

No. 91
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
102nd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2023

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, October 19, 2023.

10:00 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President, Lieutenant Governor Garlin D. Gilchrist II.

The roll was called by the Secretary of the Senate, who announced that a quorum was present.

Albert—present
Anthony—present
Bayer—present
Bellino—present
Brinks—present
Bumstead—present
Camilleri—present
Cavanagh—present
Chang—present
Cherry—present
Daley—present
Damoose—present
Geiss—present

Hauck—present
Hertel—present
Hoitenga—present
Huizenga—present
Irwin—present
Johnson—present
Klinefelt—present
Lauwers—present
Lindsey—present
McBroom—present
McCann—present
McDonald Rivet—present
McMorrow—present

Moss—present
Nesbitt—present
Outman—present
Polehanki—present
Runestad—present
Santana—present
Shink—present
Singh—present
Theis—present
Victory—present
Webber—present
Wojno—present

Senator Ruth A. Johnson of the 24th District offered the following invocation:

Heavenly Father, as we stand before You today in this chamber, help us to receive Your gifts of wisdom, hope, courage, and love. Work within our hearts, that we may do Your work here on Earth, for the betterment of the people of Michigan who have elected us to serve in the Senate.

Lord, You have loved us all of our days. Your word tells us in Psalm 139:13-16: “For you created my inmost being; you knit me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you because I am fearfully and wonderfully made; your works are wonderful, I know that full well. My frame was not hidden from you when I was made in the secret place...Your eyes saw my unformed body; all the days ordained for me were written in your book before one of them came to be.” How powerful and incredible this is.

God, Your love for us is unceasing; help us to know Your love to others. Your mercy, grace, and faithfulness have no ends. Help us to show Your mercy to all of Your children. Lord, today, be with us in this place and remind us of Your faithfulness in all things. Help us to use the strength You have given us to do what is right and just.

God, You sent us Your Son Jesus Christ to die for our sins, that we may be forgiven despite our trespasses. Help us to forgive each other for wrongs that may be done, that we might work together for Your glory. We pray this in Jesus’ name. Amen.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, led the members of the Senate in recital of the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Motions and Communications

Senator Nesbitt entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Irwin moved that Senators Camilleri, Klinefelt, Brinks, Singh, Cherry, Cavanagh and Hertel be temporarily excused from today’s session.

The motion prevailed.

Recess

Senator Irwin moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:05 a.m.

10:37 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist.

During the recess, Senators Camilleri, Brinks, Singh, Klinefelt, Cavanagh, Hertel and Cherry entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Singh moved that rule 3.902 be suspended to allow the guests of Senator Bellino admittance to the Senate floor.

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senator Albert introduced

Senate Bill No. 595, entitled

A bill to regulate political activity; to require state senators to file financial reports; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state officers and agencies; to require the promulgation of rules; to impose fees; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide remedies.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Oversight.

Senator Albert introduced
Senate Bill No. 596, entitled

A bill to regulate political activity; to require state representatives to file financial reports; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state officers and agencies; to impose fees; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; to create funds; and to provide remedies.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Oversight.

Senator Albert introduced
Senate Bill No. 597, entitled

A bill to regulate political activity; to require certain elected state officers to file financial reports; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state officers and agencies; to impose fees; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide remedies.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Oversight.

Senator Albert introduced
Senate Bill No. 598, entitled

A bill to regulate political activity; to require certain elected state supreme court justices and judges to file financial reports; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state officers and agencies; to impose fees; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide remedies.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Oversight.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of
Messages from the House

Senate Bill No. 55, entitled

A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled “The general property tax act,” by amending sections 7u and 53b (MCL 211.7u and 211.53b), section 7u as amended by 2020 PA 253 and section 53b as amended by 2022 PA 141.

The House of Representatives has substituted (H-1) the bill.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill as substituted (H-1), ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

Pending the order that, under rule 3.202, the bill be laid over one day,

Senator Singh moved that the rule be suspended.

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the substitute made to the bill by the House,

The substitute was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 548

Yeas—38

Albert	Daley	Lauwers	Polehanki
Anthony	Damoose	Lindsey	Runestad
Bayer	Geiss	McBroom	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McMorrow	Theis
Camilleri	Huizenga	Moss	Victory
Cavanagh	Irwin	Nesbitt	Webber
Chang	Johnson	Outman	Wojno
Cherry	Klinefelt		

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect, The recommendation was concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.
The Senate agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 384, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding sections 3406z, 3901a, and 4002.
The House of Representatives has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.
Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.
The Senate agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 470, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending section 759a (MCL 168.759a), as amended by 2023 PA 25.
The House of Representatives has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.
The Senate agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 506, entitled

A bill to amend 2000 PA 92, entitled “Food law,” by amending sections 3119, 4103, and 4117 (MCL 289.3119, 289.4103, and 289.4117), sections 3119 and 4103 as amended by 2018 PA 92 and section 4117 as amended by 2012 PA 178.
The House of Representatives has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.
Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.
The Senate agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 507, entitled

A bill to amend 1964 PA 284, entitled “City income tax act,” by amending sections 6 and 9 of chapter 1 and sections 3, 73, 84, 85, 86a, 86b, 86c, 91, 92, and 93 of chapter 2 (MCL 141.506, 141.509, 141.603, 141.673, 141.684, 141.685, 141.686a, 141.686b, 141.686c, 141.691, 141.692, and 141.693), section 6 of chapter 1 as amended and sections 86a, 86b, and 86c of chapter 2 as added by 2018 PA 456 and section 9 of chapter 1 as added and sections 3, 73, 84, 85, 92, and 93 of chapter 2 as amended by 1996 PA 478, and by adding section 92a to chapter 2.
The House of Representatives has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.
The Senate agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment, printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 508, entitled

A bill to amend 2003 PA 198, entitled “Farm produce insurance act,” by amending section 7 (MCL 285.317), as amended by 2016 PA 264.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 510, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 141, entitled "Grain dealers act," by amending section 6 (MCL 285.66), as amended by 2002 PA 80.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 511, entitled

A bill to amend 1980 PA 300, entitled "The public school employees retirement act of 1979," by amending section 41 (MCL 38.1341), as amended by 2022 PA 220.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, assumed the Chair.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

General Orders

Senator Singh moved that the Senate resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the General Orders calendar.

The motion prevailed, and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, designated Senator Webber as Chairperson.

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and without amendment, the following bills:

House Bill No. 4567, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," by amending section 497 (MCL 168.497), as amended by 2018 PA 603.

House Bill No. 4568, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," by amending section 931 (MCL 168.931), as amended by 1996 PA 583.

House Bill No. 4644, entitled

A bill to adopt the uniform power of attorney act; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

House Bill No. 4645, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled "Natural resources and environmental protection act," by amending section 20101b (MCL 324.20101b), as amended by 2000 PA 368.

House Bill No. 4646, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 10121 and 10301 (MCL 333.10121 and 333.10301), section 10121 as added by 2008 PA 39 and section 10301 as added by 2012 PA 179.

The bills were placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

House Bill No. 4273, entitled

A bill to amend 1917 PA 167, entitled “Housing law of Michigan,” by amending section 132 (MCL 125.532), as amended by 2000 PA 479.

Substitute (S-3).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 11:05 a.m.

11:40 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President pro tempore, Senator Moss.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 227

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was announced:

Senate Bill No. 227, entitled

A bill to amend 1973 PA 116, entitled “An act to provide for the protection of children through the licensing and regulation of child care organizations; to provide for the establishment of standards of care for child care organizations; to prescribe powers and duties of certain departments of this state and adoption facilitators; to provide penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending sections 1, 2b, and 2c (MCL 722.111, 722.112b, and 722.112c), section 1 as amended by 2022 PA 208, section 2b as amended by 2007 PA 217, and section 2c as amended by 2017 PA 257.

(This bill was read a third time on Wednesday, October 18 and consideration postponed. See Senate Journal No. 90, p. 2105.)

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Lauwers offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-2).

The substitute was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 549

Yeas—38

Albert
Anthony

Daley
Damoose

Lauwers
Lindsey

Polehanki
Runestad

Bayer	Geiss	McBroom	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McMorrow	Theis
Camilleri	Huizenga	Moss	Victory
Cavanagh	Irwin	Nesbitt	Webber
Chang	Johnson	Outman	Wojno
Cherry	Klinefelt		

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4420, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” (MCL 760.1 to 777.69) by adding section 21b to chapter XVI.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Theis offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 1, line 2, after “**may**” by inserting a comma and “**with consent of the victim,**”.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 550

Yeas—32

Albert	Chang	Irwin	Polehanki
Anthony	Cherry	Johnson	Runestad
Bayer	Daley	Klinefelt	Santana
Bellino	Damoose	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Bumstead	Hauck	McMorrow	Victory
Camilleri	Hertel	Moss	Webber
Cavanagh	Huizenga	Outman	Wojno

Nays—6

Hoitenga	Lindsey	Nesbitt	Theis
Lauwers	McBroom		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to revise, consolidate, and codify the laws relating to criminal procedure and to define the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of courts, judges, and other officers of the court under the provisions of this act; to provide laws relative to the rights of persons accused of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to provide for the arrest of persons charged with or suspected of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to provide for bail of persons arrested for or accused of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to provide for the examination of persons accused of criminal offenses; to regulate the procedure relative to grand juries, indictments, informations, and proceedings before trial; to provide for trials of persons complained of or indicted for criminal offenses and ordinance violations and to provide for the procedure in those trials; to provide for judgments and sentences of persons convicted of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to establish a sentencing commission and to prescribe its powers and duties; to provide for procedure relating to new trials and appeals in criminal and ordinance violation cases; to provide a uniform system of probation throughout this state and the appointment of probation officers; to prescribe the powers, duties, and compensation of probation officers; to provide penalties for the violation of the duties of probation officers; to provide for procedure governing proceedings to prevent crime and proceedings for the discovery of crime; to provide for fees of officers, witnesses, and others in criminal and ordinance violation cases; to set forth miscellaneous provisions as to criminal procedure in certain cases; to provide penalties for the violation of certain provisions of this act; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protest

Senator Theis, under her constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4420.

Senator Theis’ statement is as follows:

I am beyond offended that this body believes that a woman who has been sexually assaulted—that her information should be released without her permission. That amendment simply asked that the police ask for her permission before they release it. So many members of this body voted against getting a woman’s permission before her most-personal information is released to strangers. Shame on you.

Senator Theis asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Theis’ statement is as follows:

All my amendment does is require the permission of the victim before her personal information is released.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4421, entitled

A bill to amend 1985 PA 87, entitled “William Van Regenmorter crime victim’s rights act,” by amending sections 8, 38, and 68 (MCL 780.758, 780.788, and 780.818), as amended by 2012 PA 457.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 551

Yeas—38

Albert
Anthony

Daley
Damoose

Lauwers
Lindsey

Polehanki
Runestad

Bayer	Geiss	McBroom	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McMorrow	Theis
Camilleri	Huizenga	Moss	Victory
Cavanagh	Irwin	Nesbitt	Webber
Chang	Johnson	Outman	Wojno
Cherry	Klinefelt		

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to establish the rights of victims of crime and juvenile offenses; to provide for certain procedures; to establish certain immunities and duties; to limit convicted criminals from deriving profit under certain circumstances; to prohibit certain conduct of employers or employers’ agents toward victims; and to provide for penalties and remedies.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4422, entitled

A bill to amend 1985 PA 87, entitled “William Van Regenmorter crime victim’s rights act,” by amending sections 61 and 61a (MCL 780.811 and 780.811a), section 61 as amended by 2018 PA 370 and section 61a as amended by 2005 PA 184.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 2, line 6, by striking out all of subparagraph (iii) and renumbering the remaining subparagraphs.
2. Amend page 4, line 16, by striking out “(xxi)” and inserting “(xx)”.
3. Amend page 4, line 18, after “to” by striking out “(xxii)” and inserting “(xxi)”.
4. Amend page 7, line 20, by striking out “**61(1)(a)(xix), (xx), or (xxi),**” and inserting “**61(1)(a)(xviii), (xix), or (xx),**”.
5. Amend page 7, line 22, by striking out “**61(1)(a)(xix), (xx), or (xxi),**” and inserting “**61(1)(a)(xviii), (xix), or (xx),**”.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 552

Yeas—29

Albert	Cherry	Johnson	Polehanki
Anthony	Daley	Klinefelt	Santana
Bayer	Damoose	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Bumstead	Hertel	McMorrow	Victory
Camilleri	Huizenga	Moss	Webber
Cavanagh	Irwin	Outman	Wojno
Chang			

Nays—9

Bellino
Hauck
Hoitenga

Lauwers
Lindsey

McBroom
Nesbitt

Runestad
Theis

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to establish the rights of victims of crime and juvenile offenses; to provide for certain procedures; to establish certain immunities and duties; to limit convicted criminals from deriving profit under certain circumstances; to prohibit certain conduct of employers or employers’ agents toward victims; and to provide for penalties and remedies.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Senator Lindsey asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lindsey’s statement is as follows:

I like the idea of this bill. It basically expands some of the misdemeanors that would help victims qualify for certain privileges under the law, but there is one of them that stands out compared to everything else. It’s this idea that certain government employees—if they’re threatened or feel threatened—are going to get a special victim status under this law. My amendment is striking simply that portion; the rest of it would be expanded as the original bill was written. I urge a “yes” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4423, entitled

A bill to amend 1985 PA 87, entitled “William Van Regenmorter crime victim’s rights act,” by amending sections 15, 43, and 75 (MCL 780.765, 780.793, and 780.825), as amended by 2018 PA 153.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 553

Yeas—38

Albert
Anthony
Bayer
Bellino
Brinks
Bumstead
Camilleri
Cavanagh
Chang
Cherry

Daley
Damoose
Geiss
Hauck
Hertel
Hoitenga
Huizenga
Irwin
Johnson
Klinefelt

Lauwers
Lindsey
McBroom
McCann
McDonald Rivet
McMorrow
Moss
Nesbitt
Outman

Polehanki
Runestad
Santana
Shink
Singh
Theis
Victory
Webber
Wojno

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to establish the rights of victims of crime and juvenile offenses; to provide for certain procedures; to establish certain immunities and duties; to limit convicted criminals from deriving profit under certain circumstances; to prohibit certain conduct of employers or employers’ agents toward victims; and to provide for penalties and remedies.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4516, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 389, entitled “An act to provide for the prevention and treatment of domestic and sexual violence; to develop and establish policies, procedures, and standards for providing domestic and sexual violence assistance programs and services; to declare the powers and duties of the Michigan domestic and sexual violence prevention and treatment board; to establish a domestic violence prevention and treatment fund and provide for its use; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to prescribe immunities and liabilities of certain persons and officials; and to prescribe penalties for violations of this act,” by amending section 1 (MCL 400.1501), as amended by 2018 PA 281.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 554

Yeas—38

Albert	Daley	Lauwers	Polehanki
Anthony	Damoose	Lindsey	Runestad
Bayer	Geiss	McBroom	Santana
Bellino	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McMorrow	Theis
Camilleri	Huizenga	Moss	Victory
Cavanagh	Irwin	Nesbitt	Webber
Chang	Johnson	Outman	Wojno
Cherry	Klinefelt		

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4561, entitled

A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” by amending section 609h (MCL 436.1609h), as added by 2022 PA 225.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 555

Yeas—36

Anthony	Daley	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Damoose	Lauwers	Runestad
Bellino	Geiss	Lindsey	Santana
Brinks	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Bumstead	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Hoitenga	McMorrow	Theis
Cavanagh	Huizenga	Moss	Victory
Chang	Irwin	Nesbitt	Webber
Cherry	Johnson	Outman	Wojno

Nays—2

Albert	McBroom
--------	---------

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to create a commission for the control of the alcoholic beverage traffic within this state, and to prescribe its powers, duties, and limitations; to provide for powers and duties for certain state departments and agencies; to impose certain taxes for certain purposes; to provide for the control of the alcoholic liquor traffic within this state and to provide for the power to establish state liquor stores; to prohibit the use of certain devices for the dispensing of alcoholic vapor; to provide for the care and treatment of alcoholics; to provide for the incorporation of farmer cooperative wineries and the granting of certain rights and privileges to those cooperatives; to provide for the licensing and taxation of activities regulated under this act and the disposition of the money received under this act; to prescribe liability for retail licensees under certain circumstances and to require security for that liability; to provide procedures, defenses, and remedies regarding violations of this act; to provide for the enforcement and to prescribe penalties for violations of this act; to provide for allocation of certain funds for certain purposes; to provide for the confiscation and disposition of property seized under this act; to provide referenda under certain circumstances; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess until 1:30 p.m.
The motion prevailed, the time being 11:57 a.m.

The Senate reconvened at the expiration of the recess and was called to order by the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss.

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 1:31 p.m.

2:57 p.m.

The Senate was called to order by the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss.

Senator Singh moved that the following bill be given immediate effect:
House Bill No. 4561
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 175, entitled

A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled “The general property tax act,” by amending section 27b (MCL 211.27b), as amended by 2012 PA 382.

The question being on the passage of the bill,
Senator Lindsey offered the following amendment:

- 1. Amend page 5, line 6, after “**property**” by striking out the balance of the bill and inserting a period.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 556

Yeas—21

Anthony	Cherry	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Huizenga	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno
Chang			

Nays—17

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Johnson	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Lauwers	Outman	Webber
Damoose			

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4376, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 1207 (MCL 500.1207), as amended by 2018 PA 449.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 557

Yeas—36

Albert	Daley	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Anthony	Damoose	Lauwers	Runestad
Bayer	Geiss	McBroom	Santana
Brinks	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Bumstead	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Hoitenga	McMorrow	Theis
Cavanagh	Huizenga	Moss	Victory
Chang	Irwin	Nesbitt	Webber
Cherry	Johnson	Outman	Wojno

Nays—2

Bellino	Lindsey
---------	---------

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to revise, consolidate, and classify the laws relating to the insurance and surety business; to regulate the incorporation or formation of domestic insurance and surety companies and associations and the admission of foreign and alien companies and associations; to provide their rights, powers, and immunities and to prescribe the conditions on which companies and associations organized, existing, or authorized under this act may exercise their powers; to provide the rights, powers, and immunities and to prescribe the conditions on which other persons, firms, corporations, associations, risk retention groups, and purchasing groups engaged in an insurance or surety business may exercise their powers; to provide for the imposition of a privilege fee on domestic insurance companies and associations and the state accident fund; to provide for the imposition of a tax on the business of foreign and alien companies and associations; to provide for the imposition of a tax on risk retention groups and purchasing groups; to provide for the imposition of a tax on the business of surplus line agents; to provide for the imposition of regulatory fees on certain insurers; to provide for assessment fees on certain health maintenance organizations; to modify tort liability arising out of certain accidents; to provide for limited actions with respect to that modified tort liability and to prescribe certain procedures for maintaining those actions; to require security for losses arising out of certain accidents; to provide for the continued availability and affordability of automobile insurance and homeowners insurance in this state and to facilitate the purchase of that insurance by all residents of this state at fair and reasonable rates; to provide for certain reporting with respect to insurance and with respect to certain claims against uninsured or self-insured persons; to prescribe duties for certain state departments and officers with respect to that reporting; to provide for certain assessments; to establish and continue certain state insurance

funds; to modify and clarify the status, rights, powers, duties, and operations of the nonprofit malpractice insurance fund; to provide for the departmental supervision and regulation of the insurance and surety business within this state; to provide for regulation over worker’s compensation self-insurers; to provide for the conservation, rehabilitation, or liquidation of unsound or insolvent insurers; to provide for the protection of policyholders, claimants, and creditors of unsound or insolvent insurers; to provide for associations of insurers to protect policyholders and claimants in the event of insurer insolvencies; to prescribe educational requirements for insurance agents and solicitors; to provide for the regulation of multiple employer welfare arrangements; to create an automobile theft prevention authority to reduce the number of automobile thefts in this state; to prescribe the powers and duties of the automobile theft prevention authority; to provide certain powers and duties upon certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to provide for an appropriation; to repeal acts and parts of acts; and to provide penalties for the violation of this act.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 328, entitled

A bill to require certain standards for smoke alarm and certain other devices; to prohibit certain conduct and prescribe civil sanctions; to authorize the promulgation of rules; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities.

The question being on the passage of the bill,
 Senator Hertel offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-2).

The substitute was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 558

Yeas—23

Anthony	Cherry	Klinefelt	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Hauck	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Webber
Cavanagh	Huizenga	Moss	Wojno
Chang	Irwin	Polehanki	

Nays—15

Albert	Damoose	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Johnson	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Lauwers	Outman	

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators McBroom, Bellino, Theis and Nesbitt, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 328.

Senator McBroom moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom’s statement, in which Senators Bellino, Theis and Nesbitt concurred, is as follows:

Madam President, this is not the first time this piece of legislation has come forward, and I acknowledge the intention of those who have put this together is to save lives. However, I believe that it significantly neglects to consider the monetary motivations that most of our public take into account as they make decisions about their daily lives. Without a doubt, this increases the costs of smoke detectors. There is simply no way to deny that; I don’t think anybody does deny that. We are going to be buying a product that has a much more expensive battery that is of a quality that’s going to demand a higher price. When residents are motivated by whether a fire has happened in their neighborhood, or they’ve seen an advertisement, or they’ve seen a tragedy on the news, to get a smoke detector for their home, the vast majority of our residents show up at a Walmart or a Target or another hardware store and look for smoke detectors and buy the ones they can afford, and they buy as many as they’re willing to spend money on. By increasing the costs, we are going to diminish the amount of smoke detectors people buy and we are going to discourage them from putting a sufficient number of them in their homes.

Why is this so necessary, and why do we feel this legislation has to be done? Because, well, we know that our residents aren’t smart enough to change their batteries. So Big Brother is going to come down, sweep into the rescue, Well we don’t trust you to change your batteries, we don’t trust you do to the job so we’re going to just force you to buy more expensive equipment that will last longer. But what happens at the end of the ten years? What are we going to do then? Are we going to make it like license plates and mandate that they switch their smoke detectors out like we do car license plates? That’s not going to work; not unless we’re going to start a whole registration program for smoke detectors, and I probably shouldn’t even say that, probably giving somebody an idea.

It’s a nice thought that somehow or other this bill is going to increase the amount of smoke detectors in homes and increase—it’s a very nice thought that somehow or other this is somehow going to end what happens in many homes when the batteries go out, people pull them out and then forget about them, and then they don’t have a functional smoke detector. Ultimately, this is not going to change that, and I fear will only diminish the amount of smoke detectors that are in a home, which is truly one of the most critical aspects in order to have proper fire protection in your home, is to have them properly placed and to have a sufficient number of them. By increasing the costs, and by in a way even decreasing the amount of times people even have to think about this, we are actually being counterproductive to the health and safety of our residents.

I ask that people vote “no” on this. Let’s work on other ways of marketing to remind people to change their batteries. There are campaigns that have existed for a long time about changing your batteries when you set your clocks back—those are important things, those seem to work better. The opportunity manufactured homes that have the smoke detectors hard-wired into the homes. These are effective methods that truly help and protect people. This is just going to give us a ten-year blip and then we’re going to be right back to the exact same problem all over again, and possibly it’ll be even worse. I ask for a “no” vote.

Senator Hertel asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Hertel’s statement is as follows:

While I respect the comments of my colleague from the 38th District, and I wasn’t planning on speaking to this bill today, my family was one of the families who experienced a fire in this state and did not have any working smoke detectors in our home. I was 14 years old. My father was almost killed by the fire that happened in our house, and if the fire would have happened while we were sleeping, because our smoke detectors didn’t have working batteries—and this was what the Detroit firefighters told us at the time—it was the exact kind of fire that kills people in their sleep because of where it started—in the basement—and how the smoke traveled throughout the home. We likely would not have woken up and we would have died of smoke inhalation pretty quickly.

We talk about the cost issue here and if you look at the cost today of a smoke detector with a ten-year battery life—and let’s remember, every smoke detector, even if you replace the batteries in it, only lasts ten years. Every single one should be replaced after a ten-year time period. The smoke detector you have in your house today that’s 30 years old that you’re putting 9-volt batteries in every single year, technically is not a safe smoke detector by the standards we use.

With that said, a ten-year battery smoke detector costs about \$20. When you factor in over that ten years the amount of 9-volt batteries you would have to put in an old-style smoke detector, the cost is far greater than that \$20 you would spend on that one smoke detector that will last you ten years, keep your family safe, and make sure that when that fire happens, that alarm goes off and your family knows to get out of the house.

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 3:19 p.m.

3:43 p.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President pro tempore, Senator Moss.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

Senator Singh moved that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the following bill:

House Bill No. 4998, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 141, entitled “Grain dealers act,” by amending section 7 (MCL 285.67), as amended by 2004 PA 274.

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, and the bill was placed on the order of General Orders.

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bills, now on Committee Reports, be placed on the General Orders calendar for consideration today:

Senate Bill No. 530

Senate Bill No. 531

Senate Bill No. 575

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

General Orders

Senator Singh moved that the Senate resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for consideration of the General Orders calendar.

The motion prevailed, and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, designated Senator Webber as Chairperson.

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the President pro tempore, Senator Moss, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and without amendment, the following bills:

Senate Bill No. 593, entitled

A bill to list certain constitutional rights related to reproductive freedom; to prohibit the violation of certain rights and provide remedies; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Senate Bill No. 396, entitled

A bill to amend 1937 (Ex Sess) PA 4, entitled “An act relative to continuing tenure of office of certificated teachers in public educational institutions; to provide for probationary periods; to regulate discharges or demotions; to provide for resignations and leaves of absence; to create a state tenure commission and to prescribe the powers and duties thereof; and to prescribe penalties for violation of the provisions of this act,” by amending section 4 of article I, sections 2a and 3b of article II, and section 3 of article III (MCL 38.74, 38.82a, 38.83b, and 38.93), section 4 of article I as amended by 2011 PA 100 and sections 2a and 3b of article II as added and section 3 of article III as amended by 2011 PA 101.

Senate Bill No. 575, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3107c (MCL 500.3107c), as added by 2019 PA 22.

House Bill No. 4998, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 141, entitled “Grain dealers act,” by amending section 7 (MCL 285.67), as amended by 2004 PA 274.

The bills were placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 474, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2690, 2803, 2848, 2854, 9141, 10102, 16221, 16226, 16245, 16299, and 20115 (MCL 333.2690, 333.2803, 333.2848, 333.2854, 333.9141, 333.10102, 333.16221, 333.16226, 333.16245, 333.16299, and 333.20115), section 2690 as amended by 2016 PA 386, section 2803 as amended by 2020 PA 54, sections 2848 and 20115 as amended and section 2854 as added by 2012 PA 499, section 9141 as added by 2004 PA 501, section 10102 as amended by 2008 PA 39, section 16221 as amended by 2023 PA 47, section 16226 as amended by 2023 PA 48, section 16245 as amended by 2014 PA 413, and section 16299 as amended by 2020 PA 375; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Substitute (S-3).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 475, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 10d of chapter II, sections 1a and 3 of chapter IV, section 6e of chapter V, section 4a of chapter IX, and sections 13k, 16d, and 16p of chapter XVII (MCL 762.10d, 764.1a, 764.3, 765.6e, 769.4a, 777.13k, 777.16d, and 777.16p), section 10d of chapter II, section 3 of chapter IV, and section 6e of chapter V as added and section 1a of chapter IV as amended by 2020 PA 394, section 4a of chapter IX as amended by 2019 PA 115, section 13k of chapter XVII as amended by 2018 PA 587, section 16d of chapter XVII as amended by 2023 PA 59, and section 16p of chapter XVII as amended by 2008 PA 467.

Substitute (S-1).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 476, entitled

A bill to amend 2002 PA 687, entitled “Born alive infant protection act,” by amending section 1 (MCL 333.1071).

Substitute (S-1).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 477, entitled

A bill to amend 2004 PA 500, entitled “Pregnant and parenting student services act,” by amending section 5 (MCL 390.1595).

Substitute (S-1).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 529, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 46, 47, 581, 795c, 822, 842, and 846 (MCL 168.46, 168.47, 168.581, 168.795c, 168.822, 168.842, and 168.846), section 46 as amended by 2002 PA 431, section 795c as amended by 2015 PA 268, section 822 as amended by 2018 PA 614, and section 842 as amended by 2018 PA 382, and by adding section 814.

Substitute (S-2).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 395, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 1230b, 1249, 1249b, and 1280f (MCL 380.1230b, 380.1249, 380.1249b, and 380.1280f), section 1230b as added by 1996 PA 189, section 1249 as amended by 2019 PA 6, section 1249b as amended by 2019 PA 5, and section 1280f as amended by 2023 PA 7; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Substitute (S-3).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 530, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3157 (MCL 500.3157), as amended by 2019 PA 21.

Substitute (S-4).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The Committee of the Whole reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 531, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 2111f (MCL 500.2111f), as added by 2019 PA 22.

Substitute (S-2).

The Senate agreed to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bills, now on Third Reading of Bills, be placed on their immediate passage:

Senate Bill No. 474

Senate Bill No. 475

Senate Bill No. 476
Senate Bill No. 477
Senate Bill No. 529
Senate Bill No. 395
Senate Bill No. 396
Senate Bill No. 530
Senate Bill No. 531
Senate Bill No. 575
House Bill No. 4998

The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills:

Senate Bill No. 474
Senate Bill No. 475
Senate Bill No. 476
Senate Bill No. 477
Senate Bill No. 529
Senate Bill No. 395
Senate Bill No. 396
Senate Bill No. 530
Senate Bill No. 531
Senate Bill No. 575
House Bill No. 4998

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 474, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2690, 2803, 2848, 2854, 9141, 10102, 16221, 16226, 16245, 16299, and 20115 (MCL 333.2690, 333.2803, 333.2848, 333.2854, 333.9141, 333.10102, 333.16221, 333.16226, 333.16245, 333.16299, and 333.20115), section 2690 as amended by 2016 PA 386, section 2803 as amended by 2020 PA 54, sections 2848 and 20115 as amended and section 2854 as added by 2012 PA 499, section 9141 as added by 2004 PA 501, section 10102 as amended by 2008 PA 39, section 16221 as amended by 2023 PA 47, section 16226 as amended by 2023 PA 48, section 16245 as amended by 2014 PA 413, and section 16299 as amended by 2020 PA 375; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Damoose offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 30, line 25, after “2837,” by striking out the balance of the line through “17015a,” on line 26.
2. Amend page 30, line 26, after “17017,” by striking out “17515.”
3. Amend page 30, line 27, after “333.2837,” by striking out the balance of the line through “333.17015a,” on line 28.
4. Amend page 30, line 28, after “333.17017,” by striking out “333.17515.”

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 559

Yeas—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Nays—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Hoytenga offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 28, line 11, by removing section 20115 from the bill.
2. Amend page 30, line 26, after “17515,” by inserting “and”.
3. Amend page 30, line 26 after “17517” by striking out the comma and “and 22224”.
4. Amend page 30, line 28, after “333.17515,” by inserting “and”.
5. Amend page 30, line 28, after “333.17517,” by striking out the balance of the line through “333.22224,” on line 29.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 560

Yeas—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoytenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Nays—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendments:

- 1. Amend page 30, line 25, after “2835,” by striking out “2836.”.
- 2. Amend page 30, line 27, after “333.2835,” by striking out “333.2836.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 561

Yeas—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Nays—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Albert offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-5).

The question being on the adoption of the substitute,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The substitute was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 562

Yeas—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Nays—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana

Brinks
Camilleri
Cavanagh

Geiss
Hertel
Irwin

McDonald Rivet
McMorrow
Moss

Shink
Singh
Wojno

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 563

Yeas—20

Anthony
Bayer
Brinks
Camilleri
Cavanagh

Chang
Cherry
Geiss
Hertel
Irwin

Klinefelt
McCann
McDonald Rivet
McMorrow
Moss

Polehanki
Santana
Shink
Singh
Wojno

Nays—18

Albert
Bellino
Bumstead
Daley
Damoose

Hauck
Hoitenga
Huizenga
Johnson
Lauwers

Lindsey
McBroom
Nesbitt
Outman

Runestad
Theis
Victory
Webber

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protest

Senator Lauwers, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 474 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lauwers’ statement is as follows:

I’m calling these bills the back-alley-abortion legalization acts. We’re removing all protections on something we used to hear all the time about, we’ve got to protect, or we’re going to have all these bad situations. What are we doing? Whatever happened to my colleagues on the other side calling for abortion to be safe, legal, and rare? I’m so disappointed to see that now the new tagline is going to be unprofessional, dangerous, and often.

Senators Damoose, Theis, Hoitenga, Lindsey, Albert and Anthony asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

It's no secret that I have significant concerns from a moral perspective about the entire practice of abortion. But a woman who finds herself in a crisis pregnancy or an unexpected pregnancy certainly deserves our respect, our love, and our compassion. She needs our help and even those of us who consider ourselves pro-life understand that very well.

I want to speak to one aspect of this amendment that protects women who I would imagine everyone in this chamber would agree with, that coerced abortion should not be tolerated. I have joined hands with many people on both sides of the aisle over the past several years to protect people from sexual predators and to secure women's rights after sexual assaults. It's why I worked across the aisle on an almost entirely Democratic-led bill package to try to lengthen out this statute of limitations for criminal sexual conduct victims. Nobody who is the victim of sexual abuse should be dictated to on how he or she can seek justice. They had no choice in what happened to them, and they shouldn't have their choices limited now in how to prevent or how to address and respond as they begin the healing process. The very same people who joined me in that effort should now be standing with me to keep protections in place to ensure that nobody should ever be forced to have an abortion if they don't want one.

We all hear horrific stories about human trafficking. We've heard stories about abusive controlling relationships and we should all be aware that any of these situations and so many more could easily lead to a man forcing a pregnant woman to abort a child against her will. We should be together on this, that at the very minimum a woman seeking an abortion should be screened to see if she's being forced to do this. Therefore, I ask all of my colleagues, no matter where you stand on the overall issue of abortion to adopt this amendment to keep this one solitary protection in place, a simple screening for coercion prior to conducting an irreversible abortion.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

This amendment would simply maintain provisions informing women about the risks of an abortion procedure before one is administered. This is exactly the process for other elective procedures when a patient is informed of their potential risks. Absent a life-threatening emergency, it only makes sense that the risks are communicated to the patients. Some of these complications truly are major, including uterine perforation or injury and hemorrhaging, injury to adjacent organs, and that untreated, can go up to death. The health and wellbeing of citizens is a top priority and women considering an abortion deserve to know the risks. Finding out that you are pregnant is one of the most emotional moments in a woman's life. If the pregnancy is unexpected, it's even more so. When time permits in non-life threatening situations, learning about the risks of abortion is worthwhile. As one Democratic member of the House recently said, "I do not think it is too much to ask when someone's terminating a life, a 24-hour pause to be able to say for sure this is the decision you want to make. Twenty-four hours is not too much." What that timeframe allows is for a woman to hear what it is that the potential risks are and to assimilate them and then make her decision accordingly. I urge your support for this amendment.

Senator Hoitenga's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, while topics surrounding abortion are deeply personal, it can often lead to areas of disagreement within this chamber. Protecting women's access to safe health care procedures should be a unifying effort. During committee, I listened to arguments on both sides of this debate but the most impactful moment came after the committee hearing when I was handed images of an abortion clinic that was shut down by local authorities in Muskegon. These images show rust and blood-stained equipment, mold and mildew in the room, and collapsing ceiling tiles. It looks like something you would see out of a horror movie. Already under immense stress and pressure for their choice to terminate a pregnancy, I cannot fathom the additional fear these women experienced when they walked into that dreadful clinic for their procedure.

My amendment would maintain the existing rules and licensing for surgical outpatient facilities and would ensure that women would never be subjected to the type of clinic I've just described. Thank you, and I ask for your support of my amendment.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, this amendment would require the proper disposal of fetal remains resulting from an abortion. If the Democrats are going to insist on going down this path of maximizing the number of abortions in our state in order to placate their radical base, the least they could do is require that remains are properly discarded, of these babies. The absence of requirements would mean aborted babies could be placed in public waste containers; they could literally be placed anywhere. Keep in mind that there's no possible justification that this has anything to do with access to abortion. We are talking about fetal remains. I hope my colleagues would agree that this amendment is the humane thing to do. I ask for your support on my amendment.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

To begin, I will be very upfront; I did not support Proposal 3 and I wish it were not in place. That being said, the legislation Democrats are proposing today goes well beyond codifying Proposal 3, and it goes beyond what many Michigan voters believed they were voting for before it was approved. This legislation goes far, far beyond what was in place under *Roe v. Wade*.

The legislation Democrats are proposing today allows for abortion at any time, for any reason, with no limitations—right up until the second before a baby leaves the womb. But that is not what Proposal 3 mandates, and that is at the heart of this substitute I offer now. As Proposal 3 clearly permits, this substitute would maintain common-sense protections needed for patient safety and informed consent about the procedures they are contemplating. And it would allow the Legislature to continue regulating abortion in cases after the baby has reached fetal viability—meaning he or she can survive outside the womb—except in cases where an abortion is needed to protect the mother.

Let's start with safety provisions. This substitute would maintain the regulations and licensing requirements our state has in place to make sure abortion clinics are clean and safe for the women who go there. The proposal from Democrats would eliminate these safeguards for freestanding surgical outpatient facilities. Regardless of how you feel about abortion, if it is going to be legal then these provisions should be kept in place to protect the health and safety of women. These rules aren't stopping anyone from having an abortion, they are simply making sure it's done safely.

This substitute requires that an abortion would have to be performed by a qualified physician—again, it's just common sense. Additionally, pharmacists and pharmacy techs who object to facilitating abortions would not be forced to do so. Nobody should be required to participate in an abortion if it violates their deeply-held beliefs. If someone is going to have a serious medical procedure, they need to know what the procedure entails beforehand. In the case of abortion, it does not restrict access to make sure the woman is informed about the procedure and has a day to think about that decision before proceeding. This is a decision which will impact the rest of one's life and merits careful deliberation. Of course, this waiting period does not apply in the case of an urgent medical emergency. We also must maintain our existing provisions designed to protect women against being coerced or forced into having an abortion against their wishes. The Democratic legislation strips away coercion screening, and the only people it protects are the ones who may be doing the threatening and coercing, and the abortion industry.

This substitute would also maintain the requirements that abortion clinics report how many abortions they perform each year to the state. The Democrats' bills eliminates these reporting requirements, and is a first step toward eliminating the documentation that shows abortions have increased in Michigan every year for the past six years. There are more than 30,000 induced abortions in Michigan each year now, and whether you want to acknowledge it, it's a fact that should be reported just like many other statistics are reported by the state health department. It does not fit the false narrative that abortion access is unduly restricted, because it isn't unduly restricted. That is evidenced by the fact that more and more women are coming to Michigan from out-of-state to have abortions here.

Proposal 3—and now our Constitution—says, “the state may regulate the provision of abortion care after fetal viability” with some exceptions. This substitute would prohibit abortion after fetal viability unless, as the Constitution says, it is medically indicated to protect the life or physical or mental health of the mother. Cases of abortion that do occur after fetal viability should be reported. It is important to document the determination used to proceed with a late-term abortion. This substitute would require that reporting.

Nothing this substitute proposes can be labeled as extreme. Many Michigan voters who supported Proposal 3 were not calling for abortion at any time, for any reason, with no limitations. This substitute places reasonable limits on late-term abortions while allowing for exemptions laid out in the Michigan Constitution.

Senator Anthony's statement is as follows:

This has been a long afternoon and many speeches, lots of inaccuracies, lots of information that I've never read in any scholarly journal, and I would really prolong the hour to address many of the data points and misinformation that has led the conversation today so I will just keep my remarks very brief. For far too long, politicians in state capitols and courtrooms have spent many months, many years, deciding what to do with my body and the bodies of women in every corner of this state and every corner of this country. This has led to current laws that are on the books that have made reproductive health care, including the right to access a safe abortion, both restrictive and traumatic. That's simply why we are here today.

Let me remind you that last November, millions of Michiganders, constituents in every single one of our districts, voted in favor of Proposal 3 making it loud and clear that they felt strongly about upholding their right to reproductive freedom. This bill package is very simple. It is about lowering the barriers to uphold the spirit of that proposal. The proposal that, again, Michigan voters—Michigan voters—decided was the

right thing to do, to make sure we all can access affordable, reliable, safe health care, including the right to an abortion and it guarantees that this right, regardless of where you live, regardless of your ability to pay, that you would have reliable health care. I'm asking my colleagues to vote "yes" for this package. I'm asking as a Christian, I'm asking as an African American, and I'm asking as a woman who refuses to allow politicians to decide what should happen to my body. I ask for a "yes" vote on the reproductive health care package.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 475, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled "The code of criminal procedure," by amending sections 13k and 16p of chapter XVII (MCL 777.13k and 777.16p), section 13k of chapter XVII as amended by 2018 PA 587 and section 16p of chapter XVII as amended by 2008 PA 467.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Webber offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 4, following line 13, by inserting:

"Sec. 16a. This chapter applies to the following felonies enumerated in chapter 750 of the Michigan Compiled Laws:

M.C.L.	Category	Class	Description	Stat Max
750.13	Person	D	Enticing female minor under 16 for immoral purposes	10
750.14a	Person	F	Knowingly performing abortion if based on screening indicating or diagnosis of Down syndrome after fetal viability	4
750.16(1)	Person	G	Adulterate, misbrand, remove, or substitute a drug or medicine	2
750.16(2)	Person	F	Adulterate, misbrand, remove, or substitute a drug or medicine causing personal injury	4
750.16(3)	Person	E	Adulterate, misbrand, remove, or substitute a drug or medicine resulting in serious impairment of body function	5
750.16(4)	Person	C	Adulterate, misbrand, remove, or substitute a drug or medicine resulting in death	15
750.18(3)	Person	G	Mix, color, stain, or powder a drug or medicine with an ingredient or material so as to injuriously affect its quality or potency	2
750.18(4)	Person	F	Mix, color, stain, or powder a drug or medicine with an ingredient or material so as to injuriously affect its quality or potency resulting in personal injury	4
750.18(5)	Person	E	Mix, color, stain, or powder a drug or medicine with an ingredient or material so as to injuriously affect its quality or potency resulting in serious impairment of body function	5
750.18(6)	Person	C	Mix, color, stain, or powder a drug or medicine with an ingredient or material so as to injuriously affect its quality or potency resulting in death	15
750.30	Pub ord	H	Adultery	4
750.32	Pub ord	H	Cohabitation of divorced parties	4".

2. Amend page 5, line 5, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless all of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law:

- (a) Senate Bill No. 108.
- (b) Senate Bill No. 474.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments, Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 564

Yeas—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Nays—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 565

Yeas—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senator Webber asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Webber’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, this amendment would protect babies with Down syndrome. Every life is precious and should be treated as such. Individuals with Down syndrome enrich our society and add value to our state. They should have a right to live and thrive just like anyone else. My amendment would prevent medical professionals from performing an abortion post-fetal viability because the baby may have Down syndrome. I ask for support for this amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 476, entitled

A bill to amend 2002 PA 687, entitled “Born alive infant protection act,” by amending section 1 (MCL 333.1071).

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 566

Yeas—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 477, entitled

A bill to amend 2004 PA 500, entitled “Pregnant and parenting student services act,” by amending section 5 (MCL 390.1595).

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Theis offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 1, line 1, after “(1)” by striking out “An” and inserting “**To be eligible for a grant described in section 4, an**”.
2. Amend page 1, line 1, after “education” by striking out “may” and inserting “**must**”.
3. Amend page 1, line 2, after “operate” by inserting “**or agree to establish and operate**”.
4. Amend page 1, line 2, after “office” by striking out the period and the balance of the line through “meet” on line 3 and inserting “**that meets**”.
5. Amend page 2, line 15, after “information.” by inserting “An office shall not provide referrals for abortion services.”.
6. Amend page 2, following line 27, by inserting:
 “Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless Senate Bill No. 118 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 567

Yeas—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Nays—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 568

Yeas—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana

Brinks
Camilleri
Cavanagh

Geiss
Hertel
Irwin

McDonald Rivet
McMorrow
Moss

Shink
Singh
Wojno

Nays—18

Albert
Bellino
Bumstead
Daley
Damoose

Hauck
Hoitenga
Huizenga
Johnson
Lauwers

Lindsey
McBroom
Nesbitt
Outman

Runestad
Theis
Victory
Webber

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Albert and Bellino, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 474, 475, 476, and 477 and moved that the statements they made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 474 be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

The measures this chamber is voting on today go far beyond what was in place under *Roe v. Wade*. They also go beyond Proposal 3. It is abortion extremism—plain and simple—and it will have deadly consequences, not only for unborn children but potentially also for women seeking an abortion. This bill strips provisions designed to protect women out of state law. It puts women in danger.

Did Proposal 3 really establish a mandate that we eliminate screening and protections to ensure women aren’t being forced or coerced into abortion against their will? Did it mandate that patients are not given a full explanation of the procedure they are about to have and have time to weigh that decision after they are informed about it? Did it mandate the elimination of common-sense protections to make sure clinics are safe and sanitary? That is what Democrats are proposing here today. This legislative package is aiming to allow abortion at any time, for any reason, with no limitations—right up until the second a baby leaves the womb. If I am incorrect, I would appreciate if someone could explain what the limitations are. Are we as a state really going to take a position that a child inside the womb, through all stages of development, even when fully capable of living on its own, has no legal rights? That is shocking and that is wrong.

Proposal 3, sadly, did take away much of the Legislature’s ability to regulate abortion and provide protections, but it didn’t take away everything. Proposal 3 maintains a compelling state interest—which it says is “for the limited purpose of protecting the health of an individual seeking care, consistent with accepted clinical standards of practice and evidence-based medicine, and does not infringe on that individual’s autonomous decision-making.” Some of the measures in these bills today ignore that important provision. I am not surprised, but I am still saddened at the extent of these radical steps this Legislature and the Governor are taking related to abortion.

We have a Governor who will spend money promoting abortion to residents in other states, but has vetoed funding to promote adoption and maternal health here in Michigan. She is pro-choice only when it comes to the choice that ends a life. I am still baffled about how that is going to help turn around Michigan’s population decline. It does not take a mathematician to figure out that abortion isn’t going to help turn around the population decline in a state where more than 1.2 million induced abortions have been reported since 1982. It’s going to do the exact opposite.

This legislation today is built upon the fallacy that somehow Michigan laws make it difficult to get an abortion. How can abortion advocates claim there is a lack of access in Michigan when there are more induced abortions performed here now than any time since the mid-1990s? The number of abortions in Michigan has increased for six consecutive years according to reports from the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services. That number now exceeds 30,000 annually.

These bills before us today aren't about the will of Michigan voters—they go beyond that. These bills are not about protecting health. They are about promoting the abortion industry and advancing an anti-life agenda that gets more radical and extreme by the day. I urge a "no" vote.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

This bill package has been labeled as the Reproductive Health Act—Reproductive Health Act. That seems harmless. It's nice and vague, and it makes for a good-sounding headline. I can see myself coming home and talking to my wife about the Reproductive Health Act, but it is completely, 100 percent disingenuous. In fact, this health act actually puts the health of women across our state at serious risk.

Mr. President, this is not a bill of goods the Michigan voters were sold when they approved Proposal 3. A recent poll found nearly-unanimous support among those who voted in favor of Proposal 3—nearly 97 percent—support laws requiring state licensing and inspections to ensure abortion facilities meet basic public health and safety standards, just basic ones. Ninety-seven percent expect the state to protect the rights of every woman to have guaranteed access to safe and sanitary clinical conditions. And why shouldn't they? This is no different than the protections put in place for any patient seeking the services of any other health care or surgical provider in this state. Haven't I been told many times that abortion is healthcare?

Yet the Reproductive Health Act put before us today would exempt abortion providers from this very reasonable oversight and transparency. It would exempt them. No medical industry is left to regulate itself, but the repeals in this act would leave the abortion industry to do just that. Abortion clinics would be made exempt from state scrutiny. This provision is not acceptable. These bills put women in danger from bad actors who might wish to cash in on this newly regulated industry. This isn't necessary, this isn't wise, this isn't wanted, and it's dangerous. We wouldn't allow this in any other medical industry.

I shouldn't have to remind people of the dangerous conditions that existed in some of the abortion facilities across this state prior to the 2012 clinic licensing law—including the infamous "house of horrors" that operated in Muskegon. We know this because licensing requirements do not hinder abortion access. Let me repeat that, licensing requirements do not hinder abortion access, they merely act as a guard rail to help protect women who choose this path. We know this because for the last seven years, while these laws were in place, abortions have increased every year. So why remove these important protections now? Why are we willing to put abortion industry profits ahead of basic patient safety?

Michigan voters approved of maintaining abortion access when they adopted Proposal 3 following the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*. Do you think that maintaining clean and sanitary conditions inhibits access? In the same poll I mentioned earlier, 65 percent of those who voted "yes" on Proposal 3—now these are the people who voted "yes," not the people who voted "no"—65 percent of the people who voted "yes" on Proposal 3 also supported a 24-hour waiting period—which was widely accepted over the past 40-plus years. These same voters do not support removing basic health and safety measures aimed at protecting patients.

These bills, Mr. President, go well beyond maintaining abortion access that was already available in Michigan under *Roe*. I will vote "no" on this radical health act. I invite my colleagues to join me.

Senators McBroom, Victory and Theis, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 474, 475, 476, and 477.

Senator McBroom's statement, in which Senator Victory concurred, is as follows:

It's almost pointless it seems at times to stand up and speak on an issue. This issue particularly is one I have certainly stood up and spoken on before, and I know those who advocated for these policies have also stood up and spoke before. It's difficult to know whether or not, I suspect my opponents agree, whether there is anything new to be said. Many of us weren't even born when abortion became legalized in this country so we are not the first generation to debate it and what new issues we can bring to the floor. Rising to speak on it can seem very futile. Futile for those who advocate for it I'm sure and futile for those who advocate against it. Yet I feel compelled to speak regardless because truth should always be heard. Regardless whether truth is winning at any given moment, regardless if people want to hear the truth, truth must be spoken.

During the earlier debate on these bills, I once again heard proponents speak about how this is about women's rights, this is about women's health, and that those of us who oppose this legislation are seeking somehow or other to trample on those rights, seeking to control other people's bodies. The important truth that must be shared again, lest it be forgotten and lost in the cacophony, is that we are advocates against

abortion because we are advocates for human life and for human rights. Come, let us reason together, if what grows inside of a mother is not human but is simply tissue, simply material, to be expelled like a tumor or a cancer, then we wouldn't have this debate.

There are those of us who fundamentally believe that it is a human life, not a partial life, not sort of a life, not pre-life, but life itself. It is incumbent upon those who view it differently that it should simply be ended, or able to be ended, to explain how it is not human life when it has all of the aspects that we deem life to have. It has its own distinct DNA, it has its own distinct fingerprints, it has its own heart and mind and breath. The body grows and respirates, it consumes, it expels, and those who argue, Well but it is dependent, well there are a lot of lives who are dependent, where should we draw this line? At two years old? My two-year-olds were certainly dependent. At 10 years old? My seven-year-old is still very dependent. How about at 90 years old? I have a grandmother who is extremely dependent who is over 90. So it cannot be based on dependence. Where should we draw this line? We know we can't draw this line based whether they are actively participating, whether their minds are, because we recognize people who are in comas or who are sleeping are still alive and can't be snuffed out. So where I ask should that line be? It is incumbent upon the others who advocate that the ending of a life is somehow not the ending of a life to explain how it's not a life. To us it is a life and the line is very clear, we say it all the time, at conception. When this DNA is created, when the ovum and sperm come together, that is a new human life. It is entitled to all the rights every other human life is entitled to. All the rights.

These are important and profound truths. What is particularly upsetting in this discussion is where this line is just ignored. The need to even establish the line is ignored and it moves around even to the point where some literally advocate for the allowance of death after the baby is born. We see the incredible inconsistency when the determination of what is or isn't a life depends upon the perception of the one carrying the life and whether or not they want it yet or not. It's not convenient this time so therefore, I deem it not to be a life. This time I want it, I've named it, I've listened to it, so now it is a life. This tremendous inconsistency, incongruity, even hypocrisy is for the other side to answer. It is for them to stand up and say, Here's why you're wrong, here's why it is not a human life, here's why convenience, here's why expediency, here's why the debate on affordability or the circumstance of the parents do matter, this is why it is okay to say, Well life isn't going to be good enough yet, the parents aren't ready yet, so therefore it is okay because it's not really a life anyway. When we don't allow that excuse for anyone else who ends a life, at any other time, except when it's not yet born life, and even that definition seems to be in jeopardy. Once again, I know I'm not saying anything that hasn't been said or heard before. I know the chances that it makes a difference are low. Truth needs to be heard. Truth needs to be spoken. Come, let us reason together.

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, resumed the Chair.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

As Proposal 3 was being championed as a ballot question, our citizens were assured that this was just going to take us back to a pre-*Roe*-overturning position. Opponents said there would never be late-term abortions unless it was an emergency, yet late-term abortions aren't even being discouraged by our leadership at the state or federal level. They said there would be no way that protections and oversight for facilities would be removed, yet this body just did that today. They said there would be no issue with women being informed of the risks, yet this body today again made that no longer a requirement.

This is something by the way that is required of other elective procedures, and it should be. People going in for elective procedures should know what the risks are. Each one of these has been affirmatively voted against as amendments today. While it is true that our population voted for Proposal 3, it is obvious that the proponents were not being honest about what would be the reality of our state once this was adopted. The bills we're passing today show that it was entirely disingenuous.

As someone who stands here because *Roe* was not yet decided, as someone who stands here having chosen life, even when it was inconvenient, as someone who stands here as the grandmother of a child also born out of wedlock, I pray that you reconsider your positions, understand the meanings to families. I've spoken to mothers who were pregnant before *Roe* was put in place and they wonder what their choice would have been, and they honestly live with guilt because they wonder. I've spoken to women who did make that choice and who regret it every day, and they wonder what their child would look like. I stand here as someone who has a family because the right choices were made.

Senator Theis asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement and moved that the statement be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

My amendment would support adoption services and protect maternal health. Every human life is a gift from God and has dignity and value worth protecting. If Democrats are serious about growing our state's population, then we should be providing families with the support and resources they need to raise a family. Let's provide women with that support and those resources, the things that they need to keep the mother and child safe during and after the pregnancy. We need to promote adoption services in our state as well, and I ask for support on my amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 529, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," by amending sections 46, 47, 581, 795c, 822, 841, 842, and 846 (MCL 168.46, 168.47, 168.581, 168.795c, 168.822, 168.841, 168.842, and 168.846), section 46 as amended by 2002 PA 431, section 795c as amended by 2015 PA 268, section 822 as amended by 2018 PA 614, section 841 as amended by 2015 PA 197, and section 842 as amended by 2018 PA 382, and by adding section 814.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 569

Yeas—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 395, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled "The revised school code," by amending sections 1230b, 1249, 1249a, 1249b, and 1280f (MCL 380.1230b, 380.1249, 380.1249a, 380.1249b, and 380.1280f), section 1230b as added by 1996 PA 189, section 1249 as amended by 2019 PA 6, section 1249a as amended by 2015 PA 173, section 1249b as amended by 2019 PA 5, and section 1280f as amended by 2023 PA 7; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The question being on the passage of the bill,
 Senator McDonald Rivet offered the following substitute:
 Substitute (S-5).
 The substitute was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
 The question being on the passage of the bill,
 The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 570

Yeas—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protest

Senator McBroom, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 395 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

I find myself in the position again that I’ve been in several times over my years of service in the Legislature, of wondering just how wildly extreme the pendulum can swing from side to side on some issue, and why we can’t seem to hit the middle—and here we are again. I think that a lot of the policy that has led us to this day is incredibly foolish, unhelpful policy, and when members stand up and talk about how we’re ranked so poorly in education, I’m like, well, what did we get for ten, twelve years of rather poor, stupid policy?

But the alternatives that get offered then are to some other extreme, as these bills are, and I can’t for the life of me understand why we can’t seem to ever hit the middle. So we go from having evaluations based on performance pushing the 40 percent mark, which is absolutely ridiculous. As a teacher, I know that so much of what happens in the classroom from year to year is completely dependent on the hand that I’ve been dealt as a teacher, and you don’t know how that hand’s going to be dealt. How good was the teacher those students had last year? What’s going on in Johnny’s home this year? What’s going on in Susie’s home this year?

All those problems, and somehow my evaluation could be based almost entirely, 50 percent of it, on that, and then you know what else we added in there? Whether I hung posters on the wall, and whether I dressed up nice enough, and whether I said “Hello” in a friendly fashion to the students, just ridiculous, stupid teacher evaluation things, mainly put on the spot of teachers by my side of the aisle, ridiculous stuff.

But yet, now, OK, well let’s have zero percent about student growth as if that were somehow going to solve any problems either. Now we’ve had an amendment that allows a maximum of 20 percent, but it’s negotiable so who knows. And we have such lousy administrators at so many of our schools, who don’t know what they’re doing, that who knows, they might bargain away, well it might just be one percent. You know, it’s just, why can’t we figure this out? Why can’t we get some simple decisions made around here that allow for evaluation of our teachers in a sensible way, that recognizes, sure, student growth matters, but you know what else matters? The teacher’s ability to do his pedagogy. The teacher’s ability to know their subject matter. And why are we evaluating teachers by people who literally don’t have to have any significant level of training to do the evaluations? Lousy administrators. People who are pencil pushers, accountants basically, who suddenly are told, Go to the classroom and figure out whether so-and-so is actually doing a good job or not.

So, here I am, as I’ve been on so many other bills in this new era we’re in, where it’s like, Well, we’re going to undo everything you guys did for a while, but we’re not going to try to figure it out, like we were suggesting when we were in the minority, but now we’re going to swing over here and put it exactly where we really wanted it all the time.

Senators McDonald Rivet and Damoose asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator McDonald Rivet’s statement is as follows:

I was hoping to stand up here and say good afternoon, but let me now switch that to good evening.

This substitute makes some good changes to the bill. The first is that it adds student growth to the evaluation process, up to 20 percent of the whole. The source of the growth data is locally negotiated and subject to local agreement. It prohibits the use of the MME exams which have been widely understood to be the wrong measure of student growth for these purposes. It adds due process in an appeal process, including mediation. And, lastly, clarifies a section of the bill that the 90-day window refers to kindergarten teachers only.

Senator Damoose’s statement is as follows:

I think we all need to take a step back and take a real hard look at where we are in terms of education in the state of Michigan. I’m proud that we’re providing more resources to our schools than ever before in history, but that’s only part of the solution. Any honest assessment will also take into consideration that our schools are ranked 42nd in fourth-grade reading. We’re beating only eight other states. We must take a look at the fact that we are ranked 36th in math. We’re 10th lowest in SAT scores. With results like that, now is not the time to consider relaxing our standards or weakening our evaluations. Imagine, in the face of such dismal performance, we just got rid of A-F school rankings. Let’s not also get rid of meaningful teacher evaluations on top of all of this. Teaching is not like most careers. Most other industries are simple. You perform well, you get to keep your job. You don’t perform, often you are given the chance to improve. You don’t improve, you are gone. I would have expected nothing less in my business. If I didn’t do the job and perform at a high level, my clients would leave. But the whole system of education is different.

We’ve made it so hard to take action when there is a poor-performing or mediocre teacher. Let’s be clear, schools don’t want to fire teachers—they can barely find enough as it is—but, getting rid of even the mechanisms for evaluating and measuring a teacher’s performance, and helping them improve, seems to fly in the face of all of our efforts to improve our schools. Maybe someday, maybe when we are ranked in the top ten nationwide, we can get rid of standards and evaluations, but right now we need every tool we can find to measure, encourage, and enforce high standards, and drive more performance for our schools. And that’s why I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in voting “no” on this bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 396, entitled

A bill to amend 1937 (Ex Sess) PA 4, entitled “An act relative to continuing tenure of office of certificated teachers in public educational institutions; to provide for probationary periods; to regulate discharges or demotions; to provide for resignations and leaves of absence; to create a state tenure commission and to

prescribe the powers and duties thereof; and to prescribe penalties for violation of the provisions of this act,” by amending section 4 of article I, sections 2a and 3b of article II, and section 3 of article III (MCL 38.74, 38.82a, 38.83b, and 38.93), section 4 of article I as amended by 2011 PA 100 and sections 2a and 3b of article II as added and section 3 of article III as amended by 2011 PA 101.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 571

Yeas—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Johnson, Bellino, Runestad and Theis, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 395 and 396.

Senator Johnson moved that the statement she made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 395 be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Johnson’s statement, in which Senators Bellino, Runestad and Theis concurred, is as follows:

Madam President, I rise to say five words I don’t often say: I agree with the Governor. I agree with her opposition to these bills which attempt to water down educational standards in our state, to lower expectations, and to accept the status quo.

According to a report issued by the Education Trust Midwest, Michigan fell from 32nd in 2019 to 43rd in 4th-grade reading scores in 2022 based on the results of the National Assessment for Educational Progress. Fourth-grade reading scores, the report says, are an important predictor of a child’s future academic success and life outcomes. Despite record financial investments in our schools, Michigan students are struggling, and yet the bills before this body today do not address how to help Michigan students learn to read. Instead, they say if you don’t like the scores, just throw away the scorecard, the report card, when you’re evaluating teacher performance.

The substitute adopted today unfortunately does not change this. The substitute states that teacher evaluations may be based on student growth, and the substitute specifies that student growth must not exceed 20 percent of the evaluation. That means student growth, which currently accounts for 40 percent of a teacher’s evaluation, if we pass these bills could be zero percent of a teacher’s evaluation, and at the very most 20 percent of the evaluation.

There are many excellent and dedicated teachers in this state. My undergraduate degree is in K-9 education, and I saw very quickly during my student teaching the difference a great teacher can make in the lives of our state’s children. But not all teachers perform at the same level and there must be some objective accountability in evaluating their performance. To disregard student progress in making this determination is absurd.

If you believe that student progress is important, then student progress must be a part of evaluating teachers. And if you believe that student progress is important, I urge you to vote “no” on these bills.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 530, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3157 (MCL 500.3157), as amended by 2019 PA 21.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Theis offered the following amendment:

- 1. Amend page 22, following line 15, by inserting:

“Enacting section 2. This amendatory act does not take effect unless the department of insurance and financial services determines that premium rates for personal protection insurance coverage for automobile insurance policies will not increase as a result of the changes made by this amendatory act.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 572

Yeas—16

Albert	Hauck	Lauwers	Outman
Bellino	Hoitenga	Lindsey	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	McBroom	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Nesbitt	Webber

Nays—21

Anthony	Cherry	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Damoose	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno
Chang			

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Runestad

In The Chair: Geiss

Protests

Senators Moss, Cavanagh, McMorrow, Anthony, Wojno and Shink, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against adoption of the amendment offered by Senator Theis to Senate Bill No. 530.

Senator Moss moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the amendment be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Moss’ statement, in which Senators Cavanagh, McMorrow, Anthony, Wojno and Shink concurred, is as follows:

I’ve listened to this in committee, I’ve listened to this here, about how, somehow, we’re going to increase rates due to restoring health care in this bill package, and that’s kind of what this amendment seeks to address. We were promised that rates would be reduced as a result of the 2019 law, but I’m still having constituents in my district tell me that their rates increased. In committee, the insurance industry came before us and I asked them, Why is this happening, even though rate relief was promised in the 2019 law? Well, they said, Yeah, your PIP line might have gone down, but other aspects of your bill have increased due to various factors including supply chain, inflation, whatever. So rates are higher now anyways, so the heart of the bill is to restore access to health care, and that is something that I have championed for a very long time, so all this talk about rate relief, we can get real rate relief if we better target the items that are increasing our rates and rein in some of these industry costs.

I don’t think that this amendment achieves anything regarding rate relief, in an attempt to restore health care, if, God forbid, anyone of us should be in a car accident. I urge a “no” vote.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 573

Yeas—23

Anthony	Chang	Johnson	Outman
Bayer	Cherry	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Brinks	Damoose	McCann	Shink
Bumstead	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Wojno
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	

Nays—14

Albert	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bellino	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Lauwers	Santana	Webber
Hauck	Lindsey		

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Runestad

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Theis, Bellino, Lindsey, McBroom and Nesbitt, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 530.

Senator Theis, McBroom and Nesbitt moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Theis’ statement, in which Senators Bellino and Lindsey concurred, is as follows:

What I have before me is a letter from the Department of Insurance and Financial Services, the expert on this particular area, and they have been overseeing it since the change. I intend to read some information from here. They start by thanking for the opportunity to submit their opinions on this, but then they go on:

As the Committee is aware, Michigan’s 2019 auto insurance reform was a bipartisan effort 40 years in the making. Throughout the implementation of that reform and beyond, DIFS has remained committed to ensuring that drivers realize the cost savings intended by the reforms while also ensuring access to all the care to which they are entitled under Michigan law. Senate Bills 530, 531, and 575, as currently written, are not a tailored modification to address specific and documented issues—the ones that were described earlier—but rather a wholesale overhaul of the no-fault fee schedule, one of the key cost savings provisions of the 2019 reform, which would broadly increase reimbursement rates for all providers.

As a consumer protection agency, DIFS has identified a number of major impacts that this proposal would have on consumers that we urge you to consider before proceeding. First, the proposed increase in provider reimbursement rates would have a significant impact on auto insurance premiums paid by more than seven million drivers across the state. Second, the proposed bills would result in an increase to the Michigan Catastrophic Claims Association per-vehicle fee. The MCCA annual assessment for anticipated new claims has dropped by 66% since the law was implemented, decreasing from \$220 to \$74, effective July 1, 2023. Third, drivers who select lower Personal Injury Protection levels, including families who are taking advantage of the new lower choice levels to decrease their cost, would be disproportionately affected—those are the poorest among us—because the increased provider reimbursement rates will exhaust their PIP medical coverage limits much more quickly. This concern highlights the importance of examining both policyholder and provider concerns and not conflating the two. Fourth, the faster those with coverage limits exhaust their coverage, the more likely it is that they will seek excess medical costs under the at-fault driver’s Bodily Injury coverage, leading to increased BI rates as well. Fifth, and perhaps most importantly, increased insurance rates would likely lead to more uninsured drivers and less competition in the insurance marketplace, which could further increase insurance rates. Pre-reform, Michigan was the only state that required drivers to purchase unlimited lifetime medical benefits, and in fact the only state to even offer that option—by the way, the next closest is \$50,000—as a result Michigan had the most expensive auto insurance in the nation for decades, and also had a disproportionate number of uninsured drivers, especially in our most disadvantaged communities. After the reform, Michigan remains the only state to offer unlimited benefits as an option, but as a result of having lower-cost options, more than 200,000 drivers took advantage of the uninsured driver amnesty period, including more than 83,000 drivers who had not had coverage for 3 or more years. With higher rates, more drivers may find themselves unable to afford premiums and may take the risk of going without insurance, ultimately leaving them without any coverage for medical bills or vehicle repairs in the event of an accident.

Simply put, the broad-brush reimbursement rate increases proposed in these bills would substantially impact auto insurance affordability rates across the state. Immediately after the reforms, there were calls for a “fix” to address continuity of care for those injured prior to the reforms. The Supreme Court in the *Andary* case

addressed major concerns expressed by auto accident survivors and providers. To the extent specific additional issues can be identified that impact access to care, a narrower solution addressing such concerns is certainly possible. However, these bills are not narrowly tailored and will swing the pendulum too far. Accordingly, the department cannot support the bills in this form.

DIFS will, of course, continue to be a resource for this Committee and the Legislature as you continue to explore any potential changes to Michigan's auto no-fault law.

I am pleading that you take a look, that you consider what is in these bills, that you consider the additional cost to the 7 million drivers, that you consider the poorest among us and the effects this is going to have on them, and that we work with the Department of Insurance and Financial Services to come up with a surgical solution to the actual problems rather than addressing this with a broad brush and creating a major financial problem that we had just started to solve.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

I once again find myself whipsawed around by these issues. Not for the same reasons this time of the pendulum swinging too far, but because of the seeming unending ability, and this debate over car insurance, to stop advocating that either the insurance companies are out to get everybody and are extorting everyone to one extreme, or everybody's being left without any help whatsoever. When the vast majority of our population, the vast majority of my constituents who sent me down here with one directive when it came to car insurance—save people money. And who is speaking for those people?

It seems, you know, lots of allegations, Oh you're just here speaking for the hospitals, you're just here speaking for the insurance companies. Well, I want to be the person who stands up and speaks to regular people every day who have to pay car insurance, and it's too expensive. It's ridiculously expensive in this state; insanely expensive in this state. For those of us who live on a border with other states, we see it every single day when hundreds, if not thousands of our neighbors insure their cars on the other side of the line so they can get by with cheaper prices. And we do nothing but argue over either, Well this isn't good for the insurance companies, this isn't good for the hospitals, this isn't good for these health care providers.

What are we doing to argue for what's good for the drivers of this state who are paying too much for car insurance? It's too expensive. How can it be that 49 other states in this country can do so much better than we do? It's not excusable. Now we're dealing with this pile of junk, this set of bills, because there's this whole debate, Well it was 45 percent too much, maybe, well prices have gone up, who could stand a 45-percent cut? And they don't even honestly discuss the fact of how extortionary the prices were when we started.

These companies that are coming before us now who say, Well we can't possible take a 45-percent cut, that's just too much. And you discuss, Well how was it before that you dealt with the patients who were there getting the exact same treatments but weren't there from car accidents, how did you pay for them? Well, it's because we had so many people in here with the car insurance side and we could charge so much for them that the payments that we got for them from Medicaid or from the insurance companies were able to be subsidized by the other one. Well, that's not my problem. That is their fault. That's their fault for running a dishonest system in the first place. That's their fault for extorting us in the first place.

All of these folks who come here with their incredible stories, as one of my colleagues referenced before. Their desire and passion to live, being extorted by lawyers from CPAN and other organizations, being extorted by them. Because they get to get their fingers on those settlement dollars. It's real nice to get 30 percent of a million-dollar settlement isn't it? Set you up for life. Every year, collecting that nice settlement check. Go out and buy some more chiropractor offices and a limo service and a lunch service. To help those people. Pay for them to get over to Lansing. We're being extorted and I hoped that when we passed those bills a few years ago it would be the death knell of CPAN, but they had too much money, they got too much money coming in every year from those other settlements they got years ago. They just keep chipping away at us, keep on coming in and lying to us, keep on bringing the sad stories to us and extorting us. They never want to be honest with us. They never want to explain why the other states don't have the very problem that they say we would have if we got rid of our auto insurance program in this state. Dishonest. Extortion. That's what's going on from these groups.

Now this bill answers these heart-wrenching stories that we're hearing about, but they were caused by agencies and groups that were extorting the system, that couldn't handle the realignment. Then that's our fault. We're the bad guys. Now we've got to do this and drive up the cost of insurance, again. It's undeniable. You can't possibly spend all of this money and not get it from somewhere.

I know we saved money in these last bills because I've got a ridiculous amount of drivers and cars at my home. My rates have dropped more than 50 percent, but it's because I made choices about how much coverage I wanted to have, still more coverage than any other state mandates its residents to have in order to have the minimum. And I've got to fill out a ridiculous amount of paperwork every year saying, Yes I honestly do know that I am submitting to less coverage, yes I do know that I am submitting to less coverage. Because we put some law in there that makes us have to do that. Then we wonder why people don't sign up for it. Because they just, Hey, I bought my auto insurance next year, just send me the form so I can sign again, I want what I had last year. No, you can't do that, you have to fill out all these forms all over again. Oh, I don't want to do that. Boom, you're back on unlimited lifetime benefits. And then they complain to us that, Oh, I can't believe my rates went up.

Then you have the auto insurance companies, whose agents are literally telling people, Don't sign up for less coverage, keep signing up for that maximum coverage. Oh, you don't want to sign up for less coverage, what if you have an accident? What about liability? Well, we're not sure, the law—you might be subject, you might have to go to jail. They are literally doing that to people. I tell my constituents all the time, If your auto insurance agent is not saving you money, you need a new auto insurance agent, because it's out there. The savings are there if you want to take advantage of the plan.

Instead, we're going to pass this bill today and just subject our ratepayers in this state to higher prices again, and keep on making Michigan less competitive and drive more of my border residents to insure their cars on the other side of the line and just continue to gut the system, take more of our impoverished communities around the state and drive them to have no auto insurance whatsoever. It's wrong, and it shouldn't be this way. Forty-nine other states—we could adopt 49 different plans and be better.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

I have a few points for my colleague on the other side. First off, Michigan is the only state in the nation that has even an option of unlimited lifetime benefits. And building on what my colleague from the 38th Senate District mentioned earlier is that it's also one of the toughest states to opt out, or go to different levels of coverage. And so, once again, even with the positive movement on the reforms that were made in 2019, Michigan still has the highest minimums, the highest costs, because we continue to have the most generous benefits, period.

For the last 50 years, before the 2019 reforms became possible, health providers were able to charge the most exorbitant rates in the nation. They called it the chagemaster. It was the most expensive state because they were charging the highest prices, and it was built into the law. The original no-fault system was supposed to limit lawsuits, instead we've seen an increase in lawsuits over the last decades, and with the 2019 reforms, it has improved the number of lawsuits, lowering the number of lawsuits in the system. A new fraud authority, helping to root out fraud. These reforms have been clamored on for years, New Jersey was the last state that had unlimited lifetime benefits, and in the early '90s it became unaffordable for residents of New Jersey and they decided to change. The amount of fraud and corruption that happens in Florida with just a \$10,000 PIP benefit is part of the driver in terms of the cost. But what we've seen the last few years is that Michigan's created a more competitive market, the new insurers have started to enter into the system to make more competition and lower prices here in Michigan.

Now, I don't know about you, but we've seen the price of a lot of things go up over the last few years with Bidenomics and Bidenflation happening. And this is what we're seeing across the board, and now, what the majority party has done, and what they've introduced and working to push through, is a law that will actually supercharge inflation on auto insurance and folks buying auto insurance in the state of Michigan. It's not bad enough that you're seeing higher prices at the gas pump, higher prices at the grocery store. For decades, Michigan residents have clamored for more choice in the insurance market, in trying to provide ways to actually opt out and this bill doesn't provide even the opportunity for individuals to say, "I actually trust you to make the decisions that you have," so you don't have to do the annual election form.

Let's go back to January 2019. Senate Republicans introduce Senate Bill No. 1. It was the latest attempt to deliver a real solution to people in Michigan. Five months later, legislative leaders from both parties, along with Governor Whitmer, stood together while historic auto no-fault reform was signed into law. Since that time, Michigan drivers have seen cost savings, as they have finally been given the ability to decide, to a certain extent, which levels of insurance that they wish to purchase. We don't have these mandates on other things such as life insurance, or you can decide for yourself the deductible, or home insurance on whether your farm or the outbuilding is insured for replacement costs or not insured at all. Those choices are made by the individual. Since that time, Michigan drivers have seen cost savings, they have finally been given the ability to decide which insurance coverage is best for their family. We've also seen the number of insured drivers increase in the state of Michigan. We've seen new entrants into the state of Michigan, as the cost to have it has become more affordable.

But we did see, before the 2022 election began, is that the Governor rebated and pushed the Michigan Catastrophic Claims Assessment Fund to rebate a bunch of money for the election year. And then we've seen the Supreme Court, which I think was a complete misreading of the law, two months ago, increase the liability of billions of dollars onto drivers and this will increase the rates again. Unfortunately, once the bill before us does pass, does pass the House, does pass the Senate, and is signed by the Governor, car insurance in Michigan will be made more expensive. But don't just take my word for it. Just yesterday, Governor Whitmer's director of the Department of Insurance and Financial Services provided a detailed letter to the Senate Finance, Insurance and Consumer Protection Committee opposing this bill. The director made it quite clear that if this bill passes, drivers can count on the following: an increase in auto insurance premiums, an increase in the catastrophic claims per-vehicle assessment, less coverage for lower PIP levels, increased rates leading to more uninsured drivers and less competition in the marketplace. With what the Supreme Court did earlier this year, you're already seeing some insurers re-assessing Michigan because of the change in the regulatory environment here in the state, and this will add fuel to that fire. Now I don't say this often, but I agree with the Whitmer administration on this issue, on this particular bill. A vote for these bills is a vote for higher car insurance rates in Michigan.

Madam President, after the passage of the 2019 bill, Michigan drivers finally realized some cost savings. People were given the ability to choose the best coverage for them. Is there more work to do? Absolutely. We can provide more choice. Trust the individual, trust the families more instead of trusting government more. And they could count on receiving the care that they need. I ask my colleagues not to make this mistake of taking one step forward only to take three steps back. Please join me in opposing this legislation.

Senators Theis, Damoose, Anthony, Cavanagh and Brinks asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

We live in hyper-partisan times—that's no surprise. Washington is a mess, and here we are in Lansing, and we often find ourselves at odds. But Senate Bill No. 1 of 2019 was an example of true bipartisanship—a Republican Legislature working with a Democratic Governor to achieve a desperately-needed reform that had eluded lawmakers for 40 years. For the better part of that timeframe, Michigan paid the highest car insurance rates in the nation, by a lot. Our system was an extreme outlier and the exorbitant cost of insurance made driving impossible for many. Thousands of others resorted to driving without insurance. The system was utterly broken.

Madam President, we can't go back to those times. My amendment will make sure we don't. It simply says these bills will not take effect unless the Department of Insurance and Financial Services confirms rates won't go up as a result, and we've been assured that's true. If you agree the last thing Michigan drivers can afford is higher car insurance rates to go along with their higher grocery rates and their higher utility rates, I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment.

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

As a new Representative last term, I'll never forget the scene. We were all told there was a free gift for legislators in the Speaker's Library. I like all of my colleagues went and picked up a little box and it was pretty neat. It had a small cast iron frying pan. I'll never forget what happened next. We all dutifully marched back to session, presents in hand, weaving our way through a trail of people in wheelchairs who had been devastated, first in an automobile crash, then again when they lost the insurance coverage they had bought and paid for. The scene was surreal and deeply disturbing, so callous and uncaring though none of us meant it that way. It just happened. I decided to begin stopping and listening to the stories of those who were devastated by the unintended consequences of an otherwise well-intentioned law. I met so many people around the state, I decided it was simply inhumane to allow David and his mother, for instance, to continue to suffer; to allow Chris and her daughter Brittany from my own district to have their entire lives put in jeopardy because they didn't get the care they were promised; to watch five-year-old Annabelle whom many of us know, paralyzed from the neck down, sit there and smile, and it's a beautiful smile, at the thrill of just being in the Capitol. The two sponsors of these bills came with me to take a picture with her and I hope it hangs on her wall as an adult someday, but her mom Brandy told me she's 15 minutes from death every single moment of her life. If her ventilator fails, she has 15 minutes to live.

These people had their coverage cut by 45 percent, to just 55 percent of what was being charged on January 1, 2019. Imagine anything in this world that cost 55 percent of what it did a year before COVID. Michigan's Supreme Court just ruled it was absolutely wrong that such cuts were applied retroactively. We've been saying that for years, but in the end it almost doesn't matter because in the interim many of the health care businesses and professionals these people relied upon have been forced to close up shop and move elsewhere. Even if we fix this today, some of the damage is permanent and cannot be undone.

When auto no-fault reform was passed, almost everybody said it would need to be tweaked along the way. We tried to change it last term but were told we needed to give it more time to see how the reforms would work, and now I'm not going to end another year or another session looking into the eyes of those lives who continue to be turned upside down with yet another excuse, yet another term gone by with no relief.

In Scripture, Jesus says that whatever you do for the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you do for me. If we can't come together to help these people, truly among the most desperate in our society, I'm not sure anything else we do really matters. We have it in our power to fix this for so many Michigan families. Let's not walk by them again in the hallways of the Capitol. Let's pass these bills and instead stop, look them in the eyes, and say we heard you and we took action.

Senator Anthony's statement is as follows:

I rise to ask for your support of this package, which helps to remedy the various shortcomings of the 2019 auto reform law. Unlike many things that we voted on today, I'm encouraged that there has been bipartisan support for this package. And one of the most important jobs that we have is to uplift the voices of individuals in our communities, and just weeks ago, we heard from many of those voices who consistently have lined the halls of this building, asking us for relief, asking us to act to enact minor reforms that could have a major impact on their daily quality of life.

As a reminder, lawmakers tried to push reforms knowing that the 2019 legislation was not perfect. However, there has not been action and any proposals have been refused up to this point. Now we've consistently heard from the catastrophically injured individuals and their families. They shared their stories with us, and lined these halls advocating for change. My family is one of those families, and when we have talked to people whose lives have been changed for good, have changed because of a system that, before 2019, protected them, gave them a soft landing, ensured that the services they have come to expect and deserve, the system before 2019 guaranteed that type of service. These people did not ask to be in auto accidents. They did not ask to have politicians who, regardless of their motives, made decisions that would impact their lives forever. This has undoubtedly prolonged the care crisis that they are facing, and so what we all know is that we don't want to be here next year, having the same conversations with these families.

We know that we are empowered today to do one small step that could make a major difference in the lives of our people. We all want to do what's best to save money for Michiganders and lower costs for people, including the cost of auto insurance—but we can do both. We can save money for people and ensure that the catastrophically injured, the permanently disabled by auto accidents, are also taken care of. It is our right and our responsibility to do just that today. So with that, I urge a "yes" vote on this series of bills.

Senator Cavanagh's statement is as follows:

I rise today extremely proud of the legislation before us. Today we are taking a much needed and essential step to address a critical issue for some of Michigan's most-vulnerable residents. The package of these bills addresses the unintended consequences of the auto insurance reforms that resulted in limited access to care for auto accident survivors here in the state of Michigan. In the comprehensive overhaul, survivors of auto accidents prior to reform faced an uncertain future with every post-reform survivor and driver at risk of not having access of care if they ever are in an accident. These bills seek to answer the uncertainty these survivors have faced for far too long. Adjusting the reimbursement system for specialized care and supporting facility at-home care, or specialized treatment, by those we love and trust offers sustainability, quality, access to medically-necessary care, and improves quality of life for Michigan auto accident survivors who are adjusting to their new normal.

No one pictures their life after a catastrophic car accident. No Michigander plans life where they are no longer able to walk, to work, to take care of themselves on their own, but too many Michiganders, their families, and our own constituents know this reality. These bills will ensure that every Michigan driver, whether they have already been in an accident or have chosen full coverage to protect themselves in the future, have access and availability to the care and benefits that they pay for. I do not believe any reform should ever be at the cost of accessing medically-necessary care to auto accident survivors that is necessary for survival. I am excited we were able to work with stakeholders, colleagues, families, and survivors themselves to address the most urgent need of the availability of care, while not impacting cost-saving features of the current insurance law.

These bills still allow for fraud authority, utilization review, choice of lower cost personal injury protection, and still giving insurers the ability to deny any claim in the process to deem being unreasonable. Surprise, surprise. After the reform, Michigan is still experiencing one of the highest paying premiums in the nation. This package provides our residents the care that they need and provide the care that they are paying for. I am hopeful for ongoing discussions and looking forward to, after the speakers today, their support to other options regarding finally solving the exuberant cost experienced by Michigan drivers through cracking down

on discriminatory practices that do not create an artificial narrative where affordability is entirely determined by the access of care for all drivers in Michigan. But first, we need to address the most urgent issue for current and future auto accident survivors that need us as legislators to stand up for one of our most-vulnerable populations feeling real life and death consequences from this crisis of care.

I'm proud to have worked on a constructive, bipartisan solution that will benefit every Michigan driver, all seven million, and save lives. I urge a "yes" vote on these bills.

Senator Brinks' statement is as follows:

A major responsibility that we are tasked with here is not just passing laws but also having the courage to revisit laws that need improving. Many of you were here when the first iteration of no-fault reform was passed in 2019. I voted "no" largely because of the concerns that will now be addressed in this legislation. For me, it is about what we can do to ensure that people who are disabled by catastrophic accidents are simply able to live with dignity.

I'd like to thank the Senators from the 6th, 21st, and 7th districts, along with a number of members in this chamber and issue stakeholders who have provided valuable insight and spoke eloquently in favor of this legislation. By passing these bills, we can better serve the people of our state, especially those who have been in life-changing accidents, their families, and their caregivers.

I thank you, and I urge a "yes" vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 531, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled "The insurance code of 1956," by amending section 2111f (MCL 500.2111f), as added by 2019 PA 22.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 574

Yeas—23

Anthony	Chang	Johnson	Outman
Bayer	Cherry	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Brinks	Damoose	McCann	Shink
Bumstead	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Wojno
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	

Nays—14

Albert	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bellino	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Lauwers	Santana	Webber
Hauck	Lindsey		

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Runestad

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 575, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3107c (MCL 500.3107c), as added by 2019 PA 22.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 575

Yeas—23

Anthony	Chang	Johnson	Outman
Bayer	Cherry	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Brinks	Damoose	McCann	Shink
Bumstead	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Wojno
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	

Nays—14

Albert	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bellino	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Lauwers	Santana	Webber
Hauck	Lindsey		

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Runestad

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senator Santana under her constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 530, 531, and 575 and moved that she be permitted to submit, in writing, her reasons for voting “no” for inclusion in a subsequent Journal.

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4998, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 141, entitled “Grain dealers act,” by amending section 7 (MCL 285.67), as amended by 2004 PA 274.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 576

Yeas—20

Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18

Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An act to regulate the storage, warehousing, buying, and selling of farm produce within this state; to provide for the licensing, regulation, and bonding of grain dealers; to provide for warehouse receipts, acknowledgment forms, and price later agreements and their use and priority; to provide for the creation of security interests; to provide for certain powers and duties of the department of agriculture and its director; to impose certain duties on insurance companies and sureties; and to provide administrative remedies and penalties for the violation of this act.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 466

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 466, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 12606a (MCL 333.12606a), as amended by 2022 PA 168.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 577

Yeas—36

Anthony	Daley	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Damoose	Lauwers	Runestad
Bellino	Geiss	Lindsey	Santana
Brinks	Hauck	McCann	Shink
Bumstead	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh

Camilleri
Cavanagh
Chang
Cherry

Hoitenga
Huizenga
Irwin
Johnson

McMorrow
Moss
Nesbitt
Outman

Theis
Victory
Webber
Wojno

Nays—2

Albert

McBroom

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protest

Senator McBroom, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 466.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

This bill should have been considered a local act and not a general act. When reading the provisions of it, it’s very clear that it doesn’t even mask its intentions as being a local act in the normal way that we would usually mask something like that. It is, I believe, an unconstitutional act in that regard and therefore I voted “no.”

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 518, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending section 1531i (MCL 380.1531i), as amended by 2020 PA 316.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 578

Yeas—38

Albert
Anthony
Bayer
Bellino
Brinks
Bumstead
Camilleri
Cavanagh
Chang
Cherry

Daley
Damoose
Geiss
Hauck
Hertel
Hoitenga
Huizenga
Irwin
Johnson
Klinefelt

Lauwers
Lindsey
McBroom
McCann
McDonald Rivet
McMorrow
Moss
Nesbitt
Outman

Polehanki
Runestad
Santana
Shink
Singh
Theis
Victory
Webber
Wojno

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 533, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 217, 222, and 233a (MCL 257.217, 257.222, and 257.233a), sections 217 and 233a as amended by 2022 PA 224 and section 222 as amended by 2014 PA 290.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 579

Yeas—37

Anthony	Damoose	Lauwers	Polehanki
Bayer	Geiss	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hauck	McBroom	Santana
Brinks	Hertel	McCann	Shink
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Huizenga	McMorrow	Theis
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Victory
Chang	Johnson	Nesbitt	Webber
Cherry	Klinefelt	Outman	Wojno
Daley			

Nays—1

Albert

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senators Geiss, Chang, Irwin, Santana, Shink, Bayer and McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 599, entitled

A bill to amend 1953 PA 232, entitled “Corrections code of 1953,” by amending sections 34 and 35 (MCL 791.234 and 791.235), section 34 as amended by 2019 PA 14 and section 35 as amended by 2019 PA 13.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senator Santana introduced
Senate Bill No. 600, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16g of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16g), as amended by 2020 PA 50.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senator Santana introduced
Senate Bill No. 601, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 147b (MCL 750.147b), as added by 1988 PA 371.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Statements

Senators Bellino and Albert asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

Two of the biggest issues that people can’t stand about us elected officials are when they say one thing and do another, and when they abuse their power to protect their friends. According to a recent piece in the *Detroit News*, our Attorney General did both. A friend of the Attorney General—who happens to be the treasurer of the Michigan Democratic Party—was accused last year by the director of a west Michigan nursing home of using the account of an elderly, brain-damaged client to fraudulently bill an insurance company nearly \$50,000.

After the accusations came out, the Attorney General opened an investigation. The Attorney General promised not to intervene and her Financial Crimes Division director—who was rightfully concerned about the obvious conflict of interest—sent a memo to their staff letting them know he was constructing an ethical firewall to distance the Attorney General from the investigation. But according to her own emails, our Attorney General blasted through the firewall anyway. It was quicker than Chase running through a brick wall trying to save another puppy on *Paw Patrol*.

She emailed her Solicitor General saying that her friend, “wants to be able to assert that the claims were never substantiated by our investigation and the case is closed.” Two weeks later, it was closed—even though the Attorney General’s investigators never spoke to the whistleblower who filed the complaint. Imagine our police accusing people and not asking the witnesses what happened.

In response yesterday, the Attorney General’s office said their decision was made “without influence or consult with Attorney General Nessel.” Really—really? She emailed her Solicitor General indicating the wishes of her friend—the subject of the investigation. If we can’t agree that’s an improper consult, or at least a break of the department’s own firewall, then we may never agree on anything ever again.

I don’t know if the Attorney General’s friend did anything wrong at all. I don’t know; I’m not accusing her of anything, but it’s shameful that our Attorney General—who often talks a big game about the rule of law—couldn’t stay out of the case and broke her own promise. It further illustrates that she lives by two sets of rules—one for her Democratic friends and one for everybody else.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

Today I’m urging this chamber to move forward in a transparent fashion with legislation that will fulfill the financial disclosure obligation outlined in Proposal 1, which was approved by Michigan voters last November. I have introduced Senate Bill Nos. 595-598, and they were read into the record today. I am not suggesting that my proposal is perfect, it is just a starting point. Proposal 1 enacted a constitutional amendment that will require state legislators and other elected state officers to file annual financial disclosure reports. It is aimed at preventing conflicts of interest and increasing transparency for residents and taxpayers of Michigan.

This has become even more pressing as there have been questions in the media about certain business interests of House members. The public deserves to know what is going on there. The Legislature is required to enact measures accomplishing this provision by the end of the year. If the Legislature does not act by

December 31, the Michigan Constitution says a resident of the state may initiate legal action to enforce its requirements. Obviously, it should never come to that. The Legislature must act on this soon and provide transparency to the Michigan voters. The clock is ticking, especially with the talk of a possible early sine die adjournment this year.

This legislation must be done in a transparent way because it's about openness in government, and it should not be written or negotiated behind the scenes or behind closed doors. It should not be rushed through in a process to avoid public scrutiny. There should be plenty of time to have committee hearings and conduct due diligence to make sure it is done correctly. Unfortunately, I am growing increasingly concerned that the plan is to jam transparency legislation through the Legislature in a most non-transparent way. So I have introduced these bills to start what I hope will be a public conversation.

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced the enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor on Wednesday, October 18, for her approval the following bills:

Enrolled Senate Bill No. 356 at 2:35 p.m.

Enrolled Senate Bill No. 357 at 2:37 p.m.

Enrolled Senate Bill No. 358 at 2:39 p.m.

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Wednesday, October 18, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

Senate Bill No. 594

House Bill Nos. 5178 5179

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Thursday, October 19, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

Senate Bill Nos. 595 596 597 598

Committee Reports

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

Senate Bill No. 530, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled "The insurance code of 1956," by amending section 3157 (MCL 500.3157), as amended by 2019 PA 21.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-4) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mary Cavanagh
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Moss, McCann, Bayer and Irwin

Nays: Senators Huizenga, Theis and Daley

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

Senate Bill No. 531, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled "The insurance code of 1956," by amending section 2111f (MCL 500.2111f), as added by 2019 PA 22.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mary Cavanagh
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Moss, McCann, Bayer and Irwin

Nays: Senators Huizenga, Theis and Daley

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

Senate Bill No. 575, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3107c (MCL 500.3107c), as added by 2019 PA 22.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mary Cavanagh
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Moss, McCann, Bayer and Irwin

Nays: Senators Huizenga, Theis and Daley

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

House Bill No. 4926, entitled

A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled “The general property tax act,” by amending section 14a (MCL 211.14a), as amended by 2022 PA 240.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mary Cavanagh
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Moss, McCann, Bayer, Irwin, Huizenga, Theis and Daley

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 18, 2023, at 12:30 p.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Cavanagh (C), Moss, McCann, Bayer, Irwin, Huizenga, Theis and Daley

The Committee on Health Policy reported

Senate Bill No. 249, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 20904, 20912, 20950, 20952, and 20954 (MCL 333.20904, 333.20912, 333.20950, 333.20952, and 333.20954), sections 20904, 20912, and 20954 as amended by 2000 PA 375, section 20950 as amended by 2021 PA 25, and section 20952 as added by 1990 PA 179.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Kevin Hertel
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Hertel, Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Health Policy reported

Senate Bill No. 449, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 108b.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Kevin Hertel
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Hertel, Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Health Policy reported

Senate Bill No. 450, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 108a.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Kevin Hertel
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Hertel, Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Health Policy submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 18, 2023, at 12:30 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Hertel (C), Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad

The Committee on Appropriations reported

Senate Bill No. 23, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending sections 6 and 11 (MCL 388.1606 and 388.1611), section 6 as amended by 2022 PA 144 and section 11 as amended by 2022 PA 212, and by adding section 61e.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

The committee further recommends that the bill be given immediate effect.

Sarah Anthony
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Anthony, McCann, McDonald Rivet, Cherry, Bayer, Santana, Shink, Irwin, Hertel, Camilleri, Klinefelt, McMorro, Cavanagh, Bumstead, Albert, Huizenga, Outman and Theis

Nays: Senator Damoose

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Appropriations reported

Senate Bill No. 350, entitled

A bill to amend 2008 PA 549, entitled “Michigan promise zone authority act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 390.1663), as amended by 2020 PA 330.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

The committee further recommends that the bill be given immediate effect.

Sarah Anthony
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Anthony, McCann, McDonald Rivet, Cherry, Bayer, Santana, Shink, Irwin, Hertel, Camilleri, Klinefelt, McMorro, Cavanagh, Bumstead, Damoose, Huizenga and Outman

Nays: Senators Albert and Theis

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Appropriations reported

Senate Bill No. 555, entitled

A bill to amend 2008 PA 549, entitled “Michigan promise zone authority act,” by amending sections 5, 7, and 11 (MCL 390.1665, 390.1667, and 390.1671), as amended by 2016 PA 9.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

The committee further recommends that the bill be given immediate effect.

Sarah Anthony
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Anthony, McCann, McDonald Rivet, Cherry, Bayer, Santana, Shink, Irwin, Hertel, Camilleri, Klinefelt, McMorrow, Cavanagh, Bumstead, Damoose, Huizenga and Outman

Nays: Senators Albert and Theis

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Appropriations submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 18, 2023, at 2:00 p.m., Harry T. Gast Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Anthony (C), McCann, McDonald Rivet, Cherry, Bayer, Santana, Shink, Irwin, Hertel, Camilleri, Klinefelt, McMorrow, Cavanagh, Bumstead, Albert, Damoose, Huizenga, Outman and Theis

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Oversight submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 18, 2023, at 8:30 a.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Singh (C), McMorrow, Geiss, Polehanki and McBroom

Excused: Senator Lindsey

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Elections and Ethics submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, October 18, 2023, at 3:00 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Moss (C), Wojno, Santana, McMorrow, Chang, Camilleri, Johnson and McBroom

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 6:17 p.m.

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 24, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN
Secretary of the Senate

