

No. 16
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
101st Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2021

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, February 25, 2021.

10:00 a.m.

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

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

Alexander—present
Ananich—present
Barrett—present
Bayer—present
Bizon—present
Brinks—present
Bullock—present
Bumstead—present
Chang—present
Daley—present
Geiss—present
Hertel—present

Hollier—present
Horn—present
Irwin—present
Johnson—present
LaSata—present
Lauwers—present
MacDonald—present
McBroom—present
McCann—present
McMorrow—excused
Moss—present
Nesbitt—present

Outman—present
Polehanki—present
Runestad—present
Santana—present
Schmidt—present
Shirkey—present
Stamas—present
Theis—present
VanderWall—present
Victory—present
Wojno—present
Zorn—present

Senator Roger Victory of the 30th District offered the following invocation:

Lord, we thank You for this morning of a new day. We know this is a good day because it is a day that You have made. We thank You that we can come to gather on this good day, without fear, because we know that You are in control. We ask You for Your hand of guidance on the leadership of our nation, state, and community. And Lord, as we are in the season of Lent, we pray for Your help to see how we need Your compassion. And help us to see those around us more and more with Your eyes of compassion.

This we ask in Your name. Amen.

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

Motions and Communications

Senator Lauwers moved that Senators Shirkey and Schmidt be temporarily excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

Senator Chang moved that Senator Ananich be temporarily excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

Senator Chang moved that Senator McMorrow be excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

Senator Schmidt entered the Senate Chamber.

The following communication was received and read:
Office of the Senate Majority Leader

February 25, 2021

Pursuant to Public Act 412 of 1965, I am appointing the following member of the Michigan Senate to the Michigan Law Revision Commission for the term ending December 31, 2022:

Senator Jim Runestad

Pursuant to Public Act 268 of 1986, I am appointing the following member of the Michigan Senate to the Michigan Commission on Uniform State Laws for the term ending December 31, 2022:

Senator Lana Theis

Sincerely,
Mike Shirkey
16th Senate District
Senate Majority Leader

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

The following communication was received and read:
Office of the Auditor General

February 23, 2021

Enclosed is a copy of the following reports:

- Report on Internal Control, Compliance, and Other Matters of the Michigan Strategic Fund (A Discretely Presented Component Unit of the State of Michigan), Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2020 (186-0401-21).
- Report on Internal Control, Compliance, and Other Matters of the Michigan Economic Development Corporation (A Discretely Presented Component Unit of the State of Michigan), Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2020 (186-0406-21).

Sincerely,
Doug Ringer
Auditor General

The audit reports were referred to the Committee on Oversight.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of
Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senators Runestad, Barrett, Bumstead and Johnson introduced

Senate Joint Resolution E, entitled

A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the state constitution of 1963, by amending sections 13 and 26 of article IV, to provide for the end of the legislative session at certain times in certain years, and to provide rules for a bill to become a law during certain legislative sessions.

The joint resolution was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senators VanderWall, Ananich, Hollier, Wojno, Chang, Bayer, Polehanki, Geiss, Brinks and Schmidt introduced

Senate Bill No. 184, entitled

A bill to create a program to assist certain child care centers and schools with the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of certain filtered water stations and faucets; to provide for the sampling and testing of water from certain water outlets; to create certain funds; and to provide for the duties of certain state departments and officers.

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

Senators Ananich, Hollier, Wojno, Chang, Bayer, Polehanki, Geiss, Brinks, VanderWall and Schmidt introduced

Senate Bill No. 185, entitled

A bill to amend 1973 PA 116, entitled “An act to provide for the protection of children through the licensing and regulation of child care organizations; to provide for the establishment of standards of care for child care organizations; to prescribe powers and duties of certain departments of this state and adoption facilitators; to provide penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 1 (MCL 722.111), as amended by 2020 PA 6, and by adding sections 3i, 3j, 3k, and 3l.

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

Senator Lauwers introduced

Senate Bill No. 186, entitled

A bill to amend 2020 PA 220, entitled “Industrial hemp growers act,” by amending sections 103, 211, 301, 303, 305, 307, 309, 311, 401, 403, 405, 407, 503, 509, 511, 601, 603, 605, and 609 (MCL 333.29103, 333.29211, 333.29301, 333.29303, 333.29305, 333.29307, 333.29309, 333.29311, 333.29401, 333.29403, 333.29405, 333.29407, 333.29503, 333.29509, 333.29511, 333.29601, 333.29603, 333.29605, and 333.29609), and by adding chapter VIII; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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

Senators Hertel, Hollier, Santana, Geiss, Moss, Bullock, Chang, Alexander, Bayer, Ananich, McCann, Brinks and Polehanki introduced

Senate Bill No. 187, entitled

A bill to make appropriations for various state departments and agencies; the judicial branch, and the legislative branch for the fiscal years ending September 30, 2022; to provide anticipated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023; to provide for certain conditions on appropriations; to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

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

Senator Ananich entered the Senate Chamber.

Senators Hertel, Santana, Geiss, Moss, Bullock, Chang, Bayer, Alexander, Ananich, McCann, Brinks, Polehanki and Hollier introduced

Senate Bill No. 188, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled The state school aid act of 1979, by amending sections 4, 6, 6a, 11, 11a, 11j, 11k, 11m, 11s, 15, 18, 19, 20, 20d, 20f, 21f, 21h, 22a, 22b, 22d, 22m, 22p, 24, 24a, 25f, 25g, 26a, 26b, 26c, 28, 31a, 31d, 31f, 31j, 31m, 31n, 32d, 32p, 35a, 39, 39a, 41, 51a, 51c, 51d, 51f, 53a, 54, 54b, 54d, 56, 61a, 61b, 61d, 62, 65, 67, 74, 81, 94, 94a, 98, 99h, 99s, 101, 104, 104c, 105, 105c, 107, 147, 147a, 147b,

147c, 147e, 152a, 166b, 201, 206, 207a, 207b, 207c, 209, 209a, 222, 226e, 229a, 230, 236, 236b, 236c, 241, 245, 245a, 252, 256, 260, 263, 264, 265, 265a, 265b, 267, 268, 269, 270c, 275h, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 285, and 286 (MCL 388.1604, 388.1606, 388.1606a, 388.1611, 388.1611a, 388.1611j, 388.1611k, 388.1611m, 388.1611s, 388.1615, 388.1618, 388.1619, 388.1620, 388.1620d, 388.1620f, 388.1621f, 388.1621h, 388.1622a, 388.1622b, 388.1622d, 388.1622m, 388.1622p, 388.1624, 388.1624a, 388.1625f, 388.1625g, 388.1626a, 388.1626b, 388.1626c, 388.1628, 388.1631a, 388.1631d, 388.1631f, 388.1631j, 388.1631m, 388.1631n, 388.1632d, 388.1632p, 388.1635a, 388.1639, 388.1639a, 388.1641, 388.1651a, 388.1651c, 388.1651d, 388.1651f, 388.1653a, 388.1654, 388.1654b, 388.1654d, 388.1656, 388.1661a, 388.1661b, 388.1661d, 388.1662, 388.1665, 388.1667, 388.1674, 388.1681, 388.1694, 388.1694a, 388.1698, 388.1699h, 388.1699s, 388.1701, 388.1704, 388.1704c, 388.1705, 388.1705c, 388.1707, 388.1747, 388.1747a, 388.1747b, 388.1747c, 388.1747e, 388.1752a, 388.1766b, 388.1801, 388.1806, 388.1807a, 388.1807b, 388.1807c, 388.1809, 388.1809a, 388.1822, 388.1826e, 388.1829a, 388.1830, 388.1836, 388.1836b, 388.1836c, 388.1841, 388.1845, 388.1845a, 388.1852, 388.1856, 388.1860, 388.1863, 388.1864, 388.1865, 388.1865a, 388.1865b, 388.1867, 388.1868, 388.1869, 388.1870c, 388.1875h, 388.1876, 388.1877, 388.1878, 388.1879, 388.1880, 388.1881, 388.1882, 388.1885, and 388.1886), sections 6, 11, 11a, 11j, 11k, 11m, 11s, 15, 18, 20, 20d, 20f, 21h, 22a, 22b, 22d, 22m, 22p, 24, 24a, 25f, 25g, 26a, 26b, 26c, 28, 31a, 31d, 31f, 31j, 31n, 32d, 32p, 35a, 39, 39a, 41, 51a, 51c, 51d, 51f, 53a, 54, 54b, 54d, 56, 61a, 61b, 61d, 62, 65, 67, 74, 81, 94, 94a, 98, 99h, 99s, 101, 104, 105, 105c, 107, 147, 147a, 147c, 147e, 152a, 201, 206, 207a, 207b, 207c, 209, 209a, 222, 229a, 230, 236, 236b, 236c, 241, 245, 245a, 256, 265b, 263, 264, 265, 267, 268, 269, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, and 282 as amended and sections 226e, 260, 270c, and 275h as added by 2020 PA 165, sections 4 and 104c as amended by 2019 PA 58, section 19, 147b and 166b as amended and section 31m as added by 2018 PA 265, section 21f as amended by 2020 PA 147, sections 252 and 265a as amended by 2019 PA 162, section 265a as amended by 2019 PA 62, section 285 as amended by 2012 PA 201, section 286 as amended by 2015 PA 85, and by adding sections 26d, 29b, 35g, 201e, 231, 236i; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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

Senators Geiss, Bullock, Hollier, Santana and Ananich introduced

Senate Bill No. 189, entitled

A bill to amend 1984 PA 431, entitled “The management and budget act,” by amending sections 241 and 261 (MCL 18.1241 and 18.1261), section 241 as amended by 2012 PA 430 and section 261 as amended by 2020 PA 174.

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

Senator VanderWall introduced

Senate Bill No. 190, entitled

A bill to amend 1974 PA 258, entitled “Mental health code,” by amending section 137 (MCL 330.1137), as amended by 2015 PA 59, and by adding section 137b.

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

Senators VanderWall, Bizon, Theis, MacDonald, LaSata, Outman, Wojno, Brinks, Polehanki, Hertel, Alexander, Johnson, Moss, Santana, Bullock and Schmidt introduced

Senate Bill No. 191, entitled

A bill to amend 1974 PA 258, entitled “Mental health code,” by amending sections 100a, 100b, 100c, 281b, 400, 420, 423, 425, 426, 427, 429, 430, 434, 435, 438, 452, 461, 463, 498o, 517, 532, 700, 740, and 742 (MCL 330.1100a, 330.1100b, 330.1100c, 330.1281b, 330.1400, 330.1420, 330.1423, 330.1425, 330.1426, 330.1427, 330.1429, 330.1430, 330.1434, 330.1435, 330.1438, 330.1452, 330.1461, 330.1463, 330.1498o, 330.1517, 330.1532, 330.1700, 330.1740, and 330.1742), sections 100a and 100b as amended by 2020 PA 402, section 100c as amended by 2020 PA 285, sections 400 and 420 as amended by 2018 PA 595, section 281b as added by 2014 PA 200, sections 423, 425, 426, 427, 429, and 463 as amended by 2016 PA 320, sections 430, 498o, 700, and 740 as amended by 1995 PA 290, sections 434, 435, 438, 452, and 461 as amended by 2018 PA 593, sections 517 and 532 as amended by 2018 PA 596, and section 742 as amended by 2004 PA 527.

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

House Joint Resolution A, entitled

A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the state constitution of 1963, by amending section 26 of article IV, to require approval by two-thirds for certain bills.

The House of Representatives has adopted the joint resolution by a 2/3 vote.

The joint resolution was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

House Bill No. 4015, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 331, entitled “Michigan consumer protection act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 445.903), as amended by 2020 PA 296, and by adding section 3m.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill and ordered that it be given immediate effect.

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

Recess

Senator Lauwers moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 10:09 a.m.

11:41 a.m.

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

During the recess, Senator Shirkey entered the Senate Chamber.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 49, entitled

A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” by amending section 536 (MCL 436.1536), as amended by 2020 PA 126.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 16

Yeas—34

Alexander	Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt
Ananich	Geiss	McCann	Shirkey
Barrett	Hertel	Moss	Stamas
Bayer	Hollier	Nesbitt	Theis
Bizon	Horn	Outman	VanderWall
Brinks	Irwin	Polehanki	Victory
Bullock	Johnson	Runestad	Wojno
Bumstead	LaSata	Santana	Zorn
Chang	Lauwers		

Nays—1

McBroom

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 60, entitled

A bill to amend 2016 PA 407, entitled “Skilled trades regulation act,” by amending section 807 (MCL 339.5807).

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 17

Yeas—35

Alexander	Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt
Ananich	Geiss	McBroom	Shirkey
Barrett	Hertel	McCann	Stamas
Bayer	Hollier	Moss	Theis
Bizon	Horn	Nesbitt	VanderWall
Brinks	Irwin	Outman	Victory
Bullock	Johnson	Polehanki	Wojno
Bumstead	LaSata	Runestad	Zorn
Chang	Lauwers	Santana	

Nays—0

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Resolutions

Senators Polehanki, Moss, Bayer, Wojno, Alexander, Hertel and Brinks offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 19.

A resolution to designate March 1, 2021, as COVID-19 Victims and Survivors Memorial Day.

Whereas, SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) is an illness caused by a virus that can transmit from person-to-person and has spread across the world, creating a global pandemic and having catastrophic effects on human life, our communities, and our economy; and

Whereas, In response to the rapid spread of COVID-19 and recent stay-at-home orders, essential workers have stepped up to provide critical services in order to help protect our communities and save lives, while sacrificing their own health and safety; and

Whereas, COVID-19 has had a disproportionate impact on low-income communities and communities of color, exacerbating the inequities already prevalent in our systems, and has further exposed how racism and classism are America's most dangerous preexisting conditions; and

Whereas, The symptoms and severity of COVID-19 can vary dramatically by individuals and the long-term health implications for survivors is largely unknown, as many survivors suffer from lingering side effects of the disease; and

Whereas, As of February 23, 2021, more than 2.48 million people worldwide and 500,000 people in the United States have lost their lives due to COVID-19, and, in Michigan alone, more than 15,362 lives have been lost to this deadly virus; and

Whereas, Each life lost to COVID-19 matters and leaves a hole in the hearts of loved ones, family members, and surrounding communities; and

Whereas, Public health guidance and policies targeted at prevention such as social distancing, wearing masks in public, and staying home help mitigate the spread of COVID-19, prevent illness, and lessen the burden on individuals and society; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body designate March 1, 2021, as COVID-19 Victims and Survivors Memorial Day; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge local residents to continue to take preventative measures, including social distancing and following public health orders, to mitigate the spread of this virus; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution pay tribute to essential workers and those who rose in service to protect the public.

Pursuant to rule 3.204, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senator Chang was named co-sponsor of the resolution.

Senators McBroom, Zorn, Daley, Lauwers, Outman, Victory and VanderWall offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 20.

A resolution to encourage the Natural Resources Commission to add Eastern sandhill cranes to the game species list and seek U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approval to establish an Eastern sandhill crane hunting season.

Whereas, Michigan is home to an ever-increasing population of Eastern sandhill cranes. The 2020 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service fall survey of Eastern sandhill cranes estimated 18,874 cranes in Michigan prior to fall migration. An estimated 13,352 were recorded in 2018; and

Whereas, The explosion in the Eastern sandhill crane population in the state has caused significant issues for Michigan farmers. Although depredation permits are available, the resource is wasted as farmers are prohibited from possessing or consuming dead birds taken under depredation permits. A hunting season would reduce the number of nuisance birds while utilizing this food resource; and

Whereas, Eastern sandhill cranes are already hunted in Minnesota, Tennessee, and Kentucky when they migrate beyond Michigan's borders. They are classified as a game species under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1916; and

Whereas, Hunting seasons are strictly regulated by the Mississippi Flyway Council and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that the Eastern sandhill crane population remains robust. Under the Eastern Population Crane Management Plan, states may only receive approval for a hunting season from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service after submitting pertinent information to the Mississippi Flyway Council, including an estimate of the peak number of Eastern sandhill cranes and time of migration over a five-year period, proposed number of permits to be issued, and proposed season dates. States with hunting seasons are required to gather information from hunters and track the Eastern sandhill crane population; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we encourage the Natural Resources Commission to add Eastern sandhill cranes to the game species list and seek U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service approval to establish an Eastern sandhill crane hunting season; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the members of the Michigan Natural Resources Commission, the Director of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, and the Governor of Michigan.

Pending the order that, under rule 3.204, the resolution be referred to the Committee on Government Operations,

Senator Lauwers moved that the rule be suspended.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on the adoption of the resolution,
Senator Lauwers moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Natural Resources.
The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of
Motions and Communications

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

Senate Bill No. 29

Senate Bill No. 114

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

General Orders

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

The motion prevailed, and the President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, designated Senator Barrett as Chairperson.

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 29, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled "The state school aid act of 1979," by amending sections 11, 17b, 201, and 236 (MCL 388.1611, 388.1617b, 388.1801, and 388.1836), sections 11, 201, and 236 as amended by 2020 PA 165 and section 17b as amended by 2007 PA 137.

Substitute (S-3).

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

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

Senate Bill No. 114, entitled

A bill to make, supplement, and adjust appropriations for various state departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

Substitute (S-2).

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of
Motions and Communications

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

Senate Bill No. 29

Senate Bill No. 114

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of
Third Reading of Bills

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 29, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled "The state school aid act of 1979," by amending sections 11, 21f, 31n, and 167 (MCL 388.1611, 388.1621f, 388.1631n, and 388.1767), sections 11 and 31n as amended by

2020 PA 165, section 21f as amended by 2020 PA 147, and section 167 as amended by 2013 PA 122, and by adding sections 11n, 11o, 11r, 23b, 23c, 23d, and 104a.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Bayer offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 3, line 5, by striking out “\$807,349,300.00” and inserting “\$1,656,308,300.00”.
2. Amend page 3, line 20, after “exceed” by striking out “\$807,349,300.00” and inserting “\$1,656,308,300.00”.
3. Amend page 4, line 8, after “year,” by striking out the balance of the line through “116-260,” on line 12.
4. Amend page 4, line 13, after “funds” by striking out the balance of the line through “funds” on line 18.
5. Amend page 4, line 24, after “than” by striking out “\$450.00” and inserting “\$455.00”.
6. Amend page 4, line 28, by striking out “\$450.00” and inserting “\$455.00”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 18

Yeas—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 19

Yeas—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Nays—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Bayer, Brinks, McCann, Hertel, Santana, Moss, Wojno, Alexander, Bullock, Geiss, Chang, Hollier and Ananich under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 29.

Senator Bayer moved that the statement she made during the discussion of the bill be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bayer’s statement, in which Senators Brinks, McCann, Hertel, Santana, Moss, Wojno, Alexander, Bullock, Geiss, Chang, Hollier and Ananich concurred, is as follows:

I rise today to give my “no” vote explanation on Senate Bill No. 29. While I really do appreciate all the work that went into ensuring that all Michigan school districts and all Michigan students get at least a minimum amount of funding to help get through this COVID-19 time and the work they need to do—I know that was a lot of work and I appreciate that very much—but I can’t vote for this legislation because it is fundamentally flawed by a distrust of our people and our schools, our school districts, and our managers and our teachers. By withholding funds and dribbling it out with strings attached, we are saying we are more qualified to run the schools than they are, and that’s just not correct. They are the experts; we are not. We’re being too specific and we’re adding too much overhead and too much direction in how they spend the money. We’re actually hurting the individual districts and children.

Our only job with this education money provided by the federal government is to pass it along to the schools, to the districts, to the ones who know their kids and their own infrastructure needs. Let them make the decision. It’s not our money to hold on to. It’s not ours to be dribbling out, to distribute as if we were the parents handing out an allowance. Our school administrators are not children. They know how to manage their funding.

It’s not a normal time, as we know. We are still in the middle of this pandemic—hopefully moving to the end—but I implore you to reconsider this model that we have of just trickling out the money and instead distribute it as it’s designed, allowing our schools and families to recover from this tragic pandemic.

Senators Bayer, Stamas and McBroom asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bayer’s statement is as follows:

Thank you for the opportunity to talk about my amendment to Senate Bill No. 29. As it stands now, this bill is trickling out federal funding to our schools, and by doing so, hurting the schools that need it the most.

The schools serving the very poor—the schools with the most Title I funding—need this federal money now, immediately, to make the schools safe for their returning to in-person learning. They have the greatest need right now. These are the schools that are operating in buildings that are 80 years old. They are serving children in poverty with massive systemic injustice. We need these funds now. Not tomorrow, today, for the children's sake. These are federal Title I funds being disproportionately withheld and it is disproportionately affecting poorer districts across the state. It seems like what you're saying here is that districts with poor families are less qualified to manage themselves. Of course that is fundamentally not true. This amendment is simple. It mandates the distribution of all federal funding designated for our schools—all of the \$1.9 billion that our schools and our children need now. Once again, this is not our money. This is our children's money and they need it now.

Senator Stamas' statement is as follows:

This plan builds on over \$4 billion previously dedicated by the Senate Republicans over the last ten months to fight the effects of this virus. Before us today are Senate Bill Nos. 114 and 29. These bills focus on five main issues: vaccines, testing, rental assistance, direct care worker wages, and education. With this last effort, we will have invested over \$6 billion of COVID relief in increasing testing, distributing lifesaving vaccines, educating our children, and supporting our frontline workers, our small businesses, and those that are out of work. This plan is responsible and representative. It helps meet the dire needs that face the state and our people while also being smart in how we spend federal assistance dollars. Instead of issuing a blank check to the Governor to use without detailed plans, our plan funds our state's most pressing needs and saves additional resources so we can continue to assess the situation and have the ability to respond to problems as they arise. This plan before us today adds \$20 million more to testing than the Governor recommended, gets testing money to the schools to continue operating safely, to our corrections facilities and nursing homes, increases funding to direct care workers, and gets out money to help with rental assistance. It also gets kids back into schools and helps with the learning loss that has been experienced over the last year as one of our priorities, getting the extra monies and making sure all students receive at least \$450 per pupil grant for summer programs, credit recovery, before and after school programs, and they increase mental health funding for our schools. We are continuing to work for healthier families, a healthier economy, and a healthier future. I ask that my colleagues join me in supporting these bills.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

I just wanted to make a couple of brief remarks. As a proponent for local control for our schools—and I don't think anybody who has worked with me over the last ten years here can deny that I have pushed as hard to give more control back to our schools when it comes over the decisions on how to teach our children on curriculum, on handling of vast many things—letting them keep control of their calendar, letting them keep control of snow days and all sorts of decisions. I don't want to let this moment go by after the last statements made without pointing out though that if our Constitution did not want us to be diligent and to show some sort of diligence in how we spend the money, it would simply take the School Aid Fund and automatically direct its automatic distribution to schools and never come through the Legislature in the first place. It's clear that we are supposed to have a fiduciary responsibility as the Legislature over these funds before they get distributed. That's the way the Constitution is structured and I think all of us can recognize situations that have happened in school districts in our own areas where they have received funds and have been very happy to find that they've leftover funds when they're all done with the job the funds were prescribed for so they could utilize them for something else. Let's get somebody out there to do something different with the football stadium. Let's get somebody out there to do something different with the tennis courts. Maybe we can send the kids on a 500-mile trek to go to some cross country meet two states away. These things happen. Superintendents like that opportunity to have fungibility in these funds. And that's why it's only responsible for us in a time of crisis that we're currently facing to be slow, to be directive, and to make sure that we don't overgive and we allow the funds to be used as they are supposed to be so they aren't just sitting on a bunch of fungible money. I'm glad that we are doing this slowly and I felt that it was important to make that statement.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 114, entitled

A bill to make, supplement, and adjust appropriations for various state departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Alexander offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 1, line 7, after "\$" by striking out "727,763,900" and inserting "2,780,500,300".
2. Amend page 2, line 3, after "\$" by striking out "727,763,900" and inserting "2,780,500,300".

3. Amend page 2, line 5, after “revenues” by striking out “672,763,900” and inserting “2,725,500,300”.
4. Amend page 2, line 14, after “\$” by striking out “445,182,200” and inserting “2,497,918,600”.
5. Amend page 2, line 18, after “\$” by striking out “445,182,200” and inserting “2,497,918,600”.
6. Amend page 2, line 20, after “revenues” by striking out “390,182,200” and inserting “2,442,918,600”.
7. Amend page 2, following line 25, by inserting:

(2) PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Food assistance program benefits	\$	2,052,736,400
---	-----------	----------------------

GROSS APPROPRIATION	\$	2,052,736,400
----------------------------	-----------	----------------------

Appropriated from:

Federal revenues:

Total other federal revenues		2,052,736,400
-------------------------------------	--	----------------------

State general fund/general purpose	\$	0
---	-----------	----------

8. Amend page 2, line 26, after “(“ by striking out “2” and inserting “3”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 20

Yeas—16

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Moss
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Polehanki
Bayer	Geiss	Johnson	Santana
Brinks	Hertel	McCann	Wojno

Nays—19

Barrett	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bizon	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Bumstead	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Daley	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn
Horn	Nesbitt	Stamas	

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Brinks offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 5, following line 4, by inserting:

“Sec. 205. (1) In addition to the funds appropriated in part 1, federal revenues authorized by and fully funded by the federal emergency management agency in support of COVID-19 response are appropriated and may be received and expended for federal emergency management agency approved state and local pandemic response activities authorized under state law and subject to federal requirements.

(2) If additional authorization is approved in the statewide integrated governmental management application (SIGMA) by the state budget office under this section, the department of state police shall notify the subcommittees and the senate and house fiscal agencies within 30 days after the approval. The notification shall include the amount and funding source of the additional authorization, the date of its approval, and the projected use of funds to be expended.”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 21

Yeas—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Geiss offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 13, line 14, by striking out all of lines 14 through 19.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 22

Yeas—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Wojno offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 1, line 7, after “\$” by striking out “727,763,900” and inserting “1,097,648,800”.
2. Amend page 2, line 3, after “\$” by striking out “727,763,900” and inserting “1,097,648,800”.
3. Amend page 2, line 5, after “revenues” by striking out “672,763,900” and inserting “1,042,648,800”.
4. Amend page 2, line 14, after “\$” by striking out “445,182,200” and inserting “815,067,100”.
5. Amend page 2, line 18, after “\$” by striking out “445,182,200” and inserting “815,067,100”.
6. Amend page 2, line 20, after “revenues” by striking out “390,182,200” and inserting “760,067,100”.
7. Amend page 3, line 2, after “capacity” by striking out “184,942,400” and inserting “554,827,300”.
8. Amend page 3, line 5, after “\$” by striking out “445,182,200” and inserting “815,067,100”.
9. Amend page 3, line 8, after “revenues” by striking out “390,182,200” and inserting “760,067,100”.
10. Amend page 7, following line 27, by inserting:

“Sec. 252. The unexpended funds appropriated in part 1 for federal COVID epidemiology and laboratory capacity grant are designated as a work project appropriation, and any unencumbered or unallotted funds shall not lapse at the end of the fiscal year and shall be available for expenditure for projects under this section until the projects have been completed. The following is in compliance with section 451a(1) of the management and budget act, 1984 PA 431, MCL 18.1451a:

(a) The purpose of the work project is to support testing, contact tracing and other mitigation efforts associated with the department’s response to the coronavirus-19 public health emergency.

(b) The projects will be accomplished by utilizing state employees or contracts with service providers, or both.

(c) The total estimated cost of the work project is \$554,827,300.00.

(d) The tentative completion date is September 30, 2025.”.

11. Amend page 7, line 28, by striking out all of section 252.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 23

Yeas—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Hom	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Irwin offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 1, line 7, after “\$” by striking out “727,763,900” and inserting “1,106,088,800”.
2. Amend page 2, line 3, after “\$” by striking out “727,763,900” and inserting “1,106,088,800”.
3. Amend page 2, line 5, after “revenues” by striking out “672,763,900” and inserting “1,051,088,800”.
4. Amend page 3, line 13, after “\$” by striking out “282,581,700” and inserting “660,906,600”.
5. Amend page 3, line 17, after “\$” by striking out “282,581,700” and inserting “660,906,600”.
6. Amend page 3, line 19, after “revenues” by striking out “282,581,700” and inserting “660,906,600”.
7. Amend page 3, line 26, after “\$” by striking out “220,302,200” and inserting “598,627,100”.
8. Amend page 4, line 1, after “\$” by striking out “282,581,700” and inserting “660,906,600”.
9. Amend page 4, line 4, after “revenues” by striking out “282,581,700” and inserting “660,906,600”.
10. Amend page 14, line 29, by striking out the balance of the page and inserting “\$660,906,600.00”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 24

Yeas—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Recess

Senator Lauwers moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 12:50 p.m.

12:59 p.m.

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

Senator Santana offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 13, line 20, by striking out all of lines 20 through 26.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 25**Yeas—16**

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Schmidt
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	Wojno

Nays—19

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Theis
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	VanderWall
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	Victory
Daley	MacDonald	Shirkey	Zorn
Horn	McBroom	Stamas	

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Bullock offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 13, following line 26, by inserting:

“Sec. 259. The department of health and human services shall distribute COVID-19 vaccines to localities based on each locality’s compliance with federal centers for disease control guidance regarding controlling the spread of COVID-19, including enforcement of mask mandates and restrictions on gatherings.”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 26**Yeas—15**

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Moss offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 13, following line 26, by inserting:

“Sec. 259. The department of health and human services shall distribute COVID-19 vaccines to each locality based strictly on the proportional share of state COVID-19 cases within each locality.”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 27**Yeas—15**

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Hollier offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 13, following line 26, by inserting:

“Sec. 259. The department of health and human services shall distribute COVID-19 vaccines to each locality based on the per capita likelihood of death from COVID-19 in each locality, based on the most recent census bureau locality population data and COVID-19 related death statistics.”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 28

Yeas—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Chang offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 3, line 4, by striking out “reserve fund”.

2. Amend page 10, line 4, by striking out all of lines 4 through 24 and inserting:

“Sec. 253. The unexpended funds appropriated in part 1 for federal COVID immunization and vaccine grant are designated as a work project appropriation, and any unencumbered or unallotted funds shall not lapse at the end of the fiscal year and shall be available for expenditure for projects under this section until the projects have been completed. The following is in compliance with section 451a(1) of the management and budget act, 1984 PA 431, MCL 18.1451a:

(a) The purpose of the work project is to support the distribution, administration and monitoring of coronavirus-19 vaccine.

(b) The projects will be accomplished by utilizing state employees or contracts with service providers, or both.

(c) The total estimated cost of the work project is \$110,239,800.00.

(d) The tentative completion date is September 30, 2025.”.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 29**Yeas—15**

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Nays—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 30**Yeas—19**

Barrett	Johnson	Outman	Theis
Bizon	LaSata	Runestad	VanderWall
Bumstead	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Daley	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn
Horn	Nesbitt	Stamas	

Nays—15

Alexander	Bullock	Hollier	Polehanki
Ananich	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Geiss	McCann	Wojno
Brinks	Hertel	Moss	

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—1

Lauwers

In The Chair: President

Senator LaSata moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 31

Yeas—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Runestad	VanderWall
Daley	MacDonald	Schmidt	Victory
Horn	McBroom	Shirkey	Zorn

Nays—14

Alexander	Chang	Irwin	Polehanki
Ananich	Geiss	McCann	Santana
Bayer	Hertel	Moss	Wojno
Brinks	Hollier		

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—1

Bullock

In The Chair: President

Senator LaSata moved that rule 3.311 be suspended to permit reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
Senator LaSata moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 32

Yeas—20

Barrett	Johnson	Nesbitt	Stamas
Bizon	LaSata	Outman	Theis

Bumstead
Daley
Horn

Lauwers
MacDonald
McBroom

Runestad
Schmidt
Shirkey

VanderWall
Victory
Zorn

Nays—15

Alexander
Ananich
Bayer
Brinks

Bullock
Chang
Geiss
Hertel

Hollier
Irwin
McCann
Moss

Polehanki
Santana
Wojno

Excused—1

McMorrow

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Irwin, Bayer, Wojno, Hertel, Moss, Polehanki, Bullock, Alexander, Chang, Ananich, Brinks, Hollier, Santana and Geiss, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 114.

Senators Irwin, Hertel, Hollier and Santana moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Irwin’s statement, in which Senators Bayer and Wojno concurred, is as follows:

Negotiating is hard. Divided government makes it even harder. And sometimes we have intense and important philosophical disagreements over sincerely-held beliefs. But that’s not what we’re facing today. Today we’re not facing a question of left or right. This is more a question of up or down. Do you support the people of Michigan and do you want to get emergency funds working immediately on their behalf? Or do you want to withhold and delay these funds as part of a political fight with the Governor? Colleagues there are times when we must come together and put parties aside. And it’s time today that we stop taking sides between Democrats and Republicans and just take sides with the people of Michigan. Let’s put this money to work. Let’s get all of these federal funds to our people, and let’s stop playing games, stop picking sides between parties, and start taking the side of our people.

Senator Hertel’s statement, in which Senators Moss, Polehanki, Bullock, Alexander, Chang, Ananich and Brinks concurred, is as follows:

If you stick around politics long enough, you will see almost everything. Only in politics can you take money from somebody else, wait two months, spend 20 percent of it to help people, slap your name on it, call it your plan, and then get credit for doing so. Only in politics is it actually possible that people would give you credit for that. Colleagues, 66 days ago, December 21, Congress cut a deal—bipartisan, with Republicans and Democrats—to provide this funding for our people. They weren’t giving it to us, they weren’t giving it to politicians for credit later on. They were giving it to help people. Now we’ve had 66 days, almost no negotiations with both sides of the aisle, almost no negotiations with the executive office. For 66 days the best we could come up with is a one partisan plan to spend 20 percent of the money. So I just

want to remind you, just think about this for a second: the federal government, and all you see from that and all you know about that, was able to come up with a bipartisan deal. For the first time in the history that I've been around this town, Lansing is actually more dysfunctional than Washington. It's hard to believe.

Colleagues, there are literally billions of dollars in federal money, when you add it up, for vaccines, for food assistance, rent, and testing. And for some reason—I think some members have already alluded to the reason why—you want to hold on to that money. Not give it to the people. Again, it's not our money. It's not the Michigan Senate's money. It's money that was given to us by the federal government to assist people. But you want to hold on to it for longer so that you can make some political point. Colleagues, I've got to tell you, I hear your frustration when you say things like you want to open Michigan. Nobody likes this. Nobody wants to wear a mask every day. Everybody wants to be able to go out to restaurants and go watch a Michigan State game, some games more than others, but we all want to live and get back to normal in some way. But under what principle do you think that withholding money for vaccines and testing will actually get us to the end of this pandemic quicker? Under what commonsense view of the world does the Michigan government holding money longer and not getting it out to people actually end the pandemic faster? See, I want to end the pandemic too. I think we all should want to do that. But there is no point in actually hoarding this money for a longer period of time so that we don't get to the end of this crisis.

I hear about people wanting to get nursing home visitation. I think that's a noble thing to want to get people to be able to visit their families in nursing homes. We want people to be able to play sports. But what does that cost? Testing. If you look at the current amount of testing that is authorized in this bill and what we have in the pipeline moving forward, we will run out before we can appropriate more. At some point you can't keep wanting things and not actually do anything about it. And that's the problem I've seen over and over again here. We want, we want, we want to get back to normal. But we've got to actually fund the things that actually will open up Michigan. You can say and scream and cry about opening up Michigan all you want, but at the end of the day the only way to actually get there—the only way to actually do that—is to get vaccines in people's arms, to make sure that they can be tested. And for some reason you want to hoard that money over some political gain.

You know I've heard colleagues discuss that they feel neutered in this process or emasculated in this process and, you know, I went online last night and if it would make people feel better and we could get the help we need for people, I am more than happy to purchase neuticles for anyone who feels like they have lost something in this process. But we can't keep fiddling while Rome burns. If we want to get to normal, if we want this pandemic to end, if we want Michigan to come back stronger, the only way to do that is to get vaccines into people's arms. And what I can't understand is, there's no money for food assistance in this bill, for example. Millions of dollars available, hundreds of millions of dollars. Limited money for rent assistance, spreading out the vaccines, spreading out the testing. When do you think that we're going to need this money then? When will there be a bigger need than now? I hope to God, like all of you I assume hope, that six months from now the pandemic is over. Right? That six months from now we've gotten vaccines in people's arms. We don't need food assistance in six months. We don't need rent assistance in six months. We don't need testing in six months. We don't need vaccines in six months. We need it now. If you want this to end—if it's not about extending it for some political reason—then let's get this money out the door to people now. It's not your money. Congress sent it to us in order to actually solve this problem. And holding it will not do anything to solve it.

Senator Hollier's statement is as follows:

Today's bill was about how we respond to COVID-19 and how we respond to COVID-19 says a lot about how we remember the people that we've lost. I think about the first person that I lost. His name was Marlowe Stoudamire. We were at an event almost one year ago to the day. Just before Michigan's presidential primary. We were at an event. I was sitting next to him and his daughter and we were having breakfast. We were at an event called "Pancakes and Police." This moment where we were talking about how we do a better job with the Black community interacting with police. He was talking about how we were going to do more, how we were going to do this better job. And he was the first person in Detroit to die from COVID-19. He wasn't 70. He wasn't 65. And as far as anybody knew, he really didn't have these comorbidities or underlying health conditions. He was in good health, in normal health for a man of his age. He was in his forties. But that was the first person. But there have been so many more. In the city of Detroit there have been 1,847 more.

What we did today was not to make sure that there would be less of them tomorrow. We didn't make anybody safer across the state. We didn't say that we were going to do everything we could, when we can. That's what Michigan has done. We have been the state, we have been people, when, confronted with the biggest challenge in history, we roll up our sleeves and we do more work than everybody else. We sent more people to fight in the Civil War than just about any state. We made more tanks and vehicles and sent troops

to fight in World War I and World War II and the war on terrorism. Michiganders have shown up every single time. And last year, when the idea of a vaccine seemed so far, seemed like a pipedream—when people said that the fastest that anyone had made a vaccine was in six years—Michiganders said, We’ve got it. And we did it. We did it. In our state we developed the very first vaccine to get us back safe.

Yet today we’re still talking about how we don’t have enough. We’re still talking about how we aren’t getting enough shots in arms. We’re still talking about how we don’t have enough tests. But what we aren’t doing, also, is making sure that everyone who is doing this work have all the resources that they need. I get calls just like all of you from school superintendents, from parents who want to get their kids back in. But, for example, a community like Hamtramck, the windows don’t work. The ventilation systems are old. So when they get kids back in the classroom, they’re concerned about air circulation. Talking to the superintendent in Grosse Pointe, the most affluent community I represent, they are talking about class sizes; about how when they get kids back in school in the next couple of weeks, can they get kids six feet apart, and how they have to mitigate for three feet apart. And when we talk about the difference. When I was in elementary school I was in classrooms with 35, 36, sometimes 37 students. My Detroit Public Schools know, are 100 percent confident, that there is no way if kids all come back that they’re going to be able to put them six feet apart. We know that. We know that, which is why we prioritized vaccinating teachers. But what about the rest of the support staff? The janitors, all those other kind of people. Yeah, we have more vaccines to do those in Detroit. But that’s because those staff and support members who are getting vaccinated in the city of Detroit are not just Detroiters. The people who work at the courthouse, the state employees, all those folks who come into Detroit to work live in your communities and they are getting vaccinated in the city of Detroit because that makes the residents of the city of Detroit safer. It makes the residents of Michigan safer. Because that is where we have seen more death than anywhere else.

And as we talk about how we’re going to prioritize, how we’re going to come back, and how we’re going to move forward, it’s got to be based on taking care of the lives that we have in this state. And that’s not what we did today. But God willing it will be what we do next week. What we do the week after, the month after, and the rest of this legislative session, is to focus on taking care of people, the people who are the most vulnerable. And not saying they are the most vulnerable because of their race or age or gender or religion, but letting people who spend their entire lives working on figuring what makes you the most vulnerable say, These are the priorities; these are the priority groups; this is how we prioritize them. Because there was a moment they said young people couldn’t get COVID-19. And then we saw the incredible issues and the blood diseases. We saw the daughter of a police officer and a fire fighter—a young child—die of COVID-19. We saw her, the years lost, the time lost. As a nation, we have lost almost two years from our life expectancy as a whole because of COVID-19 and it is not going away anytime soon unless we can agree that we should be doing everything we can and more today. That every dollar we can send to stop this spread, we should send. Every test, every program, everything that we can do, we should be doing. And we should have been doing it yesterday. So I hope that next week, next month, and through the rest of this session, we spend our time taking care of people and prioritizing getting the resources in the hands of people who are doing this work. And that’s not what we’ve done.

Senator Santana’s statement, in which Senator Geiss concurred, is as follows:

I rise to give my “no” vote explanation on this budget. This appropriation is partial, past-due, and incomplete. While colleagues, I will acknowledge that there were some great attempts to support our communities by making sure that our direct care workers continued to receive their wage increase during this pandemic, but we’ve already missed that deadline, quite frankly, and it’s unfortunate. Secondly, this supplemental bill does not take the time to address rental assistance supports and to provide those federal dollars to our communities and the people who need a roof over their heads. The reality is this: if we’re talking about supporting small business owners through this supplemental process, we’re forgetting about those landlords who actually have those renters in their homes that need to make sure they can make the mortgage payment as well.

I think that—a Senator spoke about this earlier—that this bill is really needed, but it’s not fully complete and our communities really need to receive these monies now. They need these dollars for all of the necessary needs. Our teachers need these dollars to make sure that those kids who are going back to school have the necessary supports, our communities need these dollars for testing, and they need those dollars, quite frankly, right now. All of them, not just some of them. And yet, we’ve had this money in the bank account since December already. Colleagues, I am very fiscally responsible, but in this case, just like a business when you go take out a loan from the bank, they don’t give you a part of the loan, they give you the full loan so that you can operate your business as necessary. But in this case we’re telling our constituents and we’re telling the people of Michigan that we’re only going to partially give you what is necessary during this pandemic so that you can actually continue forward with your life and the necessary needs in a community. Testing,

businesses need these dollars for resources to continue to operate, food assistance necessary for individuals just to be able to survive. Let's stop doing this rhetoric and political thing of taking money that belongs to the people of Michigan and using our political powers to run the purse strings instead of using the dollars for the people that really need them.

Senator Barrett, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the adoption of the amendment offered by Senator Santana to Senate Bill No. 114 (see p. 222) and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the amendment be printed as his reasons for voting "no."

The motion prevailed.

Senator Barrett's statement is as follows:

I don't know the exact number of vaccine doses, I haven't updated daily the number of vaccine doses that have come to my district versus any other district. By the way, this is my "no" vote explanation on this amendment. And I'm not aware of the exact, precise number of doses that my district has received versus anybody else's or any other community in this state, because this amendment and the language that it's seeking to strike is not about who should get more or less, it's about the fairness of how we distribute it altogether.

A couple weeks ago, I became interested in the issue of the COVID-19 vaccine distribution because of a public disagreement between two Democrats. Mayor Duggan of Detroit, and Mark Hackel, the County Executive in Macomb County. Mr. Hackel rightly objected to the fact that the city of Detroit had been allotted more than double the number of vaccine doses than neighboring Macomb County in its entirety, even though the population of Macomb County is nearly one-and-a-half-times that of the city of Detroit. What we have learned since then, is that the Department of Health and Human Services is distributing the vaccine not on a COVID vulnerability scale, that would measure the risk present that affects those who are front-line health care workers, congregate and nursing home workers, and those who are elderly, which are the risk factors that we should be using and are articulated into the priority groups that are already developed. Instead, the department is using a Social Vulnerability Index, one that considers your race, your household status, your socioeconomic status, and the fluency and command of the English language, to prioritize the distribution of the vaccine. Throughout committee testimony, we were promised that people would not be eligible to jump ahead of their priority group status to gain access to the vaccine before those who were more vulnerable were offered and given the option to receive it. But yesterday, immediately following our committee testimony, the city of Detroit announced that people with a hearing impairment, regardless of age or comorbidity status, can now receive the vaccine because of the volume of doses the city has received. Meanwhile, just a few dozen miles away in Brighton, those of an elderly population still have not been granted access to the vaccine because their county ranks at the very bottom of the Social Vulnerability Index.

The language we have included in this bill is sound, and it is simple. It requires the department to use the estimated number of people in each priority group to distribute the vaccine. Ironically, I've been accused of being a racist for including language that says you cannot discriminate on the basis of race. If this is not an "Emperor has no clothes" moment, I don't know what would be.

Fifteen years ago, in November of 2006, it was a blockbuster political year for Democrats here in Michigan and across the country. The Democrats took control of the U.S. House, the Michigan State House, multiple county commission majorities across the state, and at the top of the ticket, Governor Granholm was re-elected by a margin of nearly 15 percentage points. Yet in that landslide year for Democrats, a wider majority of citizens in our state voted to etch equal opportunities into our state Constitution. The Michigan Civil Rights Initiative, as it was called, eliminated hiring and university admission preference based on race, gender, and ethnicity. On that election night, while Democrats were celebrating their victories, the Michigan Civil Rights Initiative passed by a margin of 16 percentage points. That means that many, many Democrats even, believed that we should not be discriminating and giving preference based on race. And that was for university admissions. Imagine how they'd feel about equitable access to the COVID-19 vaccine.

The amendment that I offered in committee yesterday, and is before us for consideration today in this bill, would simply use the actual hard data before us to make decisions on the distribution of the vaccine. There is much we do not know about the virus, and much we have left to learn. But there is a great deal that we have already learned over this last year that we have been living with COVID-19. And empirically, we know that the highest risk factor for serious complications from COVID is age. Those above age 65 are dramatically at higher risk of succumbing to the virus and they account for 90 percent of the COVID fatalities in our state. Let's do the right thing and distribute this vaccine based on COVID vulnerability, not social vulnerability.

Senators Alexander, Hertel, LaSata, Brinks, Geiss, Wojno, Irwin, Santana, Runestad, Chang, Hollier, Moss and McBroom asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Alexander's statement is as follows:

I rise today to offer an amendment that would allow for all federal funds that are currently available to be distributed for SNAP benefits. Over 1.2 million Michiganders currently receive SNAP benefits, and out of those 350,000 are currently receiving additional benefits provided by the state of Michigan, but there is only so much that can be done at the state level.

With the funds that have already been set aside by the federal government for this exact purpose, we can give millions of Michiganders and their families the security that is needed during these difficult times. The pandemic is not going anywhere soon, and Michigan residents deserve to know that they can keep putting food on their table. Many of you do not know what it's like to be hungry, so don't deny the ones who do.

Senator Hertel's first statement is as follows:

Just to respond to the previous speaker, current estimates show that SNAP dollars, by the end of next month, will be exasperated from what we have right now. So I don't understand what we're waiting for. These are federal dollars. They do not require the state to do anything other than spend it on food for people in the middle of a pandemic. So we don't need to wait. There's no reason to wait. There's no upside of waiting. We are not holding this money to get interest or anything else. So I guess the question back is, why not now? What would be the downside of giving the food dollars that have been given by the federal government—it's not your money. It's nobody's money who's in this room other than the federal government's money that they gave us to actually provide assistance to people. What is the downside of actually giving that money to people now?

Senator LaSata's statement is as follows:

Colleagues, I hope that we're all being vocal in our need to open the state. So I address this to Governor Whitmer. Please free our state. Please open up our businesses completely. Allow those business owners—allow the people of Michigan—to do what they know best. Treat them like adults. We are adults. Please let us make our own decisions.

Senator Hertel's second statement is as follows:

To the previous speaker, thank you. Thank you for fully admitting that the reason that you're not providing food assistance for people—because that's what this amendment is on—is because of a power struggle between the Governor and this body. It has nothing to do with the actual need of people, which is huge in the middle of this pandemic, but that your reasoning for not providing federally-guaranteed food assistance is to guarantee your own political power. Thank you for the crass ability to say that on the Senate floor. I appreciate the honesty.

Senator Brinks' statement is as follows:

I rise today to offer an amendment that provides unlimited FEMA authorizations within the state and its localities since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, so long as they are fully funded with federal dollars and are FEMA-approved projects. We need to ensure that our state can respond at a moment's notice to any natural or man-made disaster within the state. If we can provide unlimited emergency authorizations within our state and for our local communities, Michiganders can rest assured that their government is prepared to take care of them in a crisis.

This amendment would essentially guarantee that whether it's the reopening of a childcare center, domestic violence shelter, healthcare facilities, or reinstating a necessary transportation system, we can move forward with the confidence that the money is there to support doing these things safely. We've all seen the havoc caused by being unprepared for these unexpected closures during a global pandemic and this amendment would help us ensure that we are not caught off-guard again or hamstrung in the future without the necessary funds readily available.

These are federal funds that do not require a state match. Without authorization, these funds will just go to another state. This authorization would make us proactively prepared to provide resources effectively and efficiently to end this pandemic sooner, and to help our constituents. Our constituents don't deserve to suffer a second longer. I ask for your support of this amendment that serves to support all Michiganders during the toughest of times.

Senator Geiss' first statement is as follows:

My amendment would strike section 257 on informing vaccine recipients about whether the vaccine used fetal tissue in its development. Colleagues, this pandemic was never supposed to be political. Wear a mask, wash your hands, do your best to keep distant from others—really simple, basic instructions to help keep us safe and keep others safe. That's why my amendment would strike section 257 from this supplemental, because if we want to get back to the new normal, we need to get shots in arms, especially the arms of the most impacted, the most vulnerable. It's disappointing but not surprising that you're putting politics into this process in order to scare people from getting this extremely safe vaccine. I hope you will support this amendment to strike section 257 from the supplemental so we can get those vaccines into the arms of the people who need it.

Senator Wojno's statement is as follows:

As some of you have called for more and more things to be open, we should also be providing the funding necessary for testing, especially as the new coronavirus variant is said to be even more contagious, and that's what this amendment does. In fact, to quote Dr. Khaldun from a press conference just yesterday, "While we are doing well, our progress is fragile. We have to make sure we are doing enough tests so we can quickly identify any new cases, including cases infected by these new variants." Dr. Khaldun's medical credentials far exceed most all of us in this chamber. It would behoove us to listen to her and provide this free money for this purpose, and this amendment does that.

If you truly want to follow the science, I encourage you to please listen by backing those words with a vote in support of putting these federal dollars toward the necessary testing that we know is needed. My community and your communities need these resources now, not six months from now.

Senator Irwin's statement is as follows:

My amendment will ensure that 100 percent of the federal funds for rental assistance will be made available for our communities immediately. Two months ago, Congress appropriated \$660 million to assist renters and landlords in our state who are having trouble paying their bills because of the pandemic. This assistance was meant to prevent eviction and homelessness for our constituents. Now this \$660 million, I believe, should already be working for our people. But here we are, two months later, looking at a proposal to only send one-third of the money needed to help prevent evictions and homelessness. This issue affects every corner of our state. Every one of us has families in our districts that are facing eviction right now. Every one of us has landlords that are trying to hold on to their small businesses because their renters aren't making their payments. So far since January—since we've failed to act on that \$660 million—there have been 14,338 eviction filings in our state. That's 14,338 people and families who are currently facing homelessness and eviction right now. These are emergency funds. And this is an emergency. Our families are facing homelessness.

This Legislature needs to wake up and treat this emergency like an emergency. Congress has given us these tools to address this emergency with our renters and now it is our time to do our part and simply help our people. The emergency is now, not months from now. Our agencies need time to plan and if we don't spend this money by the end of the fiscal year, it goes back to D.C. and I don't think that any of us want that to happen. So support my amendment today. Let's get these dollars working on behalf of our people and let's stop using families facing eviction as political pawns.

Senator Santana's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I rise today in support of my amendment to include the Social Vulnerability Index be included as a decision point in distribution of COVID-19 vaccines. As we all know, this disease is deadly, especially to those over the age of 65. But did you know, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Blacks are 1.9 times more likely to die, Hispanic Americans are 2.3 times more likely, and Native Americans are 2.4 times more likely.

As the gentleman from the 15th District so eloquently pointed out, this vaccine should be given to those most likely to die from this disease. I agree with him wholeheartedly and the data shows across the nation that people of color are more likely to die than whites. If you look at the Social Vulnerability Index, the 21st District would receive more vaccines, the 34th District would receive more vaccines, the 35th District would receive more vaccines, and the 38th District would receive more vaccines. Those residents, according to risk factors, are more likely to die from COVID-19. This is not about race or social justice. This is about life and death. By the way, the 34th District is 80 percent white, the 35th District is 95 percent white, and the 38th District is 93 percent white.

COVID-19 is deadly and the data shows those over 65, poor, and of color are the most likely to die from this disease. So this amendment does exactly what the good gentleman of the 15th District wants it to do—protect those most likely to die from COVID-19. I encourage all my colleagues to support this amendment and protect our most vulnerable populations.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

As the state is finding out recently from news reports about this new Social Vulnerability Index that the state is using through the health departments to decide how to distribute the vaccine, they are finding out things that they never could have conceived is going on in terms of this important vaccine that needs to go to the most vulnerable. The Social Vulnerability Index uses factors—social factors—to determine how many vaccines one area gets over another area. This can create—and I believe is creating—deadly consequences. The simple fact is that the city of Detroit is getting more vaccines than its neighbors. In fact they are getting so many more that they are now offering vaccines to lower-priority populations. Their scores in terms of how high of a priority you are in Detroit, they have offered that higher priority the vaccines to the point where now they are dropping in priority.

This month the city of Detroit announced that those with intellectual or developmental disabilities are eligible for the COVID vaccine regardless of age. We know that age is the number one factor. Hakim Berry, Detroit's Chief Operating Officer, told WXYZ yesterday that Detroit can now expand eligibility—they can expand to other, lesser priority groups—because the high risk populations have all been given the chance to have the vaccine. That's wonderful that they have gotten that chance to get the vaccine in Detroit. Now they can drop down to less vulnerable populations. In fact, a 40-year-old who is hearing impaired in Detroit—hearing impaired only—can get the vaccine, but that same hearing impaired person in Oakland, Macomb, or Washtenaw cannot get that vaccine. Meanwhile the vaccines are short in Oakland County. Seniors in my district have been screaming for this vaccine, demanding. I've talked to so many of my senior centers that say, We can't get the vaccine. They'll be interested to know why.

Last week, the Detroit Health Department found out that they are going to get more doses than Oakland County with far less population. You heard that right. When seniors are most at risk to COVID and are struggling to get the vaccine, the state of Michigan is failing them with their social engineering policies, not the likelihood of death. Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have pointed to the fact that there is a lower percentage of Detroit residents who have been vaccinated than in Oakland County. That shows the importance of sending the vaccines to Detroit. But the difference in vaccine interest is not the point. The number of people who decline to be vaccinated is not the point. It misses the point by a mile. When the priority groups have been offered the vaccine then in Detroit they move on, as I just described, to the lower priority risk, the ones who are not as likely to die because Detroit has received so many more vaccines that they have to adjust to try and get them all out. They have moved on past the seniors like in Oakland County, in my district, that can't get the vaccine. It's mindboggling. Let's look at the statistics from the Department of Health and Human Services. We just looked them up. In Michigan, almost 90 percent of COVID deaths are of those over 60 years of age. Almost 90 percent over 60. And this isn't enough for us to target that population? To not use how much money you make or what kind of apartment you live in? It should be what your risk is of dying.

As I've said before and I'll say it again, this is what happens when politicians and bureaucrats start making decisions on politics and not science and common sense. There should be nothing controversial in preventing the state from using race, gender, and socioeconomic factors instead of the real harm—the possible death in deciding to distribute this vaccine. And yet there remain some who support continuing this nonsense. This is why it is so difficult getting the vaccine to the most vulnerable. This should not be controversial. This is common sense. Maybe common sense is lacking in this town. Standing up for our seniors, those with health complications, and those at most risk of dying from COVID should be a no-brainer. This should not be a partisan fight. It shouldn't be about Republicans versus Democrats. It should be about the group coming together to help those who are the most vulnerable. And that, by this proposal, is not being done.

Senator Chang's first statement is as follows:

I appreciate the passion. I think we all have a lot of passion and a lot of concerns and we do want to protect the most vulnerable. I would like to just remind everyone that the idea of social vulnerability is not a new concept. Maybe some people are learning about it now, but actually this is something the government has been using since the 70s in terms of making sure every single one of our community members gets the access to disaster relief. That is the first time they started to use the term social vulnerability to make sure that when we are responding to a natural disaster that we are protecting every single one of us. I would like to address the comment on social engineering. The fact of the matter is we have been doing a lot of social engineering in our country because we haven't dealt with systemic racism or systemic sexism or any of these things. So, I think when you talk about social engineering, we have a duty as public servants to make sure we are addressing the inequities that exist because of policies that bodies like this have failed to address. So, social engineering—I feel like you really, really need to repeat some history lessons if you're going to be talking about social engineering.

I also want to point out while I have a little bit of time here is that out of the top five counties with the highest poverty rates in Michigan, four of them are actually your counties: Isabella, Lake, Luce, and Claire. And as far as Michigan counties that have the highest percentage of poverty households, all five of them are in Republican districts: Baraga, Alger, Luce, Montmorency, Lake. So, when you talk about the most vulnerable, you need to think about the most vulnerable in your districts too. Just because you have concerns about race, because of your concerns about language ability, don't let that cloud your ability to serve your own residents. I'm really disappointed in this conversation we're having today because I feel that we have to do better. The fact that people don't understand or can't take the time to learn about history and the fact that we have the duty to ensure because of the inequities that exist, we have to do better. We have to do better to make sure that every last one of the vulnerable are served with vaccination. We cannot let people die. It is simply because we are failing to address inequities.

Senator Hertel's third statement is as follows:

You know, the state has a long history of politicians trying to divide the state, Detroit versus everybody else. It's very simple to make Detroit the bad guy when you live in certain areas of the state. But to be clear, the Social Vulnerability Index does not just affect the city of Detroit. In fact, they are one of those that are affected, but not anywhere near the most. So, just to get back to where we are in reality, if you live in the 25th District, or you're the Senator from the 25th District, or if you live in the 35th District, or you live in the 21st District, largely, the 34th District almost more than anyone else in the state, the 37th District, the 38th District, the 36th District—if you live in any of those districts, if this amendment fails, your district gets less vaccines. And there's a very simple reason for that. We can try to divide this by Detroit versus everybody, or Black versus white, or any of those other things. What it has to do with, is that those that are poor are more likely to die from this disease than those that aren't. That's just simple math, that's science. So I'm 100 percent sure that certain people want to benefit their district, and they can get up and make that argument, and that's fine, try to divide us, that's great. But what I would ask is for everybody else, whose districts I just mentioned, is the Detroit argument so convincing to you that you're willing to cut vaccines from your own district? I think common sense should say no, so I ask that you vote for the amendment.

Senator Geiss' second statement is as follows:

Maybe we should just change the name of the index to make it more palatable for you. Let me explain something to the Senator from the 24th District. The reason the Social Vulnerability Index is used is specifically because the very people who are being protected by it, who are considered vulnerable, are the same people who are more vulnerable to COVID-19. When folks in my neck of the woods were dying and getting sick, folks in Brighton were saying it's a hoax, it doesn't do anything, it doesn't matter, masks don't do anything. And now you want to jump to the front of the line? It's absolutely unconscionable that while we are using a Social Vulnerability Index to protect the very people who got the virus the most, who were the most vulnerable, who still are the most vulnerable, and it happens to be people of color. It happens to be people who are disabled. All of a sudden you want to be racially aware? It doesn't make any sense. It does not make any sense. We are trying to prevent more lives from folks who look like me being lost, but that's not what you actually care about. You're trying to shield yourselves around this conversation about racism when that's the furthest thing from what this amendment does.

Senator Hollier's first statement is as follows:

I majored in urban planning and the very first thing we learned in school is how urban planning started. It started with Dr. John Snow—not to be confused with the savior from Game of Thrones—but the inventor or precursor to modern public health and urban planning. He had a theory that contaminated water caused cholera and he researched it. He did it, and their solution—some people would have said was chaotic or mean or mean-spirited or aggressive—was to remove the water handle from a well. So, when it came out, they said, Oh, my god, this savage, this man is going to deprive a whole community of water. It was the most aggressive use of public health power that had just been created at the time. He said, No, you cannot use this water, and it saved lives. More than 600 people died of that outbreak, and it began the scientific belief in public health and planning.

What this amendment does is say, Hey, maybe we should in fact allocate vaccine based on people who are willing to comply with the treatment. This is not a crazy solution, this is not punitive, this is the same way we deal with most medical things. If, for example, you want an organ, let's say you were a lifelong smoker and you would like an organ donation, you do not get priority until you're willing to stop smoking. We do not allow people who are unwilling to take the basic preventative measures to take advantage of very scarce resources, and that's what we're talking about. We are talking about communities, people, and individuals who would like to go back to doing the same things they were doing before. They care not at all about the

impact their decisions have on others because what we haven't talked about today is that the most vulnerable individuals to contracting COVID-19 are those who are most exposed to COVID-19. What we've seen in communities across this state—particularly in Detroit—is that low-income individuals and poor individuals are more exposed. They're more exposed because of the type of work we did. We spent the last year saying that certain communities have a disproportionate share of essential workers, a disproportionate share of people who have to go into work every day. God forbid we protect them. God forbid we make them a priority, that we say we will prioritize the vaccinations in communities where people are prioritizing that safety and not trying to making people feel invulnerable.

If you are unwilling to wear a mask today, if you are unwilling to social distance today when you could in fact catch coronavirus, what do we think people will do when they feel like they can't? Even once vaccinated, you can still spread COVID-19, you can still give it to these vulnerable individuals, and they will have no reason to. They will have no reason to follow the guidance because they will feel invulnerable, and that is 100 percent unacceptable. As we look forward and talk about these things, it's critically important that we pair the critical steps necessary to curb the spread of COVID-19 with the distribution of the vaccine. We must align the two because the vaccine alone will not stop the spread of COVID-19. It only helps mitigate the harm in the most extreme cases which we have seen disproportionately impact people who are poor. The common denominator is poor. The common denominator is the type of work that you do, and the type of work that people do is different based on the compliance that people have with these things. Whether or not people are being protected in the workplace, whether or not we are doing those kinds of things, which is why, for example, we prioritized health care workers, which is why we prioritized teachers, because we said, They have to go into work and we want them to go to work.

It's hypocritical. It's insane for us to prioritize communities and people who are not willing to do the decent thing and taking care of individuals who have to go into work.

Senator Moss' statement is as follows:

Thank you for this opportunity to speak on my amendment. I've spoken many times on this floor about the virus—as early as April 25 last year—from what it looks like in my community. The first confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the state of Michigan were in and around my district, and the highest caseloads during that first wave in Oakland County were in the zip codes I represent. I talked a lot about how I felt like talking about this virus was a view from the inside looking out of it and asking for this virus to be taken seriously, pleading for attention and assistance, all the while being dismissed by some of those on the outside looking in.

Now this virus has ravaged vulnerable communities all around the state and yet still, as we've heard from members on the other side of the aisle who are refusing to use the best data available to target those communities all throughout this state that are in need of this vaccine, and very passionate about it from the other side of the aisle. They have stripped out that data from scientists, public health officials, and the CDC guidelines in our state's vaccine distribution. As a result, it could threaten the state's future vaccine supply. That is a strategy that only coronavirus likes. Mr. President, I think coronavirus wants to adopt some of those "no" vote explanations we've heard.

So, I'll bring a countering offer here today with an amendment to ensure that COVID-19 vaccines are allocated to communities all throughout Michigan based on the proportion of number of cases. Then, outreach efforts can be more concentrated and focused to those who are more at risk. Let's put out the fire where it is. Anything less than that prolongs this pandemic. I ask for support of this amendment.

Senator Hollier's second statement is as follows:

If we allocated vaccines based on lethality, which is what we talked about all day, the people who are most likely to die from COVID-19 should be the ones who receive it then we would allocate way more and very differently. As we talk about race, class, all these things that we say shouldn't matter but the reality is, they do. Reality is, they always have. Even if we just looked at life expectancy, the life expectancy for any person in the U.S. is 78.7. The life expectancy for a Black man, is 69.1. So if for example if all we did is allocate them based on life expectancy or age it immediately makes a difference for Black people. It immediately makes a difference for Black men, it makes a huge difference. If we allocated squarely based on lethality it would change fundamentally how this looks.

So the city of Detroit has had 1,848 deaths, with an infection rate of 4.4 percent and a mortality rate of 6.2 percent. Compare that to the Michigan infection rate of 5.04 percent and mortality rate of 2.35 percent. If Detroit had the same infection rate as the state, we would have lost 2,135 people. Meaning more Detroiters would have died from COVID-19 than anywhere else across the state. If Detroit had the same mortality rate, we would have 1,146 more Detroiters alive today.

Two-thirds of the deaths of Detroiters are because there is something different about living in the city of Detroit. There is something different whether you want to call it race, income, no matter what it is we know that is the case. There is no doubt or debate about those things, that is the reality of living in Detroit, of being Black, all these things and factors that are layered upon it. That is a problem. As we talk about how vaccinations have happened, there has been a discussion about saying, We should get it to the most vulnerable people. Well living in Detroit makes you the most vulnerable. You're saying it should only go to those who are this age. Well there are a lot of reasons that Black people have said no thank you to the vaccine. One, the way the health care industry and all of these things have happened clearly show a difference in how this works. There has been a huge number of refusal. Black people are disproportionately showing a higher percentage of workers in the health care industry. You have a smaller proportion of those being vaccinated, only 3.7 percent of Black people have been vaccinated in this space. I'm proud to say I was one of them. I am not 70 years old, 60 years old, but me getting vaccinated is critical in my community because that is the only reason some people said yes. I have worked with SCIU, with hospital workers, home health care workers, who said no thank you originally because they were afraid. They didn't know anyone that had been vaccinated. After I did, they said yes.

Why do we need to do these programs, why are we pushing for these things? It is because people who need to be vaccinated are still not being vaccinated. We're all pissed and upset. We're all frustrated because there are not enough doses to go around, and we get that. There is no question there are not enough doses. But if we are saying they need to go to people in communities where the likelihood you will most likely die if COVID-19 is at the highest, there is no question or doubt that if we change the formula to allocate it that way, there would be more vaccines going to Detroit. I'll say that again, if it's about where you are most likely to die of COVID-19, it's in Detroit. There are tons of counties in Michigan where the probability of you dying from COVID-19 in 2020 was zero because they had no deaths. Or there was single digit deaths or less than 25 deaths. No one from Detroit is advocating that we say to those counties, You don't get any vaccines. We aren't doing that. What we all are doing today is trying to represent our people the best, to make sure vaccines are going to people who need them the most. The way we do that is by allocating them based on the likelihood that you will die of COVID-19. My amendment does that. If you want a fair and equitable way to do that, allocate them based on the likelihood that you will die in your community of COVID-19 and that is what we can be doing.

Senator Chang's second statement is as follows:

When the federal government sent us money two months ago for COVID-19 vaccine distribution efforts, they did so with the expectation that we would use the money to help keep Michiganders safe by getting shots in arms. We all know that this is our way out of the pandemic, getting our economy back on track, and helping our struggling families with more security.

This amendment simply would ensure that we use all available dollars dedicated to this effort that's being made available to us. This pandemic won't end just because you want it to and the longer we break off critical vaccine funding into pieces, the longer this pandemic will go on. People deserve 100 percent of our vaccination efforts and federal funding, not partial support.

I ask that you support this amendment.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Lots of talk, talk, talk about how much people want to see the epidemic and all of these restrictions ended. There were lots of statements trying to assure us by passion and rhetoric. The speakers had that. Those with him feel the same way. What is their demonstration of that? Where is the evidence of that statement being truly heartfelt? Send money, spend money, demand more money. As if money were some magic bullet that has been missing when it comes to solving our epidemic. What's more, it's all about giving the money without caution. Suddenly, arguing that Congress and the President sent it, we even heard a statement that said it was Congress' money, is justification enough to appropriate it without any care. Talk about not doing our jobs. This is the neutering that I have been talking about. This is the emasculation that I am talking about. The willingness of my fellow Senator to not stand up for this institution, our corporate willingness as an institution to allow another to take our job, to take our duty, to take our responsibility, to take our power from us. Far from me needing to find what I have lost, I ask the one who has misrepresented and mischaracterized my remarks, to take his own offer and find it for himself. If we are really to believe the heated talk about seeing Michigan recover quickly, we would all be demanding that the very ones that are fundamental to our economy be allowed to return to productivity. We would demand that our students, our economy's very future, get back in the classrooms immediately. That would be evidence that we're taking it back. That would be evidence that we've found it, that we stand up for ourselves, that we would take back our role and our responsibility. That we would not shirk from controlling how the money is spent. That we would not pretend to be horrified that there be any hesitation, as if each one of us doesn't do that with our own budgets and our households. Oh look, I've got all this money, maybe I'll just spend it all right now.

No, we don't do that. We think about the future, we think about things that might come down the road that we're not sure about. We think about the possibility that something else might change, especially with crazy Congress, who knows what they're doing, what more money they might send out to us. We're careful to recognize that it's maybe not a good thing to spend it all at once. Maybe circumstances change in another month, with this Governor, who knows they might have already changed and we don't know about it yet.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Statements

Senators Polehanki, Geiss and Santana asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Polehanki's statement is as follows:

I am disappointed today that the majority party decision has been made to not put my resolution to create a COVID-19 Victims and Survivors Day up for a vote today. I don't understand this decision and can't fathom why anyone would not support it. But, this is not changing my resolve to formally recognize COVID's victims today. Here in Michigan, Governor Whitmer has ordered flags to half-staff to honor and mourn American lives lost to COVID-19.

Today I rise to speak to Senate Resolution No. 19, which declares the first Monday in March as COVID-19 Victims and Survivors Memorial Day. COVID-19 has wreaked havoc across the globe and has had catastrophic effects on human life, our community, and our economy.

First responders have worked around the clock. Doctors, nurses, and hospital staff have been pushed to their breaking points. Essential service workers have dedicated their work lives to keeping their communities afloat. And, our scientists have miraculously created a vaccine so that we can eradicate this virus.

But the vaccine can't bring back those we have lost. We've had to say goodbye to parents, grandparents, siblings, children, and friends—sometimes through a screen or window. Many of us have holes in our hearts where a loved one's absence weighs heavily on us.

Almost a year has passed since the first COVID-19 case was diagnosed in the United States. And in that time, the virus has claimed the lives of 500,000 Americans—15,000 of whom are Michiganders. Let this resolution stand as a sobering reminder of those we have lost and those who were fortunate enough to survive.

Senator Geiss' statement is as follows:

Let today, February 25, 2021, go down in history as the date when, in the wake of the public health crisis of the COVID-19 pandemic, the majority of this chamber said to the people of Michigan, *Qu'ils mangent de la brioche*. Or, rather, Let them eat cake. Except, it's even worse than that.

Whether one attributes this perilous historical phrase to Marie Antoinette or Marie Therese, this sentiment is the same; that those people, the poor, unfortunate, the hungry, the suffering, which right now is easily many of our people, should survive on the crumbs. The dregs, doled out incrementally at an arthritic pace rather than with the swift agility our people deserve.

What was done today completely neglected and ignored the fact that the sooner we get all of the funds to our communities and people, the sooner we get to some semblance of non-pandemic life. We had an opportunity today to deliver all of the funds allocated to us, to Michiganders, in critical need of sustenance and aid. But, no. Today, instead, this body again shirked its responsibility to care for our people. *Qu'ils mangent de la brioche*, this body said in an 18th century draconian measure designed to send a message. To whom?

A message it did send though. It sent a message of callous cruelty fueled by elitism and racism with its amendments to ignore the Social Vulnerability Index for vaccine distribution. It sent a message of callous cruelty fueled by elitism and racism only to provide a fraction of the funds allocated to us by the federal government. It sent a message of callous cruelty fueled by elitism and racism that people should starve and aren't even worthy of cake because there are zero dollars for food assistance in it. It sends a message that this body is the arbiter of winners and losers, picking and choosing who, what, and where is eligible for and who is worthy of our compassion and care and, in doing so, showed that this body—in its leadership that it would allow such callously calculated decisions to not send much needed aid, aid that we already paid for, to where it's needed most—who the real losers are. Are not all of our residents eligible for and worthy of our compassion and aid?

C'est damage. For shame, shame, shame. This type of treachery and torture of our residents cannot stand. We must do better and be better for Michigan's people.

Senator Santana’s statement is as follows:

Today I rise to recognize that we are towards the end of our Black History Month. But Black History Month is more than 28 days on a calendar. It is more than the story of slaves on a plantation. It is more than a few wily recognized historical leaders who led a Civil Rights Movement. It is a chance for us to reflect and self-educate ourselves about the experiences and contributions of Black Americans. Someone asked, Why do we celebrate Black history and threatened to cancel it if they were elected?

I have a response to that statement. Black history is American history. It is the story of a people who built this nation at a time when these United States did not treat us as human beings. Black history is about acknowledging that 4 million Africans lived enslaved and a bloody civil war in which 620,000 soldiers from the Union and Confederate armies died seeking an answer to one question: Should these Africans continue to be used as farm equipment or do we recognize them as human beings?

Black history is about acknowledging what we endured to achieve the same civil rights, voting rights, and equal rights under the law as our white counterparts. Black history is about recognizing that people will pay top dollar for court side tickets to watch King James dunk a ball, but if LeBron was just another Black man in the streets of America he might find himself in different categories, such as unemployed, trapped in the judicial system, incarcerated, hospitalized with multiple gunshot wounds, trapped in poverty, or dead at an early age.

Black history is an acknowledgement that while we have achieved greatness in the United States, and we have notable figures in science, medicine, government, sports, business, the military, and entertainment there are still far too many George Floyds in our communities whose names we don’t even know. Black history is about understanding that we have a long way to go before some people understand the Confederate flag is a symbol of hate.

Black history is a powerful opportunity to recommit to the hope of achieving racial justice. It is an opportunity to recognize health disparities in our communities because public health systems have been eliminated. It is a time to recognize that educational experiments on our students do not work. It is a time to look back at all the financial investments, tax breaks, land deals, and rebuilding of our communities and ask a fundamental question: How did we benefit? Black history is about the lessons we learned from the generations before us and the lessons we will teach to the generations after us. Black history is about teaching our children how to reach their full potential and work toward building a better future for our nation.

In closing, Black history is about our support of freedom, liberty, patriotism, and all of the contributions that we have given this country in exchange for the opportunities that America promises.

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following House bill and joint resolution were received in the Senate and filed on Wednesday, February 24:

House Bill No. 4015

House Joint Resolution A

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Wednesday, February 24, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

Senate Bill Nos.	166	167	168	169	170	171	172	173	174	175	176	177	178
	179	180	181	182	183								
House Bill Nos.	4321	4322	4323	4324	4325	4326	4327	4328	4329	4330	4331	4332	4333
	4334	4335	4336	4337	4338	4339	4340	4341	4342	4343	4344	4345	4346
	4347	4348	4349	4350	4351	4352	4353	4354	4355	4356	4357	4358	4359

Committee Reports

The Committee on Natural Resources reported

Senate Resolution No. 15.

A resolution to urge the Natural Resources Commission to authorize, and the Department of Natural Resources to organize, wolf hunting and trapping as part of the state’s wolf management efforts beginning in 2021.

(For text of resolution, see Senate Journal No. 13, p. 179.)
With the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

Ed McBroom
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McBroom, Bumstead, Outman and Schmidt
Nays: Senator McCann
The resolution was placed on the order of Resolutions.

The Committee on Natural Resources reported

Senate Resolution No. 17.

A resolution to urge the Natural Resources Commission and the Department of Natural Resources to end the research study begun in 2019 concerning the effectiveness of antler point restrictions as a management tool in the chronic wasting disease core area.

(For text of resolution, see Senate Journal No. 13, p. 181.)
With the recommendation that the resolution be adopted.

Ed McBroom
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators McBroom, Bumstead, Outman and Schmidt
Nays: Senator McCann
The resolution was placed on the order of Resolutions.

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Natural Resources submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, February 24, 2021, at 8:00 a.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators McBroom (C), Bumstead, Outman, Schmidt and McCann

The Committee on Appropriations reported

Senate Bill No. 29, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled "The state school aid act of 1979," by amending sections 11, 17b, 201, and 236 (MCL 388.1611, 388.1617b, 388.1801, and 388.1836), sections 11, 201, and 236 as amended by 2020 PA 165 and section 17b as amended by 2007 PA 137.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-3) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Jim Stamas
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Stamas, Bumstead, Barrett, Bizon, LaSata, MacDonald, Nesbitt, Outman, Runestad, Schmidt, Victory and Daley

Nays: None

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

The Committee on Appropriations reported

Senate Bill No. 118, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled "The state school aid act of 1979," by amending section 163 (MCL 388.1763), as amended by 2020 PA 165.

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

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

Jim Stamas
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Stamas, Bumstead, Barrett, Bizon, LaSata, MacDonald, Nesbitt, Outman, Runestad, Schmidt, Victory and Daley

Nays: Senators Hertel, Bayer, Hollier, Irwin, McCann and Santana

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

The Committee on Appropriations reported

House Bill No. 4047, entitled

A bill to make, supplement, and adjust appropriations for various state departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

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

Jim Stamas
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Stamas, Bumstead, Barrett, Bizon, LaSata, MacDonald, Nesbitt, Outman, Runestad, Schmidt, Victory and Daley

Nays: None

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

The Committee on Appropriations reported

Senate Bill No. 114, entitled

A bill to make, supplement, and adjust appropriations for various state departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

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

Jim Stamas
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Stamas, Bumstead, Barrett, Bizon, LaSata, MacDonald, Nesbitt, Outman, Runestad, Schmidt, Victory and Daley

Nays: None

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

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Appropriations submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, February 24, 2021, at 2:00 p.m., Senate Hearing Room, Ground Floor, Boji Tower

Present: Senators Stamas (C), Bumstead, Barrett, Bizon, LaSata, MacDonald, Nesbitt, Outman, Runestad, Schmidt, Victory, Daley, Hertel, Bayer, Hollier, Irwin, McCann and Santana

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Corrections and Judiciary submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, February 24, 2021, at 11:30 a.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Bizon (C), Runestad and Hollier

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Finance submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, February 24, 2021, at 12:00 noon, Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Runestad (C), Nesbitt, Daley, Bumstead, VanderWall, Chang and Alexander

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, February 24, 2021, at 3:00 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Bizon (C), Barrett, Runestad, Zorn and Bullock

Excused: Senators Johnson and Alexander

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Licensing and Regulatory Affairs/Insurance and Financial Services submitted the following:

Meeting held on Thursday, February 25, 2021, at 8:30 a.m., Room 1300, Binsfeld Office Building
Present: Senators Nesbitt (C), MacDonald and Santana

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety submitted the following:

Meeting held on Thursday, February 25, 2021, at 9:00 a.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building
Present: Senators Victory (C), VanderWall, Barrett, Johnson, Runestad, Chang and Irwin

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Appropriations Subcommittee on K-12 and Michigan Department of Education submitted the following:

Meeting held on Thursday, February 25, 2021, at 9:00 a.m., Harry T. Gast Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Schmidt (C), Outman, Daley, Theis, Bayer and Polehanki
Excused: Senator Bumstead

Scheduled Meetings**Appropriations –****Subcommittees –**

Community Health/Human Services – Tuesday, March 2, 8:00 a.m., Senate Hearing Room, Ground Floor, Boji Tower (517) 373-2768

Corrections and Judiciary – Wednesdays, March 3 and March 10, 11:30 a.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-2768

Natural Resources and Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy – Tuesday, March 2, 3:00 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-2768

Transportation – Tuesday, March 2, 11:30 a.m., Harry T. Gast Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor, Capitol Building (517) 373-2768

Energy and Technology – Tuesday, March 2, 2:00 p.m., Senate Hearing Room, Ground Floor, Boji Tower (517) 373-1721

Families, Seniors, and Veterans – Wednesday, March 3, 3:00 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building (517) 373-1721

Regulatory Reform – Tuesday, March 2, 3:00 p.m., Harry T. Gast Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor, Capitol Building (517) 373-5314

Senator LaSata moved that the Senate adjourn.
The motion prevailed, the time being 2:24 p.m.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 2, 2021, at 10:00 a.m.

MARGARET O'BRIEN
Secretary of the Senate

