

No. 96
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
102nd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2024

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, November 7, 2024.

10:00 a.m.

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

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

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

Senator Sylvia Santana of the 2nd District offered the following invocation:

Dear heavenly Father, we pray, O God, for this nation and this world. We pray, Lord God, that You will continue to watch over us as human beings who are living in a world that, oftentimes, where people are hurt. Lord God, we pray that You will open up their hearts to be healed.

We pray, Lord, for our leaders across this nation, Lord God, that You will continue to guide them with love and not hate. We pray, Lord, that You will guide the leaders in this chamber and the next, that we will continue to make decisions that are for Your people and Your people alone.

And we pray, Lord, that You would just help those who are hurting. Seek and save those who are lost today, and those who may be making decisions that are not good for their wellbeing. Lord God, we pray that You will bring people into their hearts to show them that You are still in control.

These things we ask truly in Your Son's name. Amen.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, led the members of the Senate in recital of the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

Motions and Communications

Senator Lauwers moved that Senators Nesbitt, Johnson and Runestad be temporarily excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Singh moved that Senators Anthony, Brinks and Geiss be temporarily excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

Senators Geiss and Anthony entered the Senate Chamber.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of
General Orders

Senators Brinks, Johnson, Runestad and Nesbitt entered the Senate Chamber.

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

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

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Committee of the Whole recess subject to the call of the Chairperson. The motion prevailed, the time being 10:29 a.m.

11:14 a.m.

The Committee of the Whole was called to order by the Chairperson, Senator Chang.

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

Senate Bill No. 1042, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled "Public health code," by amending sections 13501, 13521, 13522, and 13523 (MCL 333.13501, 333.13521, 333.13522, and 333.13523), sections 13501 and 13523 as amended by 1994 PA 100, section 13521 as amended by 2018 PA 544, and section 13522 as amended by 2023 PA 138; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The bill 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. 354, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending section 1531 (MCL 380.1531), as amended by 2018 PA 235.

Substitute (S-3).

The following are the amendments to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole:

1. Amend page 2, line 8, after “passed” by inserting a comma and “**if applicable, a reading test that is either the reading subtest in subsection (9) or, if the other state or federally recognized Indian tribe has approved a reading test that is based on the science of reading, the reading test approved by the other state or federally recognized Indian tribe, and passed**”.

2. Amend page 2, line 20, after “instruction” by inserting “**and, if applicable, a reading test that is either the reading subtest in subsection (9) or a reading test that is based on the science of reading and is approved by the superintendent of public instruction to replace the reading subtest in subsection (9)**”.

3. Amend page 5, line 22, after “subtest” by inserting “**that is based on the science of reading**”.

4. Amend page 8, following line 21, by inserting:

“(c) “**Science of reading**” means that term as defined in section 1280f.” and relettering the remaining subdivision.

The Senate agreed to the substitute as amended 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. 995, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending section 27c (MCL 388.1627c), as amended by 2024 PA 120.

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.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

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

House Bill No. 4928

House Bill No. 4929

House Bill No. 4930

Senate Bill No. 870

Senate Bill No. 872

Senate Bill No. 963

Senate Bill No. 964

Senate Bill No. 965

Senate Bill No. 813

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4928, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 682, 741, 742, and 909 (MCL 257.682, 257.741, 257.742, and 257.909), section 682 as amended by 2021 PA 50, section 741 as amended by 2006 PA 298, section 742 as amended by 2008 PA 171, and section 909 as amended by 2000 PA 94.

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. 403

Yeas—23

Anthony
Brinks

Damoose
Geiss

Klinefelt
McCann

Shink
Singh

Camilleri	Hauck	McDonald Rivet	Victory
Cavanagh	Hertel	Moss	Webber
Chang	Huizenga	Polehanki	Wojno
Cherry	Irwin	Santana	

Nays—15

Albert	Daley	Lindsey	Outman
Bayer	Hoitenga	McBroom	Runestad
Bellino	Johnson	McMorrow	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Nesbitt	

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

“An act to provide for the registration, titling, sale, transfer, and regulation of certain vehicles operated upon the public highways of this state or any other place open to the general public or generally accessible to motor vehicles and distressed vehicles; to provide for the licensing of dealers; to provide for the examination, licensing, and control of operators and chauffeurs; to provide for the giving of proof of financial responsibility and security by owners and operators of vehicles; to provide for the imposition, levy, and collection of specific taxes on vehicles, and the levy and collection of sales and use taxes, license fees, and permit fees; to provide for the regulation and use of streets and highways; to create certain funds; to provide penalties and sanctions for a violation of this act; to provide for civil liability of manufacturers, the manufacturers of certain devices, the manufacturers of automated technology, upfitters, owners, and operators of vehicles and service of process on residents and nonresidents; to regulate the introduction and use of certain evidence; to regulate and certify the manufacturers of certain devices; to provide for approval and certification of installers and servicers of certain devices; to provide for the levy of certain assessments; to provide for the enforcement of this act; to provide for the creation of and to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to impose liability upon the state or local agencies; to provide appropriations for certain purposes; to repeal all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act or contrary to this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on a specific date.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4929, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 8379 and 8396 (MCL 600.8379 and 600.8396), section 8379 as amended by 2000 PA 93 and section 8396 as added by 1994 PA 12.

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. 404

Yeas—23

Anthony	Damoose	Klinefelt	Shink
Brinks	Geiss	McCann	Singh
Camilleri	Hauck	McDonald Rivet	Victory

Cavanagh	Hertel	Moss	Webber
Chang	Huizenga	Polehanki	Wojno
Cherry	Irwin	Santana	

Nays—15

Albert	Daley	Lindsey	Outman
Bayer	Hoitenga	McBroom	Runestad
Bellino	Johnson	McMorrow	Theis
Bumstead	Lauwers	Nesbitt	

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

“An act to revise and consolidate the statutes relating to the organization and jurisdiction of the courts of this state; the powers and duties of the courts, and of the judges and other officers of the courts; the forms and attributes of civil claims and actions; the time within which civil actions and proceedings may be brought in the courts; pleading, evidence, practice, and procedure in civil and criminal actions and proceedings in the courts; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide remedies and penalties for the violation of certain provisions of this act; to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4930, entitled

A bill to amend 1990 PA 187, entitled “The pupil transportation act,” by amending sections 5 and 20 (MCL 257.1805 and 257.1820), section 5 as amended by 2006 PA 107 and section 20 as added by 2021 PA 52.

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. 405

Yeas—23

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

Nays—15

Albert	Daley	Lindsey	Outman
Bayer	Hoitenga	McBroom	Runestad

Bellino
Bumstead

Johnson
Lauwers

McMorrow
Nesbitt

Theis

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

“An act to regulate the equipment, maintenance, operation, and use of school buses; to prescribe the qualifications of school bus drivers; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental agencies; to create an advisory committee and to prescribe its powers and duties; and to prescribe remedies and penalties,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protests

Senators McBroom and Bellino, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 4928, 4929, and 4930.

Senator McBroom’s statement, in which Senator Bellino concurred, is as follows:

Mr. President, these bills, certainly well-intentioned and with a great deal of consideration for the safety of children and our communities, I can understand the premise of them and the reason why so many supported them. However, the Michigan Constitution, in article VIII, section 9, specifically says that, “All fines assessed and collected in the several counties, townships and cities for any breach of the penal laws shall be exclusively applied to the support of” public libraries and county libraries. I believe that these bills specifically violate the spirit of that constitutional provision, a provision that protects all of us from allowing those who enforce the laws from profiting by their enforcement. This is an important distinction that the authors of our constitutions have included in multiple versions of our constitution. It’s a principle that remains absolutely critical. Our schools and our local law enforcement and any third parties that provide cameras or equipment should not be able to profit through the use of that equipment and enforcement by the law. That’s why these bills are a bad idea: because they violate that spirit of our Constitution and that’s why I voted “no.”

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 870, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 267, entitled “Open meetings act,” by amending section 3a (MCL 15.263a), as amended by 2023 PA 214.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Johnson offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 2, line 21, after “**electronically.**” by inserting “**A member participating electronically due to a disability must still be physically located in this state during that electronic participation.**”.
2. Amend page 2, line 23, after “**participate.**” by inserting “**A public body may request appropriate documentation of military duty or disability from a member requesting to participate electronically.**”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Johnson withdrew the amendments.

Senator Johnson offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-4).

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 406

Yeas—22

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

Nays—16

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Runestad and McBroom, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 870 and moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

I think we all have sympathy for somebody who might have a mental or physical disability and want them to participate. I wanted a change that there has to be some documentation of some kind if you have a mental disability. That claim could be made and now some of the most important entities in the state of Michigan could have someone who is going to be voting on a tax increase like an ISD, could put a tax millage on and the people would like to answer some questions personally, and would not have the ability to do that.

The whole purpose of the Open Meetings Act is that the people have the right to confront the people who are going to be making these major decisions and there should be a lot of real constraints to make sure we’re having an individual who is meeting a very strict criteria and not something as open-ended as the way this bill has been written. I think it’s doing a great disservice to the people who are unable to face-to-face ask questions of individuals who are making these tremendous decisions on their behalf.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, as you and many other members here know, I’ve been working on this issue for a significant amount of time. As technology has improved, as our society has changed, there have been ongoing pressures on us to utilize various technologies for those who are serving in public bodies. Whether they need to be absent for a personal matter, traveling, or due to illness or disease that are in the community, we’ve seen a lot of pressure on this situation and most of us can speak with experience as to what the outcome of that has been because during the COVID time, we had mandates on this state that public bodies meet virtually. What went as something that prior to COVID was basically unregulated and could be seen being used by several

of our boards on an occasional basis became the norm. What I saw happen prior to COVID in several instances where virtual technology was utilized was an incredible abuse of the public trust, where members were simply called on just in time for a vote on a particular issue and participated in none of the public discussion. I witnessed meetings where the technology failed numerous times and communication between the public or between members of the board was lost on numerous occasions, therefore not fully informing the people who were voting online what was going on.

Then we came to COVID and suddenly it was mandatory on all of us to utilize these means. At first, during the early emergence, I think it was utilized with some care and caution, but over time, and many of us experienced this within this body ourselves, where we were doing so many calls by Zoom or by Teams or other methods. We saw members of boards and councils who were attending the meeting while at the McDonald’s drive-thru or while in their home drinking a beer or while in the bathroom. These are simply not excusable uses. Until we address those very important issues, we should not delve into granting more use of virtual technology for our public bodies. We don’t have any rules here for what it means if the call drops. Does the whole meeting stop? Is the meeting over? What happens? Does business go on or not? When that person comes back on the call and the meeting has continued on because a quorum was there but they’ve missed all that public testimony, are we really going to allow them to participate in the meeting in that way? Is that fair to our public? While I understand the generous nature that underlies this bill, that drives this bill forward, and the care and compassion being felt for those with a disability who might not easily be able to get to the chamber that the meeting is at, ultimately we have to write laws that govern open meetings to the defense of the public. That is the paramount virtue of the Open Meetings Act: the defense of the public’s access to the business of their government, of their elected leaders.

I’ve introduced legislation—Senate Bill No. 641—to try and help us modernize the Open Meetings Act because we definitely need to do something about this. We need to recognize that with 10,000 public bodies in this state of all different levels and job descriptions, we can and must modernize this, but this bill alone, while it’s driven by compassion and kindness, is not at all addressing numerous necessary needs about the technology, about the defense of the public’s ability to confront its elected leaders. Do we want to chance our elected leaders sitting at home drinking while participating or even potentially having someone in the room manipulating them before they can make a decision? If people can’t attend meetings, we ought to be understanding of that. We ought to give them the flexibility. I’m not criticizing any person in this chamber or on any of our other public bodies who has to miss an occasional meeting, whether it’s for a disability or for a personal reason or a professional reason. Life happens—we all know that in these jobs—but our primary understanding of a public body and its work has to first and foremost sit on the top of the heap, the rights of the public to confront its elected representatives, the rights of the public to participate and to observe and to know what its public officials are doing.

I encourage us to put this bill back in committee, get some more opportunity to merge these issues together, work this out, so we don’t go forward and pass a law that’s going to create more problems and really leave our public without its access and without its rights defend to the strongest degree. I encourage a “no” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 872, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 203, entitled “Foster care and adoption services act,” (MCL 722.951 to 722.960) by adding section 8f.

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. 407

Yeas—38

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

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 963, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 14b of chapter XVII (MCL 777.14b), as added by 2002 PA 29.

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

Substitute (S-1).

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 408

Yeas—20

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

Nays—18

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 964, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 90, entitled “Youth employment standards act,” by amending sections 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 20 (MCL 409.102, 409.104, 409.105, 409.107, 409.108, 409.110, and 409.120), section 2 as amended by 1996 PA 438, section 4 as amended by 2011 PA 80, and section 5 as amended by 2020 PA 323, and by adding sections 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d.

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. 409		Yeas—20	
Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana
Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18			
Albert	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 965, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 90, entitled “Youth employment standards act,” by amending sections 3, 21, and 22 (MCL 409.103, 409.121, and 409.122), section 3 as amended by 1997 PA 132 and section 22 as amended by 1980 PA 436.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Albert offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-2).

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 410		Yeas—20	
Anthony	Chang	Klinefelt	Polehanki
Bayer	Cherry	McCann	Santana

Brinks	Geiss	McDonald Rivet	Shink
Camilleri	Hertel	McMorrow	Singh
Cavanagh	Irwin	Moss	Wojno

Nays—18

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Albert, McBroom, Victory and Theis, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 963, 964, and 965.

Senators Albert and McBroom moved that the statements they made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 965 be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

First of all, I want to reiterate how disappointing it was to not be able to support any of the bills in this package. We were making great progress toward a compromise on penalties, but apparently this chamber is preparing to put union self-interest ahead of sound policy. The criminal penalties in this legislation are overly broad and will open up an employer to possible felony convictions for minor and non-serious violations of the act. I do agree that the law as currently on the books is insufficient for serious violations resulting in death or great bodily harm, but we should have been able to reach a compromise on lesser offenses, which should be handled through the administrative fine process. The overly punitive punishments for relatively minor offenses will cause some employers to stop offering jobs to kids.

Related to Senate Bill No. 964, I do appreciate the intent here by both the bill sponsor and LEO. They want to make sure kids are safe in a work environment, and that is commendable. But the current process for approving work permits for kids is working well, and the limited number of violations does not warrant this degree of change. Currently, 14- through 17-year-olds need to get a work permit from their local school district. This package would replace this process with a state-run bureaucracy, big government registry. It’s requiring kids and their employers to sign up through the government for permission to get a job. This is government overreach, and it is unnecessarily moving something that is best administered at the local level to a state bureaucracy. Many employers who fully comply with the law as it stands today will simply choose to not participate in this registry and kids will be missing out on job opportunities. If we had a rampant statewide problem of chronic violations of this act, then I could get behind a registry. However, that is not the case. There are occasionally a few bad actors; everyone else follows the law. I remain unconvinced that adding bureaucracy would have prevented any of the recent high-profile cases involving violations of the law.

I have spoken to local school administrators and the current process is very easy, and they are in the best position to know whether or not a student is academically ready to take on a job. A state bureaucrat in Lansing is not going to know a kid better than a school administrator that sees the kid every day. If there are any issues that arise, it is a whole lot easier to find a local school administrator rather than a state employee somewhere in Lansing.

The thing that concerns me most with this registry is the high probability that many employers will simply stop hiring kids. This is especially true when many entry-level jobs are on the cutting block due to the minimum wage increases that are set to take effect. I know from my own experience that when I was younger, having a job was extremely important. I was able to save for college, pay some expenses myself which helped my parents out, and I also learned the value and dignity that comes from a hard day's work. We have an entire generation of kids right now that are in an unprecedented state of mental distress with mental health issues. I very much believe that a young kid who is struggling may very well find meaning in their life through a job. I want to make sure these opportunities are there for our kids.

I agree with the supporters of these bills that the safety of our kids should be a top priority, including in the workplace. I do commend my colleagues for their intentions on this bill package as I know they are genuine. That being said, I firmly believe safety can be promoted without pushing law-abiding employers away from hiring kids. I encourage a "no" vote.

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

Mr. President, I think a lot of us here have probably heard a common saying amongst employers and folks across this country, that some of the best kids you can hire or the best workers you can find are those who grew up on a farm, that there's no employees like farm kid employees. There's a good reason for that, because from a very early age, those of us who were on farms are taught the value and meaning of hard work and the importance of responsibility, of fulfilling commitments, and of the accountability that comes from failing to do work because that means someone else has to do it or animals die or equipment breaks down or someone might even be hurt. These are all important values that are learned at an early age, whether you work on a farm or take a job as a lifeguard or as a summer camp worker or as someone who's helping with a youth program, someone who's working for the county and mowing grass at a park. These are all critical parts of the growing-up process.

It shouldn't just be farm kids who are the great employees out there that employers and colleges are looking for. It should be all of our kids. Many of us in this room grew up having those summer jobs and those opportunities because employers want to take a chance on a couple of kids, knew it wasn't a long-term prospect, and if that kid did a bad job mowing the grass at the park, it wasn't the end of the world and they'd get a different high schooler who could come in and do those jobs. Movie theatre jobs, drive-thru jobs, all of these types of jobs, these entry points for our teenagers, teaching them a skill, giving them self-respect, giving them some cash in their pockets, whether that was to help their families, help their own personal hobbies, or help with their college education, the value of work during the teenage years cannot be understated.

What also can't be understated at this point in our nation is the failure to have those values installed into so many people. Why has that happened? Why is that proliferating across this nation, our state, and other places? Because we continually make it harder and harder for young people to take those jobs. Whether it's because of the movement to do year-round school, whether it's the movement to increase the demands on kids and making it impossible for them to have the time to access the job market, or it's because we put too many restrictions and requirements on the employers themselves. Attacks from both sides are driving our teenagers away from the opportunities to gain skills, to help their family, and to help themselves as well as help the overall economy. While these bills are certainly driven, again, by compassion and care because there were a few bad actors that the current law didn't punish hard enough, to now create a statewide registry to create a mandatory new bureaucracy that our employers are going to have to deal with, both our county road commissions, our city parks departments, our movie theaters, our drive-ins, small summer businesses, roadside food stands, all of these folks are going to have to go to LEO? What's the state's history of running registries? It isn't very good.

This is a huge mistake, placing a huge burden onto an already-burdened sector of our economy, the young people who want to get in on some entry-level work, earn some money, help their families, help their college aspirations, we're going to depend on a statewide bureaucracy to manage this? I have to say I'm just so disappointed to see this idea getting voted on today, and I encourage all my colleagues to vote "no." Let's go back to just focusing on the penalty problem where we clearly could be doing better, but not create a bureaucracy, not break a system that is mostly still working, and not further put another burden on a great sector of the economy that's already struggling to survive.

Senators Albert, Camilleri, Polehanki, McBroom, Runestad and McMorro asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert's first statement is as follows:

This substitute was put together with the hope of crafting something that could have brought bipartisan support. We were making excellent progress in discussions with LEO and others, and I was hopeful we had a workable compromise. Unfortunately, it's my understanding that the AFL-CIO was not supportive of this proposal and essentially derailed it. I will offer my substitute anyway in the hopes that common sense will prevail.

My concern with Senate Bill No. 965 as introduced is that the proposed penalties are much too punitive. Employers could be facing felony charges for offenses that are not serious offenses, or for offenses that are not willful or intentional. First, this substitute lists the factors which LEO must use to reduce administrative fines outlined in the legislation. These factors align with federal law and include items such as the employer's previous record, whether or not reasonable precautions were taken to avoid violations, hours of the day when a minor's employment occurred, and so on. Additionally, in cases that do not result in serious death or injury, this substitute applies criminal penalties only when there are willful violations. Those penalties would be misdemeanors. In cases where death or great bodily harm occur, these penalties would still remain a felony.

The goal is to have less significant violations handled through the newly established administrative fine process. This substitute includes tougher and more punitive penalties than I would prefer, but I respect the intent of the legislation and obviously the goal of keeping kids safe in the workplace. I have attempted to find a workable compromise with this substitute. I believe this is it.

I encourage my colleagues to support this substitute for Senate Bill No. 965. We should not let union politics derail consensus legislation that would help keep our kids safely employed in Michigan.

Senator Camilleri's statement is as follows:

You know, when I think about why this bill is needed and necessary in today's day and age, oftentimes people think that young people are only working in summer service industry jobs—like I did. I worked at an ice cream shop through high school. I worked at a banquet facility that hosted weddings and things like that, all throughout my high school and college experience. I was an eager young student who wanted to start working at the age of 15 under Michigan law. That was a job that many of our students take and are in these types of positions, to learn what it's like to be in the economy and have money for yourself as a young student.

That's not for every kid. These are kids that we're talking about. I want to highlight a story from 2019 in Ionia County, where an employer illegally hired a 17-year-old to work at a meat processing facility. That 17-year-old, that young man, that child, got his hand completely cut off after getting stuck in a meat grinder. He was someone who should never have been employed at this factory, at this facility. He was someone who the employer willfully knew was not to be in that position because of his age. The employer hired him anyway and without supervision, without any type of regulation or oversight, this young man lost his hand working at a factory.

How much was that hand worth? According to the fine, barely over \$1,000. That's what the employer was slapped with as a fine for this young man losing the ability to use his hand going forward. These are real-world consequences of what child labor violations look like. This bill we're passing today should have been an easy opportunity for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to say, yes, we stand up for the working class. We stand up for employees. We're standing up to fix a system to empower people who are just trying to live their life and earn skills as young people, to enter into the workforce. But instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are siding with corporations like they always do, the hypocrites they always are, siding with big business and corporations instead of working people. This bill should be simple. It should be an easy "yes." We are updating the guidelines from the 1980s, before I was born. We're strengthening penalties, strengthening fines, and ensuring that kids who work in the workplace are protected. Please vote "yes" to support common sense regulations to update workplace safety for children.

Senator Polehanki's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I was a teacher of mostly juniors and seniors for a couple decades and I can tell you that whatever penalties are on the books for working kids late into the night are not enforced or strict enough. Teens, if working with cash, are only allowed to work until 8 p.m. or dusk; no cash, 9 p.m. There's a kid—I remember his face, I can't remember his name, very, very smart kid—worked in an industry that was mentioned by the Senator from the 38th District in his speech, and the kid would get home so late that he could not make it to first and second hour. Despite being bright, he fell behind and failed my class, and could not graduate on time. He wanted the money to pay for his car. \$10 an hour, whatever it was at that time, was considered a lot of money. He didn't have the parental support or knowledge enough to know that had he graduated high school, his lifelong earning ability would far surpass what he made at his job that worked him beyond the acceptable hours.

There are a lot of kids like him. The ones who are falling asleep all the time, tardy to first hour, couldn't make first hour especially, were the ones who were working late into the night. We have to do better for our kids in their academics.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I'm not really sure how my remarks could be so misunderstood. I'm afraid that perhaps I was speaking another language because I didn't hear myself speaking in any defense of corporations or big

business. I spoke in defense of our teenage population being able to find jobs and being able to work. I talked about the attack that's coming that's keeping both angles of getting to work—both for those who would employ them and those who wish to access the job market themselves—from being able to do so. I stand by those remarks and I find it really disturbing to be accused of desiring to see children harmed or hurt. I certainly find the accusation of hypocrisy to be absolutely ridiculous when the legislation itself contains specific carve-outs. You know who those carve-outs are for? Farmers and politicians. Don't have to register with LEO if you're a political person hiring a kid to work for you. You're exempt. Let's talk about hypocrisy that way.

Senator Albert's second statement is as follows:

I wanted to, I guess, clarify a couple things that were stated. First off, I specifically said in my remarks I agree that in cases of death or serious injury, the penalties we have now are insufficient. Nobody's arguing about that in the example of what happened in Ionia County. Definitely the penalty should be raised for that; nobody's saying otherwise. To say that we're saying otherwise is misleading. The other example about the kid who was working too late beyond the hours they should have and failed their classes, they were violating current law and the school had the ability to revoke the work permit so the administrators should have been made aware of that and the kid could have stayed home and studied. A Lansing bureaucrat is not going to solve this problem because there is no way they are going to know what's going on in that kid's classroom better than a school teacher and a school administrator. This registry is not going to help. It's actually going to make the situation worse because we're taking something away from a local level where there's more knowledge of the situation and moving it far away to a distant land where people don't know what's going on with that individual kid.

And then to argue that we're being hypocritical here is just beyond the pale and it's unnecessary and I, in my remarks, tried my best to keep it measured and give credit where credit is due. I know the intent here is to try to make our laws work better and try to keep our kids safe. However, looking at the big picture, I think, it's just going to crush the industry and kids just aren't going to work. We're going to keep kids safer because they're not going to do anything. They're going to sit at their home, play video games, maybe start smoking pot—that'd be great—who knows what they're going to get into? It would be better if they're out learning some life skills. That's what our side of the argument is. It's not being hypocritical in the slightest.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I welcome this opportunity to address an issue that has really bothered me. There was a *New York Times* investigation, I think this was last year, detailing migrant child labor in western Michigan facilities spurred state and federal investigations on Monday. The number of unaccompanied children crossing the border in recent years has exploded. Nearly 130,000 children entered the system in 2022, breaking the record of 122,000 minors in 2021. Another surge is expected. This was from an article back in 2022 when we had thousands and thousands of children coming over here, many of them employed here in the state of Michigan and if we were directing this bill, some portion of this bill, to the greatest kids at risk, that are these illegal immigrants who are coming here and being employed by these companies because they oftentimes have no parent. There's nobody at home watching them. There's no protection for them. They will be threatened being deported if they don't cooperate in any and every way. There really, really was concern about where the real problem outlined in that *New York Times* article is. It is with these illegal immigrant children, unaccompanied, coming here and being exploited. I don't see, in fact I haven't heard one word, I've been talking about this since it happened, I haven't heard one side of the aisle complaining about this as they're screaming at the top of their lungs about children. What about these children? These all-important children? These children who truly are the exploited? I don't think there's even any concern on the other side of the aisle about that.

Senator McMorrow's statement is as follows:

I would like to speak in favor of the legislation and ask for a "yes" vote because per the previous speaker's comments, that is what this legislation intends to address.

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess until 1:30 p.m.

The motion prevailed, the time being 12:14 p.m.

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

Recess

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

1:47 p.m.

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

Senator Theis moved that Senators Lauwers, Bellino and Daley be excused from the balance of today’s session.
The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 813, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judiciary act of 1961,” by amending section 2163a (MCL 600.2163a), as amended by 2018 PA 343.

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

1. Amend page 5, line 4, after “proceedings” by striking out the period and inserting a comma and “**including admission** at the preliminary examination ~~instead of in addition to~~ the live testimony of the witness.”.
- The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 11, line 19, by striking out all of subsection (26).
- The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.
- The question being on the passage of the bill,
- The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 411

Yeas—24

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

Nays—11

Albert	Huizenga	McBroom	Runestad
Hauck	Johnson	Nesbitt	Theis
Hoitenga	Lindsey	Outman	

Excused—3

Bellino	Daley	Lauwers
---------	-------	---------

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senator Runestad asked and was granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad's first statement is as follows:

I had a very similar version of this bill back when I was in the House chairing the Judiciary Committee. We workgrouped this bill back and forth, we had 20 or 30 people at a time at meetings of stakeholders to make sure we got it right. I even remember having Rose Mary Robinson on the committee. She was an attorney in Detroit and she had a clientele of mostly inner-city males whom she had served for decades. I think she was in her late 70s at the time she was in the House. She would always pick apart my bills and make sure they were done to her satisfaction. As long as I agreed, I would say, well, I can't argue with that, Rose Mary.

This amendment is one of the things she got particularly pissed off about and said she would not support this unless we included this language. Her concern was the ability to have what's called the Confrontation Clause in the Constitution, the ability to confront your accuser. My amendment says that this allows the inclusion of live testimony during preliminary examinations. While a videorecording of the testimony can be helpful, it often falls short in capturing the full context. I believe that under the Confrontation Clause of the Constitution, it is essential to permit live testimony or rebuttal at pretrial hearings to ensure a complete and fair assessment of the facts. This is the language I had after all those workgroups that pretty much everyone agreed we wanted. I hope the chamber will support the amendment.

Senator Runestad's second statement is as follows:

This is language that was added into my bill. This amendment would strike all of subsection 26 on page 11. This section allows for a forensic interviewer to testify as to the content of a juvenile's interview when that interview is not recorded. This reminds me of a case when I was having hearings on this bill. We had a man there who was accused of some kind of crime against one of his children—I don't remember the details—but the evidence against him was a caseworker's hearsay testimony. Hearsay, because all she had was her notes. When it came time to go to trial, in the trial it found out she had claimed all she had was her notes but it turns out she had an audio recording that she didn't disclose. When the court listened to the audio, it was in complete contradiction to what she testified. He testified what can happen if you don't have this corroborating evidence which is required in the forensic interview protocol.

This section allows for a forensic interviewer to testify as to the content of the juvenile's interview when the interview was not recorded. This section allows hearsay to be admitted as testimony. Currently the best practices laid out in the forensic interview protocol in the child protection act dictates the specific parameters on how these interviews should take place. There are only two counties left in the state—the same two when I was doing this 8 years ago—that do not follow these practices. This simple and effective strategy to allow honest testimony from juveniles and the inclusion of this subsection simply enables these few counties to continue to not follow the best practices of interviewing children. By striking this section as my amendment does, we will ensure that all videorecording interviews are in fact recorded and conducted in the best interest of the best practices.

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

House Bill No. 4132

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4132, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled "Michigan vehicle code," by amending sections 79d, 907, and 909 (MCL 257.79d, 257.907, and 257.909), section 79d as added by 2003 PA 315, section 907 as amended by 2024 PA 22, and section 909 as amended by 2000 PA 94, and by adding sections 2c, 627c, and 907a.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Hertel offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-5).

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 412

Yeas—21

Anthony	Geiss	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Huizenga	McMorrow	Victory
Chang	Irwin	Polehanki	Webber
Cherry	Klinefelt	Santana	Wojno
Damoose			

Nays—14

Albert	Hauck	McBroom	Outman
Bayer	Hoitenga	Moss	Runestad
Bumstead	Johnson	Nesbitt	Theis
Cavanagh	Lindsey		

Excused—3

Bellino	Daley	Lauwers
---------	-------	---------

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

“An act to provide for the registration, titling, sale, transfer, and regulation of certain vehicles operated upon the public highways of this state or any other place open to the general public or generally accessible to motor vehicles and distressed vehicles; to provide for the licensing of dealers; to provide for the examination, licensing, and control of operators and chauffeurs; to provide for the giving of proof of financial responsibility and security by owners and operators of vehicles; to provide for the imposition, levy, and collection of specific taxes on vehicles, and the levy and collection of sales and use taxes, license fees, and permit fees; to provide for the regulation and use of streets and highways; to create certain funds; to provide penalties and sanctions for a violation of this act; to provide for civil liability of manufacturers, the manufacturers of certain devices, the manufacturers of automated technology, upfitters, owners, and operators of vehicles and service of process on residents and nonresidents; to regulate the introduction and use of certain evidence; to regulate and certify the manufacturers of certain devices; to provide for approval and certification of installers and servicers of certain devices; to provide for the levy of certain assessments; to provide for the enforcement of this act; to provide for the creation of and to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to impose liability upon the state or local agencies; to provide appropriations for certain purposes; to repeal all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act or contrary to this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on a specific date.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protests

Senators McBroom and Theis, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4132.

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

The motion prevailed.

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

I've had a number of calls to my office over the past two years from citizens in Michigan who are being fined, captured by traffic cameras through construction zones in other states. I recognize the merits and the intentions, the merits of those intentions more specifically, in this legislation. However, with what I've seen of how it's been implemented in other places, I'm not convinced that this idea is ripe for prime time and that we aren't going to suffer with a lot of significant difficulties from people who are falsely accused—which doesn't seem like it should be possible and yet the calls I'm receiving from people and being falsely accused from other states are very real. Therefore, that's why I'm voting "no" and I appreciate that being put in the Journal.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

In our business, we used to drive from northern Michigan to Washington, D.C., sometimes dozens of times per year. We'd drive the painfully-long Ohio Turnpike, then we'd race through Pennsylvania, hit Breezewood, Pennsylvania, and just be flying the last part of the journey, all the way until you hit one part in Maryland, where you started seeing signs saying, Work zone, Photo enforcement. You saw a sign at about 5,000 feet, 2,000 feet, 1,000 feet, then there was a big giant sign right on the camera saying, Photo Enforcement. I can tell you that every single car was going 5-0 miles per hour—50 miles an hour, not 51, 50. The minute we got through that work zone, we put the hammer down. I won't tell you how fast because I did ask my remarks to be printed in the Journal, but it was fast.

I absolutely support this effort because I have seen this work. Mind you, I don't believe this is a slippery slope. I will never support cameras for routine speed enforcement. I hate red light cameras. We're not looking to create a government state here, but I will say that I've seen these hard-working laborers just inches away from traffic, half the time these people, as we all know, are staring at phones. It's just plain dangerous and if we care about these laborers, we have to be willing to do more than just put up signs that say, Bring 'Em Back Alive or Give 'Em A Brake. This is something we can do to protect our workers and the fact is it's really effective.

Senator Geiss' statement is as follows:

It's rare that we get a clear example of the need for a policy that's right before us the very same day we're also taking it up. House Bill Nos. 4132 and 4133 would allow MDOT to install and use automated speed enforcement systems in active work zones on the highways and streets under MDOT's jurisdiction. It's not just necessary to help calm traffic and slow folks down who are driving at ridiculous speeds in many of our construction zones, sometimes when there aren't workers present but also when they are present. This is necessary to prevent injury and death of the very people fixing our roads and bridges across Michigan. People like my constituent, a road worker who was struck and killed this morning in a work zone on I-75 in Detroit. A lot of us coming up from the southeast Michigan area might have even heard about it on the radio giving the traffic reports of where road closures were and what-not. It's very sobering to see the work we have before us have the potential to have a direct impact on the lives of the people we live near, live next to, with, and around.

These bills would help improve the safety of our workers as well as other motorists, and I strongly urge a "yes" vote on both of these bills.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4133, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled "Revised judicature act of 1961," by amending section 8379 (MCL 600.8379), as amended by 2000 PA 93.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Hertel offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-1).

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 413

Yeas—21

Anthony	Geiss	McCann	Shink
Brinks	Hertel	McDonald Rivet	Singh
Camilleri	Huizenga	McMorrow	Victory
Chang	Irwin	Polehanki	Webber
Cherry	Klinefelt	Santana	Wojno
Damoose			

Nays—14

Albert	Hauck	McBroom	Outman
Bayer	Hoitenga	Moss	Runestad
Bumstead	Johnson	Nesbitt	Theis
Cavanagh	Lindsey		

Excused—3

Bellino	Daley	Lauwers
---------	-------	---------

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

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

“An act to revise and consolidate the statutes relating to the organization and jurisdiction of the courts of this state; the powers and duties of the courts, and of the judges and other officers of the courts; the forms and attributes of civil claims and actions; the time within which civil actions and proceedings may be brought in the courts; pleading, evidence, practice, and procedure in civil and criminal actions and proceedings in the courts; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide remedies and penalties for the violation of certain provisions of this act; to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protests

Senator McBroom, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4133.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

Madam President, I again object to the passage of this bill, specifically because I believe that it violates directly and the spirit of our State Constitution: article VIII, section 9. These fines should not be split in their purpose or intent, but are directed by our Constitution to the libraries of this state, and any diversion from that, I believe, is contrary to good policy and to the Constitution.

Senator Moss and Cavanagh, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 4132 and 4133.

Senator Moss’ statement, in which Senator Cavanagh concurred, is as follows:

Of course, I have a lot of compassion for accidents that happen within construction zones. I want them to be safe. I want them to be safe for the workers. I want them to be safe for commuters. I am, though, uncomfortable with this approach of expanding policing authority to a non-policing state department. I also know that I generally hold minority views in this chamber on the effects of data and surveillance, on privacy and rights. I think speed enforcement by surveillance only leaves more concerns, like a ticket being issued to a car and a car owner rather than the offending driver, tickets being issued incorrectly and then the onus on the person to have the burden of figuring out how to remedy that. I believe that you have to have an officer physically present there pulling someone over, witnessing the violation with their own eyes, understanding on the spot by engaging with the driver all of the circumstances that led to that violation. Again, I know I hold a different view. I will counter my colleague who spoke earlier that I do think this is a slippery slope toward governance by automated systems and not by people. That’s why I voted against these bills.

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

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

Senate Bill No. 788, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” (MCL 257.1 to 257.923) by adding section 803t. The House of Representatives has substituted (H-2) the bill.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill as substituted (H-2), ordered that it be given immediate effect and amended the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “An act to provide for the registration, titling, sale, transfer, and regulation of certain vehicles operated upon the public highways of this state or any other place open to the general public or generally accessible to motor vehicles and distressed vehicles; to provide for the licensing of dealers; to provide for the examination, licensing, and control of operators and chauffeurs; to provide for the giving of proof of financial responsibility and security by owners and operators of vehicles; to provide for the imposition, levy, and collection of specific taxes on vehicles, and the levy and collection of sales and use taxes, license fees, and permit fees; to provide for the regulation and use of streets and highways; to create certain funds; to provide penalties and sanctions for a violation of this act; to provide for civil liability of manufacturers, the manufacturers of certain devices, the manufacturers of automated technology, upfitters, owners, and operators of vehicles and service of process on residents and nonresidents; to regulate the introduction and use of certain evidence; to regulate and certify the manufacturers of certain devices; to provide for approval and certification of installers and servicers of certain devices; to provide for the levy of certain assessments; to provide for the enforcement of this act; to provide for the creation of and to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to impose liability upon the state or local agencies; to provide appropriations for certain purposes; to repeal all other acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act or contrary to this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on a specific date,” (MCL 257.1 to 257.923) by adding section 803u.

Pending the order that, under rule 3.202, the bill be laid over one day,
Senator Singh moved that the rule be suspended.

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

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

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

Roll Call No. 414

Yeas—35

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

Nays—0

Excused—3

Bellino

Daley

Lauwers

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title as amended.

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

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

I just want to speak briefly on the bill. This bill came through the Senate before. We were unanimous, I believe, which is great, but I have also heard conversation about it, people who take issue with issuing a license plate that identifies, if someone so chooses, that they're a woman veteran. I've heard some things said that it could be divisive or it is identity politics, and I just don't think so. I served with men. I served with women. Not only do I not see any problem with recognizing men or women veterans, I think it overlooks something that's been going on for a long time that I would encourage my colleagues and anybody else who listens to think about: for over 60 years of the Department of Veterans Affairs' existence, part of the motto for the VA was that they were there "To care for him who shall have borne the battle." So women, going all the way back in service to World War II, Korea, etc., all through our history, have been served by an entity that says to them that they're there to serve men.

Years ago, before I was a Senator, I worked with a national veterans organization, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans Association, to talk about—they were leading on this topic, to get that language changed, and progress has been made on that. But I would just wonder, for anybody out there who believes that something as simple as allowing someone to put a license plate that says "Woman Veteran" is a problem for identity politics, how many of those individuals ever stood up and said, Maybe the VA's motto shouldn't be exclusive to men? How many people ever lifted a finger and did anything about it, or took action, or wrote a letter, or did anything like that? I think this is a totally appropriate piece of legislation. I'm glad this chamber voted in favor of it before, and I hope we will all do so again.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senators Chang and McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 1060, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled "Michigan vehicle code," by amending section 803b (MCL 257.803b), as amended by 2023 PA 129.

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

Senators McBroom and Chang introduced

Senate Bill No. 1061, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled "Michigan vehicle code," by amending section 803m (MCL 257.803m), as amended by 2003 PA 152.

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

Senators Cherry, Singh and Daley introduced

Senate Bill No. 1062, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 811j (MCL 257.811j), as amended by 2006 PA 562.

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

Senators Daley, Hertel and Cherry introduced

Senate Bill No. 1063, entitled

A bill to amend 1982 PA 249, entitled “An act to establish the state children’s trust fund in the department of treasury; and to provide certain powers and duties of the department of treasury with respect to the trust fund,” by amending section 1 (MCL 21.171), as amended by 2014 PA 306.

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

Senators Singh, Hertel, Daley and Cherry introduced

Senate Bill No. 1064, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 267, entitled “Open meetings act,” by amending section 3a (MCL 15.263a), as amended by 2023 PA 214.

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

Senators Hertel, Singh, Daley and Cherry introduced

Senate Bill No. 1065, entitled

A bill to amend 1982 PA 250, entitled “Child abuse and neglect prevention act,” by amending the title and sections 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, and 12 (MCL 722.602, 722.603, 722.604, 722.609, 722.610, and 722.612), section 2 as amended by 2018 PA 60 and section 4 as amended by 2005 PA 82.

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

Senators Geiss and Chang introduced

Senate Bill No. 1066, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 453, entitled “Elliott-Larsen civil rights act,” by amending sections 201 and 301 (MCL 37.2201 and 37.2301), section 201 as amended by 2023 PA 31 and section 301 as amended by 2023 PA 6.

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

Senators Santana and Wojno introduced

Senate Bill No. 1067, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 2534 (MCL 600.2534), as amended by 2017 PA 82.

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

Senator Moss introduced

Senate Bill No. 1068, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 509r, 509aa, 509bb, 509cc, 512, 523b, 727, 728, 730, 731, 733, 765a, and 769 (MCL 168.509r, 168.509aa, 168.509bb, 168.509cc, 168.512, 168.523b, 168.727, 168.728, 168.730, 168.731, 168.733, 168.765a, and 168.769), section 509r as amended by 2023 PA 258, section 509aa as amended by 2023 PA 86, sections 509bb and 509cc as added by 1994 PA 441, section 523b as added and sections 765a and 769 as amended by 2023 PA 81, section 727 as amended by 2004 PA 92, sections 730 and 731 as amended by 1995 PA 261, and section 733 as amended by 1996 PA 583, and by adding sections 726c, 726d, and 726e; 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 Elections and Ethics.

Senators Singh and Webber introduced

Senate Bill No. 1069, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 1202 (MCL 500.1202), as amended by 2020 PA 266.

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

Senators Singh and Webber introduced

Senate Bill No. 1070, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 1293.

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

Senators Damoose, Webber and Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1071, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 2266 (MCL 500.2266), as amended by 2018 PA 429.

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

Senators Webber and Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1072, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 1201 (MCL 500.1201), as amended by 2018 PA 449.

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

Senators Singh and Webber introduced

Senate Bill No. 1073, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 1295.

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

Senators Webber and Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1074, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 1296.

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

Senators Webber and Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1075, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 1298.

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

Senators Singh and Webber introduced

Senate Bill No. 1076, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding chapter 12C.

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

Senators Webber and Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1077, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 1294.

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

Senators Webber and Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1078, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 1297.

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

Senator Cherry introduced

Senate Bill No. 1079, entitled

A bill to amend 1969 PA 317, entitled “Worker’s disability compensation act of 1969,” by amending sections 301, 313, 354, 355, 361, 371, 401, and 891 (MCL 418.301, 418.313, 418.354, 418.355, 418.361, 418.371, 418.401, and 418.891), sections 301, 354, 361, and 401 as amended by 2011 PA 266, sections 313, 355, and 371 as amended by 1982 PA 32, and section 891 as amended by 2012 PA 83; 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 Labor.

Senators Cavanagh and Cherry introduced

Senate Bill No. 1080, entitled

A bill to amend 1969 PA 317, entitled “Worker’s disability compensation act of 1969,” by amending sections 321, 331, 335, 345, and 356 (MCL 418.321, 418.331, 418.335, 418.345, and 418.356), sections 321 and 335 as amended by 1994 PA 271, section 331 as amended by 2011 PA 266, section 345 as amended by 1996 PA 107, and section 356 as amended by 2014 PA 231.

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

Senator Singh introduced

Senate Bill No. 1081, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 152, entitled “State license fee act,” by amending sections 9 and 25 (MCL 338.2209 and 338.2225), section 9 as amended by 1988 PA 461 and section 25 as amended by 2023 PA 131.

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

Senators McMorro, Irwin, Singh, Hertel, Camilleri, Moss, Cavanagh, McCann, Santana, McDonald Rivet, Cherry, Anthony, Geiss, Polehanki, Shink, Chang, Bayer, Brinks and Klinefelt introduced

Senate Bill No. 1082, entitled

A bill to regulate the collection, processing, and selling of reproductive health data; to regulate the disclosure of reproductive health data; to require individual consent to collect, process, and sell reproductive health data; to prohibit the use of geofences around facilities that provide reproductive health services; to provide remedies and prescribe civil sanctions; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities.

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

Senator Irwin introduced

Senate Bill No. 1083, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 44 of chapter VII (MCL 767.44).

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

Senator Irwin introduced

Senate Bill No. 1084, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16a of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16a), as amended by 2023 PA 13.

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

Senator Irwin introduced

Senate Bill No. 1085, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by repealing sections 29, 30, 31, and 32 (MCL 750.29, 750.30, 750.31, and 750.32).

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of
Resolutions

Senators Bayer, Polehanki, McMorro, Chang, Klinefelt and Santana offered the following resolution:
Senate Resolution No. 144.

A resolution to recognize November 9-16, 2024, as Kindness Week.

Whereas, World Kindness Week is a global observation that emphasizes the need to be kind to one another in order to live peacefully in our local and global communities; and

Whereas, Kindness is an expression of consideration that brings out the best in others and in ourselves, with overwhelmingly positive implications for health, broader peace, and well-being; and

Whereas, Kindness fosters connection and understanding among individuals and communities that instills hope, builds self-esteem, and enhances our society; and

Whereas, Experiencing and performing acts of kindness are known to provide greater happiness and optimism, reduced feelings of helplessness and depression, and an increased sense of self-worth; and

Whereas, Acts of kindness often inspire others to “pay it forward” in meaningful ways, thereby having significant positive impacts that extend well beyond the initial acts themselves; and

Whereas, No act of kindness is too small to make a difference and change a life, and anyone can make a lasting impact and change the world through kind actions; and

Whereas, Kindness is a choice that should be encouraged, recognized, rewarded, and celebrated to achieve more of it locally and beyond; and

Whereas, World Kindness Week was first observed in 1998 and has since gained traction in communities and schools across the globe, challenging individuals to be a catalyst for the positive change they would like to see around them; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize November 9-16, 2024, as Kindness Week. During this time, individuals, families, schools, businesses, organizations, and all constituents are encouraged to perform kind acts, big or small, and subsequently “pay it forward” for the collective betterment of one another and for the greater good.

Pending the order that, under rule 3.204, the resolution be referred to the Committee on Government Operations, Senator Singh moved that the rule be suspended.

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

The resolution was adopted.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bayer’s statement is as follows:

Next week is World Kindness Week. Since 1998, World Kindness Week has gained traction in communities across the globe, challenging individuals to be catalysts for positive change. The week-long celebration is a time to promote kindness and encourage people to be kind to each other, to themselves, and to the world. The goals for Kindness Week are to highlight positive actions in the community, encourage unity and empathy, and to emphasize the importance of kindness for a peaceful community.

Kindness is an expression of consideration that brings out the best in others and ourselves, overwhelmingly positive implications for health, and broader peace and well-being. Kindness sponsors connection and understanding among individuals and communities that instill hope, builds self-esteem, and enhances our society. Being kind can have many personal benefits, including helping you age more slowly, reduce your stress, and improve your physical health.

I encourage you all to participate in World Kindness Week by doing big or small kindnesses for others—something as simple as holding the door for someone; send a note of kindness or some kind of complement; volunteer or help a business within your community; engage in conversations that promote empathy and understanding. This feels a particularly poignant time for us to know about and take the opportunity to participate in World Kindness Week in our state to help all of us remember to keep kindness in our heart, bring that kindness to others, and help spread positive actions around our communities. Remember the importance of kindness for peace.

Senator Lindsey offered the following concurrent resolution:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 20.

A concurrent resolution to amend the Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Joint Rules of the Senate and House of Representatives are hereby amended by adding Rule 29, to read as follows:

Joint Convention on the Presidential Election.

Rule 29. In the event that there is a question as to whether Michigan's electors of President and Vice President have been properly elected pursuant to the Michigan Election Law, 1954 PA 116, MCL 168.1 *et seq.*, both houses of the Legislature may be called into joint convention to address this issue as specified in this rule. This joint convention shall be referred to as the "Joint Convention on the Presidential Election." The Joint Convention on the Presidential Election shall only be used to conduct business under Article II, Section 1, Clause 2 of the *Constitution of the United States*.

A Joint Convention on the Presidential Election may be convened by unanimous agreement of the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate or by a majority of the members elected to and serving in both houses. In either case, the members convening the joint convention shall execute a written call for a Joint Convention on the Presidential Election. The call for the joint convention shall specify the date and time at which the joint session shall convene, which shall not be later than the first Friday after the second Wednesday in December. The call shall be communicated in writing to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, who shall take all reasonable steps to notify the members of the House and the Senate, respectively, of the scheduled session.

At the Joint Convention on the Presidential Election, the members shall first vote on whether the electors of President and Vice President have been elected as set forth in the Michigan Election Law. The question shall be phrased in the affirmative, such that an "aye" vote means that the electors of President and Vice President have been properly determined in accordance with the Michigan Election Law, and a "nay" vote means that the electors of President and Vice President have not been properly determined in accordance with the Michigan Election Law. The question shall be put to a record roll call vote. If a majority of the members voting on the question vote "aye," then the session of the Joint Convention on the Presidential Election shall adjourn. If a majority of the members voting on the question vote "nay," then the members shall determine which electors of President and Vice President are elected in the following manner. Each member may cast a vote for the party name of a political party, which shall be taken as a vote for the slate of electors chosen by that political party and certified to the Secretary of State under the Michigan Election Law, or for a candidate for President with no party affiliation, which shall be taken as a vote for the slate of electors chosen by that candidate and filed with the Secretary of State under the Michigan Election Law. The vote shall be taken by record roll call vote, and a majority of the members voting on the question shall be needed in order for a slate of electors of President and Vice President to be elected. The result of this vote, as recorded in the journal of each house, shall be communicated to the Governor by the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate as soon as practicable. No other action shall be taken by the Legislature during the session of the Joint Convention on the Presidential Election convened under this rule.

If a slate of electors of President and Vice President is elected under this rule, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Majority Leader of the Senate shall jointly issue a certificate of ascertainment of appointment of electors that sets forth the names of the electors appointed by the Legislature under this rule and the record of the vote in the Joint Convention on the Presidential Election. The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall transmit that certificate of ascertainment of appointment of electors to the Archivist of the United States, and also transmit six duplicate-originals of the certificate to each elector chosen as an elector of President and Vice President, on or before the date on which the electors are to convene. The electors of President and Vice President shall convene on the first Tuesday after the second Wednesday in December, as provided in the Michigan Election Law.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of
Statements

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

The citizens of the state of Michigan—and maybe some non-citizens, apparently—have made themselves clear. The Democratic trifecta in Lansing does not work for them. The most important issues to the working

families of Michigan have not changed in the past two years. They are frustrated by this stagnant economy. They are burdened by the effects of high inflation on the cost of groceries, the cost of energy, and the cost of housing. They are preparing to confront the inevitable high energy bills they'll have to pay to heat their homes this winter. And many in the service industry wonder if anyone cares that their job is on the chopping block. They sent that message this past Tuesday.

Senate Republicans have been listening. Now, I hope many of you will, too. Mr. President, I was encouraged by the Speaker of the House's comments that we must work together in a bipartisan way. It's a little interesting that he decided to join us in that sentiment a day after losing his majority, but better late than never, I guess. If only that would have been the approach for the past two years in this building.

When Senate Republicans said we wanted to work together to provide tax relief to Michigan working families, there wasn't an outstretched hand to say, Let's do it. We were ignored. When we said we were ready to get to work on a bipartisan next up energy plan, we were ignored. When we said we needed to come together to confront the illegal immigration, loopholes in our election laws, the future loss of 50,000 service industry jobs that would result in the closing of one in five restaurants—we have been ignored, so far.

You can't ignore the voices of the voters who spoke loud and clear this past Tuesday. No more partisan handouts. No more jamming bills through without testimony or committee. No more silencing of voices, especially over in the House. It's time to address the real issues that continue to burden the families of Michigan. The people have spoken. Let's get to work.

Senator Cherry's statement is as follows:

I usually don't get up for Statements but I just wanted to highlight a few items that I think people should think about when we're talking about mandate of the voters. There was one member of this chamber who actually was on the ballot two nights ago and who won overwhelmingly. When we hear discussion about addressing the needs of voters, and I think some of them were highlighted and are accurate—addressing inflation, household costs—I'd like to remind all the members of this chamber that if you're concerned about inflation, how did you vote on repealing the retirement tax? If you're concerned about addressing the needs of working families, how did you vote on the working families tax credit? This chamber has been addressing the needs that I think were shown by voters to be of interest this week, and I think one side has taken action to actually address those issues and I'd ask my colleagues if you think those are issues how are you going to be voting as we address them on other bills throughout the next session?

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 2:28 p.m.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, November 12, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN
Secretary of the Senate

