House Chamber, Lansing, Tuesday, December 4, 2018.

10:00 a.m.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The roll was called by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, who announced that a quorum was present.

Afendoulis—present  Farrington—present  Kelly—present  Reilly—present
Albert—present  Frederick—present  Kesto—present  Rendon—present
Alexander—present  Garcia—present  Kosowski—present  Roberts—present
Allor—present  Garrett—entered during session  LaFave—present  Robinson—present
Anthony—present  Gay-Dagnogo—present  LaGrand—present  Runestad—present
Barrett—present  Geiss—present  LaSata—present  Sabo—present
Bellino—present  Glenn—present  Lasinski—present  Santana—present
Bizon—present  Graves—present  Lauwers—present  Scott—absent
Brann—present  Lauwers—present  Leonard—present  Sheppard—present
Brinks—present  Greig—present  Leutheuser—present  Singh—present
Byrd—present  Greimel—present  Liberati—present  Sneller—present
Calley—present  Griffin—present  Lilly—present  Sowerby—present
Cambensy—present  Guerra—present  Love—excused  Tedder—present
Camilleri—present  Hammoud—present  Lower—present  Theis—present
Canfield—present  Hauck—present  Lucido—present  VanderWall—present
Chang—present  Hernandez—present  Marino—present  VanSingel—present
Chatfield—present  Hertel—present  Maturen—present  Vaupel—present
Chirkun—present  Hoadley—present  McCready—present  VerHeulen—present
Clemente—present  Hoitenga—present  Miller—present  Victory—present
Cochran—present  Hornberger—present  Moss—present  Webber—present
Cole—present  Howell—present  Neely—present  Wentworth—present
Cox—present  Howrylak—present  Noble—present  Whiteford—present
Crawford—present  Hughes—present  Pagan—present  Wittenberg—present
Dianda—present  Iden—present  Pagel—present  Yancey—present
Durhal—present  Inman—present  Peterson—present  Yanez—present
Elder—present  Johnson—present  Phelps—entered during session  Yaroch—present
Ellison—present  Jones—present  Rabhi—present  Zemke—present
Faris—present  Kahle—present

e/d/s = entered during session
Rep. John Reilly, from the 46th District, offered the following invocation:

“Father in Heaven, In this advent season, we are called to slow down and reflect on Your love for us. We praise You and thank You for the many gifts You have given us in this State, this nation and this world. You have demonstrated Your power, Your faithfulness and Your nature for us all to see. We ask for forgiveness and repent from ignoring You and Your precepts. We seek forgiveness for not showing love and mercy as You have shown us.

Father You tell us plainly to ask and we shall receive, seek and we shall find, knock and the door will be opened. Through Your prompting and Your promise of wisdom, we ask for wisdom in all the decisions that are made in this room this week. We ask our eyes be opened to measure correctly the issues before us and we ask for strength to follow Your ways in our law making decisions. You tell us to pray continuously and to seek Your will. You tell us in Your word our help comes from the Lord. In agreement with Your word we seek Your help to this end to do Your will in the name of Your Son Jesus Christ. Amen.”

The Speaker called Associate Speaker Pro Tempore Glenn to the Chair.


Third Reading of Bills

House Bill No. 5881, entitled
A bill to amend 1996 IL 1, entitled “Michigan gaming control and revenue act,” by amending sections 2, 4, 4a, 4c, 4d, 5, 6, 6a, 6c, and 7a (MCL 432.202, 432.204, 432.204a, 432.204c, 432.204d, 432.205, 432.206, 432.206a, 432.206c, and 432.207a), sections 2, 4, 5, and 6 as amended and sections 4a, 4c, 4d, 6a, 6c, and 7a as added by 1997 PA 69.

The bill was read a third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Moss moved to substitute (H-5) the bill.
The motion was seconded and the substitute (H-5) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Moss moved to amend the bill as follows:
1. Amend page 11, line 20, after “DISBURSEMENTS,” by striking out the balance of the subsection.
2. Amend page 34, line 27, after “CONSUMPTION” by striking out the balance of the page through “CASINO,” on line 1 of page 35 and inserting a comma.
3. Amend page 35, line 12, after “CONSUMPTION” by striking out the balance of the line through “CASINO,” on line 13 and inserting a comma.
4. Amend page 57, line 1, after “STATE” by striking out “ELECTED” and inserting “ELECTIVE”.
5. Amend page 96, line 3, after “market” by striking out “OR ADVERTISE ITS GAMBLING OPERATIONS” and inserting “its services, or send advertisements to,”.
6. Amend page 96, line 7, after “MAX” by inserting “MARKET OR”.
7. Amend page 96, line 7, after “ADVERTISE” by inserting “ITS SERVICES”.

The motion was seconded and the amendments were adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was then passed, 3/4 of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 661

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas—88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In The Chair: Glenn

The question being on agreeing to the title of the bill,

Rep. Lauwers moved to amend the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1996 IL 1, entitled “Michigan gaming control and revenue act,” by amending sections 2, 4, 4a, 4c, 4d, 5, 6, 6a, 6c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 8, 9, 9a, 9b, 9c, 12, 12a, 14, 18, 21, and 25 (MCL 432.202, 432.204, 432.204a, 432.204c, 432.204d, 432.205, 432.206, 432.206a, 432.206c, 432.207a, 432.207b, 432.207c, 432.208, 432.209, 432.209a, 432.209b, 432.209c, 432.212, 432.212a, 432.214, 432.218, 432.221, and 432.225), sections 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 14 as amended and sections 4a, 4c, 4d, 6a, 6c, 7a, 7b, 7c, 9a, 9b, 9c, 12a, 18, 21, and 25 as added by 1997 PA 69 and section 12 as amended by 2004 PA 306; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The motion prevailed.

The House agreed to the title as amended.

Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

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

House Bill No. 6269, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 11502, 11503, 11504, 11505, 11509, 11510, 11512, 11513, 11515, 11516, 11518, 11523, 11523a, 11523b, 11525, 11525a, 11525b, 11528, 11538, 11539, 11542, and 11550 (MCL 324.11502, 324.11503, 324.11504, 324.11505, 324.11509, 324.11510, 324.11512, 324.11513, 324.11515, 324.11516, 324.11518, 324.11523, 324.11523a, 324.11523b, 324.11525, 324.11525a, 324.11525b, 324.11528, 324.11538, 324.11539, 324.11542, and 324.11550), sections 11502, 11503, 11504, 11505, and 11542 as amended by 2014 PA 178, sections 11509, 11512, and 11516 as amended by 2004 PA 325, section 11510 as amended by 1998 PA 397, sections 11523, 11523a, 11525, and 11525b as amended by 2013
PA 250, section 11523b as added by 1996 PA 359, section 11525a as amended by 2015 PA 82, section 11538 as amended by 2004 PA 44, and section 11550 as amended by 2003 PA 153, and by adding sections 11511a, 11512a, and 11519a. The bill was read a third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Howell moved to substitute (H-3) the bill.

The motion was seconded and the substitute (H-3) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Howell moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 53, line 12, after “325.1006,” by inserting “OR A GROUNDWATER PROTECTION STANDARD ESTABLISHED UNDER 40 CFR 257.95(H),”.

The motion was seconded and the amendment was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was then passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call No. 662</th>
<th>Yeas—103</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
<td>Faris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Farrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Gay-Dagnogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
<td>Geiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
<td>Graves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Greig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calley</td>
<td>Greimel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambensy</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri</td>
<td>Guerra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
<td>Hammoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>Hauck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkun</td>
<td>Hertel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente</td>
<td>Hoadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td>Hoitenga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Hornberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Howell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Howrylak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianda</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durhal</td>
<td>Iden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>Inman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nays—3

| Allor            | Rabhi    | Robinson |

In The Chair: Glenn

The question being on agreeing to the title of the bill,

Rep. Lauwers moved to amend the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 11502, 11503, 11504, 11505, 11509, 11510, 11512, 11513, 11515, 11516, 11518, 11523, 11523a, 11523b, 11525, 11525a, 11525b, 11528, 11538, 11539, 11542, and 11550 (MCL 324.11502, 324.11503, 324.11504, 324.11505,
324.11509, 324.11510, 324.11512, 324.11513, 324.11515, 324.11516, 324.11518, 324.11523, 324.11523a, 324.11523b, 324.11525, 324.11525a, 324.11525b, 324.11528, 324.11538, 324.11539, 324.11542, and 324.11550), sections 11502, 11503, 11504, 11505, and 11542 as amended by 2014 PA 178, sections 11509, 11512, and 11516 as amended by 2004 PA 325, section 11510 as amended by 1998 PA 397, sections 11523, 11523a, 11525, and 11525b as amended by 2013 PA 250, section 11523b as added by 1996 PA 359, section 11525a as amended by 2015 PA 82, section 11538 as amended by 2004 PA 44, and section 11550 as amended by 2003 PA 153, and by adding sections 11511a, 11512a, 11519a, 11519b, and 11519c.

The motion prevailed.
The House agreed to the title as amended.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Associate Speaker Pro Tempore Glenn called Associate Speaker Pro Tempore Tedder to the Chair.

**House Bill No. 6056, entitled**
A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 16215 (MCL 333.16215), as amended by 2005 PA 211, and by adding section 16215a.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 663**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas—104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambensy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nays—2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garcia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In The Chair: Tedder
The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 6063, entitled**
A bill to amend 2006 PA 110, entitled “Michigan zoning enabling act,” (MCL 125.3101 to 125.3702) by adding section 205b.
Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 664**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas—91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambensy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nays—15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay-Dagnogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geiss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In The Chair: Tedder

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 5918, entitled**
A bill to amend 1994 PA 350, entitled “Public employee retirement benefits forfeiture act,” (MCL 38.2701 to 38.2705) by amending the title and by adding section 3a.
Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:
The question being on agreeing to the title of the bill, Rep. Lauwers moved to amend the title to read as follows: A bill to amend 1994 PA 350, entitled “Public employee retirement benefits forfeiture act,” by amending section 2 (MCL 38.2702), as amended by 2017 PA 43.
The motion prevailed.
The House agreed to the title as amended.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Motions and Resolutions

The Speaker, on behalf of the entire membership of the House of Representatives, offered the following resolution:

**House Resolution No. 439.**

A resolution of tribute for the Honorable Pam Faris.

Whereas, It is an honor and a privilege to commend Representative Pam Faris on her three terms serving the state of Michigan and the Forty-eighth District, which includes Clio, Davison, and Montrose within Genesee County; and
Whereas, With degrees from Mott Community College and Baker College, Pam Faris served as jury coordinator for the Genesee County Prosecutor’s Office. She has always been involved with her community, as evidenced by stints on the Mott Community College and Foundation boards, the Genesee County Health Coalition, the Michigan Community Service Commission, the Michigan Women’s Commission, Clio Vision 20/20, and the Early Childhood Investment Corporation executive committee; and

Whereas, Representative Faris won the first of her three terms in the House in 2012. She was appointed to serve on the Appropriations Committee during each term. She served as minority vice chair on the Health and Human Services, Licensing and Regulatory Affairs, and Judiciary subcommittees. She also sat on the subcommittees for Transportation, General Government, School Aid and Education, Joint Capital Outlay, and Community Colleges. She was also a member of the Michigan Capitol Committee and Legislative co-chair of the Michigan Children’s Trust Fund. Throughout her tenure, Representative Faris has worked passionately and diligently to improve education and advance women’s issues in Michigan; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we offer this expression of tribute to commend and thank the Honorable Pam Faris for her notable contributions to this legislative body and to our state; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative Faris as evidence of our esteem and best wishes.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

The Speaker, on behalf of the entire membership of the House of Representatives, offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 440.

A resolution of tribute for the Honorable Martin Howrylak.

Whereas, As he concludes his service to the Michigan House of Representatives, we offer our gratitude to Representative Martin Howrylak. Representative Howrylak has been a diligent and thoughtful advocate for the people of Troy and Clawson while representing the Forty-first District for the last six years; and

Whereas, Representative Howrylak’s education and experience prepared him well for his time in the Legislature. He focused on the geological sciences during his time as an undergraduate at the University of Michigan before earning a master’s degree there in accounting several years later. Representative Howrylak became an accountant, auditor, and small business owner, and then turned his attention to public service, spending more than a decade on the Troy City Council; and

Whereas, Representative Howrylak brought a commitment to accountability, transparency, responsibility, and ethics to all of his work in the House of Representatives. He served on the Appropriations Committee during his first term, chairing the subcommittee on Fiscal Oversight. In his second and third terms, he served on numerous committees which handled issues such as oversight, criminal justice, the judiciary, and tax policy; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we offer this expression of tribute to commend and thank the Honorable Martin Howrylak for his notable contributions to this legislative body and to our state; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative Howrylak as evidence of our gratitude and best wishes.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

The Speaker, on behalf of the entire membership of the House of Representatives, offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 441.

A resolution of tribute for the Honorable Holly Hughes.

Whereas, It is truly an honor and a privilege to salute Holly Hughes as she brings to a close her tenure as a lawmaker in the Michigan House of Representatives. As an energetic and hardworking member of the House, Representative Hughes has stamped her impression on some of the most timely and important issues in the legislative arena. Her professional manner and enthusiasm have advanced the well-being of not only her constituents in the Ninety-first District, but the residents of west Michigan and all of Michigan; and

Whereas, After obtaining a bachelor’s degree from Michigan State University, Representative Hughes served as a White River Township trustee and as a board member on the Montague Area Public Schools School Board. Representative Hughes is also a small business owner. She has been involved with multiple community organizations, including the Hackley Hospital Cornerstone Foundation, the Muskegon Promise Zone, and the U.S.S. LST 393 Veterans Museum Board; and

Whereas, Her breadth of experience has been particularly valuable to her work as chair of the Tourism and Outdoor Recreation Committee and as vice chair of the Military and Veterans Affairs Committee. She also served on the House committees on Agriculture; Commerce and Trade; Energy Policy; Families, Children, and Seniors; Health Policy; Local, Intergovernmental, and Regional Affairs, and Natural Resources, as well as the Michigan Capitol Committee. Representative Hughes has served her constituents for six years working to protect and expand benefits for our veterans, lower personal and business taxes, and improve educational opportunities for Michigan children; now, therefore, be it
Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we offer this expression of tribute to commend and thank the Honorable Holly Hughes for her notable contributions to this legislative body and to our state; and be it further
Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative Hughes as evidence of our gratitude and best wishes.
The question being on the adoption of the resolution,
The resolution was adopted.

The Speaker, on behalf of the entire membership of the House of Representatives, offered the following resolution:

**House Resolution No. 442.**
A resolution of tribute for the Honorable Tim Kelly.

Whereas, On the occasion of his retirement from the Michigan House of Representatives, the members deem it a great honor to congratulate Representative Tim Kelly as he completes his tenure with this legislative body. He has been a valuable colleague, dedicated to the Ninety-fourth District and our entire state, and we wish him well; and
Whereas, Tim Kelly received his bachelor’s degree in mass communications from the University of Denver. He started out working for his family’s emulsified asphalt materials company as production assistant and sales manager. Later, he worked for the Governor of Indiana in the Indiana Department of Commerce, and as executive director of the Indiana Human Resources Investment Council and the Council on Vocational Education. In 1995, he moved to Michigan when Governor Engler asked him to be his education policy advisor. He helped create, organize, and administer the Office of Workforce Development. Tim Kelly’s devotion to public service is further exhibited by his tenure on the Saginaw County Board of Commissioners, the Saginaw Area Catholic Schools Board of Trustees, and the St. Mary’s Hospital Community Advisory Committee. He also finds time to volunteer as head coach of the Nouvel men’s varsity tennis team; and
Whereas, First elected to the Michigan House of Representatives in 2012, and reelected in 2014 and 2016, Representative Kelly has ably served and contributed in leadership roles as befitting his vast experience in education and economic development. He is a champion for giving Michigan families flexibility in school options and setting appropriate academic standards for students. Over his three terms, he has served on the Commerce, Financial Services, Regulatory Reform, and Tax Policy committees, as well as vice chair of the Oversight Committee and chair of the Education Reform Committee. His service and leadership on the Appropriations Committee has been wide, covering a range of subcommittees: Health and Human Services, Transportation, and as chair of the subcommittee on School Aid and Education; now, therefore, be it
Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we offer this expression of gratitude to commend and thank the Honorable Tim Kelly as he concludes his service in the Michigan House of Representatives; and be it further
Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative Kelly as evidence of our esteem and best wishes.
The question being on the adoption of the resolution,
The resolution was adopted.

The Speaker, on behalf of the entire membership of the House of Representatives, offered the following resolution:

**House Resolution No. 443.**
A resolution of tribute for the Honorable Klint Kesto.

Whereas, It is with great appreciation for his commitment to the people of the Thirty-ninth District, as well as the entire state, that we honor Representative Klint Kesto on his retirement from the Michigan House of Representatives after six years of dedicated service; and
Whereas, A graduate of the University of Michigan and Wayne State University Law School, Klint Kesto came to the Legislature with a distinguished record in public service. Having previously held posts with the U.S. Department of Energy and Department of Justice, he served more than five years as a prosecuting attorney with the Wayne County Prosecutor’s office. An active member of the Chaldean community, he was a member of the Chaldean American Chamber of Commerce board, and in addition to the American Bar Association and State Bar of Michigan, a member of the Chaldean American Bar Association. Upon his election, he became the first Chaldean member of this body; and
Whereas, Representative Kesto’s tenure in the House of Representatives has been well served since 2013 by his business acumen, leadership, and tireless effort to make Michigan a better place to live and work. Through his leadership, including as chair of the Committee on Law and Justice, Representative Kesto has sought to reform state sentencing guidelines. He has worked to protect first responders from hate crimes, prohibit individuals from using positions of authority to intimidate people wishing to report crimes, and reform the state’s sexual assault laws. The counsel of Representative Kesto will be missed; now, therefore, be it
Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we offer this expression of tribute to commend and thank the Honorable Klint Kesto for his notable contributions to this legislative body and to our state; and be it further
Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to Representative Kesto as evidence of our gratitude and best wishes.
The question being on the adoption of the resolution,
The resolution was adopted.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the following remarks be printed in the Journal.
The motion prevailed.

Rep. Graves:
“You have heard and you will continue to hear my fellow outgoing Representatives stand up and say that 6 years goes by so fast. Well Tim Greimel and I will tell you that 6 years and 10 months goes by very fast as well. I look back over my time in Lansing, starting back in January of 2012 knocking doors in the snow for my first special election until now, I have been incredibly blessed and honored to serve here. As the youngest of 8 children of cotton pickers from Missouri, I never, ever expected to have this amazing opportunity and blessing.

Now getting elected and serving as a state representative is not something that I could have ever done by myself. There are so many people that have helped and supported me and they all deserve my heartfelt thanks.

The first person that I need to thank is my amazing wife, Denise Graves. Without her love and support, I would not be here. Next, I need to thank my children…Dave, Ralph, Mike Graves, Kelly Slater and Lisa Carey. I need to thank them for their tolerance, patience and support. Being a state representative requires a lot of time away from one’s family and while that has certainly been true in my case, the support of my family has never wavered.

As President Ronald Reagan once said, surround yourself with good people and good things will happen. Fortunately, I surrounded myself with good people.

I need to start by thanking the late, great Jon Farley. I made it here because of him. May you continue to rest in peace.

I was sworn in during the middle of the term but Connie Russell held my hand the first couple of weeks that I was here. She was also instrumental in making sure that I would have staff surrounding me that would help ensure my success, and thankfully I have had great staff.

Matt Sowash – we started together way back in 2012 and together I believe that we made a great team and accomplished so much together.

Ben Eikey – You transitioned from D.C. to Lansing and made all of the people from the 51st District who met you, love you.

Ken Morin – You transitioned and developed into one of the most coveted Legislative Directors in the House and had fun while doing it, just ask Representative Hoitenga.

Aaron Porter – You worked every position in the office and did so with case. Your law degree and ability to understand statutes has been invaluable. Thank you.

Scott Kempa – You have never backed down from a challenge and have been a joy to work with. You typically leave me with a smile. Keep doing what you are doing, it’s working.

Becky Burtka – You were my policy advisor when I chaired Commerce and Trade. Your invaluable insight and help in making sure that we were passing bills that were ready for prime time was so incredibly helpful. I will never forget your mood charts you could use to determine what level of a curmudgeon I would be for the day. Thank you.

As Chairman of the Oversight Committee, I want to say thank you to Brandon Lanyon (you are still on retainer), Amanda Gill and Aaron Porter for the great legal and policy advice in committee. We could not have done the great work that we did in the Oversight Committee without you three. Thank you.

To the members of the UIA workgroup, thank you for your dedication and commitment and the 8 long months, much of that spent in the House Republican Policy Office conference room that you all put in to come up with the 8-bill package. This 8-bill package didn’t receive a single no vote in either chamber, has been signed into law and has put Michigan’s unemployment Insurance Agency on track to be the best in the nation. Without the work of the members of the workgroup, this wouldn’t have happened. So thank you. Representative Hertel, thank you for being such a great co-chair on the committee.

To Chief Dickson and his team, thank you for your hard work that you do every day in keeping us safe. To Mr. Brown and Randall, Joelle and Jill, thank you for the many years of professionalism and oversight. This place could not function without you.

To the Speakers that I have served under – Jase Bolger, Kevin Cotter, and Tom Leonard… I want to say thank you. Thank you for the support, trust and confidence that you have showed me. You have an extremely difficult job and you have all accomplished it so well. So thank you.

And finally, to the people of the 51st District. I need to say thank you…thank you for trusting me to serve and represent you here in Lansing. It has been a true blessing.”

Rep. Kelly:
“Thank you Mr. Speaker, and thank you again for your leadership.

Wow! I’ve had an absolute ball! Serving the people of the 94th in particular, and the citizens of Michigan in general, has been an opportunity of a lifetime, and for that I can’t thank them enough.
I wish to thank my family, my wife Deenie, and sons’ Sean and Stone, for putting up with me throughout my time in elective politics.

Also in the gallery are two individuals, my chief of staff Nancy Bareham and Kyle Harris, my legislative assistant. The three of us have been a team since day one and I have been blessed to have them by my side. They are both extraordinary individuals and I’m delighted they are moving on with new representatives.

My thanks also to three outstanding individuals who have served as my clerks in committee, Bethany Wicksall and Sam Christiansen from House Fiscal on School Aid and Education, and Joy Brewer on Education Reform. Bethany and Sam, you have been phenomenal and I literally would not have been able to carry out my duties without you. Ditto to Derek Robinson on Ed policy.

My thanks as well to the myriad of employees who keep everything running smoothly and efficiently; Gary Randall and Rich Brown, Darlene Moore and Alice Mansfield.

Darric Cody, Justin Easter, Eric Esch, Dan Stump, Kevin Thompson, Andrea Brancato, Elaine Kupiec, Cheryl Frawley, Stephanie Satoh, and Molly Wingrove.

House Television - Dave Smith, Dave Koskinen, Mike Blonde, Tom Hayhoe and Dan Hogan.

To the men and women who protect us, Chief Dickson, Don Dunham, Fawn McHenry, Randy Carpenter, Randy Kindy, Jon Priebe, Christopher Devlin, Loren DeYoung, Tadd Deo, Geoffrey Blair, Brian Sweet and Scott Polhemus, and to Pete DePrekel, a native of Saginaw who retired earlier this year.

A special thanks to Alice Mansfield for keeping us refreshed and hydrated, and the Peckham crew for keeping our offices neat and tidy.

Thank you to my House Republican colleagues, it has been my immense pleasure in serving alongside you. Thank you to Speakers Leonard, Cotter and Bolger for your leadership and trust. Thank you to our Senate colleagues as well, especially to Senator Geoff Hansen, my partner for four years on the School Aid Budget.

To my seat mates Pat Somerville and Ray Franz in my first term. Ned Canfield in my second, and Chris Afendoulis in my third.

Thank you as well to my Democrat colleagues, while we have, and will continue to have our differences, I have thoroughly enjoyed the battle.

Thank you to all the men and women of the lobby corps. I think you’re both evil and necessary, but altogether wonderful people.

My thanks to the Capitol media corps. I appreciate the coverage and feel I got a fair shake.

I have much to be thankful for, and while I may not always show it, I am grateful to all of you. I am reminded, that I may not show my gratitude often enough. For that I am deeply sorry. I apologize for any slight, intended or otherwise, that any of you may have felt over the course of our time here together. I wish only the best for each and every one of you.

May God bless you all and those you hold dear.”

Rep. Lauwers moved that House Committees be given leave to meet during the balance of today’s session. The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of Reports of Standing Committees

The Committee on Michigan Competitiveness, by Rep. Chatfield, Chair, reported

Senate Bill No. 1171, entitled

A bill to amend 2018 PA 337, entitled “Improved workforce opportunity wage act,” by amending sections 3, 4, 4a, 4d, 10, and 15 (MCL 408.933, 408.934, 408.934a, 408.934d, 408.940, and 408.945).

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Chatfield, Lilly, Cole, Vaupel, Rendon and Wentworth

Nays: Reps. Geiss, Hammoud and Yancey
The Committee on Michigan Competitiveness, by Rep. Chatfield, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1175, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 338, entitled “Earned sick time act,” by amending the title and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 14 (MCL 408.961, 408.962, 408.963, 408.964, 408.965, 408.967, 408.968, 408.970, 408.971, and 408.974); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
- Nays: Reps. Geiss, Hammoud and Yancey

**COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The following report, submitted by Rep. Chatfield, Chair, of the Committee on Michigan Competitiveness, was received and read:

- Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018

The Committee on Financial Services, by Rep. Farrington, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 728, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 379, entitled “An act to define and regulate certain credit card transactions, agreements, charges, and disclosures; to prescribe the powers and duties of the financial institutions bureau and certain state agencies; to provide for the promulgation of rules; and to provide for fines and penalties,” by amending the title and section 1 (MCL 493.101).

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

The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
- Yeas: Reps. Farrington, Graves, Lilly, VanderWall, Gay-Dagnogo, Zemke, Clemente and Green
- Nays: None

**COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The following report, submitted by Rep. Farrington, Chair, of the Committee on Financial Services, was received and read:

- Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018
- Present: Reps. Farrington, Graves, Lilly, VanderWall, Gay-Dagnogo, Zemke, Clemente and Green
- Absent: Rep. McCready
- Excused: Rep. McCready
The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6433, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: Rep. Reilly

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6434, entitled**
With the recommendation that the substitute (H-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.
The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: Rep. Reilly

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6541, entitled**
A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” (MCL 436.1101 to 436.2303) by adding section 609d.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6542, entitled**
A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” (MCL 436.1101 to 436.2303) by adding section 609e.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None
The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6543, entitled**
With the recommendation that the substitute (H-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.
The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1154, entitled**
A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” by amending section 411 (MCL 436.1411), as amended by 2014 PA 44.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1155, entitled**
A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” (MCL 436.1101 to 436.2303) by adding section 204a.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1156, entitled**
A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” (MCL 436.1101 to 436.2303) by adding section 204a.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

**Favorable Roll Call**

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None
The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1157, entitled**


Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones

Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1158, entitled**


Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones

Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1159, entitled**


Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones

Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1160, entitled**

A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” (MCL 436.1109) by amending section 109 (MCL 436.1109), as amended by 2014 PA 42.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones

Nays: None
The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1161, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1162, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1163, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1164, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None
The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1165, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1166, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1167, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: Rep. Reilly

The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1168, entitled**
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones
Nays: None
The Committee on Regulatory Reform, by Rep. Iden, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1181, entitled**

A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” (MCL 436.1101 to 436.2303) by adding section 610d.

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

The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones

Nays: None

**COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The following report, submitted by Rep. Iden, Chair, of the Committee on Regulatory Reform, was received and read:

Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018

Present: Reps. Iden, Bellino, Crawford, Theis, Webber, Griffin, Hauck, Hoitenga, Reilly, Moss, Dianda, Chirkun, Liberati and Jones

Absent: Reps. Kesto and Love

Excused: Reps. Kesto and Love

The Committee on Energy Policy, by Rep. Glenn, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6428, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled “An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative energy suppliers; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 10y (MCL 460.10y), as amended by 2008 PA 286.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Glenn, Hauck, Barrett, Cole, Tedder, Bellino, Farrington, Griffin, Johnson, LaFave, Lower, Reilly, Lasinski, Dianda, Camilleri, Elder, Green and Sneller

Nays: None

The Committee on Energy Policy, by Rep. Glenn, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6429, entitled**

A bill to amend 1951 PA 35, entitled “An act to authorize intergovernmental contracts between municipal corporations; to authorize any municipal corporation to contract with any person or any municipal corporation to furnish any lawful municipal service to property outside the corporate limits of the first municipal corporation for a consideration; to prescribe certain penalties; to authorize contracts between municipal corporations and with certain nonprofit public transportation corporations to form group self-insurance pools; and to prescribe conditions for the performance of those contracts,” by amending section 3 (MCL 124.3), as amended by 2000 PA 155.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.
Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Glenn, Hauck, Barrett, Cole, Tedder, Bellino, Farrington, Griffin, Johnson, LaFave, Lower, Reilly, Lasinski, Dianda, Camilleri, Elder, Green and Sneller
Nays: None

The Committee on Energy Policy, by Rep. Glenn, Chair, reported
House Bill No. 6430, entitled
A bill to amend 1909 PA 279, entitled “The home rule city act,” by amending section 4f (MCL 117.4f), as amended by 2000 PA 156.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Glenn, Hauck, Barrett, Cole, Tedder, Bellino, Farrington, Griffin, Johnson, LaFave, Lower, Reilly, Lasinski, Dianda, Camilleri, Elder, Green and Sneller
Nays: None

The Committee on Energy Policy, by Rep. Glenn, Chair, reported
House Resolution No. 387.
A resolution to encourage the Michigan Agency for Energy to undertake a collaborative discussion with all interested stakeholders concerning the potential to integrate energy storage into Michigan’s electric market.
(For text of resolution, see House Journal No. 63, p. 2013.)
With the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Glenn, Hauck, Barrett, Cole, Tedder, Bellino, Farrington, Griffin, Johnson, LaFave, Lower, Reilly, Lasinski, Dianda, Camilleri, Elder, Green and Sneller
Nays: None

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The following report, submitted by Rep. Glenn, Chair, of the Committee on Energy Policy, was received and read:
Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018
Present: Reps. Glenn, Hauck, Barrett, Cole, Tedder, Bellino, Farrington, Griffin, Johnson, LaFave, Lower, Reilly, Lasinski, Dianda, Camilleri, Elder, Green and Sneller
Absent: Rep. Garrett
Excused: Rep. Garrett

Messages from the Governor

The following message from the Governor was received December 3, 2018 and read:

EXECUTIVE ORDER
No. 2018-12

AUTISM COUNCIL
MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

AMENDMENT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER 2012-11

WHEREAS, Section 1 of Article V of the Michigan Constitution of 1963 vests the executive power of the state of Michigan in the Governor; and
WHEREAS, Section 2 of Article V of the Michigan Constitution of 1963 empowers the Governor to make changes in the organization of the Executive Branch or in the assignment of functions among its units that he considers necessary for efficient administration; and
WHEREAS, the state of Michigan recognizes that the goals of maximizing the potential for children and adults with autism spectrum disorders are the same as those for other children and adults: personal independence and social responsibility; and
WHEREAS, it is important that the state of Michigan encourage early identification of children with autism spectrum disorders to provide early intervention services for children to achieve optimal participation in their home, school, and community; and
WHEREAS, effective coordination of federal, state, and local resources is needed to provide screening, diagnosis, early intensive behavior intervention, and evidence-based treatment for children and adults with autism spectrum disorders to assist all individuals with autism spectrum disorders to reach their fullest potential; and
WHEREAS, continuation of the Autism Council, created by Executive Order 2012-11, with expanded membership and within the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, will advise and assist in the development of a statewide comprehensive, coordinated, multidisciplinary, interagency system; and provide implementation, monitoring, and updating of the Michigan Autism Spectrum Disorders State Plan to ensure that the key recommendations in the document become reality for individuals with autism spectrum disorders and their families throughout Michigan;
NOW, THEREFORE, I, Brian Calley, Governor of the state of Michigan, by virtue of the power and authority vested in the Governor by the Michigan Constitution of 1963 and Michigan law, order the following:

I. AMENDMENT OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 2012-11
Section I of Executive Order 2012-11 is amended to provide as follows:
B. “Department” means the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services.

II. AMENDMENT TO SECTION II OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 2012-11
Section II of Executive Order 2012-11 is amended to provide as follows:
A. The council is an advisory body within the Department.
B. The council shall consist of 16 members appointed by the Governor. The 4 members added to the council by this Order shall be appointed to terms expiring on September 30, 2021. The 12 members of the council previously appointed and serving under Section II of Executive Order 2012-11 may continue serving in the same manner as the original appointment for the balance of the unexpired term. After the initial appointments, all members of the council shall be appointed to 4-year terms.
C. The council shall consist of the following members:
   • The Director of the Department, or his or her designee, from within the Department.
   • An individual representing child welfare and children’s services designated by the Director of the Department.
   • An individual representing Michigan Rehabilitation Services and employment services designated by the Director of the Department.
   • The Director of the Department of Insurance and Financial Services, or his or her designee, from within the Department of Insurance and Financial Services.
   • The Director of the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs, or his or her designee, from within the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs.
   • The Superintendent of Public Instruction, or his or her designee, from within the Department of Education.
   • Two (2) individuals who have autism spectrum disorders (ASD), or two (2) individuals who have a family member who have ASD, or one of each.
   • An individual representing the school systems, being someone from an intermediate school district, local school district, or transition coordinator.
   • An individual representing pre-paid inpatient health plans (PIHP) or local community mental health service programs (CMHSP).
   • An individual representing Recipient Rights for the public system.
   • An individual representing certified behavior analysts.
   • An individual representing state funded initiatives.
   • An individual representing state universities.
   • An individual representing a non-profit organization serving those with ASD.
   • A physician representing health care providers servicing individuals with ASD.

III. AMENDMENT TO SECTION III OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 2012-11
Section III of Executive Order 2012-11 is amended to provide as follows:
A. The council shall act in an advisory capacity and shall do all of the following:
   1. Promote, monitor, and update the Michigan ASD State Plan. The plan shall do the following:
   Provide for comprehensive, lifespan supports to individuals with ASD and their families through access to information and resources, coordination of services, and implementation of evidence-based practices.
2. Annually complete a report of the progress and recommendations of the Michigan ASD State Plan and submit the report to the Director of the Department no later than 60 days after the close of each fiscal year.
3. Provide to the Director of the Department and the Governor a Michigan ASD State Plan and updated recommendations a minimum of every 5 years beginning Fiscal Year 2019.
4. Coordinate and collaborate with state agencies to implement the Michigan ASD State Plan recommendations, increase the accuracy of education, resources and training to employees, and maintain best-practice standards for all services and funding provided in Michigan.

* * * *

IV. AMENDMENT TO SECTION IV OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 2012-11

Section IV of Executive Order 2012-11 is amended to provide as follows:
A. The council shall be staffed and assisted by personnel from the Department as directed by the Director of the Department. Any budgeting, procurement, and related management functions of the council shall be performed under the direction and supervision of the Director of the Department.
B. The Director of the Department shall designate the Chairperson of the council.
C. The council may select from among its members a Vice-Chairperson, with terms to be reviewed every 2 years.
D. The council shall select from among its members a Secretary, with terms to be reviewed every 2 years. Council staff shall assist the Secretary with record keeping responsibilities.
E. The council may create sub-advisory groups to assist the council with the implementation of the Michigan ASD State Plan and policy recommendations.

* * * *

J. Members of the council shall serve without compensation.

* * * *

V. MISCELLANEOUS

Section V of Executive Order 2012-11 is amended to provide as follows:

* * * *

D. Executive Order 2012-11, which created the council, remains in full force and effect, in accordance with its original terms, except as amended by this Order.
E. This Order does not invalidate any actions already taken by the council in accordance with Executive Order 2012-11.

[SEAL]

Michigan this 3rd day of Dec, in the Year of our Lord Two Thousand Eighteen.

BRIAN CALLEY
GOVERNOR – Acting
BY THE GOVERNOR:
RUTH A. JOHNSON
SECRETARY OF STATE

The message was referred to the Clerk.

Communications from State Officers

The following communication from the Department of State Police was received and read:

November 30, 2018

On behalf of Colonel Kriste Etue, please find attached the final recommendations from the School Safety Task Force as required by executive order 2018-5. This report has been shared with Governor Snyder as well but has not been made public.

Thank you,
Chelsea A. Deckler
Office of the Director
Michigan State Police
P.O. Box 30634
Lansing, MI 48909-0401
TX: 517-284-3344
Cell: 517-388-4066

The communication was referred to the Clerk.

Reps. Garrett and Phelps entered the House Chambers.
By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Announcement by the Clerk of Printing and Enrollment

The Clerk announced that the following bills had been reproduced and made available electronically on Thursday, November 29:

**House Bill Nos.** 6552 6553 6554 6555 6556 6557 6558 6559 6560

The Clerk announced that the following bills had been reproduced and made available electronically on Tuesday, December 4:

**Senate Bill Nos.** 1255 1256 1257 1258 1259 1260

The Clerk announced that the following Senate bills had been received on Tuesday, December 4:

**Senate Bill Nos.** 553 641 964 1103 1136 1141 1185 1196 1207 1211 1219 1244

Reports of Standing Committees

The Committee on Judiciary, by Rep. Runestad, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6344, entitled**
A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 8125 (MCL 600.8125), as amended by 2012 PA 16.

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

The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Runestad, Theis, Cole, Hornberger, LaFave, Greimel, Guerra and Sowerby

Nays: Reps. Howrylak and Robinson

The Committee on Judiciary, by Rep. Runestad, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1187, entitled**
A bill to amend 2013 PA 93, entitled “Michigan indigent defense commission act,” by amending section 7 (MCL 780.987), as amended by 2018 PA 214.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Runestad, Theis, Howrylak, Cole, Hornberger, LaFave, Greimel, Guerra and Sowerby

Nays: None

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The following report, submitted by Rep. Runestad, Chair, of the Committee on Judiciary, was received and read:

Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018

Present: Reps. Runestad, Theis, Howrylak, Cole, Hornberger, LaFave, Greimel, Robinson, Guerra and Sowerby

The Committee on Health Policy, by Rep. Vaupel, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 4134, entitled**
A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 16147.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.
Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Nays: Rep. Garcia

The Committee on Health Policy, by Rep. Vaupel, Chair, reported

House Bill No. 4135, entitled
A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 2212d.
With the recommendation that the substitute (H-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.
The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Nays: None

The recommendation was concurred in and the bill was referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Nays: None

The recommendation was concurred in and the bill was referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

The Committee on Health Policy, by Rep. Vaupel, Chair, reported

House Bill No. 6431, entitled
A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending sections 3801, 3803, 3807a, 3809, 3809a, 3811a, 3813, 3815, 3819a, 3827, 3829, 3831, 3835, 3839, 3843, and 3847 (MCL 500.3801, 500.3803, 500.3807a, 500.3809, 500.3809a, 500.3811a, 500.3813, 500.3815, 500.3819a, 500.3827, 500.3829, 500.3831, 500.3835, 500.3839, 500.3839, and 500.3847), sections 3801, 3803, 3809, 3815, 3831, and 3839 as amended and sections 3807a, 3809a, 3811a, and 3819a as added by 2009 PA 220, sections 3813, 3843, and 3847 as added by 1992 PA 84, sections 3827 and 3835 as amended by 2006 PA 462, and section 3829 as amended by 2002 PA 304, and by adding section 3811b; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.
With the recommendation that the substitute (H-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.
The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Nays: None
The Committee on Health Policy, by Rep. Vaupel, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 1198, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 17017 (MCL 333.17017), as added by 2012 PA 499.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Vaupel, Tedder, Garcia, Sheppard, Calley, Farrington, Hauck, Kahle and Noble
Nays: Reps. Brinks, Neeley, Ellison, Hammoud and Hertel

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The following report, submitted by Rep. Vaupel, Chair, of the Committee on Health Policy, was received and read:
Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018
Absent: Rep. Garrett
Excused: Rep. Garrett

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 4618, entitled**

A bill to amend 1964 PA 284, entitled “City income tax act,” by amending section 4 of chapter 1, sections 64a, 73, 82, 84, 85, 92, and 93 of chapter 2, and section 60 of chapter 3 (MCL 141.504, 141.664a, 141.673, 141.682, 141.684, 141.685, 141.692, 141.693, and 141.760), section 64a of chapter 2 as added and sections 73, 82, 84, 85, 92, and 93 of chapter 2 and section 60 of chapter 3 as amended by 1996 PA 478, and by adding section 2b to chapter 1 and sections 86a, 86b, 86c, 86d, 96, and 97 to chapter 2.

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

The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Byrd, Neeley, Ellison and Yancey
Nays: Reps. Howrylak and Johnson

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 5025, entitled**

A bill to amend 1941 PA 122, entitled “An act to establish the revenue collection duties of the department of treasury; to prescribe its powers and duties as the revenue collection agency of this state; to prescribe certain powers and duties of the state treasurer; to establish the collection duties of certain other state departments for money or accounts owed to this state; to regulate the importation, stamping, and disposition of certain tobacco products; to provide for the transfer of powers and duties now vested in certain other state boards, commissions, departments, and offices; to prescribe certain duties of and require certain reports from the department of treasury; to provide procedures for the payment, administration, audit, assessment, levy of interests or penalties on, and appeals of taxes and tax liability; to prescribe its powers and duties if an agreement to act as agent for a city to administer, collect, and enforce the city income tax act on behalf of a city is entered into with any city; to provide an appropriation; to abolish the state board of tax administration; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to declare the effect of this act,” by amending section 30a (MCL 205.30a), as amended by 1995 PA 116.

Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.

The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.
Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Byrd, Neeley, Ellison and Yancey
Nays: Rep. Johnson

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported
House Bill No. 5801, entitled
A bill to amend 1933 PA 62, entitled “Property tax limitation act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 211.203), as amended by 1996 PA 580.
With the recommendation that the substitute (H-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.
The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Johnson, Kahle, Lower, Byrd, Neeley, Ellison and Yancey
Nays: None

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported
House Bill No. 6549, entitled
A bill to amend 1933 PA 167, entitled “General sales tax act,” by amending section 4x (MCL 205.54x), as amended by 2009 PA 53.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Kahle, Lower, Byrd and Yancey
Nays: Reps. Johnson, Neeley and Ellison

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported
House Bill No. 6550, entitled
A bill to amend 1937 PA 94, entitled “Use tax act,” by amending section 4k (MCL 205.94k), as amended by 2012 PA 429.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Kahle, Lower, Byrd and Yancey
Nays: Reps. Johnson, Neeley and Ellison

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported
House Bill No. 6559, entitled
A bill to amend 2018 PA 57, entitled “Recodified tax increment financing act,” by amending sections 213c, 312b, and 411b (MCL 125.4213c, 125.4312b, and 125.4411b).
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.
Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Kahle, Lower, Byrd, Neeley, Ellison and Yancey
Nays: Rep. Johnson

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported
House Bill No. 6560, entitled
A bill to amend 1996 PA 381, entitled “Brownfield redevelopment financing act,” by amending section 15a (MCL 125.2665a), as amended by 2016 PA 471.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Howrylak, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Kahle, Lower, Byrd, Neeley, Ellison and Yancey
Nays: Rep. Ellison

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported
Senate Bill No. 1097, entitled
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Howrylak, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Johnson, Kahle, Lower, Byrd, Neeley and Yancey
Nays: Rep. Ellison

The Committee on Tax Policy, by Rep. Tedder, Chair, reported
Senate Bill No. 1170, entitled
A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” (MCL 206.1 to 206.713) and by adding sections 254 and 675 and part 4.
Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Howrylak, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Johnson, Kahle, Lower, Byrd, Neeley, Ellison and Yancey
Nays: None

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The following report, submitted by Rep. Tedder, Chair, of the Committee on Tax Policy, was received and read:
Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018
Present: Reps. Tedder, Maturen, Howrylak, Leutheuser, Lucido, Vaupel, Johnson, Kahle, Lower, Byrd, Neeley, Ellison and Yancey
The Committee on Government Operations, by Rep. Chatfield, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 4856, entitled**
A bill to designate the period beginning on September 11 through September 17 of each year as Patriot Week in this state. Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Chatfield, Lauwers and Barrett
Nays: None

The Committee on Government Operations, by Rep. Chatfield, Chair, reported

**House Bill No. 6553, entitled**
A bill to amend 1846 RS 2, entitled “Of the legislature,” (MCL 4.82 to 4.85) by adding section 3a. Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Chatfield, Lauwers and Barrett
Nays: Reps. Singh and Greig

The Committee on Government Operations, by Rep. Chatfield, Chair, reported

**Senate Bill No. 660, entitled**
A bill to amend 1988 PA 466, entitled “Animal industry act,” by amending section 46 (MCL 287.746), as added by 2009 PA 117, and by adding section 47. Without amendment and with the recommendation that the bill pass.
The bill was referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:
Yeas: Reps. Chatfield, Lauwers, Singh and Greig
Nays: Rep. Barrett

**COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The following report, submitted by Rep. Chatfield, Chair, of the Committee on Government Operations, was received and read:
Meeting held on: Tuesday, December 4, 2018
Present: Reps. Chatfield, Lauwers, Barrett, Singh and Greig

**Second Reading of Bills**

**House Bill No. 6403, entitled**
A bill to amend 1953 PA 192, entitled “An act to create a county department of veterans’ affairs in certain counties, and to prescribe its powers and duties; to create the county veteran service fund and to provide for contributions to and expenditures from that fund; and to transfer the powers and duties of the soldiers’ relief commission in those counties,” by amending section 3a (MCL 35.623a), as added by 2018 PA 210.
Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Military and Veterans Affairs,
The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Wentworth moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6444, entitled
A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending sections 1201, 1207, 1208a, and 1211 (MCL 500.1201, 500.1207, 500.1208a, and 500.1211), section 1201 as amended by 2012 PA 462, section 1207 as amended by 1993 PA 200, and sections 1208a and 1211 as added by 2001 PA 228.
Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Insurance,
The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Wentworth moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6551, entitled
A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 22.
Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Families, Children, and Seniors,
The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Rendon moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6432, entitled
The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Webber moved to amend the bill as follows:
1. Amend page 1, line 9, after “sell.” by inserting “IF AN APPLICATION FOR HEALTH BENEFITS THAT IS PACKAGED WITH INSURANCE IS SUBMITTED BY AN AGENT TO A HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION OR TO AN AFFILIATE OF A HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION AND THE HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION OR THE AFFILIATE OF A HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION KNOWS THE AGENT OF RECORD FOR THE GROUP’S CURRENT HEALTH BENEFITS, THE HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION OR THE AFFILIATE OF A HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION SHALL NOTIFY THE AGENT OF RECORD OF THE APPLICATION UNLESS ANY OF THE FOLLOWING APPLY:
   (A) THE SUBMITTING AGENT IS THE AGENT OF RECORD.
   (B) BOTH OF THE FOLLOWING APPLY:
      (i) THE GROUP AUTHORIZES CHANGING THE AGENT OF RECORD TO THE SUBMITTING AGENT.
      (ii) THE AGENT OF RECORD IS NOT EMPLOYED BY A HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION OR AN AFFILIATE OF A HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION.
   (C) THE GROUP REQUESTS IN WRITING THAT THE AGENT OF RECORD NOT BE NOTIFIED.
2. Amend page 2, following line 4, by inserting:
   “(5) AS USED IN THIS SECTION, “AGENT OF RECORD” MEANS A PERSON THAT IS A HEALTH BENEFIT AGENT AUTHORIZED TO REPRESENT A SUBSCRIBER TO TRANSACT INSURANCE, INCLUDING THE PURCHASING, SERVICING, AND MAINTENANCE OF HEALTH BENEFITS AND THAT IS SHOWN
ON THE RECORDS OF THE HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION OR THE AFFILIATE OF A HEALTH BENEFIT CORPORATION AS THE AGENT TO WHOM COMMISSION IS TO BE PAID.

The motion prevailed and the amendments were adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Webber moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6431, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending sections 3801, 3803, 3807a, 3809, 3809a, 3811a, 3813, 3815, 3819a, 3827, 3829, 3831, 3835, 3839, 3843, and 3847 (MCL 500.3801, 500.3803, 500.3807a, 500.3809, 500.3809a, 500.3811a, 500.3813, 500.3815, 500.3819a, 500.3827, 500.3829, 500.3831, 500.3835, 500.3839, 500.3843, and 500.3847), sections 3801, 3803, 3809, 3815, 3831, and 3839 as amended and sections 3807a, 3809a, 3811a, and 3819a as added by 2009 PA 220, sections 3813, 3843, and 3847 as added by 1992 PA 84, sections 3827 and 3835 as amended by 2006 PA 462, and section 3829 as amended by 2002 PA 304, and by adding section 3811b; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Committee on Health Policy,

The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Vaupel moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4134, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 16147.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Canfield moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4135, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 2212d.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Committee on Health Policy,

The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Canfield moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 5639, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” (MCL 257.1 to 257.923) by adding section 217i.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Roberts moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 5385, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 627 and 628 (MCL 257.627 and 257.628), section 627 as amended by 2016 PA 445 and section 628 as amended by 2016 PA 447.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Hughes moved to substitute (H-2) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Hughes moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.
By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

Rep. Cole moved that House Bill No. 6431 be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 6431, entitled
A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending sections 3801, 3803, 3807a, 3809, 3811a, 3813, 3815, 3819a, 3827, 3829, 3831, 3835, 3839, 3843, and 3847 (MCL 500.3801, 500.3803, 500.3807a, 500.3809, 500.3811a, 500.3813, 500.3815, 500.3819a, 500.3827, 500.3829, 500.3831, 500.3835, 500.3839, 500.3843, and 500.3847), sections 3801, 3803, 3809, 3815, 3831, and 3839 as amended and sections 3807a, 3809a, 3811a, and 3819a as added by 2009 PA 220, sections 3813, 3843, and 3847 as added by 1992 PA 84, sections 3827 and 3835 as amended by 2006 PA 462, and section 3829 as amended by 2002 PA 304, and by adding section 3811b; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 666

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas—107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambensy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nays—1

Robinson

In The Chair: Tedder

The question being on agreeing to the title of the bill,
Rep. Lauwers moved to amend the title to read as follows:
A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending sections 2266, 3801, 3803, 3811a, 3813, 3815, 3819a, 3827, 3829, 3831, 3835, 3839, 3843, and 3847 (MCL 500.2266, 500.3801, 500.3803, 500.3811a, 500.3813, 500.3815, 500.3819a, 500.3827, 500.3829, 500.3831, 500.3835, 500.3839, 500.3843, and 500.3847)
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed.

Rep. Lauwers moved that House Bill No. 6403 be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 6403, entitled**

A bill to amend 1953 PA 192, entitled “An act to create a county department of veterans’ affairs in certain counties, and to prescribe its powers and duties; to create the county veteran service fund and to provide for contributions to and expenditures from that fund; and to transfer the powers and duties of the soldiers’ relief commission in those counties,” by amending section 3a (MCL 35.623a), as added by 2018 PA 210.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call No. 667</th>
<th>Yeas—108</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
<td>Faris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Farrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allor</td>
<td>Garcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Gay-Dagnogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
<td>Geiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
<td>Graves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Greig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calley</td>
<td>Greimel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambensy</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri</td>
<td>Guerra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
<td>Hammoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>Hauck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkun</td>
<td>Hertel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente</td>
<td>Hoadley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td>Hoitenga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Hornberger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Howell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Howrylak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianda</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durhal</td>
<td>Iden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>Inman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nays—0**

In The Chair: Tedder

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Lauwers moved that **House Bill No. 4134** be placed on its immediate passage. The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 4134, entitled**
A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 16147. Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 668**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rep. Name</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
<td>Freis</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
<td>Farrington</td>
<td>Kosowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Frederick</td>
<td>LaFave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allor</td>
<td>Garrett</td>
<td>LaGrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>LaSata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Lasinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
<td>Greig</td>
<td>Lauwers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
<td>Guerra</td>
<td>Leutheuser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
<td>Hammoud</td>
<td>Liberati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
<td>Hauck</td>
<td>Lilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calley</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambensy</td>
<td>Hertel</td>
<td>Lucido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri</td>
<td>Hoadley</td>
<td>Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
<td>Hoitenga</td>
<td>Maturen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>Hornberger</td>
<td>McCready</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield</td>
<td>Howell</td>
<td>Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkun</td>
<td>Howrylak</td>
<td>Moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente</td>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Neeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
<td>Iden</td>
<td>Noble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Inman</td>
<td>Pagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>Pagel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elder</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellison</td>
<td>Kahle</td>
<td>Phelps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yeas—95</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nays—13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In The Chair: Tedder

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Lauwers moved that **House Bill No. 4135** be placed on its immediate passage. The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 4135, entitled**
A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 2212d. Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:
In The Chair: Tedder

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Lauwers moved that **House Bill No. 6444** be placed on its immediate passage. The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 6444, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending sections 1201, 1207, 1208a, and 1211 (MCL 500.1201, 500.1207, 500.1208a, and 500.1211), section 1201 as amended by 2012 PA 462, section 1207 as amended by 1993 PA 200, and sections 1208a and 1211 as added by 2001 PA 228.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:
The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Lauwers moved that House Bill No. 6551 be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 6551, entitled**
A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 22.
Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 671**

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Lauwers moved that House Bill No. 6432 be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 6432, entitled**
Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 672**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas—107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nays—3**

| Johnson | Reilly | Robinson |

In The Chair: Tedder
The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 6378, 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 2018 PA 181, and by adding sections 43h, 43i, and 43j.
The bill was read a third time.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
Rep. Miller moved to substitute (H-5) the bill.
The motion was seconded and the substitute (H-5) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
Rep. Albert moved to amend the bill as follows:
1. Amend page 12, line 5, after “subsection.” by inserting “BEGINNING WITH THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 2022 AND FOR EACH SUBSEQUENT STATE FISCAL YEAR UNTIL THE RATE DESCRIBED IN THIS SUBSECTION IS ZERO, THE OFFICE OF RETIREMENT SERVICES AND THE RETIREMENT BOARD MAY AGREE TO REDUCE THE RATE DESCRIBED IN THIS SUBSECTION BY ANY NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL BASIS POINTS.”.
The motion was seconded and the amendment was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was then passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 673

Yeas—63

Afendoulis Afendoulis
Albert Alexander

Garcia Garcia
Glenn Graves
Kesto LaFave LaSata
Rendon Roberts Runestad
The question being on agreeing to the title of the bill,
Rep. Lauwers moved to amend the title to read as follows:
A bill to amend 1980 PA 300, entitled “The public school employees retirement act of 1979,” by amending sections 41, 42, and 42a (MCL 38.1341, 38.1342, and 38.1342a), section 41 as amended by 2018 PA 181, section 42 as amended by 2017 PA 92, and section 42a as added by 2018 PA 328, and by adding sections 43h, 43i, and 43j.

The motion prevailed.
The House agreed to the title as amended.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

The Speaker Pro Tempore assumed the Chair.

Second Reading of Bills

Senate Bill No. 1171, entitled
A bill to amend 2018 PA 337, entitled “Improved workforce opportunity wage act,” by amending sections 3, 4, 4a, 4d, 10, and 15 (MCL 408.933, 408.934, 408.934a, 408.934d, 408.940, and 408.945).
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Hammoud moved to substitute (H-2) the bill.
The motion did not prevail and the substitute (H-2) was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Kelly moved to substitute (H-4) the bill.
The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-4) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

**Third Reading of Bills**

**Senate Bill No. 1171, entitled**
A bill to amend 2018 PA 337, entitled “Improved workforce opportunity wage act,” by amending sections 3, 4, 4a, 4d, 10, and 15 (MCL 408.933, 408.934, 408.934a, 408.934d, 408.940, and 408.945).

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 674**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yeas—60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afendoulis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nays—48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambensy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilleri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chirkun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dianda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

"An initiation of legislation to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act which would fix minimum wages for employees within this state; prohibit wage discrimination; provide for a wage deviation board; provide for the administration and enforcement of the act; prescribe penalties for the violation of the act; and supersede certain acts and parts of acts including 2014 PA 138,"

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Wittenberg, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, shameful ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and that’s why I voted no."

Reps. Chirkun, Brinks and Hammoud, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No V ote Explanation – SB 1171 (One Fair Wage)

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today."
Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Reps. Zemke and Lasinski, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964:

‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4, 303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Rep. Hoadley, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on SB 1171. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. It cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. This amounts to a legislature-initiated pay cut, and I won’t support it.”

Reps. Green and Jones, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No Vote Explanation – SB 1171 (One Fair Wage)

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.
SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting a petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.

No Vote Explanation - SB 1175 (Michigan Time to Care)
The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting a petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.

Rep. Yaroch, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:
“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:
As a constitutional conservative, I do not believe the Michigan Constitution grants the Legislature the authority to amend a citizens’ initiative in this manner. Someday it might be decided that this bill meets the letter of the Michigan Constitution, but there should be no doubt that it violates the spirit of the Constitution.”

Rep. Geiss, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:
“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:
Today I voted no on SB 1171 in solidarity with the hundreds of thousands of people that supported the original initiative. Regardless of party or economic policies that guide our decisions all of us serving were sent here to do one thing above all else—represent the people of Michigan to the best of our abilities. The fact of the matter is, the people have already spoken on this matter. Hundreds of thousands of people across Michigan joined together, exercised their constitutional right, and wrote a law.

In doing so, they told us all a few things. They told us that they are tired of being forced to live paycheck to paycheck, always worried about whether they will be able to afford to meet their basic needs for survival. They told us that they wanted a better future for themselves, their children, their neighbors, and Michigan as a whole. And they told us that they felt it was time they take this matter into their own hands, as legislative leadership was not prioritizing this crucial need of theirs. And just when it looked like their needs would be addressed, after they had taken all of the necessary steps, and worked so hard to accomplish what they did, their voices are now on the verge of being silenced.
I was not sent here to silence my people, especially those whose voices cannot be raised, those who cannot come here and have their voices heard—the disproportionate numbers of mothers, of single-women heads of households in urban AND rural communities, people of color, people with disabilities, seniors whose pensions we tax, and others in low-wage and minimum wage and often part-time jobs who struggle to make ends meet, who struggle daily to get by, for whom there is too much month at the end of the money—the very same people who members of this body vilify for needing public assistance not because they’re lazy or don’t work hard enough, but because they don’t earn enough to feed their families, the very same people who through SB1171 will be pushed further into poverty—that’s today’s 21% of the population of Michigan’s kids; 15% of Michigander’s today who are among those who want the law—PA 337 of 2018—in tact is who I speak for because I was sent here to listen to and amplify their voices and like all of us I was sent here to uphold the constitution and this bill is unconstitutional.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964).

Let us be clear that the legislative session means the two-year period of time that begins on the second Wednesday of January of the odd year and culminates with the sine die session in December of the following even year. It does not mean a session day or other type of session that bodies within the legislature may meet, which are subdivisions of each two-year legislative session.

And, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

And while the current AG has a difference of opinion on this matter—and we have a conflict of opinions from two attorneys general on it—rather than moving full steam ahead and rushing to reconsider and dismantle the very law that this body enacted in September, we should press pause, put on the brakes, let the existing law stand and get a third opinion on the matter.

The language was good enough for us to vote on and adopt as law earlier this year. Why reconsider it now? If a law that is passed by this body that comes from a ballot initiative—a referendum by the people—can be brought back up for reconsideration in the same session with another bill, then that should be the case for any other legislation that this body passes.

And while we have known this was a possibility ever since these proposals passed the House back in September and that this ploy was as transparent as any I have seen…I held out hope. I held out hope that some might have a change of heart, and recognize that what is before us today is wrong. I thought it might be possible for some to decide that they wouldn’t play these games – employing shady bait-and-switch tactics with the intent of circumventing the will of the people. We must consider whose survival is at stake here: the trust of the people and their economic security.”

Rep. Elder, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Once again, Republicans have rushed through legislation to rig the rules against working families, following through on their promise to rob Michiganders of these much-needed benefits. Hundreds of thousands of Michigan workers voiced their support for these ballot initiatives; but as usual, GOP legislators are playing games with the livelihoods of working families throughout our state instead of supporting policies that provide them real relief. Passing this legislation today is nothing short of an attack on Michigan’s working families and they deserve better. For these reasons and more, I voted no on Senate Bill 1171.”

Rep. Chang, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.
SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will put many Michiganders back into poverty and onto Medicaid — as stated in the nonpartisan House Fiscal analysis. This bill will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our residents expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Rep. Gay-Dagnogo, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“No Vote Explanation – SB 1171 (One Fair Wage)

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Reps. Pagan, Rabhi, Sowerby and Greig, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“No Vote Explanation – SB 1171 (One Fair Wage)

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.
SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Rep. Anthony, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:
• Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
• Colleagues, I rise to oppose this misguided and harmful legislation before us.
• So last week was my very first week on the House floor.
• And while many tried to prepare me for the fast pace and chaos of lame duck, NOTHING could prepare me for this misleading and deliberate attempt at usurping the will of the people.
• It is hard enough to provide for your family and deal with the daily stressors of life, without the anxiety that comes with living paycheck to paycheck.
• We have a responsibility to promote policies that lift Michiganders into the middle class. That means being able to cover the basic necessities, including putting food on the table, gas in your car, and school supplies in your child’s backpack.
• This legislation is a slap in the face to every person who agrees we should take care of our workers…and to every person who stood in the cold this afternoon on the Capitol lawn- and elsewhere- to show their support for economic equality.
• We owe it to our constituents to support the original One Fair Wage ballot initiative, eliminate the sub-minimum wage, and keep the dream of economic advancement alive for ALL of Michigan’s residents.
• Mr. Speaker, with the state capitol being in my house district, and many members in this chamber frequenting local businesses (coffee shops and restaurants throughout my community, I find it unconscionable that we would be here supporting legislation that disrespects hundreds of workers that we see each and every week.
• Reinforcing this outdated system prevents working families, particularly women and people of color from earning a decent minimum wage and becoming part of the middle class.
• Research has overwhelmingly proven that eliminating the sub-minimum wage drastically reduces the poverty rate for women and people of color and it often leads to more equal treatment of women in the workplace.[2]
• By voting against this legislation today, you would be supporting the original ballot initiative, thus upholding the will of the people who are OUR constituents throughout every corner of this state.
• Colleagues, I am asking you to listen to your constituents and hear their voices above the noise around you—above the partisanship and the political motivations behind any lame duck agenda.
• I hope you will all join me in voting no on this bill and instead supporting our service industry workers and bringing economic equality to the working men and women throughout our state.
• Thank you.”

Rep. Clemente, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:
I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is unconstitutional and unprecedented. SB 1171 delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade, and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Instead of increasing wages, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation, when compared to current law.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional, because it seeks to amend an initiated law during the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without
violated the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). SB 1171 is also unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today, and I voted no.”

Rep. Guerra, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The majority party not only lied when they chose to adopt an increase to minimum wage, only to gut it two months later-but they also chose to play political games with the livelihoods of Michiganders. The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today, and I voted no.”

Rep. Camilleri, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.”

Rep. Ellison, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Because I so strongly supported the initiative, I chose to place good public policy ahead of the possibility of partisan gamesmanship, by voting to adopt the citizen initiated legislation when it came before the Legislature earlier this year. I chose to trust those of my colleagues who claimed to be adopting the initiative for all of the RIGHT reasons. I trusted them when they said they would not gut the initiative. Yet today, the House broke that trust by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.
SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.

SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

**Second Reading of Bills**

**Senate Bill No. 1175, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 338, entitled “Earned sick time act,” by amending the title and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 14 (MCL 408.961, 408.962, 408.963, 408.964, 408.965, 408.967, 408.968, 408.970, 408.971, and 408.974); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Geiss moved to substitute (H-2) the bill.
The motion did not prevail and the substitute (H-2) was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Kelly moved to substitute (H-4) the bill.
The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-4) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

**Third Reading of Bills**

**Senate Bill No. 1175, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 338, entitled “Earned sick time act,” by amending the title and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 14 (MCL 408.961, 408.962, 408.963, 408.964, 408.965, 408.967, 408.968, 408.970, 408.971, and 408.974); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 675**

| Afendoulis | Garcia | Kesto | Reilly |
| Albert | Glenn | LaFave | Rendon |
| Alexander | Graves | LaSata | Roberts |
| Allor | Griffin | Lauwers | Runestad |
| Barrett | Hauck | Leonard | Sheppard |
| Bizon | Hernandez | Leutheuser | Tedder |
| Brann | Hoitenga | Lilly | Theis |
Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:

“An initiation of legislation to provide workers with the right to earn sick time for personal or family health needs, as well as purposes related to domestic violence and sexual assault and school meetings needed as the result of a child’s disability, health issues or issues due to domestic violence and sexual assault; to specify the conditions for accruing and using earned sick time; to prohibit retaliation against an employee for requesting, exercising, or enforcing rights granted in this act; to prescribe powers and duties of certain state departments, agencies, and officers; to provide for promulgation of rules; and to provide remedies and sanctions,”

The House agreed to the full title.

Reps. Green and Jones, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“No Vote Explanation – SB 1171 (One Fair Wage)

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 370,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act and ensure that all Michiganders have a chance to earn one fair wage. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by cutting the wages of hardworking Michiganders and gutting this hard-won initiated law. I voted no on SB 1171, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it will harm working Michiganders and their families who struggle each day to make ends meet. It delays a modest hourly minimum wage increase to $12.00 for over a decade and then freezes that wage indefinitely. Perhaps more galling, it actually cuts the real wages that tipped workers will receive over the life of the legislation when compared to current law. Hundreds of thousands of Michiganders didn’t sign a petition asking for a pay cut.
SB 1171 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1171 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.

**No Vote Explanation - SB 1175 (Michigan Time to Care)**

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.

Rep. Chang, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

1.7 million Michiganders in the private sector couldn’t earn paid sick time and the law we recently passed this fall allows them to do so. But by excluding hundreds of thousands of employees from eligibility to earn paid sick leave, by cutting the number of paid sick time hours a worker could earn in almost half, by cutting down the amount of time a worker has to file a claim if their employer violated the act by more than 80 percent, and with all the other elements of this bill, Senate Bill 1175, this legislation is not tweaking or minor modifications for the business community – this is the gutting of good public policy that affects those 1.7 million Michiganders.

So today I want to discuss two things – business productivity and the will of the people.

My husband has worked in small business development in Detroit for over ten years. He knows and interacts with small business owners every day and has helped many with training and resources. I trust his instincts when it comes to small business issues – and he opposes this bill and supports the earned paid sick time law. There are small business owners in Michigan who oppose this bill and support the earned paid sick time law, and I applaud them both for helping drive Michigan’s economy and for standing up for the values they believe in.

I want to be clear - The weakening of Michigan’s earned paid sick law is not just bad for working families and for public health – it’s also bad for business. There is a lot of false rhetoric about what Michigan’s earned paid sick time law means for the economy. This is fearmongering, and it is irresponsible, and not based on the reality of how earned paid sick time laws have played out in other cities and states.
When workers stay at home to get better or go to the doctor to get medical care, that means they and their employer can hold down health care costs for more serious illnesses. This means more productive workers on the job, not people coming in to work sick. This means decreased turnover of workers and the associated costs.

National research shows that nine out of ten employers either rarely or never need to hire replacement workers when their workers use sick time under the law.

And workers who finally are able to earn sick time are, on the whole, using it responsibly — nationally, workers in small businesses use an average of 2.2 days a year. In some cases, a large percentage of workers in some cities with earned paid sick time laws don’t even use any of their sick days they earned. Workers use sick time when they are sick and really need it. They should be able to earn up to the 72 hours per year as called for in Michigan law because as we all know, sometimes one’s health requires attention for as much time as is needed so there can be a full recovery and we can’t predict who or when you might need this.

Research has shown that in other states with strong earned paid sick time laws, there have been minimal effects on cost to the business, and businesses have not needed to make changes like increased prices or reducing hours for workers. And guess what — in states where earned paid sick time laws have passed, there hasn’t been an economic disaster — on the contrary, economies are doing well, there are still new businesses being started, and more people getting jobs.

In one city that passed an earned paid sick time law, many employers were hesitant or opposed, and then a couple years later, over 80 percent supported the law. In another city, a few years after their law was enacted, two-thirds of the employers said they supported the law.

When I took action in favor of the policy to create earned paid sick leave in Michigan in September, I did so because hundreds of thousands of Michiganders made it clear they support this fundamental policy. They made it clear that access to earned paid sick leave was necessary to protect the public health by allowing sick workers to stay home, rather than spreading their illness to their coworkers or customers. They made it clear that survivors of domestic abuse and sexual assault deserve the opportunity to heal and recover without being penalized by their employer. They made it clear that guaranteeing access to earned paid sick leave for Michigan workers is critical to improving the quality of life for us all. I could not agree with them more.

When I was elected to this body in 2015, one of the first issues I tackled was earned paid sick leave. I have fought for this right every year that I have served in this chamber, and I continue to inspired by the hard work and activism of so many Michiganders that brought this issue to the forefront this year. But when the people of our state signed on to support these policies, they did not intend for this body to usurp the process, only to strip workers of these new freedoms.

Weakening our earned paid sick leave law after intervening in the citizen initiative process is an affront to the hundreds of thousands of people whose voices deserve to be heard on this issue. I oppose Senate Bill 1175 and instead, support the will of Michiganders everywhere by protecting their freedom to care for themselves or a loved one when sick. We owe it to the people we serve.”

Rep. Chirkun, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No Vote Explanation - SB 1175 (Michigan Time to Care)

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1175 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever
been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious
ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our
Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law
adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Rep. Wittenberg, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following state-
ment:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and
enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition
to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or
the health of their family. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and
unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes
the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size
and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the
benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally,
it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal
right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was
adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature
enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation
of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6,
1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting
to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved
only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever
been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, hu-
milliating ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect
for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an
initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expect and deserve better from this House and that’s why I voted no.”

Rep. Elder, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following state-
ment:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Once again, Republicans have rushed through legislation to rig the rules against working families, following through
on their promise to rob Michiganders of these much-needed benefits. Hundreds of thousands of Michigan workers voiced
their support for these ballot initiatives; but as usual, GOP legislators are playing games with the livelihoods of working
families throughout our state instead of supporting policies that provide them real relief. Passing this legislation today is
nothing short of an attack on Michigan’s working families and they deserve better. For these reasons and more, I voted
no on Senate Bill 1175.”

Reps. Brinks and Lasinski, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the
following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No Vote Explanation - SB 1175 (Michigan Time to Care)

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and
enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition
to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or
the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical,
political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick
Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted
no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes
the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size
and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the
benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally,
it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal
right to access earned sick time.
SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Rep. Yaroch, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“As a constitutional conservative, I do not believe the Michigan Constitution grants the Legislature the authority to amend a citizens’ initiative in this manner. Someday it might be decided that this bill meets the letter of the Michigan Constitution, but there should be no doubt that it violates the spirit of the Constitution.”

Rep. Zemke, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1175 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964:

‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Rep. Geiss, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Today I voted no in opposition to SB1175. Its supporters are telling a large group of Michigan’s working people and their families and advocates—the very people who have entrusted us to be their voices, to SERVE them in these chambers—that their voices and efforts do not matter. That their rallying using their constitutional right, their safety net to guarantee checks and balances, to let us as lawmakers know that we need to implement real change because they are sick and tired of unfair policies under which Michigan workers have dealt with for far too long.

It is unconscionable that anyone could ever be asked to choose between their health and their job.
Yet that is the sad reality that many in Michigan face at some point in their careers. In fact, this bill will leave 55% of Michigan’s workers—1.7 million people in our state—without guaranteed access to sick time...many of these workers are the same people preparing and serving our food, stocking our shelves at the market, selling us holiday gifts, and preparing our rooms and changing our linens in hotels across the state and working in other service-sector jobs.

Earned paid sick leave gives all Michigan workers the freedom to prioritize the health of themselves and their families without the fear that they are putting their financial stability at risk.

The supporters and proponents of this bill want you to believe that the current law is bad for business and that its replacement that we have before us is better. It is not. Working sick costs the national economy $160 billion annually in lost productivity. Human resource execs and small business owners agree that presenteeism is a problem because of productivity loss and the risk of spreading infection and employees to go to work sick endanger profits by putting the productivity of other workers at risk as well as the put the health and safety of their customers and the public at risk. The current law is good public health policy. SB1175 is bad public health policy because it leaves so many people uncovered.

The supporters and proponents of this bill also want to sell us a bill of goods that linking it to the Family Medical Leave Act—the FMLA—is a good thing. The author of the FMLA—former Congressman William D. Ford (from Taylor)—and who has had conversations with people who worked closely with him on the FMLA, that even when FMLA was being debated and passed over a quarter century ago, that the FMLA didn’t go far enough then. Congressman Ford wanted the FMLA to not only cover a wider range of people and include people who work in businesses with fewer than 50 people, he also believed that it should be PAID leave, not unpaid. The current law—PA 338 of 2018—does exactly that and is more closely aligned to the actual spirit and intent of FMLA than what we have before us does.

Put another way, PA 338 of 2018—allows you to be a human being without getting fired.

And that cuts to the heart of this legislation. Because Michigan’s wealthy CEO’s don’t believe they employ human beings. And they’ve long bankrolled their special interest friends in the fight to ensure they don’t have to treat their workers as such.

With these changes, this body will be telling Michigan’s working families that it doesn’t view them as human beings, either. This will tell them that the employer’s bottom line is more important than their ability to take sufficient care of themselves and their family. It tells Michigan’s workers and their families that the unproven, unfounded fears of business climate and economic Armageddon are more important than the very people—the human beings—who help make those businesses successful.

According to this legislation, if a company is made up of less than 50 employees, the employer would not be required by law to give its workers even 1 measly hour of sick leave.

Not even one.

With these changes, an employer also is under no obligation to provide workers with earned sick time until they have hit the one year anniversary of their start date. Zero hours.

So if someone works for a small company, or if they haven’t been there more than a year— they better not get sick—or be prepared to face the consequences. According to this legislation, one would have to give notice in advance of needing to take the sick time. I guess nobody supporting it has ever awakened vomiting or had a child wake up with a fever of 104 or an aging relative have a stroke or heart-attack. I guess nobody supporting this legislation can’t empathize one iota with the woman getting assaulted on her way to her night-shift job being at the hospital to undergo the process of getting a rape kit done and questions from the police about pressing charges and what happened because of the ridiculous time-

 constraints written into the bill about notification of use of one’s sick time.

How can anyone be expected to make that work?

It doesn’t. And it isn’t supposed to.

Senate Bill 1175 is a disgrace. It is Dickensian.

It drastically and unnecessarily strips the initiative of the benefits. SB 1175 has nothing to do with protecting the economy, as its supporters attempt to claim. This is nothing but yet another attempt at winning favor with and carrying the water of the same group that likes to wax poetic about letting market forces dictate business-related policy. Well the market—the customers—of the Earned Paid Sick Leave Act—are the people that it affects, and the market has spoken: they want and need an Earned Paid Sick Leave Act in the form of the existing PA 338 of 2018 and not what we have before us here. It is as clear as day.

Furthermore, the people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1175 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the
benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognized the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.”

Reps. Gay-Dagnogo and Hammoud, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

**No Vote Explanation - SB 1175 (Michigan Time to Care)**

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognized the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Reps. Rabhi, Sowerby, Guerra and Greig, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.

SB 1171 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size
and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Rep. Clemente, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is unconstitutional, and unprecedented. SB 1175 reduces the number of Michigan residents eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit, and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. It distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional, because it seeks to amend an initiated law during the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). SB 1175 is also unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today, and I voted no.”

Rep. Camilleri, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Those same citizens were wrongly denied the right to vote on this initiated law by a cynical, political act of the Legislature earlier this year. Today, the House compounds that injury by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.”

Rep. Ellison, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

The people of the state of Michigan have, through our Constitution, reserved to themselves the power to initiate and enact laws. Over 380,000 of our fellow citizens exercised that constitutional right when they signed an initiative petition to enact the Earned Sick Time Act and ensure no Michigander is forced to choose between their job and their health or the health of their family. Because I so strongly supported the initiative, I chose to place good public policy ahead of the possibility of partisan gamesmanship, by voting to adopt the citizen initiated legislation when it came before the Legislature earlier this year. I chose to trust those of my colleagues who claimed to be adopting the initiative for all of the RIGHT reasons. I trusted them when they said they would not gut the initiative. Yet today, the House broke that trust by reducing the Earned Sick Time Act to little more than an empty promise, accessible to fewer Michiganders and worth even less to far more. I voted no on SB 1175, because this legislation is, unconscionable, unconstitutional, and unprecedented.
SB 1171 is unconscionable because it undoes nearly all the good work done by the Earned Sick Time Act. It slashes the number of Michiganders eligible to receive the benefit of earned sick time. For those still eligible, it reduces the size and usability of the benefit. It removes the domestic partners of eligible employees (and their children) entirely from the benefit and the ability of parents to use the benefit to attend essential meetings at a child’s school or place of care. Finally, it distorts to the point of being unrecognizable the provisions of the act designed to allow workers to enforce their legal right to access earned sick time.

SB 1175 is unconstitutional because it seeks to amend an initiated law in the same legislative session in which it was adopted by the Legislature. As Attorney General Frank Kelley wrote so clearly and concisely in 1964: ‘[T]he legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963.’ OAG, 1964, No. 4,303, p 311 (March 6, 1964). The notion that the Constitution approves of what this House has done today is as indefensible as it is insulting to the Michiganders who signed the petitions proposing the law being eviscerated today.

Finally, SB 1175 is unprecedented. Since the adoption of 1963 Michigan Constitution, the Legislature has approved only seven initiative petitions under the provisions of Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Only one of those initiated laws has ever been amended subsequent to approval and never in the same legislative session. This Legislature is breaking new, ignominious ground today. For over a half century, our predecessors in this House have had the wisdom, and the respect for our Constitution, to refrain from any attempt to flagrantly disregard the manifest will of the people by gutting an initiated law adopted mere weeks ago.

Our citizens expected and deserved better from this House today and I vote no.”

Second Reading of Bills

**Senate Bill No. 1051, entitled**

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Government Operations,

The substitute (H-1) was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. VerHeulen moved to substitute (H-3) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-3) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

**House Bill No. 6086, entitled**

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Regulatory Reform,

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Vaupel moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

**Senate Bill No. 751, entitled**
A bill to amend 1980 PA 299, entitled “Occupational code,” by amending section 1203a (MCL 339.1203a), as added by 1997 PA 97.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

**House Bill No. 6253, entitled**

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Kesto moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.
House Bill No. 6254, entitled
A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 411j (MCL 750.411j), as amended by 2009 PA 82.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Farrington moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

The Speaker Pro Tempore called Associate Speaker Pro Tempore Tedder to the Chair.

House Bill No. 6255, entitled
A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 49 (MCL 750.49), as amended by 2006 PA 129.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Marino moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6256, entitled
A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 159g (MCL 750.159g), as amended by 2014 PA 300.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. LaFave moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6257, entitled
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. VanderWall moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6258, entitled
A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 157m (MCL 750.157m), as amended by 1988 PA 335.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Guerra moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6465, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending section 3112 (MCL 324.3112), as amended by 2005 PA 33.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 5372, entitled
A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 625b (MCL 257.625b), as amended by 2008 PA 462.
Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Committee on Judiciary,
The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Bellino moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.
House Bill No. 5806, entitled
A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” (MCL 600.101 to 600.9947) by adding chapter 10C. Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Committee on Judiciary.

The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Calley moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 5807, entitled
A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 1088, 1091, 1093, 1094, 1095, and 1098 (MCL 600.1088, 600.1091, 600.1093, 600.1094, 600.1095, and 600.1098), section 1088 as added and section 1095 as amended by 2017 PA 161, section 1091 as amended by 2017 PA 163, section 1093 as added by 2013 PA 274, section 1094 as added by 2013 PA 276, and section 1098 as added by 2013 PA 275.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Calley moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 5808, entitled
A bill to amend 1939 PA 288, entitled “Probate code of 1939,” by amending section 6 of chapter XIIA (MCL 712A.6), as amended by 2004 PA 221.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Calley moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6205, entitled
A bill to amend 1988 PA 466, entitled “Animal industry act,” by amending the title and sections 1, 3, 7, 9, 11b, 12, 14, 19, 20, 22, 31, 39, 40, 43, and 44 (MCL 287.701, 287.703, 287.707, 287.709, 287.711b, 287.712, 287.714, 287.719, 287.720, 287.722, 287.731, 287.739, 287.740, 287.743, and 287.744), the title and section 43 as amended by 1996 PA 369, sections 1, 20, 39 and 40 as amended by 2000 PA 323, sections 3, 9, 11b, 14, 19, 22, and 44 as amended by 2002 PA 458, section 7 as amended by 1994 PA 41, and sections 12 and 31 as amended by 2003 PA 271, and by adding sections 3a, 3b, 12a, 12b, 14a, 17b, 17c, 17d, 43a, and 43b; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Agriculture.

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Lauwers moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 22, following line 26, by inserting:

“(4) NOTWITHSTANDING ANY OTHER PROVISION OF THIS ACT, THE STATE VETERINARIAN SHALL BE NOTIFIED OF A REPORTABLE DISEASE FOUND IN A WILD BIRD, WILD ANIMAL, GAME, OR PROTECTED ANIMAL UNDER THE NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT, 1994 PA 451, MCL 324.101 TO 324.90106, OR A STATE OR FEDERAL FISH HATCHERY. THE APPROPRIATE RESOURCE AGENCY, INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, SHALL RETAIN AUTHORITY OVER THE WILD BIRD, WILD ANIMAL, GAME, PROTECTED ANIMAL, OR STATE OR FEDERAL FISH HATCHERY.”.

The motion prevailed and the amendment was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Lauwers moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6206, entitled

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Howell moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.
House Bill No. 6207, entitled
A bill to amend 1965 PA 232, entitled “Agricultural commodities marketing act,” by amending section 2 (MCL 290.652), as amended by 2002 PA 601.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Victory moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6208, entitled
A bill to amend 1937 PA 284, entitled “An act to prevent the spread of infectious and contagious diseases of livestock; to require persons, associations, partnerships and corporations engaged in the buying, receiving, selling, transporting, exchanging, negotiating, or soliciting sale, resale, exchange or transportation of livestock to be licensed and bonded by the department of agriculture; to keep a producers’ proceeds account; to provide for the refusal, suspension or revocation of such licenses; to provide for weighmasters; to provide for the inspection and disinfection of yards, premises and vehicles; and to provide penalties for the violation of this act,” by amending sections 4 and 7 (MCL 287.124 and 287.127), as amended by 2012 PA 317.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Alexander moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6209, entitled
A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending sections 50 and 50b (MCL 750.50 and 750.50b), section 50 as amended by 2007 PA 152 and section 50b as amended by 2008 PA 339.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Vaupel moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6210, entitled
A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 12m of chapter XVII (MCL 777.12m), as amended by 2015 PA 213.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Vaupel moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6211, entitled
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Wentworth moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6212, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 358, entitled “An act to regulate the possession of ferrets; to provide for the licensing of ferrets; to provide for requirements for importation and rabies control procedures for ferrets; to provide for the powers and duties of certain governmental entities; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 1 (MCL 287.891).
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Calley moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6213, entitled
A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled “The general property tax act,” by amending sections 7dd and 34c (MCL 211.7dd and 211.34c), section 7dd as amended by 2015 PA 107 and section 34c as amended by 2012 PA 409.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Barrett moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.
House Bill No. 6214, entitled
A bill to amend 2000 PA 274, entitled “Large carnivore act,” by amending section 2 (MCL 287.1102), as amended by 2016 PA 305.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Frederick moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6216, entitled
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Cole moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6393, entitled
A bill to amend 2001 PA 266, entitled “Grade A milk law of 2001,” by amending section 6 (MCL 288.476), as amended by 2016 PA 259.
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Alexander moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6394, entitled
The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Alexander moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 6344, entitled
A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 8125 (MCL 600.8125), as amended by 2012 PA 16.
Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Committee on Judiciary.
The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Rep. Singh moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of
Motions and Resolutions

Rep. Cole moved that when the House adjourns today it stand adjourned until Wednesday, December 5, at 10:00 a.m.
The motion prevailed.

Messages from the Senate

House Bill No. 5539, entitled
A bill to amend 2013 PA 183, entitled “Student safety act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 752.913).
The Senate has passed the bill, ordered that it be given immediate effect and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.
The House agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.
House Bill No. 5658, entitled
A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 27b of chapter VIII (MCL 768.27b), as added by 2006 PA 78.

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

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 5660, entitled

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

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 5661, 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 2017 PA 74.

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

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 5697, entitled

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

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 5794, entitled
A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” (MCL 750.1 to 750.568) by adding section 145g.

The Senate has substituted (S-1) the bill.

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

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

House Bill No. 5798, entitled

The Senate has substituted (S-1) the bill.

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

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Senate Bill No. 641, entitled
A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 16111, 16343, 18201, 18211, 18221, 18223, 18233, and 18237 (MCL 333.16111, 333.16343, 333.18201, 333.18211, 333.18221, 333.18223, 333.18233, and 333.18237), section 16111 as amended by 2006 PA 392, section 16343 as added by 1993 PA 79, sections 18211 and
18221 as amended by 2006 PA 395, section 18223 as amended by 2018 PA 24, section 18233 as amended by 1994 
PA 234, and section 18237 as amended by 1998 PA 496, and by adding sections 18225, 18226, and 18236.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Health Policy.

Senate Bill No. 964, entitled
A bill to amend 1972 PA 106, entitled “Highway advertising act of 1972,” by amending sections 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 7a, 9, 
17, 17a, 19, and 23 (MCL 252.302, 252.303, 252.304, 252.306, 252.307, 252.307a, 252.309, 252.317, 252.317a, 252.319,
and 252.323), sections 2, 4, 6, 7, 7a, and 17 as amended and section 17a as added by 2014 PA 2 and sections 3, 9, and
19 as amended by 2006 PA 448, and by adding section 8; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Senate Bill No. 1103, entitled
A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 8401a, 8402, 8403,
8404, 8405, 8406, 8409, 8412, 8420, and 8423 (MCL 600.8401a, 600.8402, 600.8403, 600.8404, 600.8405, 600.8406,
600.8409, 600.8412, 600.8420, and 600.8423), section 8401a as amended by 1998 PA 547, sections 8402 and 8409 as
amended by 1991 PA 192, sections 8404 and 8412 as amended by 1984 PA 278, section 8405 as amended by 1996
PA 579, and section 8420 as amended by 2005 PA 151.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

Senate Bill No. 1136, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” (MCL 324.101 to 324.90106)
by amending the heading of part 414 and by adding sections 41401, 41402, and 41403.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Senate Bill No. 1141, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” (MCL 324.101 to
324.90106) by adding section 11109.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Senate Bill No. 1185, entitled
A bill to amend 2016 PA 407, entitled “Skilled trades regulation act,” by amending section 733 (MCL 339.5733), as
amended by 2018 PA 331.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Regulatory Reform.

Senate Bill No. 1195, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” (MCL 324.101 to
324.90106) by adding section 11109.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.

Senate Bill No. 1196, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending section 11104
(MCL 324.11104), as amended by 2001 PA 165 and by adding sections 11132 and 11514b.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.
Senate Bill No. 1207, entitled
A bill to amend 1972 PA 230, entitled “Stille-DeRossett-Hale single state construction code act,” (MCL 125.1501 to 125.1531) by adding section 13g.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Regulatory Reform.

Senate Bill No. 1211, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 1511, 30101, 30112, 30301, 30304, 30305, 30306, 30307, 30311, 30314, 30316, 30319, and 32301 (MCL 324.1511, 324.30112, 324.30301, 324.30304, 324.30305, 324.30306, 324.30307, 324.30311, 324.30314, 324.30316, 324.30319, 324.30321, and 324.32301), section 1511 as added by 2011 PA 237, section 30101 as amended by 2014 PA 351, sections 30112, 30314, 30316, 30319, and 32301 as added by 1995 PA 59, section 30301 as amended by 2012 PA 247, section 30304 as amended by 2004 PA 325, sections 30305, 30306, 30311, and 30321 as amended by 2013 PA 98, and section 30307 as amended by 2006 PA 430.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Michigan Competitiveness.

Senate Bill No. 1219, entitled
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Regulatory Reform.

Senate Bill No. 1244, entitled
A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 20101, 20114d, 20114e, 20120a, and 20120b (MCL 324.20101, 324.20114d, 324.20114e, 324.20120a, and 324.20120b), sections 20101, 20114d, 20120a, and 20120b as amended by 2014 PA 542 and section 20114e as amended by 2014 PA 178, and by adding section 20120f.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Michigan Competitiveness.

Introduction of Bills

Rep. Roberts introduced
House Bill No. 6561, entitled
A bill to amend 1915 PA 31, entitled “Youth tobacco act,” by amending the title and sections 1, 2, and 4 (MCL 722.641, 722.642, and 722.644), as amended by 2006 PA 236.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Regulatory Reform.

Reps. Whiteford, Rendon and Crawford introduced
House Bill No. 6562, entitled
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Elections and Ethics.
Reps. Whiteford, Rendon and Crawford introduced

**House Bill No. 6563, entitled**

A bill to amend 1851 PA 156, entitled “An act to define the powers and duties of the county boards of commissioners of the several counties, and to confer upon them certain local, administrative and legislative powers; and to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act,” by amending section 16c (MCL 46.16c), as added by 1988 PA 37.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Elections and Ethics.

---

Reps. Rendon, Whiteford and Crawford introduced

**House Bill No. 6564, entitled**


The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Elections and Ethics.

---

Reps. Crawford, Whiteford and Rendon introduced

**House Bill No. 6565, entitled**


The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Elections and Ethics.

---

Reps. LaGrand, Rabhi, Ellison, Moss, Anthony, Dianda, Zemke, Brinks, Elder, Peterson, Cochran, Robinson and Sabo introduced

**House Bill No. 6566, entitled**

A bill to amend 1966 PA 261, entitled “An act to provide for the apportionment of county boards of commissioners; to prescribe the size of the board; to provide for appeals; to prescribe the manner of election of the members of the county board of commissioners; to provide for compensation of members; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 (MCL 46.401, 46.402, 46.403, and 46.404), sections 1, 2, and 3 as amended by 2011 PA 280.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Elections and Ethics.

---

Reps. Sowerby, Chirkun, Yanez, Clemente, Moss, Zemke, Hertel, Anthony, Green, Ellison, LaGrand, Liberati and Rabhi introduced

**House Bill No. 6567, entitled**

A bill to amend 1951 PA 51, entitled “An act to provide for the classification of all public roads, streets, and highways in this state, and for the revision of that classification and for additions to and deletions from each classification; to set up and establish the Michigan transportation fund; to provide for the deposits in the Michigan transportation fund of specific taxes on motor vehicles and motor vehicle fuels; to provide for the allocation of funds from the Michigan transportation fund and the use and administration of the fund for transportation purposes; to promote safe and efficient travel for motor vehicle drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians, and other legal users of roads, streets, and highways; to set up and establish the truck safety fund; to provide for the allocation of funds from the truck safety fund and administration of the fund for truck safety purposes; to set up and establish the Michigan truck safety commission; to establish certain standards for road contracts for certain businesses; to provide for the continuing review of transportation needs within the state; to authorize the state transportation commission, counties, cities, and villages to borrow money, issue bonds, and make pledges of funds for transportation purposes; to authorize counties to advance funds for the payment of deficiencies necessary for the payment of bonds issued under this act; to provide for the limitations, payment, retirement, and security of the bonds and pledges; to provide for appropriations and tax levies by counties and townships for county roads; to authorize contributions by townships for county roads; to provide for the establishment and administration of the state trunk line fund, local bridge fund, comprehensive transportation fund, and certain other funds; to provide for the deposits in the state trunk line fund, critical bridge fund, comprehensive transportation fund, and certain other funds of money raised by specific taxes and fees; to provide for definitions of public transportation functions and criteria; to define the purposes for which Michigan transportation funds may be allocated; to provide for Michigan transportation fund grants; to provide for review and approval of transportation programs; to provide for submission of annual legislative requests and reports; to provide for the establishment and functions of certain advisory entities; to provide for conditions for...
grants; to provide for the issuance of bonds and notes for transportation purposes; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies and officials; to provide for the making of loans for transportation purposes by the state transportation department and for the receipt and repayment by local units and agencies of those loans from certain specified sources; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending sections 11, 12, and 13 (MCL 247.661, 247.662, and 247.663), as amended by 2015 PA 175.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Reps. Faris and Lilly introduced  
**House Bill No. 6568, entitled**  

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Elections and Ethics.

Reps. Bellino, Kahle, Brann, Lucido and LaFave introduced  
**House Bill No. 6569, entitled**  
A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” (MCL 257.1 to 257.923) by adding section 811hh.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Rep. Bellino introduced  
**House Bill No. 6570, entitled**  
A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 7333, 16221, 16226, and 17754 (MCL 333.7333, 333.16221, 333.16226, and 333.17754), section 7333 as amended by 2018 PA 34, sections 16221 and 16226 as amended by 2017 PA 249, and section 17754 as amended by 2014 PA 525.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Health Policy.

Rep. Runestad introduced  
**House Bill No. 6571, entitled**  
A bill to amend 1974 PA 381, entitled “An act to encourage and contribute to the rehabilitation of former offenders and to assist them in the assumption of the responsibilities of citizenship; to prescribe the use of the term “good moral character” or similar term as a requirement for an occupational or professional license or when used as a requirement to establish or operate an organization or facility regulated by this state; and to provide administrative and judicial procedures to contest licensing board or agency rulings thereon,” by amending section 1 (MCL 338.41).

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

Rep. Runestad introduced  
**House Bill No. 6572, entitled**  
A bill to amend 1978 PA 397, entitled “Bullard-Plawecki employee right to know act,” by amending sections 7 and 9 (MCL 423.507 and 423.509).

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

Rep. Runestad introduced  
**House Bill No. 6573, entitled**  

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

Rep. Tedder introduced  
**House Bill No. 6574, entitled**  
A bill to amend 2007 PA 36, entitled “Michigan business tax act,” by amending sections 11, 500, and 505 (MCL 208.1117, 208.1500, and 208.1505), section 117 as amended by 2011 PA 292, section 500 as amended by 2016 PA 426, and section 505 as amended by 2011 PA 305.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Tax Policy.
Rep. Tedder introduced
House Bill No. 6575, entitled
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Tax Policy.

Rep. Johnson introduced
House Bill No. 6576, entitled
A bill to amend 2007 PA 36, entitled “Michigan business tax act,” by amending section 500 (MCL 208.1500), as amended by 2016 PA 426, and by adding section 402; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Tax Policy.

Rep. Johnson introduced
House Bill No. 6577, entitled
A bill to amend 1995 PA 24, entitled “Michigan economic growth authority act,” by amending section 8 (MCL 207.808), as amended by 2009 PA 123.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Tax Policy.

House Bill No. 6578, entitled
A bill to amend 1887 PA 128, entitled “An act establishing the minimum ages for contracting marriages; to require a civil license in order to marry and its registration; to provide for the implementation of federal law; and to provide a penalty for the violation of this act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 551.103), as amended by 2006 PA 578.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Families, Children, and Seniors.

House Bill No. 6579, entitled
A bill to amend 1897 PA 180, entitled “An act to provide for the issuance of marriage licenses and certificates without publicity in certain cases; and to provide criminal and civil penalties for violation of this act,” by amending section 1 (MCL 551.201), as amended by 1983 PA 199.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Families, Children, and Seniors.

House Bill No. 6580, entitled
A bill to amend 1921 PA 352, entitled “An act to prohibit the marriage of a person under 16 years of age and to declare the marriage void,” by amending section 1 (MCL 551.51), as amended by 1983 PA 198.
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Families, Children, and Seniors.

Rep. Howrylak introduced
House Bill No. 6581, entitled
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Law and Justice.

Reps. Lilly and Faris introduced
House Bill No. 6582, entitled
The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Elections and Ethics.
Announcements by the Clerk

The Clerk received the following dissent from Rep. Rabhi:

I dissent to moving SB1171 to 3rd reading as it is contrary to the spirit and letter of the constitution to pass a citizen initiated law and then amend it within the same legislative session."

The Clerk received the following dissent from Rep. Rabhi:

I dissent to moving SB1175 to 3rd reading as it is contrary to the spirit and letter of the constitution to pass a citizen initiated law and amend it within the same legislative session.”

____

Rep. Iden moved that the House adjourn.
The motion prevailed, the time being 7:40 p.m.

Associate Speaker Pro Tempore Tedder declared the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 5, at 10:00 a.m.

GARY L. RANDALL
Clerk of the House of Representatives