state. Organizations like the Arab American Association of New York and American Family Support Center are consistently providing comprehensive services to those in need regardless of their identity.

We know that Arab Americans in our state deserve our celebration and respect, and I thank Senator Brisport for recognizing these communities through this resolution.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Salazar.

Senator Gounardes on the resolution.

SENATOR GOUNARDES: Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise too to thank our sponsor for this resolution. And I have the privilege to represent a wide diversity of the Arab American diaspora. Whether they are immigrants from Morocco, from Palestine, from Jordan, from Syria, from Iraq, from Kuwait, from Egypt, from many of the nations where -- around the globe where Arabs come from, they've all settled in -- not just throughout New York City, but particularly in many of the neighborhoods that I get to represent in Brooklyn.

Senator Salazar mentioned Bay Ridge. That's probably the newest wave of Arab immigrants we have here in my district. But it begins even a century earlier when we saw the first wave of Syrian and Lebanese immigrants who settled in downstate Brooklyn, establishing shops, establishing restaurants, becoming the first pioneers of their communities to settle here in the United States.

I am incredibly proud to represent that full spectrum of Arab American neighbors who live in New York City. And one of my favorite things every year, in fact, on Good Friday -- as many of you know, I'm Greek Orthodox. On Good Friday, at the church that I attend, we do a procession where we walk around the church.

And two blocks away there is an Antiochian Orthodox Church, Lebanese, Arab American, Christians, also celebrating

Good Friday.

Our two congregations come together and we chant the Good Friday hymns not just in English and not just in Greek, but also in Arabic.

And it is such a beautiful picture of what makes New York City so great, and that you have all these diverse cultures, all of these diverse nationalities coming together and sharing in this common experience together.

That is what makes our city and our state such a beautiful place to welcome so many others, whether they came here 100 years ago or they came here just yesterday.

And so I want to thank again Senator Brisport for reminding us of the importance of Arab American Heritage Month.

I see some of my constituent groups that are here today: The Arab American Association, the Arab American Family Support Center. And I'm proud to support this resolution.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Gounardes.

To our guests from the Arab American community, we thank you for your leadership and I welcome you on behalf of the Senate. We extend to you all of the privileges and courtesies of this house.

Please rise and be recognized.

(Standing ovation.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The question is on the resolution. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

(Response of "Aye.")

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Opposed, nay.

(No response.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The resolution is adopted.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Senator Brisport would like to open that resolution for cosponsorship.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The resolution is open for cosponsorship. Should you choose not to be a cosponsor, please notify the desk.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Let's take up the calendar, please.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 186, Senate Print 114, by Senator Cleare, an act to amend the Banking Law.

SENATOR LANZA: Lay it aside.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Lay it aside.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 311, Senate Print 5340C, by Senator Stavisky, an act to amend the Education Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Read the last section.

SENATOR LANZA: Lay it aside.

(Pause; off the record.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: I believe that Calendar 311 was laid aside in error.

Senator Lanza would like to remove that lay-aside, and let's take that bill up.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The lay-aside has been removed.

The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 311, Senate Print 5340C, by Senator Stavisky, an act to amend the Education Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 4. This act shall take effect on the 180th day after it shall have become a law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 311, voting in the negative are Senators Gallivan, Griffo, Helming, Lanza, Martinez, Ortt and Palumbo.

Ayes -- oh, sorry.

In relation to Calendar 311, voting in the negative are Senators Gallivan, Griffo, Lanza, Martinez, Ortt, Palumbo and Weik.

Ayes, 51. Nays, 7.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 450, Senate Print 2224B, by Senator Krueger, an act to amend the Legislative Law.

SENATOR LANZA: Lay it aside.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Lay it aside.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 454, Senate Print 2708A, by Senator May, an act to amend the Public Service Law.

SENATOR LANZA: Lay it aside.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Lay it aside.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 485, Senate Print 3147, by Senator Cooney, an act to amend the Insurance Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 2. This act shall take effect on the 30th day after it shall have become a law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: Ayes, 58.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 493, Senate Print 5280A, by Senator Sepúlveda, an act to amend the Real Property Tax Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 4. This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: Ayes, 58.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 543, Senate Print 5598A, by Senator May, an act to amend the General Business Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 4. This act shall take effect on the 180th day after it shall have become a law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 543, voting in the negative are Senators Borrello, Oberacker, Stec, Walczyk and Weik.

Ayes, 53. Nays, 5.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 613, Senate Print 4188B, by Senator Comrie, an act to amend the Penal Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: Ayes, 58.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 654, Senate Print 2078, by Senator Mayer, an act to amend the Labor Law.

SENATOR LANZA: Lay it aside.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Lay it aside.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 671, Senate Print 1116, by Senator Gounardes, an act to amend the Executive Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: Ayes, 58.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number

672, Senate Print 2546, by Senator Myrie, an act to amend the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law.

SENATOR LANZA: Lay it aside.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Lay it aside.

Senator Gianaris, that completes the reading of today's calendar.

SENATOR GIANARIS: All right. On to the controversial calendar, please.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Secretary will ring the bell.

The Secretary will read.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 186, Senate Print 114, by Senator Cleare, an act to amend the Banking Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Mr. President, I believe the sponsor just stepped out for a moment.

Let's stand at ease until she comes back.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Senate will stand at ease momentarily.

(Whereupon, the Senate stood at ease at 11:50 a.m.)

(Whereupon, the Senate reconvened at 11:51 a.m.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The Senate will return to order.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Okay, Mr. President, let's proceed with the debate, please.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Borrello, why do you rise?

SENATOR BORRELLO: Thank you, Mr. President.

Would the sponsor yield for a question?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR CLEARE: Through you, Mr. President, I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Through you, Mr. President.

We've been through this bill I think

six years now, I think since my first year in the Senate. I'm just curious what the status is in the other house and why this bill continues to come up and pass this chamber but hasn't seemed to go any further.

SENATOR CLEARE: It's my understanding it's made it -- through you, Mr. President -- into third reading on some occasions.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR CLEARE: Through you, Mr. President, I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: So New York State already restricts banks, institutions, from actually investing in private-prison contractors, contractors that provide private-prison services within New York State. In other words, New York State doesn't allow private prisons, essentially.

So what is the intent of this bill if it doesn't occur here in New York State?

SENATOR CLEARE: To make sure that our banks are not investing in private prisons in general outside of New York State.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR CLEARE: Through you, Mr. President, yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Through you, Mr. President. Are you aware of any state-chartered banks that are currently investing in private-prison contractors?

SENATOR CLEARE: No. Through you, Mr. President, no.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Okay. Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR CLEARE: Through you, yes, I will yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The

sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: So we don't allow them here in New York State. We don't have any state-chartered banks because this only can impact state-chartered banks. We don't have any purview over federally chartered institutions. We don't have any state-chartered banks that are actually invested in private prisons outside of New York State.

So isn't this bill really just trying to regulate what happens in states outside of New York?

(Pause.)

SENATOR CLEARE: There is some renewed pressure with what we -- we have limited ability to regulate what happens federally with immigration, but there has been some renewed activity in terms of us investing in private facilities that detain people.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR CLEARE: Through you, Mr. President, yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: So -- well, this bill's been around long before, you know, we've had any immigration enforcement of any kind -- or of any significance, honestly, in the previous four years.

So you're saying now this bill's intent has shifted to be more about immigration enforcement?

SENATOR CLEARE: No. There's still a great concern about investing in private prisons outside of New York State.

You know, you and I have talked about previous corruption scandals where people were being sentenced and sent to private prisons. And we don't want our banks to be a part of that. We don't want to be investing in that kind of situation. Among other things that are going on in these private prisons, wherever they are.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR CLEARE: I do. Through

you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: So really, then, we're just saying to banks within New York State: We're going to tell you where you're going to invest your -- and how you're going to invest your money.

And essentially outside of New York State, we're trying to essentially impede their ability -- isn't that kind of a slippery slope now that we're going to be telling banks how they should be investing their money outside of the state that we govern?

SENATOR CLEARE: No, I don't think so. I think that, you know, there's a moral issue here where we invest our money. And I think that private prisons are just not a place that we should be investing our money.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR CLEARE: Through you, Mr. President, I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Well, when you say "our money," I mean, we're not talking about government money, right, we're talking about people that have given their money to a bank or another state-chartered institution. And, you know, so we're really talking about regulating how a private entity invests money provided to them by private citizens, not by the government, correct?

SENATOR CLEARE: Right. Through you, Mr. President, right.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Mr. President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Borrello on the bill.

SENATOR BORRELLO: Thank you, Mr. President.

Thank you, Senator Cleare, once again for this debate.

I want to also mention that Senator Cleare has been very instrumental in personal advocacy for something she believes in. She believes that indeed financial institutions should not be investing in private prisons, and she's gotten some -- she's been very effective. She's gotten some action through her advocacy.

I believe some nationally chartered banks that we have absolutely no control over have actually voluntarily decided not to invest because of her advocacy. So I commend you for that, even if I disagree with it.

But at the end of the day, that's the way to go about this. Because again, this targets a very narrow group of people, state-chartered banks. We've lost 40 percent of our state-chartered banks just in my time here in the Senate, six years.

People just choose to -- banks choose to no longer deal with the heavy regulation of New York State, and they choose to then become federally chartered institutions or to discontinue doing business in New York State altogether.

This is just another nail in that coffin, essentially, people having the choice of having more opportunity to find banks to only invest in them, to provide them with mortgages and car loans and business loans.

The harder that we are on our state-chartered banks, which are community banks, our local banks -- the harder that we are on them, the less they're going to provide critical finances here in New York State, critical support.

But also this is about interstate commerce in a lot of ways. This bill is saying we're going to tell a bank in New York State where and how they can invest their money -- not in New York State government taxpayer money, the money that's given to them by private citizens, and how they can invest that.

And that's a very slippery slope. Because what's next? Are we going to tell people that you can't invest in certain food companies because we don't like the way -- the food that they manufacture and sell and distribute? Are we going to tell -- we're no longer going to allow people to invest in car companies because they make internal combustion engines instead of electric vehicles?

The list goes on and on of what a slippery slope this bill really is.

So once again, I'll be a no on this

bill, and we will see what happens next.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Borrello.

Are there any other Senators wishing to be heard?

Seeing and hearing none, debate is closed.

The Secretary will ring the bell.

Senator Serrano.

SENATOR SERRANO: Mr. President, upon consent, we've agreed to restore this bill to the noncontroversial calendar.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Upon consent, the bill is restored to the noncontroversial calendar.

Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Sanders to explain his vote.

SENATOR SANDERS: Thank you,

Mr. President.

A point of information. It was stated that there are no private prisons in New York State. I have one in my district. I just wanted to state that.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Sanders to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Cleare to explain her vote.

SENATOR CLEARE: Thank you, Mr. President.

While this bill has come to the floor on many occasions, today is probably one of the most important times in recent history. That is because on the federal level, under the Trump administration, the use of private prisons for incarceration and detention is on the rise.

In January 2025, a Trump executive order rescinded the Biden directive that required the Justice Department not to renew contracts with private prison firms. Increased ICE activity virtually guarantees the for-profit companies who operate private prisons a pipeline of revenue.

However, in New York, we're going to

take the opposite course and the high road. This bill sets a very clear moral and policy principle which follows upon the fact that we already prohibit the operation of private prisons in New York State, per Section 121 of the Correction Law.

Senate Bill 114 extends this principle further by prohibiting any state-chartered banking institution from providing financing or investing in the stocks, securities, or other obligations of an entity that owns or operates a private correctional facility.

New York has been wise enough to ban the very existence of private prisons in the state, and thus it is completely logical to prohibit banks chartered by the very same state from investing in an activity that we have declared is not only prohibited but morally unacceptable.

As we stand here today, over 115,000 people in this country are in private prisons, and the number being detained by ICE only adds to this alarming figure.

In my public service career I have

helped numerous constituents who had family members in private prisons, and the experience was exceptionally burdensome. It is often impossible to make contact with your loved ones, set up visits, or perform any kind of wellness check. There's no accountability, no care or compassion. Safety, health, labor and other standards are lax.

New York banks should not be allowed to profit from institutions that the state itself deems impermissible to even exist, plain and simple.

I proudly vote aye, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Cleare to be recorded in the affirmative.

Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 186, voting in the negative are Senators Ashby, Borrello, Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick, Chan, Gallivan, Griffo, Helming, Lanza, Mattera, Murray, Oberacker, O'Mara, Ortt, Rhoads, Rolison, Ryan, Stec, Tedisco, Walczyk, Weber and Weik. Also Senator Martins.

Ayes, 36. Nays, 22.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 450, Senate Print 2224B, by Senator Krueger, an act to amend the Legislative Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Walczyk, why do you rise?

SENATOR WALCZYK: I rise to go briefly on the bill and then would ask the sponsor to yield for some questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Walczyk on the bill.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Thank you, Mr. President.

We have in New York State a comprehensive lobbying regulation. The purpose of the regulation is to provide those regulated by the Commission on Ethics and Lobbying in Government, as well as the public, a consolidated resource for understanding and complying with the requirements of our legislative law known as the Lobbying Act.

Under current law, every lobbyist must file a biannual registration statement if they receive more than $5,000 or more in reportable compensation.

This bill clarifies that to be if they receive five grand or more in reportable compensation or expenses, they must file a biennial registration statement. The purpose of the biennial registration statement is to memorialize the engagement of the lobbyist by the client and should reflect the current terms of the engagement at any point in time.

When people donate to a nonprofit, they expect their money to fulfill the mission of that charity, not to be spent on lobbyists.

And with that, Mr. President, I would ask the sponsor to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: I'm not the sponsor, but I'm happy to yield on behalf of Senator Krueger.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Mayer yields in the stead of Senator Krueger.

Senator Walczyk.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President.

This bill allows nonprofits to spend

$10,000 a year on lobbyists without having to file any reports, is that correct?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President.

This bill changes the expenditure threshold, currently at $5,000, to 10,000. It simply allows very small nonprofits to be exempt from the requirement if they spend less than $10,000.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Mayer, do you yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President. Is there a size of -- you said very small.

Is there a size requirement for the size of the nonprofit?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. No, there aren't.

But there are, according to our

reports, only 33 nonprofits that would fall within this category statewide.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Does the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President. How did you arrive at the 33 if there's no threshold for the size?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. That's the COLEG reporting of the number of lobbyists who were between the 5,000 and 10,000 threshold.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President. So -- and this applies in 2026, in our current calendar year, so even retroactive for money that may have already been spent on lobbying.

You're saying there's 33 nonprofits that have already exceeded the 5,000 threshold in lobbying efforts?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. According to the reports we have from COLEG, there are 33 small nonprofits who have spent between $5,000 and $10,000 who would be impacted by this change.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Does the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: And just to be clear, that's 33 that have already exceeded the current statute of $5,000, so they're somewhere between $5,000 and $10,000 in lobbying this year?

SENATOR MAYER: That's those who have filed who would be impacted by this change in law, yes.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Nonprofits are prohibited from endorsing candidates or directly contributing to political campaigns.

Is there anything in this legislation that would require a lobbyist that's lobbying for a nonprofit not to be able to contribute to political campaigns or endorse candidates?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. There's no change in the current law other than changing the threshold.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Some nonprofits receive tax money from the State of New York to implement various programs in our very benevolent state.

They would -- if this bill goes into law, they would also be able to hire a lobbyist up to $10,000 on retainer for each year. Am I understanding that correctly?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. As I stated previously, there is no change other than the threshold number from 5,000 to 10,000.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, will the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: And that means that that lobbying up to $10,000 wouldn't have to be filed and follow the rest of the regulations, so there would be no public disclosure on how that money was spent in the lobbying efforts?

Am I understanding that correctly,

if this bill becomes law?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. The threshold would only apply if more than $10,000 was spent on lobbying.

SENATOR WALCZYK: And would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Some nonprofits are also global in their nature. While they are hosted here in the United States, they can in fact receive foreign monies.

Is there any prohibition in this legislation that would say if you've received foreign monies into your nonprofit, that you can't lobby in the State of New York and not disclose it up to $10,000, as we've already established?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. I recognize that my colleague is trying to imply other changes.

There is no other change other than

5,000 to 10,000.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Thank you.

Mr. President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Walczyk on the bill.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Many nonprofits also have 501(c)(4)s. Those are -- those are their ability to really reach out and impact PACs, political action committees, to issue advocacy campaigns, lobby, that sort of thing.

This bill would affect the 501(c)(3)s. There's been some reporting about 501(c)(3)s showing that nonprofits have illegally, directly from the nonprofit, directly into political campaigns.

But there is also a loophole. Right now that loophole is that if $5,000 or less is spent on a lobbyist for your nonprofit, you're not subject to the same reporting requirements that the rest of the lobbying world is, in this fat regulation on comprehensive regulations for lobbyists in the State of New York, that exists in order to make sure that there is transparency on the funding that is spent in lobbying.

And I know the people that work in

these halls understand how these things work.

This bill would expand that lobbying loophole for nonprofits, allowing up to $10,000 for a nonprofit -- we're talking about supposed to be going to charity, people that donate to a nonprofit believe that their money is going to the actual thing that the nonprofit stands for, not to be spent on a lobbyist.

But if that nonprofit decides that it really needs to lobby, right now if they're spending over $5,000 on lobbying, it has to be publicly disclosed through our regulations. And the public, including the contributors to that nonprofit, have to see it.

This bill would expand that up to $10,000. So you could funnel nonprofit money into lobbying firms that then show up to your campaign events, contribute to your campaigns.

It is a loophole that eliminates transparency at the same time that we're seeing reporting that nonprofits have directly contributed to campaigns. That's already a mistake.

And then by admission from the stand-in for the sponsor today, 33 have already exceeded that $5,000 threshold this year -- have already done the wrong thing, should have to disclose to the people that have donated to those nonprofits, to the people of the State of New York, who often their tax money is donated to those nonprofits and directed through our budgetary process.

This bill is very bad for transparency and headed down a very dangerous road. And with that, I will be voting no, Mr. President, and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Walczyk.

Are there any other Senators wishing to be heard?

Senator Martins, why do you rise?

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you, Mr. President. If the sponsor would yield for a couple of questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Mayer, do you yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So is there anything in this bill that would prevent several not-for-profit 501(c)(3)s to each contribute up to $5,000 or $10,000, in a cumulative effort to influence policy?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. I believe that under current law the concept of cumulative lobbying is not authorized.

You would have to file -- each not-for-profit would have to file their own lobbying expenses. Which, I would point out,is a significant amount of work for small not-for-profits, as we know, in our communities. But each not-for-profit is required, under the law, to file its own disclosure.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the Senator yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Mayer yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: You keep using the term "small not-for-profit." But this really has nothing to do with the size of the not-for-profit, it merely has to do with the amount that they're willing to absorb in lobbying efforts. Right?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. The reason I am using the word "small" is because the expenses associated with the filing are a burden on small not-for-profits, small being either small in staff, small in assets, or in other ways small.

That is why, to my understanding, Senator Krueger sponsored this bill, to address the concerns of small not-for-profits in each of our communities who are burdened with using the contributions they receive in order to hire someone to do these complicated forms.

We are simply saying that the activities of up to $10,000 are such, in the current time, where they should not require you to go out and hire someone to do the form. This is a modest amount of money, and it is not required to be disclosed under this bill up to $10,000.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Mr. President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Martins on the bill.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

You know, it's a bit of a slippery slope when we talk about things like this, because you've always got to set a threshold. And the threshold was set at $5,000, and I think for a reason.

When we start talking about small not-for-profits as opposed to large not-for-profits, all based on how much they're willing to spend to influence policy, we're missing the mark.

It has nothing to do with the size of the not-for-profit, Mr. President, it has everything to do with the public disclosure that should be expected when we are looking at a 200 -- this year nearly $270 billion budget.

With an increase in spending in the billions year over year, what kind of accountability do we expect to have and should the public expect? And is this the time when we should be loosening that kind of oversight?

Small not-for-profits, large not-for-profits really have very little to do with this issue. It's how much they're willing to expose themselves to scrutiny. So you can have a very large not-for-profit that chose not to involve themselves in lobbying because they didn't want to go through the effort.

But we've just -- through this bill would increase that threshold and double it from 5,000 to 10,000 just because we don't want to be a burden to small not-for-profits.

But it has nothing to do with the size. It has to do with the scrutiny and oversight that this law was initially supposed to provide.

I'm concerned, although the spirit -- I'm concerned that we will have lobbying efforts from multiple 501(c)(3)s, each one lobbying up to that $10,000 threshold, aggregating it in order to influence public policy -- again, without having the necessary oversight.

And here's the reality. If you want to come here, if you want to influence policy, if you want to use your not-for-profit money or for-profit money to influence how we spend money in the State Capitol, taxpayer funds, yeah, you should be open to that scrutiny. Why not?

Why should we be lessening it just for the sake of those 33, which miraculously I guarantee you will multiply as we lessen that threshold. We're basically inviting people to go out there and spend money lobbying up to $10,000. And why would we do that without providing any oversight at all?

It's bad policy, Mr. President. I'll be voting no.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you Senator Martins.

Are there any other Senators wishing to be heard?

Seeing and hearing none, debate is closed.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: We've agreed to restore this bill to the noncontroversial calendar.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is restored to the noncontroversial calendar.

Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 5. This act shall take effect on the 60th day after it shall have become a law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Mayer to explain her vote.

SENATOR MAYER: Thank you, Mr. President.

I find it somewhat concerning that this great fear about these small not-for-profits -- what I call small, and I think everyone would agree most of them are quite small -- is somehow a travesty to those who contribute.

In the first place, this original limit that we have of 5,000 was enacted 21 years ago in the Laws of 2005. I would say, given the current rate of inflation, any change, a modest change that affects 33 not-for-profits is perfectly reasonable and respective of the fact that people contribute and don't want their money to be spent on the hiring of a specialist to file the forms.

Let me tell you the names of a number of the groups that fall within this. Adirondack North Country Association. Epilepsy Foundation of Northeastern New York. National Multiple Sclerosis Society of New York. A Place for Rover, Inc. St. Michael's Protestant Episcopal Church. Catholic Charities Community Services of the Archdiocese of New York. Friends of the Earth. Unique People's Services. Justice Innovation. Chautauqua County Humane Society. Mount Pleasant Cottage School Union Free School District. Cerebral Palsy Associations of New York State, Inc.

Of the very many organizations that are required to file, these 33 that I have before me should not be burdened by the requirement of filing simply because they hire someone to come up to Albany and work on one bill in a modest amount of time and spend less than $10,000.

This makes sense. This is timely. And this is absolutely supportive of both the small not-for-profits and those that contribute to them.

I vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator

Mayer to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Rhoads to explain his vote.

SENATOR RHOADS: Thank you, Mr. President.

Many of my colleagues have made excellent points on this side of the aisle. What concerns me is the apparent hypocrisy that's coming out of this chamber with respect to transparency.

Less than a month ago, with lightning speed, we passed through the Senate -- and it also passed through the Assembly, landing language on the Governor's desk -- a bill requiring 501(c)(3)s and really even private individuals who simply want to come up and express their opinion with respect to nominations that come before this chamber -- not even policy, nominations that come before this chamber -- to go through the expense of actually filing as a lobbying organization. That was incredibly important for the purposes of transparency.

Yet here we are turning around and saying groups that actually spend money on lobbyists that will actually show up at campaign fundraisers, and actually donate to individual politicians, now we're saying, Nah, we really don't need the transparency for that.

It is nonsense. Either we are for transparency or we are against it. And it seems as though the Majority in this chamber decides that it wants to pick winners and losers as to when disclosure for the people of the State of New York is important and when it's not.

I'll be voting no on this legislation. Thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Rhoads to be recorded in the negative.

Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 450, voting in the negative are Senators Ashby, Borrello, Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick, Chan, Gallivan, Griffo, Helming, Lanza, Martins, Mattera, Murray, Oberacker, O'Mara, Ortt, Palumbo, Rhoads, Rolison, Stec, Tedisco, Walczyk, Weber and Weik. Also Senator Skoufis.

Ayes, 35. Nays, 23.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 454, Senate Print 2708A, by Senator May, an act to amend the Public Service Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Walczyk, why do you rise?

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, would the sponsor yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator May, do you yield?

SENATOR MAY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President.

This bill passed the Energy Committee last month, then was amended pretty significantly. Can you describe your reasoning for the changes?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President.

As my colleague is no doubt aware, this bill was vetoed last year. And in the process, in the ensuing year, a lot of additional transmission technologies have been tested all over the country.

And so we expanded this bill to include a number of additional -- rather than just the grid-enhancing technologies that were discussed last time, advanced transmission technologies in general are comprehended in this bill.

SENATOR WALCZYK: And would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President.

So I'm seeing -- this was a NYSERDA study bill before. Now utilities have to make an implementation plan, they have to both study and make an implementation plan to upgrade their infrastructure and their transmission under the new version of this bill that's changed pretty significantly in the last few weeks.

Who pays for that plan?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. Another part of the veto message last year was to say that they were already doing these things. And what we know is that they are not actually taking into account these advanced transmission technologies.

Right now ratepayers pay a lot to utilities for their increasing investments in new infrastructure, which is a main way that utilities make money for their shareholders. They don't spend nearly enough time or energy on trying to make the grid more efficient.

And that's the purpose of this, is to move electrons faster and more efficiently to get rid of some of the bottlenecks that drive costs up. So while there would be costs associated with this, the savings would be significantly more, estimated in the tens of millions of dollars a year to ratepayers around the state.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: So who would pay for that plan?

SENATOR MAY: The savings would be much greater than any investments that would be made. But ...

(Pause.)

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. The cost of the studies is estimated at about $250,000. But as I said, the returns are in the millions. And that would be a savings for ratepayers.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President. This also requires an implementation plan. And who would pay for the upgrades once it's implemented?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. The implementation plan would -- is not required to be fulfilled, is my understanding.

These are voluntary. But the idea

is we want the utilities to be doing this kind of study so that they can save money for ratepayers, as I said before.

So again, it will be voluntary if the -- if there are outlays.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President.

Page 3, line 1: "The commission shall review implementation plans submitted under paragraph A of this subdivision and, where consistent with the public interest, direct the timely deployment of the technologies identified in such implementation plans."

If the PSC is directing a utility to implement their plan, how is that voluntary?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. So these studies will be done in the context of a rate-increase request.

And the idea is to get them to do, as it says, consistent with the public interest, investments that will actually save money compared to the large-scale infrastructure investments that they would be proposing otherwise.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: And through you, Mr. President. So just to get it on the record, the public interest would not include CLCPA, any guidance there, it would -- so you're saying this bill is specifically targeted at cost effectiveness.

This plan could only be directed by the PSC to be implemented by a utility if it actually reduces the cost for the ratepayer? Is that the case?

SENATOR MAY: Through you

Mr. President, yes.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: This bill still includes a NYSERDA study that was vetoed when you -- and that study is due a year after the implementation of the law. The utility piece also goes into effect a year after the implementation.

Why would we pay for a NYSERDA study -- which is also paid for by ratepayers -- at the same time we're expecting the utilities to create an implementation plan, do their own study, also paid for by the ratepayers? Why does the NYSERDA piece still exist in your bill if they're both running concurrently and on the same timeline?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. So the idea is NYSERDA is creating criteria for future rate-case implementation plans. The rate-case implementation plans would trigger the actual PSC implementation of this.

So either way, we are trying to insert into all of these processes cost savings that are not being realized right now.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Why would you need NYSERDA criteria if this is optional for utilities to do?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. These -- there is a large array of these technologies. And figuring out which ones are appropriate in which areas of New York State, in which -- to which utility systems in New York State, to which -- and just which technologies as they are rapidly evolving are the most cost-effective to implement -- is something that should be done overall so that it can be applicable to the specific implementation.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President.

As you mentioned earlier, this bill was vetoed in the past, and from that veto message 119, adding this new requirement along with an additional reporting requirement creates a duplicative and expensive process for utilities and ultimately ratepayers at the conclusion of that veto message.

On page 2 of your bill, utilities would -- in their implementation plan, they would own and operate battery storage facilities. Am I reading that correctly?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President, battery storage is one of the options that is comprehended under advanced transmission technologies. And so that could be an option.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: And through you, Mr. President, utilities must implement plans for data center growth at the cost of ratepayers as well?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President, yes.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Does the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: How does having ratepayers pay for utilities to upgrade the grid to prepare for data center growth, how does that reduce the cost for ratepayers?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. First of all, upgrade the grid is a loaded term, I would say, because we're not talking about building whole new, extremely expensive transmission infrastructure -- which may be necessary in New York State, but we are trying to avoid some of those huge expenses by directing the PSC and the utilities to find cheaper ways to move those electrons around the system.

Which may include any number of software and hardware interventions in the transmission system as it exists now.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I will.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Data centers specifically are known to use a lot of power. That's a lot of the concerns of ratepayers across the State of New York, many of them saying, Do not bring data centers here, our prices are already 50 percent higher than the national average. We can't afford to bring these things online until we create some actual production and reduce the cost.

So that's why I pointed out in your bill the increased flexibility and rationality in long-term planning, including for data center growth and other major load growth.

How can we read that line in your bill, the requirement that utilities under this law be directed by the PSC to implement data center growth in the State of New York -- how could ratepayers anticipate that that's going to lower their energy bill?

(Pause.)

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. This does not stipulate data center growth.

It just means that there needs to be a plan for growth in general, which we anticipate to be accelerating because of things like AI and data centers and -- and, let's say, the Micron project in Central New York.

There are a lot of pressures on the

grid right now and a lot of pressure, as I've said multiple times, to build out a lot of new, expensive infrastructure. This is directing the various players to figure out if there are ways to do it more cheaply. And efficiently.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, briefly on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Walczyk on the bill.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Yeah, on page 2 of your bill it absolutely does stipulate -- line 36, "including for data center growth." It is absolutely stipulated in this bill.

Forcing utilities to pay for upgrades in the area where a data center may be preparing for that growth, that would be at the cost of the ratepayers. This bill would require them to bring it into their next rate case when they're asking for an increase in how much your bill is going to go up and how much money they're going to get additionally out of New Yorkers that are paying for electric and natural gas in our state -- would require them to pay more in order to prepare for data center growth.

At least that's how it's written. I

didn't write the bill.

And with that, Mr. President, would the sponsor yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I would.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President. How do you expect giving our utility companies -- NYSEG, National Grid, Con Ed -- more control over power and battery storage will lower energy bills?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. Let me first address the previous comments, which is this bill does not stipulate data center growth in New York. It just recognizes that data centers are growing everywhere and putting pressure on our grid here in New York as elsewhere in the country. So planning for them is only sensible.

In terms of battery storage, right now one of the biggest expenses to utility ratepayers comes from peak energy that we -- when there is a heat wave or some other peak demand event, the utilities are buying energy at very high costs, usually from out of state, and passing that cost on to ratepayers.

Battery storage allows them to bank the energy against those kinds of events so that they can bring those peak costs down and save ratepayers an enormous amount of money.

This is something we heard last week about -- there were several debates about utility-related bills, and someone mentioned that utility rates are lower in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania also has old utility infrastructure, but they use these technologies. And it has brought down rates as much as 40 percent in some places.

So all of these technologies together have the impact of shifting us away from peak energy costs and distributing those costs in ways that they are much lower for the ratepayers.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: I do.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The

sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: How much -- if your bill becomes law, how much can utility ratepayers expect their energy bills to go down?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President. There are various estimates. As I mentioned before, tens of millions of dollars a year are one of the estimates we've heard. As I said, in Pennsylvania they've seen 40 percent decreases in some markets.

I -- I can't say exactly. But I can say that this issue of peak energy, especially now that global fossil fuel energy costs have gone up so dramatically, that the savings could be very significant.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Through you, Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAY: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR WALCZYK: I just want to go back to an earlier part of our discussion --

through you, Mr. President.

The cost-effectiveness, if the PSC is looking at this, would that include just specific to ratepayers? Or would they think about global costs, health benefits, the planet, carbon emissions and the impact on human life and the cost savings in some of the ways that individuals have calculated the costs?

I know it can get pretty funny here. But I just want to be sure, especially as we're establishing legislative intent, you're talking about specifically the PSC cannot direct utilities to implement a plan unless it directly affects lowering cost rates. Am I reading you correctly?

SENATOR MAY: Through you, Mr. President, that's correct.

And there is an enumeration of some of the considerations that can be taken.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Thank you.

Mr. President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Walczyk on the bill.

SENATOR WALCZYK: New York State's energy prices are 50 percent higher than the national average. And you might ask: Could it get worse? Yup. In the 1990s we had some of the highest rates in the nation. Believe it or not, we were even less competitive in the 1990s, and we didn't even have the CLCPA yet. All the green-energy subsidy that you're seeing on your bills right now did not exist, and we were leading nationally in high energy costs anyway.

Then, utilities had a monopoly so they could control both production and distribution. And what we did is the Public Service Commission -- believe it or not, there was a time they looked out for the ratepayers at the Public Service Commission -- they decoupled production and delivery. So our utility companies became in charge of the lines.

Other independent power producers became competitive, because they had to compete through the NYISO for the daily rates of producing energy for our grid. It made us more competitive.

This bill will force utilities to raise rates. It allows them to monopolize battery storage. It forces them to raise rates to bring on data center growth. And the NYSERDA study that was vetoed for being duplicative and costing ratepayers money that they were already spending on these things, still exists in this bill.

So the ratepayers will be getting hit twice. Their utility company, when they go to the PSC with a rate case, will have to come up with a plan ready to be implemented, ready for the PSC to tell them, yes, do this plan for more batteries and data-center growth and upgrading your transmission lines the way that we said.

At the same time, NYSERDA will be taking both your tax money and your ratepayer money and be studying the thing that they're already in charge of doing at the utility end.

Could it get worse? Yeah. If you support bills like this, rates will continue to go up.

I'll be voting no and hope my colleagues will do the same.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Are there any other Senators wishing to be heard?

Seeing and hearing none, debate is closed.

Senator Liu.

SENATOR LIU: Mr. President, upon consent, we've agreed to restore this bill to the noncontroversial calendar.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: On consent, the bill is restored to the noncontroversial calendar.

Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 3. This act shall take effect on the 90th day after it shall have become a law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator May to explain her vote. Excuse me.

Senator Harckham to explain his vote.

SENATOR HARCKHAM: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I rise to thank Senator May for this important piece of legislation.

I won't even address the just utter fabrication that we just heard as to what this bill represents, an utter fabrication about the

CLCPA.

What I will say quite simply is there are several studies out there that show our grid operates at 50 percent efficiency. Fifty percent efficiency. We talk a lot in this chamber about getting taxpayers their value for their money. Any business or any system operating at 50 percent efficiency is not good for ratepayers or taxpayers.

All this bill is saying is let's study how we can utilize the new technologies the rest of the country and the rest of the world are using to make the grid more efficient, more cost-effective, and less expensive. And the rest we heard was folly.

I strongly support this bill. I thank the sponsor. I'll be voting aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Harckham to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Skoufis to explain his vote.

SENATOR SKOUFIS: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

Whether you want to use the word "fabrication" -- I was going to use "mischaracterization." That's a lot of what we heard during this debate.

Unfortunately, this bill is very simple, it's very modest.  It requires a study. It can require a study; it doesn't even have to require a study when there's a capital improvement being sought.  It requires an analysis -- it can require an analysis.

But to be clear, this bill does not in any way, shape or form promote data centers. And to be clear, as the sponsor noted in her remarks, this just is an acknowledgment that data centers are cropping up throughout New York State.  And they pose a severe challenge, and this bill presents a modest way of perhaps reconsidering how to approach this type of challenge.

I encourage my colleague from across the aisle to instead spend some time on, for example, what we heard reported this morning, just today.  And that is that we have an IDA in this state, the Rockland County IDA, that issued $77 million in tax breaks -- half of which, by the way, would have been state revenue.

For what?  To support, to promote a data center that creates one single job.  The largest per-job subsidy -- not just in New York State history, in our nation's history.

We should spend less time mischaracterizing a good bill like this. And if we actually care about our rates and actually care about our grid and how much energy is being pulled from it by these data centers, I suggest we start there instead.

I vote yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Skoufis to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Walczyk to explain his vote.

SENATOR WALCZYK: Thank you, Mr. President. Maybe I should have kept us on debate a little bit longer.

When the commission reviews the plan, there's also a line in this bill that says "direct the timely deployment of the technologies identified in the plan." That's not an option. And part of that plan includes data-center growth.

So let me just be clear. I'll be a no, Mr. President. But I don't like to say that it's mischaracterized. I didn't write this bill. Those are the changes that you're writing into law today.

I'll be voting no. Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Walczyk to be recorded in the negative.

Senator May to explain her vote.

SENATOR MAY: Thank you, Mr. President.

And I want to thank my colleagues who spoke in favor of this bill.

New York State and the entire Northeast has an energy affordability problem because our grid is so old and desperately in need of upgrades of various kinds. We only hear from the utilities now about building out more of the grid because that is where they make money that they can share with their shareholders.

And when we ask them to be more efficient in their use of the grid to employ technologies that will actually deliver energy more cheaply to their ratepayers, they are typically pretty resistant of that.

Which is why you do need to either goad them or require them to at least study the idea of what could be more efficient. Especially in a -- in a proceeding where they're proposing a rate hike, it is only appropriate for us to direct them and give them some guidance about the various technologies that could be used to make a difference in this case.

I think this is the only responsible way to treat our ratepayers, to make sure that we are directing the people who are delivering the energy to know and study and, if and when possible, employ the latest technologies that can maybe sense where the grid is hotter and cooler and direct the electrons to move in the right direction so that -- by the path of least resistance. That is the whole idea here.

And it -- it works. It is working in many parts of the country.

I suspect there is a subtext here about battery storage that we didn't pursue very much in debate. But I just want to say New York State takes very seriously the fact that there have been some battery storage fires in the past.

The Governor put together a panel of experts from all over the country to study that problem and come up with new fire safety codes for battery storage in New York State that are now the strongest in the entire country.

And I believe that is one of many technologies that are available to us to actually steer our energy costs away from the high peak energies that we are all paying for right now.

So I'm proud of this bill. I hope that it -- I hope that it will overcome the veto that occurred last time. I hope that all of the evidence of how much good advanced transmission technologies are doing elsewhere in the country will really move the needle and convince the Governor this time that it's worth signing this bill into law.

I vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator May to be recorded in the affirmative.

Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 454, voting in the negative are Senators Ashby, Borrello, Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick, Griffo, Helming, Lanza, Martins, Mattera, Murray, Oberacker, O'Mara, Ortt, Rhoads, Stec, Walczyk and Weik. Also Senators Tedisco and Gallivan.

Ayes, 40. Nays, 18.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 654, Senate Print 2078, by Senator Mayer, an act to amend the Labor Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Murray, why do you rise?

SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. President.

Would the sponsor yield for a few questions, please?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you. Through you, Mr. President.

So under this section -- I'm just trying to get some clarification as to the process. Under this, under Section 2, subdivision 1, section (f) and (i), it says: Upon notification that an employer has been convicted of failing to pay the wages of an employee pursuant to subdivision 1 of Section 198A of this article, failing to pay minimum wage or overtime pay, pursuant to

Section 662 of this article, or "Wage Theft" under Section 155.05 of the Penal Law.

It's saying "conviction." It's my understanding that under the Penal Law, that would be criminal. But the first two would be Labor Law, which would be an administrative hearing. Is that correct? Or does it go -- everything go to criminal court?

(Pause.)

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President. The sections that you were referring to refer to convictions of criminal penalties under the Labor Law.

So the person is convicted in a criminal court of violations of the Labor Law. And that would prompt the next part of the process.

SENATOR MURRAY: Through you, Mr. President, would the sponsor continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MAYER: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MURRAY: So for clarification, they will go through the criminal court process completely and have to be convicted. It's not an administrative hearing through the Department of Labor. Is that correct?

SENATOR MAYER: Through you, Mr. President, yes, that's correct.

SENATOR MURRAY: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. President, on the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you. Senator Murray on the bill.

SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you, Senator Mayer, for that clarification.

My concern here is only that there remains some confusion. I'm a little concerned about the smaller businesses. Over the past couple of years, under Labor Law Section 190 and 191, we've had the frequency of pay issue, the issue of manual labor. And when those claims were filed, attached to that many times was wage theft, which isn't really attached to that.

I understand what the attorneys were trying to do, but it had a terrible impact on small businesses throughout the state.

Now, in the last budget, either last year or the year before, we recognized that and took some action to minimize the penalties to the companies, because the confusion still remains under exactly what qualifies as manual labor in regard to the frequency of pay.

My concern here is we never did clarify that. The commissioner never actually -- I have a bill that actually would require the commissioner to clarify exactly which positions qualify as manual labor for the purposes of paying the employees.

Let me be clear. Wage theft is abhorrent. It should never occur. If these workers work hard, they earn their pay, they deserve to be paid properly, period. And if an employer doesn't do that, on purpose, then they need to be convicted and penalized, and they should have their license stripped.

My concern is with the confusion still there under the frequency of pay issue, there can be mistakes. And so I want to be careful that we're not under a first incident where it might have truly been a mistake that someone is now going to lose their license.

We already are one of the most business-unfriendly states in the entire country. I don't want to add to that.

So for that reason I'd like to see a little more discussion on this, a little more clarity, and really I'd like the commissioner to step forward and clarify the frequency of pay issue before we go this step.

So I'll be voting no.  Thank you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY:   Thank you, Senator Murray.

Are there any other Senators wishing to be heard?

Seeing and hearing none, debate is closed.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS:   Mr. President, we've agreed to restore this bill to the noncontroversial calendar.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY:   This bill has been -- we have agreed to restore this bill to the noncontroversial calendar.

Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY:   Section 8.  This

act shall take effect immediately.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Mayer to explain her veto.

SENATOR MAYER: Thank you, Mr. President. And thank you to my colleague for asking questions.

This bill has nothing to do with a mistake. This bill has to do when people, employers, particularly employers who disadvantage other small companies, don't pay people what they're owed and there are criminal charges, criminal charges filed by a district attorney.

This bill was prompted by a case in my county where individuals tried to get the money they were owed administratively from a small contractor. In May '22, this contractor was arrested for failing to pay wages. He changed the name of his company and then was arrested a second time and a third time, each time failing to pay wages. And there were criminal charges. He changed the name of his business while the first two cases were pending and avoided recognition as the defendant in these separate wage-theft cases. These are criminal cases, not administrative cases.

Now he has been charged a fourth time by the district attorney of Westchester County -- thank you to her.

These individuals are people who are paid such small amounts -- let me just tell you how small the amounts are.

One employee was hired at a daily rate of $160. He's owed $8,400 for work over three years.

Another employee was to be paid $900 a week for demolition, painting, carpentry and drywall. He was either not paid or his paychecks bounced, for a total of 19,000.

We are talking about working people thinking they are going to get paid for a day's work, an honest wage. They have done everything right. They went to the Department of Labor, they went to the district attorney. The district attorney -- one district attorney brought three cases; another one brought a fourth case.

There was simply not a way to ensure

this doesn't happen. And it really hurts the other small businesses who basically, in my opinion, should call out this kind of contractor rather than defending him. They should call out these bad actors.

This bill actually sets a penalty and gives courts the power to stop them from doing business. We need to protect our neighbors who are doing these low-wage jobs, make sure they get paid for a day's work. That's what this bill does.

I vote aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Mayer to be recorded in the affirmative.

Senator Murray to explain his vote.

SENATOR MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. President.

And in that scenario, I agree with you a thousand percent. And in most, I would say, I would agree a thousand percent. As I said, there is no place for those types of bad actors, absolutely no place.

Now let me give you an example that happened in my district. Two sisters saved all their lives, worked through fast food restaurants, saved up enough money to finally open their own Dairy Queen establishment. They got caught up in this frequency of pay issue. On top of it, wage theft charges were put on top, which really didn't apply. But when it went through the system, they got caught up in it.

It didn't get to the criminal court where they were convicted because their attorneys urged them, Settle everything and we'll agree to drop this, that and the other.

My concern is maybe we could make the language -- hone it in a little bit to protect the people that truly are trying to do it right, that aren't trying to rip off their workers, that aren't trying to be bad actors. And it still can happen, in this case.

What I'd like to see is that we hone the language a little bit more to protect our small business owners as well. Because if we do take the licenses away in a case where a mistake was made, we're putting people out of work as well. So I'd like there to be a little more discussion on this bill.

Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator

Murray to be recorded in the negative.

Senator Martins to explain his vote.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to support the bill. I want to thank the sponsor for the bill.

Look. We have a tremendous problem in New York State when it comes to wages, when it comes to paying people what they are due, whether it's certified payrolls on public jobs and holding them to the task, or whether it is people who time and again open businesses to close them just to avoid liability.

And we see it not only in the wage area, we see it also with workers' comp, also involving employers where they routinely will close their businesses in order to avoid liability.

So this is a step in the right direction. I would love, Mr. President, to see legislation on this floor -- and hopefully somebody will think about this -- where we actually hold those business owners, corporate owners, personally liable for these wages. Not just removing their licenses, not just suspending their licenses.

But when someone steals from their employees, let's hold them personally accountable so they can't just keep creating and opening new businesses in order to avoid the responsibility they have to those who work for them.

I'll be voting aye.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Martins to be recorded in the affirmative.

Announce the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 654, voting in the negative are Senators Borrello, Gallivan, Murray, Oberacker, Stec and Weik.

Ayes, 52. Nays, 6.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

THE SECRETARY: Calendar Number 672, Senate Print 2546, by Senator Myrie, an act to amend the Real Property Actions and Proceedings Law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Martins, why do you rise?

SENATOR MARTINS: Yes, Mr. President, if the sponsor would yield for a few questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Senator, I know that the bill deals with abandoned properties, multifamily dwellings in our communities.

How is it determined that a property is abandoned?

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. So this bill would amend a section of law where the process is if you initiate a foreclosure proceeding, that you would then stop the city or locality from taking possession of that property.

And the gap that this bill is trying to amend is that you cannot use the initiation of that proceeding to prevent you from making the necessary repairs. The city, the locality initiates the proceeding to try to possess that property because it has fallen into disrepair.

And so to answer your question

directly, it is a determination between the city and the locality on what disrepair means.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Mr. President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: Is there any definition in the statute or in the underlying statute that clarifies what criteria the municipality should use in determining whether a property is abandoned, whether it's just vacant?

And frankly, is it the same thing, vacant and abandoned, in your mind?

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. On the first question, outside of this section of law, disrepair is defined as -- or abandoned, rather, is -- (pause).

Injury to life, safety and health is the standard that is used when making that determination.

And to your second question on

whether abandoned is the same or different than vacant, I do think that there is a distinction, but that distinction is made by the locality.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Mr. President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: Is there any requirement that the municipality determine that the property is actually vacant before they initiate a proceeding? Or is it specifically with regard to the state of repair of the property?

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. Yes, the city does have to make a determination on whether or not someone is present.

It is subject to a vacate order, and that vacate order is often accompanied by a determination that there was some danger to life, health, et cetera. And so there is a process to make sure that that's not the case.

I think part of what you may be getting at is for owner-occupied homes or multi-dwellings, what sort of goes into that analysis.

And I will say for the record that New York amended for not multi-dwellings but for one-to-four-home dwellings in 2016, what we call colloquially the Zombie Law, that has brought down the amount of disrepair in these types of homes. This was done in response to the 2008 housing crisis, where there was a lot of abandonment by banks for this category of homes.

This is trying to meet that standard and that gap for multi-dwellings. We have some of the same problems, particularly in New York City, with a host of multi-dwelling buildings that have been either abandoned or there is confusion around the ownership, and they have subsequently had many, many code violations that are currently being litigated and gone after.

And this is an attempt to make this process as clear as possible, but also have someone be responsible and not be able to use at court to protect them from making repairs.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Mr. President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So as I understand it, the law currently allows for the municipality to deem a property abandoned, but then couldn't be stopped from acquiring the property if a lender starts a foreclosure proceeding.

And this would change that to require the lender to actually do certain things in addition to starting a foreclosure proceeding, right?

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President, that's correct, mostly.

So it's not just that the procedure would be stopped, it would give the option for them to appoint a receiver. And if that receiver does not take the appropriate action within 90 days, then the city can come in and claim ownership.

SENATOR MARTINS: Through you, Mr. President, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So let's say the lender -- and when we're talking about a lender we're dealing with anyone, not just institutional lenders. It could be somebody who just lent money and is secured by that property.

If the lender receives a notice from their municipality that the property has been abandoned, does it require that the lender or that the borrower be in foreclosure and that the property be in foreclosure or in arrears if they're being paid on their debt, on their mortgage? Is that a requirement of this, in order for the municipality to take action?

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. Give me one second.

Through you, Mr. President. It

would not always be a requirement that there be some issue of payment. It could be the case -- this does make reference to the mortgagee or the lienholder.

But the underlying principle here is to ensure that the repairs are done and that the lienholder or the mortgagee would have had to invoke this sort of protection provided by the law when a foreclosure proceeding has been commenced.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Mr. President, through you, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So if the property owner is current on their mortgage obligation, making their payments every month, what would be the basis for a lender to foreclose in order to prevent perhaps losing a property?

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. Just to clarify the question, are you saying in the event that someone is present in the home and making payments or the payments are being otherwise made?

SENATOR MARTINS: I'll clarify.

Mr. President, through you, if I can continue to --

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: By all means.

SENATOR MARTINS: If you have a property owner that continues to make their payments on a mortgage and a municipality determines, whether correctly or incorrectly, that the property is abandoned so as to start this sequence, there's a notice that goes to the lender.

They're being paid on their mortgage, and yet this would require them to start a foreclosure proceeding in order to protect their interest in the property -- that is, the amount that they lent -- or risk losing the property.

What would their basis be for a foreclosure proceeding if they'd been paid on their mortgage?

(Pause.)

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. So two things.

One, if the lienholder, having received the payments, and the person, the entity making the payments, believes that there was some impropriety in this determination, the lienholder has an option to take possession and make those repairs themselves.

But perhaps more importantly, and the policy point is, if there are conditions that are posing a threat to health, safety, imposing some danger to life in that respect, we're saying that all of the tools of government should be utilized and to impose some sort of pressure to ensure that these repairs are made.

And that's why the options aren't just that the city can take possession, but that there can be repairs made by the lienholder themselves.

SENATOR MARTINS: Through you, Mr. President, if the sponsor would continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So that is -- that's part of my concern, Senator, in the fact that if the person or institution that lent the money that's secured by the property has been paid, there is no basis, I would think, other than the document -- the mortgage -- and the terms between them and the person they lent money to, that would allow for them to foreclose.

I didn't see anything in this bill that would give them the right as a mortgagee to actually be able to intervene -- notwithstanding the fact that they were made whole and have been paid -- and actually take possession of the property. Unless I missed it.

Can you speak to that?

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. I'm just going to read in the bill, starting on line 17, where it says -- and this is the amendment -- "takes possession of the premises as provided in the mortgage and brings the building into compliance."

And so within the four corners of what the contract had been, that is what allows for this possession-taking.

But I take your point that you are concerned about what sort of pressures are being exerted even outside of that contractual agreement. And I think that is a policy difference that we have, in that we are hoping to exert pressure to get repairs done that are posing threats to people's health and safety.

SENATOR MARTINS: Through you, Mr. President, if the sponsor will continue to yield.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Will the sponsor yield?

SENATOR MYRIE: Yes.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The sponsor yields.

SENATOR MARTINS: So let's say we have a private transaction, an individual decides to lend a friend some money so that they can buy a property, and they agree they're going to put a mortgage on the property, the terms of the mortgage are standard, you pay, the person pays, and as a result there is no need to foreclose.

Standard terms in a mortgage don't normally allow for foreclosure absent a default in payment. And therefore, in the four corners of the document, there is no mechanism for that individual -- in this case I'm framing it as a private individual -- to actually intervene in order to protect their investment.

So I'm questioning whether or not there should be, in the absence of something within the four corners of the document -- that traditionally doesn't include a provision such as this -- allowing for them to intervene.

Shouldn't something be in this bill that would allow them that opportunity to do so? Because the risk here is that they will actually lose the money that they invested and were counting on to be repaid.

SENATOR MYRIE: Through you, Mr. President. I think, if I'm understanding my colleague, the trouble and concern that you have is with not necessarily the fact that repairs need to be made, but that the triggering process in which the mortgage payer would be subject to foreclosure because the repairs have not been made, are extracontractual. And that there should be some other mechanism to trigger the repair-making process.

Did I understand that correctly? Through you, Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Martins.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you, Senator.

On the bill.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Senator Martins on the bill.

SENATOR MARTINS: And that's -- that's precisely the point. And I thank you for clarifying that, because we can identify the problem.

We all have zombie buildings in our communities that become a blight on the community. In the past we have adopted legislation here that has allowed and empowered municipalities to intervene, spend money, acquire the property, make those repairs and put those costs on the property as liens. And eventually, when the property is sold, the municipality will get that money back.

There are ways of being able to do that where you can ask the municipality to actually intervene in order to protect the property, protect the community, and to make the property safe.

And obviously, Mr. President, there are issues with that having to do with privacy issues, property ownership issues where, anytime somebody walks onto somebody else's property, there are concerns there.

But we all understand, because we've seen it, that there are zombie properties in our communities that we want to do something about.

The question is, who is the right person or entity that should be expected to do something about it?

Now, it's great for us to be able to identify groups, identify the problem -- but then we point to somebody and say, Now we're going to make it your problem in order for you to fix it.

And sometimes that's where we go astray. Because as well-intentioned as we may be, the idea we're just going to pick somebody out of the air and say that's the person who's going to be responsible for fixing this mess, is perhaps misguided.

Now, we all think about lenders in the context of banks and they've got money and large financial institutions. But that's not always the case. And even when it is the case, that's not what they signed up for.

Now, we did pass legislation in this body that says that we do have situations such as this, the bank -- when the borrower, the property owner falls behind on payments -- has to go into inspections, make sure it's occupied. If it's not occupied, they have a responsibility to start foreclosure proceedings. And they have now a responsibility to maintain and secure the property. That already exists.

But now we're going a step further, and we're saying even if that property is not in default, if the person continues to make their payments and the municipality determines that the property -- for their own reasons, Mr. President, is abandoned, which isn't clear -- now, it may be, you know, that we have a different concept of gardens. We've had debates on this floor about that as well, whether we have natural plantings as opposed to grass, and how we maintain properties.

But if the municipality determines that the property is abandoned, all of a sudden we have a responsibility on the lender, be they institutional or private, to now have to do something when there has been no default under that mortgage. And they have to start a foreclosure proceeding.

On what terms, Mr. President? I don't know. Because the person's making the payments on that mortgage, and yet it's now their responsibility because if the municipality takes the property, they're out of luck. And the money that they invested in order to -- and secured with that property is at risk.

So although I understand the legislation, I understand the intent, I'm just questioning whether or not the group that we have identified in order to put pressure, in order to resolve this issue, is actually the group that we should be considering in the context of what we currently have in the law.

And so perhaps rather than just picking a bank or a financial institution and deciding that's the person we're going to make pay -- why? Because. Because that's really the answer, right? Why are they responsible? Because we said so.

Perhaps they're not the right entity because they don't have the ability to intervene unless there's actually been a default under the document.

And so, Mr. President, as we have in the past, perhaps this is another opportunity for us to reconsider this line and maybe look at empowering our local municipalities and allowing them to go in there and intervene, and making sure that they can secure any expense that they have with regard to securing the property, even going so far as demolishing the property in order to clear a blight.

And they are able to then secure that with a lien on the property, so when the property is eventually sold, they can recoup that money and actually provide protection for the local community in real terms.

They make the decision that it's abandoned. Let them then take the next step to actually secure the property and make it right.

So, Senator, I appreciate the bill. I appreciate the sentiment. I just think we may be slightly off. I'm more than happy to work with you, if you're willing, in terms of looking for an alternative.

But under the current construct, Mr. President, I'd have to vote no. Thank you.

Thank you, Senator.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Thank you, Senator Martins.

Are there any other Senators wishing to be heard?

Seeing and hearing none, debate is closed.

Senator Gianaris.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Mr. President, we have also agreed to restore this bill to the noncontroversial calendar.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill will be restored, upon consent, to the noncontroversial calendar.

Read the last section.

THE SECRETARY: Section 2. This act shall take effect on the 120th day after it shall have become a law.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Call the roll.

(The Secretary called the roll.)

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: Announce

the results.

THE SECRETARY: In relation to Calendar 672, voting in the negative are Senators Ashby, Borrello, Canzoneri-Fitzpatrick, Chan, Gallivan, Griffo, Helming, Lanza, Martins, Mattera, Murray, Oberacker, O'Mara, Ortt, Palumbo, Rhoads, Rolison, Stec, Tedisco, Walczyk, Weber and Weik.

Ayes, 36. Nays, 22.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The bill is passed.

Senator Gianaris, that completes the reading of today's controversial calendar.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Is there any further business at the desk?

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: There is no further business at the desk.

SENATOR GIANARIS: Can I have my colleagues' attention for a moment.

There were a series of committee meetings that were scheduled for early this afternoon. They are being rescheduled as follows.

Insurance and Social Services will now be meeting at 2:30. The Housing and

Investigations Committees will now be meeting at 3:00 p.m.

And that is because there will be an immediate meeting of the Majority Conference in Room 332.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: The committee meetings were rescheduled as noted. Please listen to and reach out to your respective committee chairs.

And there will be an immediate meeting of the Majority Conference in Room 332.

SENATOR GIANARIS: I move to adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 21st, at 3:00 p.m.

ACTING PRESIDENT BAILEY: On motion, the Senate stands adjourned until Tuesday, April 21st, at 3:00 p.m.

And it's playoff time, so go New York, go New York, go!

(Whereupon, the Senate adjourned at 1:19 p.m.)