

No. 110  
STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**Journal of the Senate**  
102nd Legislature  
**REGULAR SESSION OF 2024**

---

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Friday, December 20, 2024.

12:30 a.m.

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

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 Roger Victory of the 31st District offered the following invocation:

Lord, You have written that there is a time under heaven for all things.

“A time to be born, a time to die; a time to plant, a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to kill, a time to heal; a time to break down, a time to build up; a time to weep, a time to laugh; a time to mourn, a time to dance; a time to cast away stones, and a time to gather stones together; a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing; a time to seek, and a time to lose; a time to keep, and a time to cast away; a time to tear, and a time to sew; a time to keep silent, and a time to speak; a time to love, and a time to hate; a time for war, and a time for peace.”

As we approach the time of the Christmas season, we give You thanks for the gift of Your Son, the Prince of Peace, for which we are grateful. Lord, we ask, May the peace be upon Your creation. This we ask in Your name. Amen.

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

### **Motions and Communications**

Senator Singh moved that Senator Anthony be temporarily excused from today’s session.  
The motion prevailed.

### **Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 12:34 a.m.

12:59 a.m.

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

During the recess, Senator Anthony entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Singh moved that the Committee on Government Operations be discharged from further consideration of the following bills:

#### **House Bill No. 4095, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308d.

#### **House Bill No. 4096, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308c.

#### **House Bill No. 5549, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308e.

#### **House Bill No. 5659, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 548, entitled “Comprehensive school safety plan act,” by amending the title and section 3 (MCL 28.803) and by adding section 6; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

#### **House Bill No. 5660, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 6, 1241, and 1310a (MCL 380.6, 380.1241, and 380.1310a), section 6 as amended by 2016 PA 192, section 1241 as added by 2018 PA 549, and section 1310a as amended by 2016 PA 532; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 5788, entitled**

A bill to enact the uniform public expression protection act; and to provide protections and remedies to persons sued for exercising rights to expression and other constitutionally protected rights.

**House Bill No. 5825, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 3406jj.

**House Bill No. 5956, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 3406jj.

**House Bill No. 5829, entitled**

A bill to amend 1964 PA 208, entitled “An act to grant scholarships to students enrolled in postsecondary education institutions; and to provide for the administration of the scholarship program,” by amending sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 5a, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 (MCL 390.972, 390.973, 390.974, 390.975, 390.975a, 390.976, 390.977, 390.978, 390.979, and 390.980), sections 3 and 4 as amended by 2021 PA 40, section 5 as amended by 1986 PA 270, sections 6, 8, and 9 as amended by 1980 PA 500, and section 7 as amended by 2004 PA 181; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 6027, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 390, entitled “Emergency management act,” by amending the title and section 19 (MCL 30.419), the title as amended by 2006 PA 267 and section 19 as amended by 2018 PA 264, and by adding section 18a.

**House Bill No. 5022, entitled**

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” by amending sections 254, 675, 813, 831, and 839 (MCL 206.254, 206.675, 206.813, 206.831, and 206.839), as added by 2021 PA 135.

**House Bill No. 4854, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1300.

**House Bill No. 5964, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 16189 (MCL 333.16189), as amended by 2022 PA 38.

**House Bill No. 5834, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 7103, 7105, 7106, 7401, 7403, 7403a, 7451, 7453, and 7455 (MCL 333.7103, 333.7105, 333.7106, 333.7401, 333.7403, 333.7403a, 333.7451, 333.7453, and 333.7455), section 7103 as amended by 1988 PA 60, section 7105 as amended by 1993 PA 80, section 7106 as amended by 2021 PA 60, section 7401 as amended by 2016 PA 548, section 7403 as amended by 2016 PA 307, section 7403a as added by 2010 PA 354, section 7451 as added by 1988 PA 139, section 7453 as amended by 2024 PA 18, and section 7455 as amended by 2024 PA 19.

**House Bill No. 5835, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 13m (MCL 777.13m), as amended by 2016 PA 549.

**House Bill No. 6046, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding sections 89 and 89a.

**House Bill No. 5695, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 109p.

**House Bill No. 6144, entitled**

A bill to amend 1935 PA 59, entitled “An act to provide for the public safety; to create the Michigan state police, and provide for the organization thereof; to transfer thereto the offices, duties and powers of the state fire marshal, the state oil inspector, the department of the Michigan state police as heretofore organized, and the department of public safety; to create the office of commissioner of the Michigan state police; to provide for an acting commissioner and for the appointment of the officers and members of said department; to prescribe their powers, duties, and immunities; to provide the manner of fixing their compensation; to provide for their removal from office; and to repeal Act No. 26 of the Public Acts of 1919, being sections 556 to 562, inclusive, of the Compiled Laws of 1929, and Act No. 123 of the Public Acts of 1921, as amended, being sections 545 to 555, inclusive, of the Compiled Laws of 1929,” (MCL 28.1 to 28.16) by adding section 5a.

**House Bill No. 6145, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 372, entitled “An act to regulate and license the selling, purchasing, possessing, and carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices; to prohibit the buying, selling, or carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices without a license or other authorization; to provide for the forfeiture of firearms and electro-muscular disruption devices under certain circumstances; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide immunity from civil liability under certain circumstances; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to prohibit certain conduct against individuals who apply for or receive a license to carry a concealed pistol; to make appropriations; to prescribe certain conditions for the appropriations; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act,” by amending section 14 (MCL 28.434), as amended by 2010 PA 295.

**House Bill No. 6146, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 239 (MCL 750.239), as amended by 2010 PA 294.

**House Bill No. 5785, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 18221, 18223, 18233, and 18237 (MCL 333.18221, 333.18223, 333.18233, and 333.18237), section 18221 as amended by 2006 PA 395, section 18223 as amended by 2018 PA 24, section 18233 as amended by 1994 PA 234, and section 18237 as amended by 1998 PA 496.

**House Bill No. 5300, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 288, entitled “Probate code of 1939,” by amending sections 1 and 3 of chapter XI (MCL 711.1 and 711.3), section 1 as amended by 2020 PA 40 and section 3 as added by 2000 PA 111.

**House Bill No. 5303, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2831 and 2872 (MCL 333.2831 and 333.2872), section 2831 as amended by 2024 PA 25.

**House Bill No. 5636, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2811, 2823, 17101, 20104, 20106, and 20161 (MCL 333.2811, 333.2823, 333.17101, 333.20104, 333.20106, and 333.20161), section 2811 as amended by 1998 PA 332, section 17101 as added by 2016 PA 417, section 20104 as amended by 2022 PA 187, section 20106 as amended by 2017 PA 167, and section 20161 as amended by 2023 PA 138, and by adding sections 2823a and 22224c and part 207.

**House Bill No. 6052, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 570, 795b, and 797a (MCL 168.570, 168.795b, and 168.797a), as amended by 2023 PA 81.

**House Bill No. 6053, entitled**

A bill to amend 1969 PA 161, entitled “An act to regulate the filing of certain actions involving elections,” by amending section 1 (MCL 691.1031); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 6054, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 11d of chapter XVII (MCL 777.11d), as amended by 2024 PA 75.

**House Bill No. 6055, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 305, 497, 523b, 662, 664, 668b, 720d, 720e, 720f, 720g, 720j, 759, 759a, 759e, 761d, 764c, 765a, 768, 798b, 805, 807, 813, and 829 (MCL 168.305, 168.497, 168.523b, 168.662, 168.664, 168.668b, 168.720d, 168.720e, 168.720f, 168.720g, 168.720j, 168.759, 168.759a, 168.759e, 168.761d, 168.764c, 168.765a, 168.768, 168.798b, 168.805, 168.807, 168.813, and 168.829), section 305 as amended by 2010 PA 334, section 497 as amended by 2023 PA 184, sections 523b, 720d, 720e, 720f, and 720g as added and sections 662, 668b, 765a, 768, 798b, and 805 as amended by 2023 PA 81, section 720j as amended by 2023 PA 259, section 759 as amended by 2023 PA 270, section 759a as amended by 2023 PA 193, section 759e as added by 2023 PA 86, section 761d as amended by 2023 PA 85, section 764c as amended by 2023 PA 84, and sections 813 and 829 as amended by 2018 PA 603, and by adding section 644k; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 5887, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” (MCL 750.1 to 750.568) by adding section 213b.

**House Bill No. 5888, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 161 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.161), as amended by 2016 PA 150.

**House Bill No. 4665, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” by amending sections 3 and 4 (MCL 38.1603 and 38.1604), as amended by 2018 PA 674.

**House Bill No. 4666, entitled**

A bill to amend 1943 PA 240, entitled “State employees’ retirement act,” by amending section 55 (MCL 38.55), as amended by 2011 PA 264, and by adding sections 50b, 50c, 50d, 64a, 64b, and 64c.

**House Bill No. 4667, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” (MCL 38.1601 to 38.1674) by adding sections 24c, 24d, 24e, and 24f.

**House Bill No. 6088, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 196, entitled “Public transportation authority act,” by amending sections 8, 18, and 29 (MCL 124.458, 124.468, and 124.479), sections 8 and 18 as amended by 2006 PA 175.

**House Bill No. 4938, entitled**

A bill to authorize the state administrative board to convey state-owned real property in Kent County; to prescribe conditions for the conveyance; to provide for powers and duties of state departments regarding the property; and to provide for disposition of the revenue from the conveyance.

**House Bill No. 6075, entitled**

A bill to amend 2012 PA 615, entitled “Michigan energy assistance act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 400.1233).

**House Bill No. 5594, 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.

**House Bill No. 6166, entitled**

A bill to amend 1980 PA 383, entitled “Convention and tourism marketing act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 141.883).

**House Bill No. 4900, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 4011, 4012, 4015, 4031, 4061a, 6023, 6027, 6059, and 6104 (MCL 600.4011, 600.4012, 600.4015, 600.4031, 600.4061a, 600.6023, 600.6027, 600.6059, and 600.6104), section 4011 as amended and section 4061a as added by 1994 PA 346, section 4012 as amended by 2015 PA 14, and section 6023 as amended by 2012 PA 553, and by adding sections 4001a, 4032, 4033, 6001a, 6023b, 6023c, 6023d, 6023e, 6023f, and 6023g.

**House Bill No. 4901, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 5451 (MCL 600.5451), as amended by 2012 PA 451.

**House Bill No. 6058, entitled**

A bill to amend 2011 PA 152, entitled “Publicly funded health insurance contribution act,” by amending the title and sections 3, 4, and 5 (MCL 15.563, 15.564, and 15.565), section 3 as amended by 2018 PA 477, section 4 as amended by 2013 PA 271, and section 5 as amended by 2013 PA 272, and by adding sections 3a and 4a.

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

Senator Singh moved that the Committee on Labor be discharged from further consideration of the following bills:

**House Bill No. 5164, entitled**

A bill to create the call center jobs retention act; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to impose certain duties on certain employers; and to prescribe civil sanctions.

**House Bill No. 5165, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled “Michigan strategic fund act,” (MCL 125.2001 to 125.2094) by adding section 15.

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

Senator Singh moved that the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety be discharged from further consideration of the following bills:

**House Bill No. 4191, entitled**

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 307 (MCL 257.307), as amended by 2020 PA 376.

**House Bill No. 4192, entitled**

A bill to amend 1953 PA 232, entitled “Corrections code of 1953,” by amending section 34c (MCL 791.234c), as added by 2012 PA 24.

**House Bill No. 4193, entitled**

A bill to amend 1972 PA 222, entitled “An act to provide for an official personal identification card; to provide for its form, issuance and use; to regulate the use and disclosure of information obtained from the card; to prescribe the powers and duties of the secretary of state; to prescribe fees; to prescribe certain penalties for violations; and to provide an appropriation for certain purposes,” by amending section 1 (MCL 28.291), as amended by 2021 PA 105.

**House Bill No. 4194, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 23, entitled “Enhanced driver license and enhanced official state personal identification card act,” by amending section 5 (MCL 28.305), as amended by 2021 PA 106.

**House Bill No. 5400, entitled**

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

**House Bill No. 5401, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16g of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16g), as amended by 2023 PA 278.

**House Bill No. 4485, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 24 of chapter VII (MCL 767.24), as amended by 2018 PA 182.

**House Bill No. 4384, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” (MCL 760.1 to 777.69) by adding section 34b to chapter IX.

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

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

**House Bill No. 4095**

**House Bill No. 4096**

**House Bill No. 5549**

**House Bill No. 5659**

**House Bill No. 5660**

**House Bill No. 5788**

**House Bill No. 5825**

**House Bill No. 5956**

**House Bill No. 5829**

**House Bill No. 6027**

**House Bill No. 5022**

**House Bill No. 4854**

**House Bill No. 5964**

**House Bill No. 5834**

House Bill No. 5835  
House Bill No. 6046  
House Bill No. 5695  
House Bill No. 6144  
House Bill No. 6145  
House Bill No. 6146  
House Bill No. 5785  
House Bill No. 5300  
House Bill No. 5303  
House Bill No. 5636  
House Bill No. 6052  
House Bill No. 6053  
House Bill No. 6054  
House Bill No. 6055  
House Bill No. 5887  
House Bill No. 5888  
House Bill No. 4665  
House Bill No. 4666  
House Bill No. 4667  
House Bill No. 6088  
House Bill No. 4938  
House Bill No. 6075  
House Bill No. 5594  
House Bill No. 6166  
House Bill No. 4900  
House Bill No. 4901  
House Bill No. 6058  
House Bill No. 5164  
House Bill No. 5165  
House Bill No. 4191  
House Bill No. 4192  
House Bill No. 4193  
House Bill No. 4194  
House Bill No. 5400  
House Bill No. 5401  
House Bill No. 4485  
House Bill No. 4384

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

### **Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 1:05 a.m.

1:15 a.m.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

### **Messages from the House**

Senator Singh moved that rule 3.202 be suspended to permit immediate consideration of the following bills:

**House Bill No. 5100**  
**House Bill No. 5101**

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

**House Bill No. 5100, entitled**

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” (MCL 206.1 to 206.847) by adding sections 677.

The House of Representatives has substituted (H-2) the Senate substitute (S-1).

The House of Representatives has concurred in the Senate substitute (S-1) as substituted (H-2) and amended the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “An act to meet deficiencies in state funds by providing for the imposition, levy, computation, collection, assessment, reporting, payment, and enforcement by lien and otherwise of taxes on or measured by net income and on certain commercial, business, and financial activities; to prescribe the manner and time of making reports and paying the taxes, and the functions of public officers and others as to the taxes; to permit the inspection of the records of taxpayers; to provide for interest and penalties on unpaid taxes; to provide exemptions, credits, rebates, and refunds of the taxes; to create certain funds; to provide for the expenditure of certain funds; to impose certain duties and requirements on certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to prescribe penalties for the violation of this act; to provide an appropriation; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” (MCL 206.1 to 206.847) by adding sections 677; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 661**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title as amended.

**House Bill No. 5101, entitled**

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “An act to meet deficiencies in state funds by providing for the imposition, levy, computation, collection, assessment, reporting, payment, and enforcement by lien and otherwise of taxes on or measured by net income and on certain commercial, business, and financial activities; to prescribe the manner and time of making reports and paying the taxes, and the functions of public officers and others as to the taxes; to permit the inspection of the records of taxpayers; to provide for interest and penalties on unpaid taxes; to provide exemptions, credits, rebates, and refunds of the taxes; to

create certain funds; to provide for the expenditure of certain funds; to impose certain duties and requirements on certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to prescribe penalties for the violation of this act; to provide an appropriation; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” (MCL 206.1 to 206.847) by adding section 717.

The House of Representatives has substituted (H-2) the Senate substitute (S-1).

The House of Representatives has concurred in the Senate substitute (S-1) as substituted (H-2) and agreed to the full title.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 662**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—19**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—1**

Wojno

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Singh moved to reconsider the vote by which the House substitute was not concurred in.

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

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

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

**Roll Call No. 663**

**Yeas—20**

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

Nays—18

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 1:26 a.m.

1:33 a.m.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

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

House Bill No. 5551, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 22c and 24b (MCL 168.22c and 168.24b), section 22c as added by 1995 PA 261.

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

Senator Singh moved that the Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection be discharged from further consideration of the following bill:

House Bill No. 5394, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 10120 (MCL 333.10120), as amended by 2023 PA 101.

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

Senator Singh moved that the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety be discharged from further consideration of the following bills:

House Bill No. 5569, entitled

A bill to impose civil liability and prescribe criminal penalties for the nonconsensual creation or dissemination of deep fake sexual images; and to provide for remedies.

House Bill No. 5570, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 17b of chapter XVII (MCL 777.17b), as added by 2002 PA 28.

**House Bill No. 5587, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 33 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.33), as amended by 2021 PA 84.

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

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

**House Bill No. 5551**

**House Bill No. 5394**

**House Bill No. 5569**

**House Bill No. 5570**

**House Bill No. 5587**

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

**Third Reading of Bills**

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

**House Bill No. 4224**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was announced:

**House Bill No. 4224, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” by repealing sections 107a and 107b (MCL 400.107a and 400.107b).

(This bill was read a third time on Thursday, December 19 and consideration postponed. See Senate Journal No. 109, p. 2141.)

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

1. Amend page 1, following line 2, by inserting:

“Enacting section 2. This amendatory act does not take effect unless all of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law:

(a) Senate Bill No. 846.

(b) Senate Bill No. 847.”.

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

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

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

**Roll Call No. 664**

**Yeas—17**

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

**Nays—21**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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. 665**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to protect the welfare of the people of this state; to provide general assistance, hospitalization, infirmary and medical care to poor or unfortunate persons; to provide for compliance by this state with the social security act; to provide protection, welfare and services to aged persons, dependent children, the blind, and the permanently and totally disabled; to administer programs and services for the prevention and treatment of delinquency, dependency and neglect of children; to create a state department of social services; to prescribe the powers and duties of the department; to provide for the interstate and intercounty transfer of dependents; to create county and district departments of social services; to create within certain county departments, bureaus of social aid and certain divisions and offices thereunder; to prescribe the powers and duties of the departments, bureaus and officers; to provide for appeals in certain cases; to prescribe the powers and duties of the state department with respect to county and district departments; to prescribe certain duties of certain other state departments, officers, and agencies; to make an appropriation; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on specific dates,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

## Protests

Senators Albert, Lindsey, Lauwers and Nesbitt, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4224 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 Albert’s statement is as follows:

In 2018, our state approved common-sense legislation that most able-bodied people who are capable of working should also make efforts toward working if they are going to receive taxpayer-funded healthcare coverage through Medicaid. It was part of a plan that expanded the eligibility of Obamacare. This proposal before us today would eliminate the workforce engagement provisions in that state law.

You may hear some say that this provision should be removed because the requirements never went into effect. In 2020, an activist federal judge blocked them in a highly unfortunate ruling. I say we should take the exact opposite approach. Instead of abandoning these very practical and common-sense provisions, we should instead work with the federal government to find a way for them to be implemented. These workforce engagement requirements were adopted with a lot of thought and consideration. Again, they apply only to the able bodied. Beyond that, there were exceptions for people with young kids, people with disabilities, pregnant women, and others who would have faced significant challenges meeting the requirements. There’s also flexibility in meeting the workforce engagement requirements—job training, job searches related to job training, internships, and community service were all among the steps that count. I would hope that most Michiganders agree that folks who may be struggling financially are able to access health care when they are in need, but taxpayers should not be paying the bill for able-bodied people to collect any sort of welfare and choose not to work, even though they could. I urge a “no” vote on this proposal today.

A work requirement law should remain on the books so we can work with the federal government and find a way for it to be implemented. This law is intended to help families get out of poverty and help them work toward self-sufficiency. It’s a way to help struggling families get out of poverty by encouraging them to work, and it respects taxpayers who pay for this program. Thank you, Mr. President, I urge a “no” vote.

Senator Lindsey’s statement is as follows:

My colleague who just spoke covered a lot of the substance of the background of what’s going on and what we’re changing here so I also just want to add to that that we should think about the change in the law we’re making and the context of the situation we’re facing here in Michigan. Right now, Michigan’s unemployment rate is relatively low, and in many places there are available jobs and even businesses across the state that are facing shortages of workers in trying to recruit people and having difficulty doing so. When you think about the changes that were put into law years ago to try to incentivize people who are participating in these programs to connect them with jobs, training, or other opportunities, even education, internships, community service, we’ve all got to ask ourselves the question, Even if this were a good set of policies, is right now the right time to send the message to the people of Michigan that we would rather have you stay out of the workforce than go look to be an active participant in it.

I think we should make sure that people are able to build the necessary skills and experiences that can lead to meaningful careers, and we should do more to incentivize that, not take steps to disincentivize it. In that spirit and encouraging my colleagues to make sure that assistance remains available for people who need it—that is of course an important thing we maintain—but also make sure we keep some of these incentives for people to engage in our workforce. I would urge everyone in this chamber to vote “no” on House Bill No. 4224.

Senator Lauwers’ statement is as follows:

A little history on House Bill No. 4224. It was introduced March 9, 2023—not 2024, 2023. It was referred to the Health Policy Committee in the House on March 14, 2023—that’s normal, that’s fine. The Health Policy Committee reported the bill on the 23rd of March in 2023 without amendment, just 9 days after referral and appeared to be on the fast track. But that’s where the fast track ended. It was referred to Second Reading that same day where it sat in the House and it sat, and it sat. House Bill No. 4224 sat for over a year. In fact, it sat without action for one year and eight months, until November 13, 2024, a week after our Democratic colleagues lost control of the House.

It was then passed on a party-line vote and given immediate effect. On November 26, it was referred to the Senate Committee on Housing and Human Services, a day we did not meet for session; and a week after the Thanksgiving Day legislative break, with 24-hours’ notice, House Bill No. 4224 was taken up by the committee for the first time and voted out the same day, on December 10, four legislative days after arriving from the House in the Senate.

House Bill No. 4224 was placed on the Senate calendar for a vote yesterday, the first legislative day this week, and now we are asked to vote on it in the wee hours of Friday morning. Talk about a railroad job. From fast track to off the tracks for a year and eight months to a vote in a matter of days after the election, wow. What's the hurry all of a sudden? Is this betraying policy for politics? I urge a "no" vote. This will only serve to drag our state back more quickly to the Lost Decade of the last time we had a Democratic Governor.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

When Medicaid was expanded in Michigan nearly ten years ago, it was done so in a bipartisan manner. In fact, there was a supermajority in this chamber and there was a larger majority in the House Chamber of Republicans that expanded Medicaid. I know the concept sounds foreign to the current Democratic majority of what a bipartisan consensus actually looks like, but part of that agreement was that those who were receiving these expanded benefits, the people being helped by these expanded benefits, and were physically able to work would be required to make an honest attempt to find a job, to find employment. Seems like a fair compromise. A hand up, not a handout. A balance between personal responsibility and economic mobility.

That compromise, unfortunately, was never put into motion. Government bureaucrats dragged their heels, Governor Whitmer suspended them during her heavy-handed COVID shutdowns and mandates, and now this Democratic majority wants to eliminate the semblance of personal responsibility completely. Medicaid was designed to assist those who were genuinely in need, offering a safety net for the unemployed, the disabled, or those who are just temporarily unable to work. These expanded benefits that were voted on nearly a decade ago, removing work requirements, sends a dangerous message, that one can rely indefinitely on taxpayer-funded aid even if you're able-bodied, even if you're able to go to work, without striving to better themselves. These work requirements are not just about employment. They're about dignity, purpose, being a role model, improving and bettering the lives of not just them but the next generation. And yet, you create these whole commissions trying to figure out why we can't increase workforce participation, why we can't go ahead and figure out why more people aren't participating in our workforce and growing the economy here in Michigan, encourage participation in our economy, develop personal growth, reduce dependency on government aid. Removing work requirements reinforces the type of dependency that undermines the very families we strive to help, that we all should be here to help. For those for whom Medicaid isn't a permanent necessity, it should be a steppingstone out of hardship, not a lifestyle.

I urge a "no" vote on this bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

This bill before us is really just an admission from its sponsors that it has become hard to find a job. Unfortunately, the Democratic solution is simply to throw up their hands and roll back work requirements for Healthy Michigan. My amendment, however, offers a solution to this problem. Let's not roll over and give up; let's start by rolling back some of the onerous labor regulations this Democratic-controlled Legislature has put in place to stifle small businesses and job growth in this state. We can start with reinstating right-to-work. I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

**House Bill No. 4177**

**House Bill No. 5817**

**House Bill No. 5818**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4177, entitled**

An act to provide for the establishment of history museum authorities; to provide for the powers and duties of a history museum authority; to authorize the levy and collection of a property tax by a history museum authority; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

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. 666**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protests**

Senators Runestad, Johnson and Albert, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4177 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:

We’ve seen this playbook before and we know exactly how it ends. Detroit and Wayne County continue their relentless efforts to drain the resources away from Oakland County. This is a strategy aimed at extracting millions upon millions of dollars from the hardworking property owners and taxpayers of Oakland County, not for the benefit of our Oakland County communities but to fund Detroit’s discretionary spending and political priorities. Where are the Representatives, the Senators, who represent Oakland County who would pass these massive tax bills on Oakland County residents and their homes? They don’t want to ask in Detroit, the voters there, to approve these initiatives, knowing full well the answer would be a resounding “no.” They want to broaden the reach, forcing our Oakland County residents to bear the financial burden of these Detroit museums.

Just look at the evidence of what the Democrats have done to the Oakland County taxpayers—the people who are trying to pay their property tax. Regional Transit Authority of Southeastern Michigan, functional only by the forced subsidies from Oakland County taxpayers despite the overwhelming benefit to Detroit and offering very little to Oakland County residents. The Detroit Institute of Arts, Oakland County is paying for a big chunk of that. We all saw, what was it, about 15 years ago, the \$500,000 gigantic salary for the Detroit Institute of Arts, the same Detroit Institute of Arts that does not have any transparency, no open meetings, no FOIA, yeah. That’s what we’re paying for in Oakland County—disproportionately paying for in Oakland County. The Detroit Zoo, another, yeah, it’s a great resource, but one that Oakland County funds far beyond our share and, again, has no transparency. The Great Lakes Water Authority, another avenue of endless financial extraction. The hotel tax that Oakland County residents pay for Detroit, the legislators here on the Democratic side simply do not care what happens to their taxpayers in Oakland County. They would tax every and any tax they could possibly put on Oakland County and send to Detroit and Wayne County. There’s no real concern about people getting taxed out of their homes.

My gosh, over on this side of the aisle we care so much about our people and what they're paying in taxes. Over here, any and every tax the Democrats have put forward, what do we get in return for these exploding property taxes driven by the insatiable demands of Detroit's political machines where they get all the vendor contracts, everything is going to Detroit? Families in Oakland County are being taxed out of their homes; long residents being forced to leave because they can no longer afford the skyrocketing taxes the Democrats keep putting on Oakland County. This isn't about regional cooperation or shared prosperity. It's about a one-sided exploitation of our taxpayers. It's about Detroit politicians and their allies using these Oakland County legislators on that side as the personal ATM for Detroit, funneling our Oakland County taxpayers' dollars over to Detroit vendors, political allies, and special interests.

Where is the loyalty on that side for the taxpayers? I hope the taxpayers tomorrow read about all of this stuff they're going to have to pay because of the legislators over there putting these taxes to them. The voters put their trust in elected officials to protect their interests; their interests are getting ignored. Instead of representing Oakland County, they are more loyal to the Detroit Democratic machine. That's what we're seeing here tonight. The endless cycle of taxation and redistribution is unsustainable. It's time for the representatives from Oakland County to represent the people of Oakland County, to fight for them, the people who elected them, to stop the exploitation. Oakland County residents deserve representatives who will protect their homes, their businesses, their future, not sacrifice them all to the—

Let this serve as a wakeup call to taxpayers of Oakland County. We will not remain silent while their livelihoods are siphoned away. Enough is enough, and I know you don't like the tone and that's what it's about, not the message.

Senator Johnson's statement is as follows:

When I was the Oakland Clerk and Register of Deeds during the Great Recession, we saw foreclosures recorded in our office go from a single drawer to every drawer of a large filing cabinet. The foreclosures were in numbers only second to the Great Depression. They're not just pieces of paper, they represent families who have lost their homes. We should not be putting more taxes on people's homes. But that's exactly what this bill will do. We should not be bailing out private museums by raising property taxes. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting "no" on this bill.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

I feel like I have an interesting perspective on this piece of legislation because I don't live in the area in which it will impact directly. It will impact my district indirectly because for better or worse, how southeast Michigan does affects the entire state. That's just the nature of our state. Most of the population lives there, a lot of the investors who either live throughout the country or internationally are going to come in through Detroit and see how that economy is going. That's largely their first impression of our state as a whole. This is not an indictment on history. Even my local townships have history museums, and then I was a history major in undergrad. I love history and it's extremely important we preserve that so I do appreciate that.

When I look at this legislation, it's not how it's going to affect Oakland and Macomb and how they're going to be, tilt the scales, they're going to be disproportionately impacted more than in Wayne County. I always kind of see this, I don't want to say divide, but this tension between these different counties. What I see with this legislation is that it's actually going to hurt all of them. There's not winners and losers; there's just losers. A wise man once said, Have you ever heard of anybody taxing themselves into prosperity? I think that applies right here. The gentleman who said that came up with what's called the Laffer curve and it showed empirically that if you overtax a population, it causes negative growth outcomes for that region as a whole. I think that's what's happening here.

I remember when I was Appropriations chair, I had a meeting with the mayor of Detroit and I prepared what I wanted to talk about when I went there. I did some research. I had talked to some members from the area and we got to talking about property taxes, and I was curious. I started looking at the cities within Wayne County and what their property tax rates—I was astounded. I think the city of Detroit is roughly 90 mills, maybe more than 90 mills. I think the city of Inkster—I can't remember which city it was—was over 100 mills. Then I started digging into what are they paying mills on? I couldn't believe it. I think the city of Grand Rapids is, like, 65 mills. This is expensive. I drew the conclusion that—if you look at the city of Detroit, they have a corporate income tax—I believe it's the only city in the state that has a corporate income tax—they have a city income tax on their residents, and then they're paying 90 mills. They're taxing your citizens into poverty. If you lowered the tax rate, it would increase economic growth which would lift everybody in the area and it would lift everybody in the state. I just look at this, and for me this represents a misguided step in what our priorities should be.

I love history and I think there are a lot of people in our state who would donate through philanthropic means to achieve whatever history goals you guys want to try to preserve in this area, but I just really, again,

from what I started with I have an interesting perspective here because I don't live in that region. Sometimes when you're looking from across, you can see things from a different perspective. I just look here and all I can think about is that same refrain: Have you ever seen a government tax itself into prosperity? If you just let people keep more of their money—I'm not saying all of it. We need taxes, we need to make sure our streets are safe, we need to make sure things run on time, we get that, we're here to be administrators to some degree—people expect certain services from their government, they're willing to pay taxes—but museums? That's where you start drawing the line of, OK, maybe we're starting to tax philanthropic things where we should have the citizens come up and preserve these initiatives.

For this reason, I am a "no."

Senator McMorro 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 McMorro's statement is as follows:

It's really interesting to hear so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have such strong opinions about, as was noted, an area where you do not live. First of all, I want to set the record straight: the Detroit Zoo is in Royal Oak which is in Oakland County. Beyond that, this is an issue about local control. Hearing some of the commentary from the other side of the aisle takes me back to 2014. I just want to read one quote from then-Oakland County Executive Brooks Patterson. "I used to say to my kids, 'First of all, there's no reason for you to go to Detroit. We've got restaurants out here.' They don't even have movie theatres in Detroit—not one. I can't imagine finding something in Detroit that we don't have in spades here. And, before you go to Detroit, you get your gas out here. You do not, do not, under any circumstances, stop in Detroit at a gas station. That's just a call for a carjacking." He went on later in this interview to say, when he was asked how the city of Detroit might fix some of its financial issues, "What we're gonna do is turn Detroit into an Indian reservation, where we herd all the Indians into the city, build a fence around it, and then throw in the blankets and corn."

This region has had a very ugly history where we divide Detroit from Oakland County, where we make Detroit a slur, where Detroiters means something dark and ugly. What we know now with our population growth council, when you talk to young people, we cannot succeed as metro Detroit and as the state of Michigan if we are not a region. All this legislation does is put it to the voters to decide. Time and time again, voters have decided to support their cultural institutions. Let's let the voters decide on their own future.

Senator Santana's statement is as follows:

I just want to take the opportunity to remind people that this conversation regarding this enabling legislation that is before us today started almost a year and a half ago with the three county executives from the southeastern Michigan area and through their partnership, there was a collaboration and an agreement upon making sure this opportunity existed for a lot of our cultural museums as well as other attractions here in the state of Michigan to help support continue the need for cultural aspects of our Michigan fabric. I just want to remind people that the purpose of this legislation is to allow for the local municipalities to opt into supporting this legislation and letting the voters decide on how they want to support this potential millage.

Let's be clear about what the real intent of this bill is. I just want for you all to know that section 15 says, "If a majority of electors in the county voting on the question of a tax as provided in section 17 approve the tax." That means to let the voters decide on what they want to do. We pay for all types of things in this state and most importantly, continue to make sure that Michigan is attractive.

More importantly, making sure we continue a history here in Michigan for everyone who lives, works, and plays here is definitely necessary, so I urge a "yes" vote on this legislation because it's about the taxpayers in those areas deciding what's good for southeastern Michigan.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5817, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 57, entitled "Recodified tax increment financing act," by amending sections 201, 301, 402, 523, 603, 703, and 803 (MCL 125.4201, 125.4301, 125.4402, 125.4523, 125.4603, 125.4703, and 125.4803), section 402 as amended by 2023 PA 312.

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. 667**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to provide for the recodification and establishment of certain tax increment finance authorities; to prescribe the powers and duties of the authorities; to correct and prevent deterioration in residential, commercial, and industrial areas and certain other areas; to authorize the acquisition and disposal of interests in real and personal property; to authorize the creation and implementation of development plans and development areas; to promote residential and economic growth; to create certain boards; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain boards; to authorize the issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to levy certain taxes; to authorize the use of tax increment financing; to prescribe powers and duties of certain state officials; to provide for rule promulgation; to provide for enforcement of this act; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Hauck and Bellino, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5817.

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

The one thing everybody always seems to miss when it comes to property taxes is the business aspect of it. Businesses are uncapped so why, if you’re a business, would you go into communities like this? It’s hard for me—I have a special place in Detroit because my aunt and uncle live there and my dad worked there when he got out of the service, but let’s talk about the city of Detroit for a minute. Back in the 1950s and early ’60s, Detroit had probably either the or one of the richest zip codes in the world. From the ’60s to the ’70s, they went almost bankrupt. You’ve got to work pretty hard to do that. One of the main reasons were taxes and overregulating. I want to help Detroit, I want to help them get back on the map, but you can’t keep on taxing people and expecting them to live in these communities or afford their houses. We’ve got bills up here where we’ve got to look at adding more money to pay for energy because—

My dad would always say, Roger, he called me Roger because that is my name, Roger, sometimes he would get upset and call me Tim, Harry, or Neal because that’s my other brothers’ names so people would get confused, I couldn’t understand my dad. My dad was from Detroit and he always said about how things in Detroit are taxed really high and it’s—I love Detroit, but I just think that taxes are way too high. The other

thing that’s going to happen is, when is this going to be on the ballot? This will be on the ballot when everybody’s gone or when—so nobody will know about it, it’ll be a secret ballot so everybody has to vote. When is enough, enough?

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5818, entitled**

A bill to amend 1996 PA 381, entitled “Brownfield redevelopment financing act,” by amending section 2 (MCL 125.2652), as amended by 2023 PA 90.

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. 668**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to authorize municipalities to create a brownfield redevelopment authority to facilitate the implementation of brownfield plans; to create brownfield redevelopment zones; to promote the revitalization, redevelopment, and reuse of certain property, including, but not limited to, previously developed, tax reverted, blighted, or functionally obsolete property; to promote the utilization of certain property for housing development; to prescribe the powers and duties of brownfield redevelopment authorities; to permit the issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness by an authority; to authorize the acquisition and disposal of certain property; to authorize certain funds; to prescribe certain powers and duties of certain state officers and agencies; and to authorize and permit the use of certain tax increment financing.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Webber, Theis and McBroom, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 4177, 5817 and 5818.

Senators Webber and Theis moved that the statements they made during the discussion of House Bill No. 4177 be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Webber's statement is as follows:

The people of Michigan are not asking to pay more in taxes or for the creation of new quasi-government entities to tax them. In fact, voters sent a clear message in November that they want their elected leaders to work on policies to help ease the growing cost of living, not take more and more money from their pockets. These bills would open up property owners in all 83 counties to the possibility of paying additional taxes to support more than 100 museums across our state, whether they live near these institutions or not. For metro Detroiters, it was controversial when the Legislature created this ability for the Detroit Institute of Arts and the Detroit Zoo. Property owners I speak with in Oakland and Macomb counties remain frustrated by these levied taxes, particularly when the DIA proposal went from a one-time millage to a renewal.

Owning a home is already expensive. Let's not submit all of Michigan to this kind of excessive taxation. I urge a "no" vote on these bills.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

I rise to explain my vote against this package of bills that would enable county boards of commissioners to create history museum authorities, funded by yet another layer of taxation on our residents. Let me begin by saying I deeply value the importance of preserving our history and the critical role museums play in educating our communities. However, I cannot support legislation that would create an additional taxing authority, increasing the financial burden on Michigan families who are already struggling under the weight of rising costs. They already can't afford to put food on the table. They're already having difficulty paying the bills even keeping the roof over their head, and we're going to tax them more—or at least give the opportunity for it.

This legislation not only opens the door to higher property taxes but also establishes yet another government entity with the power to tax. While well-intentioned, such entities often grow far beyond their initial purpose, resulting in greater bureaucracy and less accountability to taxpayers. Rather than placing the responsibility on the backs of our hardworking citizens, we should look for other innovative ways to support these institutions if in fact they need to be supported. There are other avenues to preserve and celebrate Michigan's history without expanding government yet more or imposing even further taxes on the already-burdened citizens of Michigan. For these reasons, I respectfully ask for a "no" vote on this package of bills.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Madam President, I just want to make a few short remarks about why millage increases and proposals such as this can be so troubling. In particular after a previous speaker mentioned how this allows the taxpayers to decide. The issue is, Who are the taxpayers vs. who is voting? That's not necessarily the same thing. This is something that, when our Constitution was adopted, the people who wrote it and the citizens who adopted our Constitution well understood. In article II, section 6, it says, "Whenever any question is required to be submitted by a political subdivision to the electors for the increase of the ad valorem tax rate limitation imposed by Section 6 of Article IX for a period of more than five years, or for the issue of bonds, only electors in, and who have property assessed for any ad valorem taxes in, any part of the district or territory to be affected by the result of such election or electors who are the lawful husbands or wives of such persons shall be entitled to vote thereon. All electors in the district or territory affected may vote on all other questions." Of course, this has been rendered unenforceable by Supreme Court actions that happened in the 1960s, but our state is structured to work this way.

Our tax code is meant to operate under this very premise, that the people who vote to raise property taxes are the people who pay property taxes. The consequences of that loss of this particular foundational element of the way our government works in this state is evidenced all around us in the outrageously high property taxes we pay in this state, by the crisis of property taxes we've had in this state that has been addressed piecemeal over the years—including by Proposal A in 1994.

Just some examples: right now the millage rate in Detroit is 85.551. it's incredibly high. This is because we have violated this foundational element. While it remains unenforceable, we just continue to violate that foundational element. I know people will say, Well, that tax of course is paid then by other people because it's passed along, and there's some truth to that. In the end, the property taxes for all people go up high but the regressiveness of it is particularly felt by those who own the properties. It is the ultimately regressive tax—property taxes. There's no tax in this state more regressive. Republicans always bellyaching about income tax, they're wrong. They should be bellyaching about property taxes. Every one of us in this state should be bellyaching about property taxes. They're the worst. No tax in this state is more impactful on the impoverished people of this state, no tax is more debilitating to the inheritance of people in this state, than property taxes. To expand that ability to take those, and then to mull it over by saying, The voters decide, is akin to taxation without representation.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Motions and Communications**

Senator Singh moved to reconsider the vote by which the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole was concurred in relative to the following bill:

**House Bill No. 4173, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” (MCL 760.1 to 777.69) by adding section 34a to chapter IX.

The motion prevailed.

The question being on concurring in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole,

The recommendation was not concurred in, and the bill was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

Senator Singh moved to reconsider the vote by which the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole was concurred in relative to the following bill:

**House Bill No. 4675, entitled**

A bill to amend 2003 PA 258, entitled “Land bank fast track act,” by amending sections 4, 13, and 14 (MCL 124.754, 124.763, and 124.764).

The motion prevailed.

The question being on concurring in the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole,

The recommendation was not concurred in, and the bill was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

**Recess**

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 2:35 a.m.

3:00 a.m.

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

Senator Singh moved that the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety be discharged from further consideration of the following bills:

**House Bill No. 5588, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 1 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.1), as amended by 2002 PA 34.

**House Bill No. 5589, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 37 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.37), as amended by 2015 PA 137.

**House Bill No. 5590, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 31 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.31), as amended by 2002 PA 137.

**House Bill No. 5591, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 39 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.39), as amended by 2006 PA 548.

**House Bill No. 5592, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 22 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.22), as amended by 2003 PA 134.

**House Bill No. 5593, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 41 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.41), as added by 1998 PA 317.

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

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

**House Bill No. 5588**

**House Bill No. 5589**

**House Bill No. 5590**

**House Bill No. 5591**

**House Bill No. 5592**

**House Bill No. 5593**

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

### Messages from the Governor

The following messages from the Governor were received:

Date: December 17, 2024

Time: 12:38 p.m.

To the President of the Senate:

Sir—I have this day approved and signed

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 504 (Public Act No. 167), being**

An act to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled “An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative energy suppliers and certain providers of electric vehicle charging services; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 10gg (MCL 460.10gg), as added by 2018 PA 348.

(Filed with the Secretary of State on December 17, 2024, at 1:06 p.m.)

Date: December 17, 2024

Time: 12:40 p.m.

To the President of the Senate:

Sir—I have this day approved and signed

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 881 (Public Act No. 168), being**

An act to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled “An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative energy suppliers and certain providers of electric vehicle charging services; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of

providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 9t (MCL 460.9t), as added by 2013 PA 95.

(Filed with the Secretary of State on December 17, 2024, at 1:08 p.m.)

Date: December 17, 2024

Time: 12:42 p.m.

To the President of the Senate:

Sir—I have this day approved and signed

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 880 (Public Act No. 169), being**

An act to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled “An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative energy suppliers and certain providers of electric vehicle charging services; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 9t (MCL 460.9t), as added by 2013 PA 95.

(Filed with the Secretary of State on December 17, 2024, at 1:10 p.m.)

Date: December 17, 2024

Time: 12:44 p.m.

To the President of the Senate:

Sir—I have this day approved and signed

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 353 (Public Act No. 170), being**

An act to amend 2012 PA 615, entitled “An act to provide energy assistance for low-income households; and to prescribe certain powers and duties of certain state departments and agencies,” by amending sections 2, 4, and 5 (MCL 400.1232, 400.1234, and 400.1235) and by adding section 4a.

(Filed with the Secretary of State on December 17, 2024, at 1:12 p.m.)

Date: December 17, 2024

Time: 12:46 p.m.

To the President of the Senate:

Sir—I have this day approved and signed

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 1001 (Public Act No. 171), being**

An act to amend 1986 PA 316, entitled “An act to create the Michigan education trust; to prescribe the powers and duties of the trust and of its board of directors; to provide for advance tuition payment contracts; to establish an advance tuition payment fund and to provide for its administration; to provide for remedies; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts on specific dates,” by amending sections 4 and 8 (MCL 390.1424 and 390.1428), section 8 as amended by 2004 PA 388.

(Filed with the Secretary of State on December 17, 2024, at 1:14 p.m.)

Respectfully,  
Gretchen Whitmer  
Governor

The following messages from the Governor were received and read:

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointment to office pursuant to Executive Order No. 2009-21, MCL 445.1992:

**Michigan Asian Pacific American Affairs Commission**

Aimee Jachym of 2237 Lorraine Avenue, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008, Kalamazoo County, succeeding Roland Coloma whose term has expired, appointed for a term commencing December 19, 2024, and expiring November 30, 2028.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 8, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution and Public Act 48 of 1963 (2nd Ex. Sess.), MCL 390.551:

**Central Michigan University Board of Trustees**

Jeffrey Stoutenberg of 115 Helen Street, Midland, Michigan 48640, Midland County, succeeding Michael Sandler whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

Ashok Kondur of 4705 Wendrick Drive, West Bloomfield, Michigan 48323, Oakland County, succeeding Isaiah Oliver whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 5, Section 29 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963:

**Michigan Civil Rights Commission**

Gloria Lara of 2381 Cloverly Street, N.W., Walker, Michigan 49544, Kent County, will be reappointed as a member representing Independents, for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2028.

Richard White III of 19419 Silvercrest Street, Southfield, Michigan 48075, Oakland County, succeeding Richard Corriveau whose term is expiring, will be appointed as a member representing Democrats, for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2028.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointment to office pursuant to Article 8, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution and Public Act 48 of 1963 (2nd Ex. Sess.), MCL 390.551:

**Eastern Michigan University Board of Regents**

Sean Gray-Lewis of 2900 East Jefferson Avenue, Apartment C1, Detroit, Michigan 48207, Wayne County, succeeding Alexander Simpson whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 8, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution and Public Act 114 of 1949, MCL 390.802:

**Ferris State University Board of Trustees**

LaShanda Thomas of 611 University Place, Suite 1300, Grosse Pointe, Michigan 48230, Wayne County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

Matthew Evans of 727 Harcourt Road, Grosse Pointe Park, Michigan 48230, Wayne County, succeeding Anna Seibold whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 8, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution and Public Act 120 of 1960, MCL 390.842:

**Grand Valley State University Board of Trustees**

Brandon Hofmeister of 155 Underdown Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105, Washtenaw County, succeeding Kate Pew Wolters whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

Jason Trice of 1307 Springborrow Drive, Flint, Michigan 48532, Genesee County, succeeding Randall Damstra whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 8, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution and Public Act 70 of 1885, MCL 390.352 and Public Act 21 of 1963 (2nd Ex. sess.), MCL 390.861:

**Michigan Technological University Board of Trustees**

Steven Tomaszewski of 13304 Julie Anne Court, Fenton, Michigan 48430, Genesee County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

Shannon Dare Wayne of 1212 Beavertail Lane, Milan, Michigan 48160, Washtenaw County, succeeding Derhun Sanders whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 8, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution and Public Act 48 of 1963 (2nd Ex. Sess.), MCL 390.551:

**Northern Michigan University Board of Trustees**

Venus Joy Brown of 19933 Shrewsbury Road, Detroit, Michigan 48221, Wayne County, succeeding Alexis Hart whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

Lisa Fittante of 1100 Westwood Avenue, Kingsford, Michigan 49802, Dickinson County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointment to office pursuant to Public Act 300 of 1980, MCL 38.1322:

**Michigan Public School Employees Retirement System Board**

Glenda Booker of 18237 Oakfield Street, Detroit, Michigan 48235, Wayne County, appointed as an individual working as a classroom teacher or as other certified school personnel and who is an employee of the largest school district, for a term commencing December 19, 2024, and expiring March 30, 2028.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 5, Section 28 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963 and Public Act 286 of 1964, MCL 247.803:

**State Transportation Commission**

Suzanne Schulz of 177 Bona Vista Drive, N.W., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504, Kent County, will be reappointed as an Independent, for a term commencing December 22, 2024, and expiring December 21, 2027.

Heath Salisbury of 12295 Duffield Road, Gaines, Michigan 48436, Genesee County, will be reappointed as a Democrat, for a term commencing December 22, 2024, and expiring December 21, 2027.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Article 8, Section 6 of the Michigan Constitution and Public Act 48 of 1963 (2nd Ex. Sess.), MCL 390.551:

**Western Michigan University Board of Trustees**

Kelly Burris of 1530 Wellesley Drive, Detroit, Michigan 48203, Wayne County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

James Liggins, Jr., of 4438 Willow Point Lane, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49004, Kalamazoo County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2032.

December 19, 2024

I respectfully submit to the Senate the following appointments to office pursuant to Public Act 317 of 1969, MCL 418.213, Executive Order No. 2003-18, MCL 445.2011, and Executive Reorganization Order No. 2019-3, MCL 125.1998:

**Workers' Compensation Board of Magistrates**

Kevin Davis of 8089 Orchardview Drive, Washington Township, Michigan 48095, Macomb County, succeeding Keith Castora whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 27, 2025, and expiring January 26, 2029.

Richard Ehrlich of 2900 Windwood Court, Commerce Township, Michigan 48382, Oakland County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 27, 2025, and expiring January 26, 2029.

Kevin Kales of 8114 Winona Avenue, Allen Park, Michigan 48101, Wayne County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 27, 2025, and expiring January 26, 2029.

Lenny Segel of 31092 North Park Drive, Farmington Hills, Michigan 48331, Oakland County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 27, 2025, and expiring January 26, 2029.

David Williams of 891 North Oxford Road, Grosse Pointe Woods, Michigan 48236, Wayne County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 27, 2025, and expiring January 26, 2029.

Lisa Woons of 1842 Newton Avenue, S.E., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506, Kent County, will be reappointed for a term commencing January 27, 2025, and expiring January 26, 2029.

John Chowning of 7497 Glen Hatt Drive, Linden, Michigan 48451, Genesee County, succeeding John Housefield whose term is expiring, will be appointed for a term commencing January 27, 2025, and expiring January 26, 2029.

Respectfully,  
Gretchen Whitmer  
Governor

The appointments were referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The following message from the Governor was received and read:

December 19, 2024

Due to an error on the December 10, 2024 letter filed with your office, pursuant to Public Act 164 of 1975, MCL 18.302, please be advised of the following corrections appearing in **bold**:

**Hispanic/Latino Commission of Michigan**

Jesse Bernal of 960 Oakleigh Road, N.W., Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504, **Kent** County, reappointed for a term commencing December 10, 2024, and expiring December 10, 2027.

Rudy Flores of 223 Buddlong Street, Adrian, Michigan 49221, Lenawee County, succeeding **Anthony Garcia-Rubio** whose term has expired, appointed for a term commencing December 10, 2024, and expiring December 10, 2027.

Kaylee Burke of 8900 Northland Drive, Stanwood, Michigan 49346, Mecosta County, succeeding **Sonya Hernandez** whose term has expired, appointed for a term commencing December 10, 2024, and expiring December 10, 2027.

Respectfully,  
Gretchen Whitmer  
Governor

The message was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

**Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 3:03 a.m.

3:10 a.m.

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

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 Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, designated Senator McCann as Chairperson.

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

**House Bill No. 4095, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled "The revised school code," (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308d.

**House Bill No. 4096, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled "The revised school code," (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308c.

**House Bill No. 5549, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled "The revised school code," (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308e.

**House Bill No. 5659, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 548, entitled "Comprehensive school safety plan act," by amending the title and section 3 (MCL 28.803) and by adding section 6; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 5660, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 6, 1241, and 1310a (MCL 380.6, 380.1241, and 380.1310a), section 6 as amended by 2016 PA 192, section 1241 as added by 2018 PA 549, and section 1310a as amended by 2016 PA 532; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 5788, entitled**

A bill to enact the uniform public expression protection act; and to provide protections and remedies to persons sued for exercising rights to expression and other constitutionally protected rights.

**House Bill No. 5825, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 3406jj.

**House Bill No. 5956, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 3406jj.

**House Bill No. 5829, entitled**

A bill to amend 1964 PA 208, entitled “An act to grant scholarships to students enrolled in postsecondary education institutions; and to provide for the administration of the scholarship program,” by amending sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 5a, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 (MCL 390.972, 390.973, 390.974, 390.975, 390.975a, 390.976, 390.977, 390.978, 390.979, and 390.980), sections 3 and 4 as amended by 2021 PA 40, section 5 as amended by 1986 PA 270, sections 6, 8, and 9 as amended by 1980 PA 500, and section 7 as amended by 2004 PA 181; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 6027, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 390, entitled “Emergency management act,” by amending the title and section 19 (MCL 30.419), the title as amended by 2006 PA 267 and section 19 as amended by 2018 PA 264, and by adding section 18a.

**House Bill No. 5022, entitled**

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” by amending sections 254, 675, 813, 831, and 839 (MCL 206.254, 206.675, 206.813, 206.831, and 206.839), as added by 2021 PA 135.

**House Bill No. 4191, entitled**

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 307 (MCL 257.307), as amended by 2020 PA 376.

**House Bill No. 4192, entitled**

A bill to amend 1953 PA 232, entitled “Corrections code of 1953,” by amending section 34c (MCL 791.234c), as added by 2012 PA 24.

**House Bill No. 4193, entitled**

A bill to amend 1972 PA 222, entitled “An act to provide for an official personal identification card; to provide for its form, issuance and use; to regulate the use and disclosure of information obtained from the card; to prescribe the powers and duties of the secretary of state; to prescribe fees; to prescribe certain penalties for violations; and to provide an appropriation for certain purposes,” by amending section 1 (MCL 28.291), as amended by 2021 PA 105.

**House Bill No. 4194, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 23, entitled “Enhanced driver license and enhanced official state personal identification card act,” by amending section 5 (MCL 28.305), as amended by 2021 PA 106.

**House Bill No. 4854, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1300.

**House Bill No. 5964, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 16189 (MCL 333.16189), as amended by 2022 PA 38.

**House Bill No. 5834, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 7103, 7105, 7106, 7401, 7403, 7403a, 7451, 7453, and 7455 (MCL 333.7103, 333.7105, 333.7106, 333.7401, 333.7403, 333.7403a, 333.7451, 333.7453, and 333.7455), section 7103 as amended by 1988 PA 60, section 7105 as amended by 1993 PA 80, section 7106 as amended by 2021 PA 60, section 7401 as amended by 2016 PA 548, section 7403 as amended by 2016 PA 307, section 7403a as added by 2010 PA 354, section 7451 as added by 1988 PA 139, section 7453 as amended by 2024 PA 18, and section 7455 as amended by 2024 PA 19.

**House Bill No. 5835, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 13m (MCL 777.13m), as amended by 2016 PA 549.

**House Bill No. 6046, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding sections 89 and 89a.

**House Bill No. 5695, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 109p.

**House Bill No. 6144, entitled**

A bill to amend 1935 PA 59, entitled “An act to provide for the public safety; to create the Michigan state police, and provide for the organization thereof; to transfer thereto the offices, duties and powers of the state fire marshal, the state oil inspector, the department of the Michigan state police as heretofore organized, and the department of public safety; to create the office of commissioner of the Michigan state police; to provide for an acting commissioner and for the appointment of the officers and members of said department; to prescribe their powers, duties, and immunities; to provide the manner of fixing their compensation; to provide for their removal from office; and to repeal Act No. 26 of the Public Acts of 1919, being sections 556 to 562, inclusive, of the Compiled Laws of 1929, and Act No. 123 of the Public Acts of 1921, as amended, being sections 545 to 555, inclusive, of the Compiled Laws of 1929,” (MCL 28.1 to 28.16) by adding section 5a.

**House Bill No. 6145, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 372, entitled “An act to regulate and license the selling, purchasing, possessing, and carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices; to prohibit the buying, selling, or carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices without a license or other authorization; to provide for the forfeiture of firearms and electro-muscular disruption devices under certain circumstances; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide immunity from civil liability under certain circumstances; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to prohibit certain conduct against individuals who apply for or receive a license to carry a concealed pistol; to make appropriations; to prescribe certain conditions for the appropriations; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act,” by amending section 14 (MCL 28.434), as amended by 2010 PA 295.

**House Bill No. 6146, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 239 (MCL 750.239), as amended by 2010 PA 294.

**House Bill No. 5785, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 18221, 18223, 18233, and 18237 (MCL 333.18221, 333.18223, 333.18233, and 333.18237), section 18221 as amended by 2006 PA 395, section 18223 as amended by 2018 PA 24, section 18233 as amended by 1994 PA 234, and section 18237 as amended by 1998 PA 496.

**House Bill No. 5300, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 288, entitled “Probate code of 1939,” by amending sections 1 and 3 of chapter XI (MCL 711.1 and 711.3), section 1 as amended by 2020 PA 40 and section 3 as added by 2000 PA 111.

**House Bill No. 5303, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2831 and 2872 (MCL 333.2831 and 333.2872), section 2831 as amended by 2024 PA 25.

**House Bill No. 5636, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2811, 2823, 17101, 20104, 20106, and 20161 (MCL 333.2811, 333.2823, 333.17101, 333.20104, 333.20106, and 333.20161), section 2811 as amended by 1998 PA 332, section 17101 as added by 2016 PA 417, section 20104 as amended by 2022 PA 187, section 20106 as amended by 2017 PA 167, and section 20161 as amended by 2023 PA 138, and by adding sections 2823a and 22224c and part 207.

**House Bill No. 6052, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 570, 795b, and 797a (MCL 168.570, 168.795b, and 168.797a), as amended by 2023 PA 81.

**House Bill No. 6053, entitled**

A bill to amend 1969 PA 161, entitled “An act to regulate the filing of certain actions involving elections,” by amending section 1 (MCL 691.1031); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 6054, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 11d of chapter XVII (MCL 777.11d), as amended by 2024 PA 75.

**House Bill No. 6055, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 305, 497, 523b, 662, 664, 668b, 720d, 720e, 720f, 720g, 720j, 759, 759a, 759e, 761d, 764c, 765a, 768, 798b, 805, 807, 813, and 829 (MCL 168.305, 168.497, 168.523b, 168.662, 168.664, 168.668b, 168.720d, 168.720e, 168.720f, 168.720g, 168.720j, 168.759, 168.759a, 168.759e, 168.761d, 168.764c, 168.765a, 168.768, 168.798b, 168.805, 168.807, 168.813, and 168.829), section 305 as amended by 2010 PA 334, section 497 as amended by 2023 PA 184, sections 523b, 720d, 720e, 720f, and 720g as added and sections 662, 668b, 765a, 768, 798b, and 805 as amended by 2023 PA 81, section 720j as amended by 2023 PA 259, section 759 as amended by 2023 PA 270, section 759a as amended by 2023 PA 193, section 759e as added by 2023 PA 86, section 761d as amended by 2023 PA 85, section 764c as amended by 2023 PA 84, and sections 813 and 829 as amended by 2018 PA 603, and by adding section 644k; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

**House Bill No. 5551, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 22c and 24b (MCL 168.22c and 168.24b), section 22c as added by 1995 PA 261.

**House Bill No. 5394, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 10120 (MCL 333.10120), as amended by 2023 PA 101.

**House Bill No. 5569, entitled**

A bill to impose civil liability and prescribe criminal penalties for the nonconsensual creation or dissemination of deep fake sexual images; and to provide for remedies.

**House Bill No. 5570, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 17b of chapter XVII (MCL 777.17b), as added by 2002 PA 28.

**House Bill No. 5587, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 33 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.33), as amended by 2021 PA 84.

**House Bill No. 5588, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 1 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.1), as amended by 2002 PA 34.

**House Bill No. 5589, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 37 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.37), as amended by 2015 PA 137.

**House Bill No. 5590, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 31 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.31), as amended by 2002 PA 137.

**House Bill No. 5591, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 39 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.39), as amended by 2006 PA 548.

**House Bill No. 5592, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 22 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.22), as amended by 2003 PA 134.

**House Bill No. 5593, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 41 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.41), as added by 1998 PA 317.

**House Bill No. 5887, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” (MCL 750.1 to 750.568) by adding section 213b.

**House Bill No. 5888, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 161 of chapter XVII (MCL 777.161), as amended by 2016 PA 150.

**House Bill No. 4665, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” by amending sections 3 and 4 (MCL 38.1603 and 38.1604), as amended by 2018 PA 674.

**House Bill No. 4666, entitled**

A bill to amend 1943 PA 240, entitled “State employees’ retirement act,” by amending section 55 (MCL 38.55), as amended by 2011 PA 264, and by adding sections 50b, 50c, 50d, 64a, 64b, and 64c.

**House Bill No. 4667, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” (MCL 38.1601 to 38.1674) by adding sections 24c, 24d, 24e, and 24f.

**House Bill No. 6058, entitled**

A bill to amend 2011 PA 152, entitled “Publicly funded health insurance contribution act,” by amending the title and sections 3, 4, and 5 (MCL 15.563, 15.564, and 15.565), section 3 as amended by 2018 PA 477, section 4 as amended by 2013 PA 271, and section 5 as amended by 2013 PA 272, and by adding sections 3a and 4a.

**House Bill No. 6088, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 196, entitled “Public transportation authority act,” by amending sections 8, 18, and 29 (MCL 124.458, 124.468, and 124.479), sections 8 and 18 as amended by 2006 PA 175.

**House Bill No. 4938, entitled**

A bill to authorize the state administrative board to convey state-owned real property in Kent County; to prescribe conditions for the conveyance; to provide for powers and duties of state departments regarding the property; and to provide for disposition of the revenue from the conveyance.

**House Bill No. 4485, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 24 of chapter VII (MCL 767.24), as amended by 2018 PA 182.

**House Bill No. 4384, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” (MCL 760.1 to 777.69) by adding section 34b to chapter IX.

**House Bill No. 6075, entitled**

A bill to amend 2012 PA 615, entitled “Michigan energy assistance act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 400.1233).

**House Bill No. 5594, 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.

**House Bill No. 6166, entitled**

A bill to amend 1980 PA 383, entitled “Convention and tourism marketing act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 141.883).

**House Bill No. 4900, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 4011, 4012, 4015, 4031, 4061a, 6023, 6027, 6059, and 6104 (MCL 600.4011, 600.4012, 600.4015, 600.4031, 600.4061a, 600.6023, 600.6027, 600.6059, and 600.6104), section 4011 as amended and section 4061a as added by 1994 PA 346, section 4012 as amended by 2015 PA 14, and section 6023 as amended by 2012 PA 553, and by adding sections 4001a, 4032, 4033, 6001a, 6023b, 6023c, 6023d, 6023e, 6023f, and 6023g.

**House Bill No. 4901, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 5451 (MCL 600.5451), as amended by 2012 PA 451.

**House Bill No. 5400, entitled**

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

**House Bill No. 5401, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16g of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16g), as amended by 2023 PA 278.

**House Bill No. 5164, entitled**

A bill to create the call center jobs retention act; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to impose certain duties on certain employers; and to prescribe civil sanctions.

**House Bill No. 5165, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled “Michigan strategic fund act,” (MCL 125.2001 to 125.2094) by adding section 15.

**House Bill No. 5269, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 504a, 506, 525, 527, 557, 560, 1311h, and 1311k (MCL 380.504a, 380.506, 380.525, 380.527, 380.557, 380.560, 380.1311h, and 380.1311k), section 504a as amended and sections 525 and 527 as added by 2003 PA 179, section 506 as added by 1993 PA 362, sections 557 and 560 as added by 2009 PA 205, section 1311h as amended by 2012 PA 620, and section 1311k as added by 1999 PA 23.

**House Bill No. 5699, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 362 and 370 (MCL 168.362 and 168.370), section 362 as amended by 1980 PA 112 and section 370 as amended by 2022 PA 104.

**House Bill No. 5700, entitled**

A bill to amend 1909 PA 279, entitled “The home rule city act,” (MCL 117.1 to 117.38) by adding section 3c.

**House Bill No. 5701, entitled**

A bill to amend 1895 PA 3, entitled “The general law village act,” by amending sections 4, 5, and 13 of chapter II and section 3 of chapter V (MCL 62.4, 62.5, 62.13, and 65.3), sections 4 and 5 of chapter II and section 3 of chapter V as amended by 2012 PA 551 and section 13 of chapter II as amended by 2003 PA 305.

**House Bill No. 5702, entitled**

A bill to amend 1909 PA 278, entitled “The home rule village act,” (MCL 78.1 to 78.28) by adding section 24e. The bills were placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Motions and Communications**

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

**House Bill No. 4095**

**House Bill No. 4096**

**House Bill No. 5549**

**House Bill No. 5659**

**House Bill No. 5660**

House Bill No. 5788  
House Bill No. 5825  
House Bill No. 5956  
House Bill No. 5829  
House Bill No. 6027  
House Bill No. 5022  
House Bill No. 4191  
House Bill No. 4192  
House Bill No. 4193  
House Bill No. 4194  
House Bill No. 4854  
House Bill No. 5964  
House Bill No. 5834  
House Bill No. 5835  
House Bill No. 6046  
House Bill No. 5695  
House Bill No. 6144  
House Bill No. 6145  
House Bill No. 6146  
House Bill No. 5785  
House Bill No. 5300  
House Bill No. 5303  
House Bill No. 5636  
House Bill No. 6052  
House Bill No. 6053  
House Bill No. 6054  
House Bill No. 6055  
House Bill No. 5551  
House Bill No. 5394  
House Bill No. 5569  
House Bill No. 5570  
House Bill No. 5587  
House Bill No. 5588  
House Bill No. 5589  
House Bill No. 5590  
House Bill No. 5591  
House Bill No. 5592  
House Bill No. 5593  
House Bill No. 5887  
House Bill No. 5888  
House Bill No. 4665  
House Bill No. 4666  
House Bill No. 4667  
House Bill No. 6058  
House Bill No. 6088  
House Bill No. 4938  
House Bill No. 4485  
House Bill No. 4384  
House Bill No. 6075  
House Bill No. 5594  
House Bill No. 6166  
House Bill No. 4900  
House Bill No. 4901  
House Bill No. 5400  
House Bill No. 5401  
House Bill No. 5164  
House Bill No. 5165  
House Bill No. 4173  
House Bill No. 4675

House Bill No. 5269  
House Bill No. 5699  
House Bill No. 5700  
House Bill No. 5701  
House Bill No. 5702

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**

**Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 3:49 a.m.

4:25 a.m.

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

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

House Bill No. 4173  
House Bill No. 5269  
House Bill No. 4191  
House Bill No. 4192  
House Bill No. 4193  
House Bill No. 4194  
House Bill No. 6046  
House Bill No. 5825  
House Bill No. 5300  
House Bill No. 5303  
House Bill No. 4665  
House Bill No. 4666  
House Bill No. 4667  
House Bill No. 6058

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4173, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” (MCL 760.1 to 777.69) by adding section 34a to chapter IX.

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. 669**

**Yeas—21**

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

Nays—17

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

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

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protests

Senators Runestad and Albert, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4173 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:

This bill is just another attempt at another end-run around the Truth in Sentencing by just shortening the sentences just before they are handed down. Another effort to simply let more people out of prison instead of holding people accountable, preventing them from committing more crimes—let’s just let them out early when they do get convicted.

This bill would create a new bureaucracy to review sentencing guidelines. Its mandated duties under a companion bill—Senate Bill No. 377, already passed but not effective without this bill—will result in moving felons from the DOC to the jail, recommendations to reduce sentences, and recommendations to gut the Truth in Sentencing that we have here in the state of Michigan.

This bill is disguised as a way to take a look at current sentencing guidelines and their appropriateness because the Legislature doesn’t, quote, Have the time or expertise to do so, according to testimony. The commission would then submit its recommendations—which never end, it’s ongoing—to the Legislature for potential action. The new commission would be made up of 14 members, all political appointees, including the chairperson—Governor appointed—the Attorney General, and DOC Director.

Of the membership, victims can only count for sure on just two votes—one from the single police officer representing both MSA and MACP, and one from the single representative of the victim's organization. The chairperson would be appointed by the Governor, a full-time salaried employee, to run the commission—that could be anyone with a professional background in criminal law. It also allows the commission to establish subcommittees consisting of individuals not on the commission made of who knows what, experts or whatever, from within or out of the state.

Our current system is down from roughly 51,515 prisoners back in 2006, incarcerated individuals, to 32,986 as of 2023 incarcerated individuals. Clearly, we don't need this woke commission with all of the reductions we have had in prisoners already. There is also no sunset on this commission, it would just go on and on, making these suggestions in perpetuity. I urge a "no" vote.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

In my first term in the Legislature, I was serving in the House. I served on the Law and Justice Committee. This was new for me; I didn't have a background in criminal justice. I was in the Marine Corps, then went to business school and then was an analyst.

I remember having a conversation with the chair. There was some bill that was up that dealt with what the sentencing guidelines would be. I said "I don't understand, why are we differentiating it this way? If two people commit the same act, violate the same law, why is the one who happens to have some circumstances associated with it penalized more, when the other person maybe just didn't injure somebody else when they were drunk driving or what have you? They did the same thing; shouldn't they get the same penalty?" He said "No, that's just not the way it's done. We always design our penalties based on what outcomes are."

It kind of opened my eyes a little bit to how difficult it is to try to find what a just sentence is, because if you look at certain crimes, and you try and compare them to others, and it's a really imperfect process. We are fallible people, we cannot come up with a perfect and just sentencing system, and even if we could, it wouldn't be applied the same way by every judge throughout the entire state. That was one of the reasons why Truth in Sentencing was established, because the justice was so different between communities throughout our state, like we got to have some minimum standard here.

So I learned a lot, and it opened my eyes. I think as an analyst I was like "Okay let's get these numbers right, let's get them balanced, let's get some fairness here". We're never going to get perfect at it. Do we have it perfect now? No. Could we make it better? Probably, absolutely. I appreciate the sentiment behind these. We want to find where there's imbalances and make it better, I can appreciate that.

Looking into these bills, I see a history here that really needs to be considered. We have a felony sentence structure that's based on all three branches of government playing a role. Maximum term is set by the Legislature, the minimum is set by a sentencing judge. The actual time is set by the parole board, which is part of the executive branch. Back in 1983, the Michigan Supreme Court created sentencing guidelines and required their use by an administrative order. The court used these guidelines for several years before placing less reliance and emphasis on their guidelines. This change in focus led to the Legislature to get involved, and the Legislature in 1994 established the sentencing commission with directions to develop sentencing guidelines. The commission met regularly for two years before releasing their recommendations in 1997. The statutory sentencing guidelines were enacted by Public Act No. 317 of 1998 to be used for all felony offenses. The enactment of the guidelines was tie-barred to the adoption of the sentencing policy requiring the offenders serve at least the entire minimum sentence, known as Truth in Sentencing. The adoption of these legislatively created sentencing guidelines was considered to bring the system back into balance, with each branch handling their appropriate roles.

The guidelines have been amended based on circumstances or more knowledge that comes to light, or changes of opinion over the years. But then, the biggest change happened in 2015 when the Michigan Supreme Court rendered the previously mandatory sentencing guidelines advisory-only. This decision was called *People v. Lockridge*. It was applying the United States Supreme Court precedent which held that Michigan's mandatory sentencing guidelines violate the Sixth Amendment. So now, a sentencing court is free to exercise its own discretion, to depart from guidelines without having to basically give reasons as to why they do so. That's issue number one with why I am opposed to these bills, because the judges aren't going to have to follow them anyway. They're simply guidelines. The judges can have discretion to do what they want. We already have these guidelines in place.

The second reason why I am opposed, if you look at the composition of this board, there's one individual that's going to be on this board that really stands out, and it's a formerly incarcerated person. I wish there was a victim, or a victim's family member that held this place, rather than an incarcerated person. This person's not going to have a voting authority, but they are going to have the ability to be present in these meetings and try to influence the decisions made in these meetings, and I just find it inappropriate. Why would somebody who committed a crime, be able to then set what the standards are, or help set the standards? That's backwards, it should be the victims that are helping set the standards.

So those are the two reasons why I am opposed to this bill, and I encourage a "no" vote.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I'm proud to stand in support of House Bill No. 4173. I think this is an important package for the state of Michigan and I think there's been a little bit of confusion for those who might think that somehow this opposes Truth in Sentencing. I strongly disagree with that. The bill doesn't automatically reduce sentences, they don't allow people to get out of prison early. The bill is to set up a commission to study what our sentencing of criminals is. Right now, what do we usually do? A lawmaker writes a bill on a crime he thinks should exist and then they say, Oh by the way, you have to have a secondary bill with sentencing guidelines. How long should people go to jail for this crime? Should they go to prison? What should it be? What should the size of the fine be? A legislator, most of the time, says, I don't know. What do you think it should be? What's the normal rate going to be? What do other similar crimes have? That's really the extent of the expertise that usually goes into most of our sentencing bills in this state. Then we have the administration of that law by the courts and finally the execution of it by the Governor's office through the prison system. It's not a smart system. It doesn't work well. We don't know whether or not a person is more rehabilitated after 12 years or if they need 40 or if they only needed 3.

In this situation, where certainly we could have a permanent committee that would do this and we could study these things ourselves, but the truth is that our positions are pretty fluid and we're not here for all that long. We need some sort of continuity, we need longevity, and we need institutional knowledge that comes from having this commission. Other states that have Truth in Sentencing laws similar to Michigan have sentencing commissions as part of their makeup. They have permanent sentencing commissions that advise the legislature on what the proper term should be. Some of those states, maybe the commissions have power; in this one, we're not giving them power. We're just asking them to do the research, do the hard work, bring together the experts in the field, and provide for us recommendations, provide for us some guidance so that we can do our jobs better.

When we look at who gets appointed to this commission, I give a lot of credit to the ones who I've worked with, other members, and outside advocates on this issue including a former colleague of mine, Dave LaGrand. We've had this commission huge—over 20 members—we've shrunk it down, it's grown, it's shrunk as different groups want in. We can't fit everybody but I think we have a great representation of the different areas that need to be represented in these discussions. We have representatives from the Legislature, we have the Attorney General's office, we have judges from courts in small communities, we have judges from courts in large communities, from the sheriffs' association, from the State Police, from the prosecuting attorneys, and even with somebody who has been incarcerated before being represented who can offer, I think, some significant input on how the rehabilitative process has worked, we also require there be somebody representing victims' services and that is very likely if you've met folks at victims' services, somebody who is a victim of crimes.

This bill has been through a lot over the last two years and even in terms prior to this, and it's time we get this done and establish a permanent sentencing commission. I recommend a "yes" vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5269, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled "The revised school code," by amending sections 504a, 506, 525, 527, 557, 560, 1311h, and 1311k (MCL 380.504a, 380.506, 380.525, 380.527, 380.557, 380.560, 380.1311h, and 380.1311k), section 504a as amended and sections 525 and 527 as added by 2003 PA 179, section 506 as added by 1993 PA 362, sections 557 and 560 as added by 2009 PA 205, section 1311h as amended by 2012 PA 620, and section 1311k as added by 1999 PA 23.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Damoose offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 8, following line 23, by inserting:

**"Sec. 1282a. Subject to state and federal law, a school district shall post the school district's state assessment performance on the homepage of the school district's website."**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 670

Yeas—18

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Damoose offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 8, following line 23, by inserting:

**“Sec. 1232. (1) By not later than November 1 of each year, each school district shall post all of the following information on its website that is accessible to the public:**

**(a) The average salary for new teachers and the average salary for veteran teachers employed by the school district or, if there are fewer than 5 new teachers or 5 veteran teachers at the school district, the average salary for all teachers employed by the school district.**

**(b) The average salary for support staff employed by the school district.**

**(2) As used in this section:**

**(a) “New teacher” means an individual who has held a teaching certificate for less than 5 years.**

**(b) “Support staff” includes, but is not limited to, student-facing paraprofessionals, food service workers, bus drivers, and literacy coaches.**

**(c) “Veteran teacher” means an individual who has held a teaching certificate for 5 or more years.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 671

Yeas—18

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

Roll Call No. 672

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

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

“An act to provide a system of public instruction and elementary and secondary schools; to revise, consolidate, and clarify the laws relating to elementary and secondary education; to provide for the organization, regulation, and maintenance of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to prescribe rights, powers, duties, and privileges of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to provide for the regulation of school teachers and certain other school employees; to provide for school elections and to prescribe powers and duties with respect thereto; to provide for the levy and collection of taxes; to provide for the borrowing of money and issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to establish a fund and provide for expenditures from that fund; to make appropriations for certain purposes; to

provide for and prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, the state board of education, and certain other boards and officials; to provide for licensure of boarding schools; to prescribe penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protest**

Senator Damoose, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5269.

Senator Damoose’s statement is as follows:

I find it interesting that while the majority has been putting charter schools under a microscope, they’ve also been giving teacher unions unchecked power to do whatever they want.

I am all for financial transparency, but I ask this: Why only charter schools? Why aren’t we extending the same transparency requirements to all schools that require public dollars? I wager that that is because this is not about transparency at all. The real targets are alternatives to traditional public schools, like homeschooling and charter schools, and this yet is another example of the majority going after the kinds of schools they just don’t like.

Charters as a whole have performed better than their counterparts and have provided a major benefit to the communities that house them and the students who attend them. That is well documented. If we are aiming for transparency, then all schools should be subject to the same level of scrutiny. But if the only option in this majority’s eyes is picking and choosing who the state goes after, I’d suggest we better use those costs with teaching our children better no matter what the schools are.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Damoose’s first statement is as follows:

If transparency is really the goal of these bills, and they are not actually intended to close the doors of charter schools, then we should ensure transparency for all schools and it should be transparency that benefits all parents and students. My amendment simply requires all public schools—not just charter schools—to post their annual assessment data so parents have a better understanding of how their schools are performing.

I ask support of this simple common sense, yet important, transparency measure.

Senator Damoose’s second statement is as follows:

If these bills are truly about transparency and not actually intended to close the doors of charter schools, then what’s good for the goose is surely good for the gander. Do we really believe traditional public school parents deserve less information about their schools than charter school parents?

My amendment requires all public schools to post the more detailed salary data that this bill currently only requires of charter schools. Of course, if these bills were really about transparency and better governance of charter schools, why we wouldn’t be rushing them through at the last minute during lame duck? There certainly would be no controversy about applying the same requirements to all public schools.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4191, entitled**

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 307 (MCL 257.307), as amended by 2020 PA 376.

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. 673**

**Yeas—20**

Anthony  
Bayer

Chang  
Cherry

Klinefelt  
McCann

Polehanki  
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

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. 4192, entitled**

A bill to amend 1953 PA 232, entitled “Corrections code of 1953,” by amending section 34c (MCL 791.234c), as added by 2012 PA 24.

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. 674**

**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

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

“An act to revise, consolidate, and codify the laws relating to probationers and probation officers, to pardons, reprieves, commutations, and paroles, to the administration of correctional institutions, correctional farms, and probation recovery camps, to prisoner labor and correctional industries, and to the supervision and inspection of local jails and houses of correction; to provide for the siting of correctional facilities; to create a state department of corrections, and to prescribe its powers and duties; to provide for the transfer to and vesting in said department of powers and duties vested by law in certain other state boards, commissions, and officers, and to abolish certain boards, commissions, and offices the powers and duties of which are transferred by this act; to allow for the operation of certain facilities by private entities; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain other state departments and agencies; to provide for the creation of a local lockup advisory board; to provide for a lifetime electronic monitoring program; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; to make certain appropriations; to repeal certain parts of this act on specific dates; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4193, entitled**

A bill to amend 1972 PA 222, entitled “An act to provide for an official personal identification card; to provide for its form, issuance and use; to regulate the use and disclosure of information obtained from the card; to prescribe the powers and duties of the secretary of state; to prescribe fees; to prescribe certain penalties for violations; and to provide an appropriation for certain purposes,” by amending section 1 (MCL 28.291), as amended by 2021 PA 105.

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. 675

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:

**House Bill No. 4194, entitled**

A bill to amend 2008 PA 23, entitled “Enhanced driver license and enhanced official state personal identification card act,” by amending section 5 (MCL 28.305), as amended by 2021 PA 106.

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. 676**

**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

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

“An act to authorize the secretary of state to issue enhanced driver licenses and state personal identification cards to United States citizens who reside in Michigan to facilitate travel between the United States and Canada; to establish certain funds and prescribe duties for certain officials; and to prohibit certain conduct and prescribe penalties.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 4191, 4192, 4193 and 4194.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

Not having sufficient time to conduct due diligence, I will be voting “no.”

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 6046, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding sections 89 and 89a.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Albert offered the following amendment:

- 1. Amend page 5, following line 11, by inserting:

“Enacting section 2. This amendatory act does not take effect unless Senate Bill No. 184 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 677**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

**Protest**

Senator Camilleri, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against adoption of the amendment offered by Senator Albert to House Bill No. 6046 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 Camilleri’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, it is now 5:17 a.m. in the morning and we’re here with a proposal that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know has not been vetted by committee. There were no hearings, there was no discourse, it was introduced in fiscal year 2023—that was a year ago. People are sleeping right now and Christmas is a week from now. We need to ensure we have proper debate over our appropriations bills.

In all seriousness, we could have had a debate about appropriations but House Republicans walked off the job. They left the chamber on the other side of the Capitol Building and said they threw their hands in the air and didn’t want to invest in school safety grants which we could have agreed on. They did not want to invest in additional supports for public safety or public universities or community colleges. Hundreds of millions of dollars that we could have closed the books on, but House Republicans walked off the job. That is something we should all be in agreement upon because we could be debating this amendment as we speak.

I ask for a “no” vote, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

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. 678**

**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

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

“An act to protect the welfare of the people of this state; to provide general assistance, hospitalization, infirmary and medical care to poor or unfortunate persons; to provide for compliance by this state with the social security act; to provide protection, welfare and services to aged persons, dependent children, the blind, and the permanently and totally disabled; to administer programs and services for the prevention and treatment of delinquency, dependency and neglect of children; to create a state department of social services; to prescribe the powers and duties of the department; to provide for the interstate and intercounty transfer of dependents; to create county and district departments of social services; to create within certain county departments, bureaus of social aid and certain divisions and offices thereunder; to prescribe the powers and duties of the departments, bureaus and officers; to provide for appeals in certain cases; to prescribe the powers and duties of the state department with respect to county and district departments; to prescribe certain duties of certain other state departments, officers, and agencies; to make an appropriation; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on specific dates,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

I rise to request your support for my amendment. Investing in community violence prevention is a worthy endeavor, so let’s make sure we’re putting our state’s money and resources in the best places to keep our communities and children safe. My amendment adds a tie-bar which would invest \$1 billion—connect it to a \$1 billion supplemental—to address safety concerns at K-12 schools, universities, and community colleges and work to provide prosecutors with tools they need to reduce caseloads.

I think we could all agree that ensuring school and community safety is a worthy endeavor. I ask for a “yes” vote on my amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5825, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 3406jj.

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. 679**

**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

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

“An act to revise, consolidate, and classify the laws relating to the insurance and surety business; to regulate the incorporation or formation of domestic insurance and surety companies and associations and the admission of foreign and alien companies and associations; to provide their rights, powers, and immunities and to prescribe the conditions on which companies and associations organized, existing, or authorized under this act may exercise their powers; to provide the rights, powers, and immunities and to prescribe the conditions on which other persons, firms, corporations, associations, risk retention groups, and purchasing groups engaged in an insurance or surety business may exercise their powers; to provide for the imposition of a privilege fee on domestic insurance companies and associations and the state accident fund; to provide

for the imposition of a tax on the business of foreign and alien companies and associations; to provide for the imposition of a tax on risk retention groups and purchasing groups; to provide for the imposition of a tax on the business of surplus line agents; to provide for the imposition of regulatory fees on certain insurers; to provide for assessment fees on certain health maintenance organizations; to modify tort liability arising out of certain accidents; to provide for limited actions with respect to that modified tort liability and to prescribe certain procedures for maintaining those actions; to require security for losses arising out of certain accidents; to provide for the continued availability and affordability of automobile insurance and homeowners insurance in this state and to facilitate the purchase of that insurance by all residents of this state at fair and reasonable rates; to provide for certain reporting with respect to insurance and with respect to certain claims against uninsured or self-insured persons; to prescribe duties for certain state departments and officers with respect to that reporting; to provide for certain assessments; to establish and continue certain state insurance funds; to modify and clarify the status, rights, powers, duties, and operations of the nonprofit malpractice insurance fund; to provide for the departmental supervision and regulation of the insurance and surety business within this state; to provide for regulation over worker’s compensation self-insurers; to provide for the conservation, rehabilitation, or liquidation of unsound or insolvent insurers; to provide for the protection of policyholders, claimants, and creditors of unsound or insolvent insurers; to provide for associations of insurers to protect policyholders and claimants in the event of insurer insolvencies; to prescribe educational requirements for insurance agents and solicitors; to provide for the regulation of multiple employer welfare arrangements; to create an automobile theft prevention authority to reduce the number of automobile thefts in this state; to prescribe the powers and duties of the automobile theft prevention authority; to provide certain powers and duties upon certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to provide for an appropriation; to repeal acts and parts of acts; and to provide penalties for the violation of this act,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5300, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 288, entitled “Probate code of 1939,” by amending sections 1 and 3 of chapter XI (MCL 711.1 and 711.3), section 1 as amended by 2020 PA 40 and section 3 as added by 2000 PA 111.

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. 680**

**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

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 certain aspects of the family division of circuit court, to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the family division of circuit court and its judges and other officers, to the change of name of adults and children, and to the adoption of adults and children; to prescribe certain jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the family division of circuit court and its judges and other officers; to prescribe the manner and time within which certain actions and proceedings may be brought in the family division of the circuit court; to prescribe pleading, evidence, practice, and procedure in certain actions and proceedings in the family division of circuit court; to provide for appeals from certain actions in the family division of circuit court; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, agencies, and officers; to provide for certain immunity from liability; and to provide remedies and penalties,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protest**

Senator Runestad, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5300 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, this bill seeks to amend the name-change petition process but fails to include critical safeguards to ensure a person’s criminal history follows them when they petition the court for a name change. For example, if someone is charged with an offense or is subject to an extreme risk protection order prohibiting them from purchasing or possessing a firearm, their criminal history must transfer to and be connected with their new name. This connection requires the involvement of the Michigan State Police which serves as a repository for criminal history records in Michigan. Without this safeguard, someone previously prohibited from firearm possession could exploit a name change to legally acquire one.

The same concern applies to individuals prohibited from obtaining certain licenses such as becoming a police officer or supervising vulnerable populations in a setting like day care or senior homes. Without proper safeguards, these prohibitions could be circumvented, putting the public at risk. While the bill’s language on page 2, line 9, suggests a court “may use L.E.I.N. or ICHAT to determine whether there is a criminal record,” this provision is inadequate. It provides no clear responsibility or guidance to the court on how to handle cases with pending charges or existing criminal history. Additionally, ICHAT, the publicly-accessible platform, does not include all offenses on an individual’s certified criminal history record, especially those that would disqualify someone from prohibited activities.

As drafted this bill undermines the efforts of the 102nd session, particularly regarding the Democrats’ virtue signaling about firearms legislation. The Democrats virtue signal but here is a real opportunity to make sure we work with law enforcement to safeguard vulnerable populations and stop this bill’s loophole that endangers the public, but the Democrats don’t care. They just want to smash everything through tonight.

For these reasons, I urge a “no” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5303, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2831 and 2872 (MCL 333.2831 and 333.2872), section 2831 as amended by 2024 PA 25.

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. 681**

**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

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

“An act to protect and promote the public health; to codify, revise, consolidate, classify, and add to the laws relating to public health; to provide for the prevention and control of diseases and disabilities; to provide for the classification, administration, regulation, financing, and maintenance of personal, environmental, and other health services and activities; to create or continue, and prescribe the powers and duties of, departments, boards, commissions, councils, committees, task forces, and other agencies; to prescribe the powers and duties of governmental entities and officials; to regulate occupations, facilities, and agencies affecting the public health; to regulate health maintenance organizations and certain third party administrators and insurers; to provide for the imposition of a regulatory fee; to provide for the levy of taxes against certain health facilities or agencies; to promote the efficient and economical delivery of health care services, to provide for the appropriate utilization of health care facilities and services, and to provide for the closure of hospitals or consolidation of hospitals or services; to provide for the collection and use of data and information; to provide for the transfer of property; to provide certain immunity from liability; to regulate and prohibit the sale and offering for sale of drug paraphernalia under certain circumstances; to provide for the implementation of federal law; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide for sanctions for violations of this act and local ordinances; to provide for an appropriation and supplements; to repeal certain acts and parts of acts; to repeal certain parts of this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on specific dates,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protests

Senator Nesbitt, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 5300 and 5303.

Senator Nesbitt’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I’ve done a fair amount of talking this evening and this morning, I guess, so as I rise to oppose this package of bills and this ridiculous process the majority is undertaking right now, I thought I’d let others do the talking for me: “Lame duck is not the time to pass complicated legislation that impacts millions of Michiganders.” “Lame duck sessions have unfortunately produced policies that do not receive a full vetting and would do considerable damage in our state.” “Michigan’s lame duck session is why voters hate politics.” “What has happened in lame duck has set a stage that is not a good environment for working together.”

These quotes were from, in order, the Senators from the 1st District, 3rd District, 21st District, and lastly, the Senate Majority Leader.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4665, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” by amending sections 3 and 4 (MCL 38.1603 and 38.1604), as amended by 2018 PA 674.

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Albert offered the following amendment:  
1. Amend page 10, following line 13, by inserting:  
    “(c) Senate Bill No. 496.”.  
The question being on the adoption of the amendment,  
Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.  
The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.  
The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 682**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Albert offered the following amendment:  
1. Amend page 10, following line 13, by inserting:  
    “(c) House Bill No. 4605.  
    (d) House Bill No. 4606.”.  
The question being on the adoption of the amendment,  
Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.  
The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.  
The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 683**

**Yeas—18**

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

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

Roll Call No. 684

Yeas—25

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

Nays—13

Albert	Hauck	Lauwers	Outman
Bellino	Hoitenga	Lindsey	Runestad
Bumstead	Johnson	Nesbitt	Theis
Daley			

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 Michigan department of state police retirement system; to create certain reserves and certain funds for this retirement system; to provide for the creation of a retirement board within the department of technology, management, and budget; to prescribe the powers and duties of the retirement board; to prescribe the powers and duties of the department of state police, the department of technology, management, and budget, and certain state officers; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,”  
The Senate agreed to the full title.

### Protest

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4665 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

Before I read my speech, I think it’s of note to highlight—I received an email on October 30 when we were contemplating the Senate bills that were the same version of this. I’ll read the email. I haven’t heard that anything has changed from the position. So it says, Good morning Senators—I should also note, I’m not going to read everybody’s name, but it seems that all 38 members are listed on here. So, “Good morning Senators, as you contemplate your vote on Senate Bill Nos. 165-167, please know that MSP has significant concerns with these bills and we’re kindly asking you vote ‘no’ on the upcoming bills.” I just wanted to put that in the record.

The well-being of the dedicated men and women serving as corrections officers in Michigan prisons has been a priority of mine since joining the Legislature. There is no question we must do more to help recruitment and retention efforts to improve conditions for these officers, and the other state employees covered in this legislative package. Something must be done. It is clear that there are significant retention issues and it is causing critical staffing shortages, particularly for corrections officers. But this proposal—while well-intentioned—is not the solution. To think that an employee is going to gut out 20 years at a job that mandates overtime and does not pay well, relative to other jobs with significantly less risk, for a pension is an oversimplification. For starters, I contend we would see much more success in improving retention through wage increases for these officers, who are a critical component of our public safety.

The Legislature does not set corrections officer pay—that is bargained by the executive branch and Michigan Corrections Organization. But the Legislature could encourage higher wages by setting aside money to pay for one within the state budget process. Based on preliminary estimates my office has received, setting aside roughly \$25 million to \$50 million could support corrections officer pay raises of between five and ten percent. We also should consider changes that would address employee wellness, and potentially waive some of the college credit completion requirements for being a corrections officer.

A pension may be appealing, but it’s not enough when everything else about the job is grueling. I’m not going to say a pension means nothing, but to think it is everything is to miss the bigger picture. What is going to happen if this proposal becomes law and we find no improvement in staffing recruitment or retention in 1, 5 or even 10 years? Employees very well may see no difference in staffing rates and wages will then be constrained by growing unfunded liabilities. This proposal would move corrections officers, conservation officers and others into the Michigan State Police Retirement System. Over the long run, this plan increases risk for both the Michigan taxpayer and the State Troopers already in the fund.

Before getting into the specifics of this bill package, it is worth noting that I also have dedicated a good portion of my time in the Legislature to helping ensure our public retirement systems are adequately funded upfront. I have personally negotiated billions of new dollars into pension funds and worked on numerous reforms to improve the structure of the funds—adding sustainability. In 2019, when Governor Whitmer and her administration raided the public-school employee pension system by erroneously lowering its payroll growth assumption, I pushed back and defended the fund. Even our Attorney General agreed that the administration’s maneuvering was in violation of state statute. It would have shortchanged the pension fund by hundreds of millions of dollars over time. I worked to right that wrong and improve the system’s health for two main reasons. First, we have an obligation to ensure that employees in these systems receive the benefits they expect and deserve in retirement. Secondly, we also have an obligation to make sure these systems are affordable and sustainable for taxpayers. We must not burden our children and grandchildren with future debt they did not create. Unfortunately, this system was again raided this year with the erroneous interpretation of there being two contribution floors, which resulted in \$670 million being diverted from the pension this year alone.

It’s important that policymakers and the taxpayers they represent know the true costs of pension and retiree health systems. For example, in the 2023-2024 fiscal year alone, our state spent an estimated \$229 million of just the corrections budget on legacy costs alone. We need to know the extent of these costs in order to make better decisions moving forward, which is why I believe the Democrats did taxpayers a disservice when they removed the bill sections from department budgets identifying how much these legacy costs are.

One might ask, What can happen when information on faltering public pensions is ignored? You don’t have to look far to see the consequences. It happened in Detroit roughly ten years ago. Retirees had their pension benefits reduced, and cost-of-living adjustments were eliminated. Many retirees were also stuck with previously unexpected health care costs. This was the result of poor planning and management, and we have an obligation to prevent situations like this from happening again.

We have made improvements in recent years to avoid this same situation from occurring at the state level, but there is still a long, long way to go. Michigan's pension systems still face massive debt. The last audited reports I have seen show the state owes roughly an aggregate \$40 billion of retirement debt. We pay billions annually to help offset that debt. We cannot afford anything that might move our state backwards on this issue. When trying to get out of a hole, it does not make sense to start digging deeper.

While the State Police pension system has improved in recent years, the fund is still in less than ideal financial shape. The most recent audited financial report I have seen, shows the troopers' retirement system being about 66 percent funded with nearly \$1.2 billion in unfunded liabilities. I was glad to spearhead a \$100 million principal deposit in the last legislative session, but it has a long way to go. To put it bluntly, it is nowhere near healthy enough to start making a material expansion.

There are no shortage of historical examples illustrating how cost estimates on running a healthy pension system are massively underestimated. In fact, a well-funded pension system is the exception, not the rule. Governments have a very poor track record when it comes to this. There is nothing in this proposal which looks to learn from the experience of the past and avoid the same mistakes. We are doing the same thing and expecting different results, which is the definition of insanity.

I can tell you from experience, both from actually working at the state pension fund and working on pension legislation while serving in the Legislature, the future financial risks to current state troopers is being underestimated. First and foremost, I agree with this bill's advocates that new employees who are proposed to enter into this system will be in a differing unit than the existing employees—that is true, and it does separate the bank accounts, if you will—but that does not isolate how the risks are applied in the event of unfunded liabilities going forward. I'll give an example. Let's say the discount rate that is used to calculate the payment of a corrections officer who has 15 years of service is 6 percent. They will be given a specific amount needed to purchase their years of service to transfer into the fund. If the actual investment returns that are experienced over the next 10 years are only 4 percent, then the estimates are wrong, and it will cost more to pay that employee's pension than expected. That creates more debt. This debt will be spread out over all employees in the system, including the state troopers who receive no benefit from this proposal. I presented this scenario in committee to the director of the Office of Retirement Services and they confirmed its accuracy. We are adding risk to those who receive no benefit and this is unfair.

This proposal unnecessarily adds risk to the state police retirement system. At a very minimum, if we are going to add state employees back into the pension system, it is much more prudent to do so in the State Employees Retirement System. This will avoid a situation where existing state troopers are responsible to pay for unfunded liabilities created by this proposal.

On top of that, there is another aspect of this bill package that is unfair. New hires going forward will not be given a choice on which type of retirement they can elect. They will be forced into the pension system. There is no reason to prevent them from having a choice between managing their own retirement or deferring to the state because the defined contribution style 401(k) is already in place. I know this can be done because public school employees are currently able to make this choice for themselves. At a minimum, this new pension system should be an option and not a mandate. For whatever reason, a number of employees will prefer to manage their own money and there is no reason to take that option away from them.

The good news is that we have other ways to address these concerns. I have offered an alternative plan to help these officers. This plan makes reforms to improve our current system rather than simply moving back to the failed policies of the past. My plan would address the issue of these employees not saving enough in their 401(k) accounts and offer a defined benefit option for those who want one. The 401(k) employee match increases are more than tripled after a 5-year phase-in. This will increase the 401(k) contributions from up to 10 percent of an employee's paycheck to up to 24 percent. Additionally, if an employee wants a defined benefit income, they would be able to select an annuity provider to do so, receiving a guaranteed income from a highly regulated provider which is held to much higher scrutiny than a state funded pension. Additionally, this plan would provide corrections officers and others covered in this legislative package up to \$10,000 in retention bonuses split up over a four-year period. This addresses the staffing and retirement problems while being less expensive and more sustainable over the long run.

I must vote "no" on this legislative package as it is presented today. I ask my colleagues to do the same, and support the alternative I have proposed.

Senators Albert 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 Albert's first statement is as follows:

This bill seeks to open the Michigan State Police Retirement System to corrections officers, conservation law enforcement officers, and other public servants. We are told that it is meant to provide more incentives in order to recruit professionals to these careers. It's no secret, particularly when it comes to our corrections

officers, that Michigan is losing to our neighbors when it comes to recruiting and we need to do work to help get more public servants in place who go in harm’s way each and every shift. Thankfully, we do have amazing, dedicated corrections officers that are at work, even right now. Unfortunately, the vast majority of them work in understaffed situations and face mandatory overtime situations far too often.

My amendment will build upon the incentive package for those who seek out these careers in Michigan by providing a significant bonus structure to those who serve faithfully in these roles after their first two years. I ask for a “yes” vote on my amendment, which is a tie-bar to a bill I’ve previously introduced to not only make Michigan more competitive in this arena, but more importantly, a place where corrections officers can afford to call home and raise their families.

Senator Albert’s second statement is as follows:

My amendment simply seeks to ensure that we provide vital public safety funding to our local police departments in addition to these incentives designed to recruit public servants. It’s important that we work to keep our local communities safe by investing in all the units of our public safety personnel. I ask for a “yes” vote on my amendment.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, as you and many of the members are probably aware, I’ve spoken many times about our situation at Corrections and how I feel about the current management and the situation we’re in. We are in a crisis mode at so many of our facilities—a crisis that, I believe, this bill helps to address. I certainly agree with the previous speaker that it doesn’t address all of the problems. We need immediate triage that only the administration can do. We need short-term repair to wages to make us competitive with other states, but we also need long-term advantages and competitive benefits for our employees to be enticed to stay in Michigan as well. This gives us that long-term part. There’s more to be done and hopefully next term we’ll have that chance, but right now is our chance to at least reach out to these hardworking men and women who do a dangerous job to keep us safe every day, who right now are being forced to work double shifts, who are being forced to violate the 32-hour rule repeatedly, for being called in, missing family events, spending all their free time just driving home, getting some food, going to sleep, get in the shower, getting back on the road, driving back to work again, having no other time in their schedule.

We offer crappy benefits, terrible pay. While the previous speaker, I think, certainly has exceptional knowledge and understanding of how the pension systems works and the problems that we have government-funded pensions, because why? Because the Legislature is a very undependable body and fails in its obligations repeatedly. We have at least shown and demonstrated over the years some diligence in our obligations to public safety folks. Our officers at Corrections are part of that team, part of that public safety team that keeps us safe, and we have to continue that pledge. We have a responsibility to make sure the public stays and remains safe, and that the state employees who do that are well taken care of.

This is a good first step in getting us there. While it certainly is not without the risks of future Legislatures being less than diligent in that responsibility, we have to hope that they will be and as they have been with the State Police so far. I ask for a “yes” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4666, entitled**

A bill to amend 1943 PA 240, entitled “State employees’ retirement act,” by amending section 55 (MCL 38.55), as amended by 2011 PA 264, and by adding sections 50b, 50c, 50d, 64a, 64b, and 64c.

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. 685**

**Yeas—25**

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

Nays—13

Albert	Hauck	Lauwers	Outman
Bellino	Hoitenga	Lindsey	Runestad
Bumstead	Johnson	Nesbitt	Theis
Daley			

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 a state employees’ retirement system; to create a state employees’ retirement board and prescribe its powers and duties; to establish certain funds in connection with the retirement system; to require contributions to the retirement system by and on behalf of members and participants of the retirement system; to create certain accounts and provide for expenditures from those accounts; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local officers and employees and certain state departments and agencies; to prescribe and make appropriations for the retirement system; and to prescribe penalties and provide remedies,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4667, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” (MCL 38.1601 to 38.1674) by adding sections 24c, 24d, 24e, and 24f.

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. 686

Yeas—25

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

Nays—13

Albert	Hauck	Lauwers	Outman
Bellino	Hoitenga	Lindsey	Runestad
Bumstead	Johnson	Nesbitt	Theis
Daley			

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 Michigan department of state police retirement system; to create certain reserves and certain funds for this retirement system; to provide for the creation of a retirement board within the department of technology, management, and budget; to prescribe the powers and duties of the retirement board; to prescribe the powers and duties of the department of state police, the department of technology, management, and budget, and certain state officers; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,”  
The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protests

Senator Lauwers, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 4665, 4666 and 4667.  
Senator Lauwers’ statement is as follows:  
Just a brief “no” vote explanation here, and I do mean brief. It’s really a personal story of my experience as an employer and a hard lesson I had to learn years ago. I was pretty proud of myself that day. I just explained to all my employees how we had increased their benefits, and one of my younger employees who had two young children at home—younger than that, he was probably in his late-20s or early-30s, something like that—stopped me just outside the office afterwards and said, I think I’m going to have to quit. I thought, what are you talking about? I felt so good, I just increased your benefits—better retirement, better health care. And he said, Yeah, I wish you’d quit giving me more benefits and just raise my pay. He said, I cant feed my kids with benefits, I need money now.  
I really think that if we wanted to solve this issue—we seem so hung up on this retirement thing, and I think that has a lot to do with people who make money in that system more than it has to do with the actual employees. If we want to recruit more people, if we want to attract more people, you have to give them a raise. Let’s consider increasing the wages 25 percent, 50 percent. That’s how we bring more people to it, and that’s how you make the job look like something you really want to get into and stay in.  
So, I just put that out there to my colleagues. I hope that—I think this may help, but I really don’t think it’s going to solve the issue. I think we’ve got to come back to this issue next session and we really need to discuss compensating people fairly, at least to a level where you can compete with the states around you and the other alternatives these individuals have.

The following bill was read a third time:  
**House Bill No. 6058, entitled**  
A bill to amend 2011 PA 152, entitled “Publicly funded health insurance contribution act,” by amending the title and sections 3, 4, and 5 (MCL 15.563, 15.564, and 15.565), section 3 as amended by 2018 PA 477, section 4 as amended by 2013 PA 271, and section 5 as amended by 2013 PA 272, and by adding sections 3a and 4a.  
The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:  
1. Amend page 3, following line 14, by inserting:  
“(4) A public employer shall not increase its contribution to the medical benefit plan of a legislator who becomes a local official after voting on this bill or has other conflict of interests.”  
The question being on the adoption of the amendment,  
Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.  
The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.  
The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 687

Yeas—17

Albert	Hauck	Lauwers	Outman
Bellino	Hoitenga	Lindsey	Runestad

Bumstead  
Daley  
Damoose

Huizenga  
Johnson

McBroom  
Nesbitt

Victory  
Webber

Nays—20

Anthony  
Bayer  
Brinks  
Camilleri  
Cavanagh

Chang  
Cherry  
Geiss  
Hertel  
Irwin

Klinefelt  
McCann  
McDonald Rivet  
McMorrow  
Moss

Polehanki  
Santana  
Shink  
Singh  
Wojno

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Theis

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Daley offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 7, following line 11, by inserting:

**“Sec. 5a. A public employer shall provide coverage for fertility diagnostic care, fertility treatment, and standard fertility preservation services, including in-vitro fertilization and standard fertility preservation services.”**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Point of Order

Senator Singh raised the Point of Order that House Bill No. 6058 amends the publicly funded health insurance contribution act. Because the act does not address these types of covered medical care, this offered amendment isn’t germane to the bill.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, ruled that the offered amendment is not germane.

Senator Hauck offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 3, following line 14, by inserting:

**“(4) A local unit of government that increases local wages above the statewide minimum wage must increase its contribution to the medical benefit plan to 100%.”**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 688

Yeas—18

Albert  
Bellino  
Bumstead  
Daley  
Damoose

Hauck  
Hoitenga  
Huizenga  
Johnson  
Lauwers

Lindsey  
McBroom  
Nesbitt  
Outman

Runestad  
Theis  
Victory  
Webber

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Albert offered the following amendment:

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

**“(4) Notwithstanding subsections (1) and (2), a public employer’s contribution under this section must not exceed the maximum amount small business employers contribute in each applicable year. A public employer that increases its contribution above the maximum amount small business employers contribute in any applicable year must post notice of the increase on its website.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 689

Yeas—18

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Albert offered the following amendment:

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

**“(4) This section does not apply to an employee who does not comply with federal immigration law or actively enables government censorship in a manner that is contrary to the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.”.**

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

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

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

**Roll Call No. 690**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 7, following line 11, by inserting:

**“Sec. 5a. Beginning on the effective date of the amendatory act that added this section, a public employer that is a school district, a public school academy, or an intermediate school district, as those terms are defined in sections 4 to 6 of the revised school code, 1976 PA 451, MCL 380.4 to 380.6, shall pay 100% of the employees’ medical benefits.”.**

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

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

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

**Roll Call No. 691**

**Yeas—18**

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.  
The motion prevailed.  
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 692

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

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:  
“An act to limit a public employer’s expenditures for employee medical benefit plans; to provide the power and duties of certain state agencies and officials; to provide for exceptions; and to provide for sanctions,”  
The Senate agreed to the full title.

### Protests

Senators Albert, Daley, McBroom, Runestad, Bellino, Lindsey and Nesbitt, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 6058.

Senators Albert, Daley, McBroom and Runestad moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

I think the best way I can get the discussion going for this bill proposal here is, I have a couple communications I’ve received from different parts of education we have in this state. The first is a letter from the Michigan Association of State Universities. It’s entitled, “VOTE NO on HB 6058, SB 1129 and SB 1130.” Those last two aren’t up for right now. It says, “80/20 Employer Health Insurance Mandates Will Drive Up Costs for Students and Families.” The letter starts

Dear Michigan State Lawmaker:

I am writing today to convey MASU’s strong opposition to HB 6058 . . . all of which would drastically increase costs to state universities, and ultimately, the students they serve. These bills, if enacted, would not only eliminate the current cap in state law on the portion of employee health care that a public employer must pay for (currently 80%); they would in fact flip this cost constraint on its head and turn it into an 80% floor for employer contributions.

In FY 2024, the 15 state universities spend \$502 million on employee health insurance—a figure equal to 31% of the entire state appropriation to university operations. These bills will drive up costs to universities by tens of millions of dollars. The universities have done their best for over twenty years to maintain affordability for students and families despite being down \$1.2 billion in adjusted state appropriations to university operations since FY2002. Such a policy would have to be paid for through some mechanisms, including additional costs to students and families, and reduced health insurance benefits to employees, thus hurting the intended goal of this legislation.

Michigan’s public universities are large, complex, and require multiyear budget models to ensure that they provide high quality education to students in a stable and efficient manner. They require flexibility in negotiating, implementing, and paying for what is a major expenditure. A mid-year cost increase to the universities with no advance warning or implementation period would be unbudgeted, unfunded, and untenable.

We strongly urge that this legislation is not taken up during the remaining hours of this session, and if it is, to vote no. However, if the employer health insurance coverage mandate is enacted, the state must provide additional offsetting operations support to the universities or risk increased costs to Michigan students.

That’s the universities’ side of it. I also, without being asked, was sent an e-mail from one of my superintendents today in my K-12 district. I’m not going to read the whole e-mail, but I am going to read a paragraph of it, and I’m not going to read the specific school district—I don’t think we need to single someone out.

[My school district] serves many students who are already struggling academically and facing profound social-emotional challenges. These are children who rely heavily on the critical resources we provide—whether it’s access to small class sizes, mental health support, or after-school programming. If this legislation proceeds without supplemental funding, we will be forced to make decisions that will directly impact these services, further jeopardizing the success and well-being of our students. They cannot afford to lose any more of the support they depend on.

While I support the effort to provide relief to provide relief for rising health care costs for employees, this must not come at the expense of our children’s education. Placing this burden on school districts mid-year is untenable and risks destabilizing the very systems designed to support the most vulnerable members of our community.

I find it very interesting that two people who I have to suspect have never spoken to each other ever before—I have no reason to believe these two people know each other—the word they used in common in both of these communications was untenable. It’s nice to have a talking point. We’re going to help the

employees, this is great. Guess what, it's a zero-sum game. Finance is a zero-sum game when it comes to this. If we're going to increase costs, they're going to have to be made up somewhere else. At least to do this on the universities, they can increase costs for the students. That doesn't work for K-12. What do they do? They just have to cut costs. They have to cut services. First they'll start going through support services, start cutting custodial staff, start cutting staff and doing contracted services if that's cheaper, if they can save money that way. Maybe cutting some programming. If they still can't make up the deficit, what comes next? Now you start laying off staff. It's not going to be good for students. This is not going to be helping student outcomes. This is not good policy. I can't help but think there's a shift that's really starting to accelerate. The public is really starting to trust Republicans more than Democrats on education. I don't want to oversimplify it. I know my colleagues across the aisle genuinely want to improve student outcomes. I know that's true. I want to believe that, but it's not reflected in this bill. This bill is putting union interests first. I wish I could stay up here and speak for 24 hours—I wish I could filibuster this—but unfortunately it's already 6:30 in the morning, I've been speaking for a lot tonight—I should say this morning, I've been speaking a lot over this whole session. This is bad policy. This cost-sharing thing has worked very well. I haven't even gotten into the local government side of it. This applies to more than just schools. It applies to our local governments as well, which is a huge employer for our state. It also pertains to the state government itself so this is going to have a General Fund impact if it actually gets signed into law.

All of this stuff we're voting on, this one especially, I think it's very possible we could start next year out with a budget imbalance. We just saw yesterday the Federal Reserve came out and announced a quarter-point rate cut but they also lowered their projections from four rate cuts next year to two, and you saw the markets react. There was a 3 percent drop in the S&P 500. I don't like to take a single data point and extrapolate that one single snippet over the whole next year—I don't want to do that—but I think it's always best to hope for the best and plan for the worst. Boy, if we come out with the CREC being slightly down next year and we pass all of stuff like this, we're really walking on thin ice. It's not prudent, it's not good for students in my district, and I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Senator Daley's statement is as follows:

There's so many reasons, as you can tell by the list up here, to oppose this bill. I am married to a schoolteacher, and back when we passed this piece of legislation, I supported it. It cost us money out of our home income when she had to start paying a part of it, but she had to have some skin in the game. Teachers didn't know what they were paying for insurance, and didn't care because it was covered 100%. We had to do this.

There's a lot of other members that can talk about those type of issues, but another reason to oppose this bill, is because it's 6:30 in the flipping morning. Twenty-and-a-half hours after we started this session. The next thing is, the disgrace we're making out of this institution. Bringing legislation over here that has never been vetted in this great body. Maybe the controlling party wants to introduce a bill to go from a bicameral legislature to a unicameral legislature. It's too damn long tonight, folks, I can't even talk right. Maybe that's what we need to, because if we aren't going to do our job, it's an embarrassment. I've got so much respect for this seat and being in this room, and it should be an embarrassment for every single person in here to pass these things without having them go through a committee. I'm sure there's over a hundred of them we've worked on today. This is just one of those, and we can get up and give the same “no” vote explanation on every single one of them. So with that, we'll move on to the next person.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

When I was in the House of Representatives in my first term, this 80/20 hard cap legislation was passed. And I was a “no” vote then as well. The ironies of that are not lost on me, as it seems to be a repeated theme over the last term, where I was a “no” vote on what the Republicans did, and end up being a “no” vote to reverse what the Republicans did. Because we can't seem to find a good compromise, and a centralized good policy instead of swinging from one wild extreme to the other, which will only lead to swinging back again when the power dynamics shift. These are not sensible changes, and it's not a sensible way to govern. And whether it's wild swings with prevailing wage, or Right to Work, or ratios for union apprenticeships, or now for health care coverage for state and school employees, these are not good things to do.

We need to reform the 80/20, like I said. I voted against its enactment in the first place, because it was bad policy, but it's bad policy to just go back to the former status quo as well. That was also untenable. We need a balanced approach that recognizes the realities our schools face with funding, the realities of out-of-control inflationary pressures on insurance costs, and on the realities of the beginning wages for starting teachers, and how they are not part of the negotiations, and simply have to take the bitter pill foisted on them by those who have been in the employment for a long time, and have much higher wages to pay for those benefits. We need to find a balanced approach, something that lasts, something that can't just be swept away every time the power dynamics of the Legislature changes. I recommend a “no” vote.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

So we are here, voting on bills that have never been through committee, slopping through garbage bills that have never been through committee, not having the opportunity to ask questions to vet, to see what the unintended consequences are, the exact thing that the people here in the state of Michigan do not want to see, whatever side it is, this completely horrendous process is an outrage. And this bill in particular is an outrage, because it's going require all of these local units of government, they've been calling saying, How are we going to afford to do this? Well I'll tell you how they're going to afford to do it, it's property tax primarily, and what have we been doing tonight? Just layering on more and more and more property tax, busting these poor homeowners, and now the local units of government to pay for this, are going to have to increase the property tax. They're going to have to do everything, increase the assessments, everything, to try to stay solvent.

What, for the unions? For the people here who already voted that they want to be able to leave here and go out and get those jobs and get this for themselves? That's what was voted here today. On the other side, they want to be able to vote this for themselves and go out and get that for themselves. How are the people out there who are working and paying for their property tax, who don't get 80 percent, how many out there, the small business, they don't get a guaranteed 80 percent, but you want it for you and the unions, that's all this is about. It's an outrage. Doing this in the dead of night, with no committee process, for something for you and the unions, not the taxpayers, not for those property taxpayers that are getting screwed with all of the stuff that we've done here today. It's an outrage. I think tomorrow, when they start realizing what has been done here on this chamber tonight, screwing the taxpayers and the property owners for the Democrats and their special interests.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I have a hard time thinking about passing this because all of us great collective, paying our bills, paying our share, why do we give people a free pass? Why am I paying 20 percent of my healthcare when some retirees pay nothing? I've dropped a bill to change that a few times. Why am I paying 20 percent when some retirees pay 10 percent? Why are we making it so public workers pay nothing? Don't we pay 90 percent of their pay, 90 percent of their healthcare, 90 percent of their retirement? Why are we paying even more? When I was first elected, I would walk into superintendent meetings and I would get blamed for the state of education. It was all the Republicans fault, now I walk into these superintendent meetings and I say, How do you like it now?

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

I am having to adjust what I was going to say in this topic. This is my "no" vote explanation for House Bill No. 6058, but, I've got to give credit where credit is due to the opposition. The Majority Floor Leader obviously knew that if the chamber heard my words on this bill they would change their minds, and the Senator from the 16th District, probably, and the Republican Leader. But I will just observe that, as many have pointed out, that this bill is going to massively increase the cost associated with these benefits, and I can't believe that we haven't learned our lesson from where we were before. The state came a long way, in the time from about 2010 to, you know, the late 2010s, and all of it seems like it's being wiped away. And, we are going to back, we are going to reinstitute policies that were resulting in exorbitant costs that really led to a point where there were no option but this type of reform. The only other option was sky rocketing tax rates and finding other places to track down revenue to cover these, and I just can't believe we are going there again. We are going to be a few years down the road and we might be seeing national trends of economic growth and prosperity, and Michigan unfortunately left behind again.

The last thing I will say about this bill, and why I opposed it, is I think about the process involved in bringing forth this kind of legislation. You know, it strikes me that some of the comments I read about who was in support and who was opposing, I think that it's pretty clear that one of the primary drivers behind this is, in particular, the MEA, the Michigan Education Association. You know, it's bizarre to me that of all the education-policy related questions that have come up, I don't know if I can come across one where they have really gone to the mat and demanded change that was going to increase outcomes for our students. I mean, I get it. Right? Fight for the employees, and you know try and care for them, but that's one piece of the education ecosystem. So, when you see something like this, we know people are willing to wait it out, you know, I can't see the clock. People willing to wade it out until almost 7 a.m., overnight session, to get something that is, you know, going to have a short-term benefit, of maybe giving people a little more of a benefit, but it's certainly not going to help the students. I've never seen that sort of commitment from anybody from the education lobby to say, let's go in there and all of our force and energy behind transformational policy that's going to improve outcomes for our students. But they will certainly do that to try to, you know, drive up these costs and increase their benefits. So, for all those reasons, and many more, I oppose this legislation and I, with as much spirit as I can, protest the passage of this bill.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

Well this won't be a surprise to Michigan's taxpayers, but we have yet another bill before us that was just voted on, in a party line vote, without a hearing, without a review by our Senate Fiscal Agency, and for what? To allow government to make the taxpayers foot a larger bill for government workers. For us. The waitress at your local diner has to pay a premium and you have done nothing to save her job this time. The carpenter hammering drywall has to pay a premium. You've done nothing to fix their paid sick leave. Almost every hard-working Michigan family pays something into their healthcare. In fact, I grew up on a farm. Every year, my parents shopped around to try to find the best deal, because it's expensive. It isn't cheap. What you are asking is for those same people to keep at it, while also footing the full bill for government employees. A legislative session that is showing this Democratic majority to be completely out of touch with struggling Michigan families. I can see why you didn't want a committee to vet this proposal. I can understand why you guys voted for a \$700 million income tax increase earlier this year, while you stole \$670 million a year going forward from the teacher pension fund. Squandered a \$9 billion surplus, and here we are yet with another giveaway for tax takers at the expense of taxpayers, another advancement towards another lost decade. Yet another shining example of why people are fleeing this state under a Democratic Governor. If this was allowed to happen before the actual vote, I would have urged a "no" vote on this. This is my "no" vote explanation.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I have often stood at this podium to decry Michigan's woeful transparency and accountability standards. Earlier today, in fact, it appears FOIA reforms were one of the many victims of the Democrats' lame duck dysfunction in the House. The revolving door phenomenon is another gaping hole in our state law. Most often, that's legislators voting on bills in December and then being hired by someone who benefited from those votes in January. These bills also raise the possibility of such a conflict, which my amendment seeks to avoid. It simply says that any legislator voting in favor of this generous new benefit for public employees cannot then turn around and benefit from their vote if they become a public employee themselves.

I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment.

Senator Hauck's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, last week this chamber passed legislation that will allow local units of government to raise wages beyond the statewide minimum wage. If a local unit of government can afford such a expense, they should also be able to afford an even greater contribution to the health of their employees. My amendment will benefit local government employees in the community by requiring the local unit of government to cover 100 percent of their healthcare benefits. I ask for your support.

Senator Albert's first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, my amendment ensures fairness. I would hope we can agree on working for the government shouldn't come with benefits above and beyond what is working in the private sector just because the government can stick it to taxpayers with the bill. This amendment simply says public sector health care contribution rates should mirror the average small business contributions. I ask for my colleagues' support.

Senator Albert's second statement is as follows:

This amendment is designed to ensure that this bill does not apply to employees who are not in compliance with federal immigration laws or who actively support government censorship in ways that violate the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. We should not reward hard-earned taxpayer dollars to those who disregard our laws. I ask for a "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

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

**House Bill No. 4384**

**House Bill No. 6075**

**House Bill No. 5594**

**House Bill No. 5400**

House Bill No. 5401  
House Bill No. 5164  
House Bill No. 5165  
House Bill No. 4095  
House Bill No. 4096  
House Bill No. 5549  
House Bill No. 5659  
House Bill No. 5660

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4384, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” (MCL 760.1 to 777.69) by adding section 34b to chapter IX.

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.  
The motion prevailed.

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

**Roll Call No. 693**

**Yeas—21**

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

**Nays—17**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to revise, consolidate, and codify the laws relating to criminal procedure and to define the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of courts, judges, and other officers of the court under the provisions of this act; to provide laws relative to the rights of persons accused of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to provide for the arrest of persons charged with or suspected of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to provide for bail of persons arrested for or accused of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to provide for the examination of persons accused of criminal offenses; to regulate the procedure relative to grand juries, indictments, informations, and proceedings before trial; to provide for trials of persons complained of or

indicted for criminal offenses and ordinance violations and to provide for the procedure in those trials; to provide for judgments and sentences of persons convicted of criminal offenses and ordinance violations; to establish a sentencing commission and to prescribe its powers and duties; to provide for procedure relating to new trials and appeals in criminal and ordinance violation cases; to provide a uniform system of probation throughout this state and the appointment of probation officers; to prescribe the powers, duties, and compensation of probation officers; to provide penalties for the violation of the duties of probation officers; to provide for procedure governing proceedings to prevent crime and proceedings for the discovery of crime; to provide for fees of officers, witnesses, and others in criminal and ordinance violation cases; to set forth miscellaneous provisions as to criminal procedure in certain cases; to provide penalties for the violation of certain provisions of this act; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 6075, entitled**

A bill to amend 2012 PA 615, entitled “Michigan energy assistance act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 400.1233).

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.

The motion prevailed.

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

**Roll Call No. 694**

**Yeas—25**

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

**Nays—13**

Albert	Hauck	Lauwers	Nesbitt
Bellino	Hoitenga	Lindsey	Runestad
Bumstead	Johnson	McBroom	Theis
Daley			

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to provide energy assistance for low-income households; and to prescribe certain powers and duties of certain state departments and agencies,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

Protest

Senator Runestad, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 6075.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

So earlier this week, *MIRS* reported that Governor Gretchen Whitmer told the legislative leaders that they should not expect to see any signatures on any more bills until they have fulfilled their promises to pass certain pieces of legislation that she wanted. If that’s the case, all of this time here is a gigantic waste of the people’s time. The Governor has issued her marching orders.

There’s billions and billions of dollars the Governor wants in order to sign any of these bills, and I urge a “no” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 5594, 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,

Senator Huizenga offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 7, following line 7, by inserting:

“(4) **The department shall establish and implement digital data security protection standards for registry data involving minors that prevents the leaking of personal data of any Michigan citizen in the registry. The security data standards must be equal to or greater than those used for Amazon.com customer data. The department must yearly review and update these data security standards in order to protect the sensitive data of minors and their work locations.**”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 695

Yeas—18

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.  
The motion prevailed.  
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 696**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to provide for the legal employment and protection of minors; to provide for the issuance and revocation of work permits; to provide for the regulation of hours and conditions of employment of minors; to prescribe powers and duties of the departments of labor and education; to provide for the enforcement of this act; to prescribe penalties; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Albert, McBroom and Hoytenga, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5594.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

I do appreciate the intent here by both the bill sponsor and by 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 bill replaces this process a state-run, big-government registry. It’s requiring kids and their employers to sign up through the government for permission to get or provide a job. This is government overreach, and it is unnecessary. It’s 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 may simply choose to not participate in this registry and kids will miss out on job opportunities. If we had a rampant statewide problem of chronic violations of this act, I could get behind this registry. That, however, 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 recent high-profile cases involving violation 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 their student is ready academically to take on a job. A state bureaucrat in Lansing is not going to know a kid better than a school administrator who sees that 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 the most with this registry is the high probability that many employers will simply stop hiring minors. 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 when I was younger that having a job was extremely important. I was able to save for college, pay some expenses myself which helped my parents, and I also learned the value and dignity that come with a hard day's work. We have an entire generation of kids right now that are seeing unprecedented 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 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, and I know their intentions are genuine. That being said, I firmly believe safety can be promoted without pushing law-abiding employers away from hiring kids. There's just no need for a statewide database. And you may ask yourself, Why are some employers going to step away? Why are they just going to stop hiring kids? They don't want the state government breathing down their neck—many of whom are going to have flashbacks to state agencies that were just right there, ready to take them out during all the COVID lockdown nonsense. We've created a culture where there's this animosity between job providers and the government, and it's going to take time for that to heal. This is just opening up another wound, and it's going to make it hard for job providers to want to hire kids. It's going to set us back; it's going to set our kids back. I urge a "no" vote.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Madam President, House Bill No. 5594 proposes to create a statewide registry, proposes to enact an enormous bureaucracy, to trust a state department to be able to nimble and responsive to the individual needs and situations of our children. This is something that is just not possible for them to do. Right now, we have a system that works well, a system that has had few violations, but clearly needs reforms with higher penalties, clearly needs stronger provisions for those who are bad actors. I don't disagree with those, and I do, as my colleague who spoke beforehand, agree that there are the best of intentions going on with this legislation.

However, the difficulty of our employers to navigate this, and then to hire young people who are just learning the job field, is only going to discourage that from taking place. And over the years, we have seen dueling problems for hiring young people into the workplace. Between the state regulations that restrict the hours and the time, now the pressure put on the employers themselves, and the wages that continue, we are supposed to have a special minimum wage for younger children that's been overridden, it becomes more and more difficult for our kids to find those jobs. Especially with the increased school years that we continue to foist on them, and so many other pressures on their time and their scheduling, our kids are losing a valuable part of their growing up, and their maturing process, if they can't get into the job field. Either because the rules make it too hard for them, or the rules make it too hard for the employers to hire them, it's an unwise proposition. Especially when, in the end, it's a solution provided for something that is not that enormous of a problem. Or at least not a problem that couldn't be better addressed with simply raising the penalties and doing better enforcement on the law that we already have.

A "no" vote is the appropriate response to this, and look at reforming the current laws without creating a vast bureaucracy that will just plague an already problem-ridden system.

Senator Hoyenga's statement is as follows:

After 21 hours of voting, I'm sure LSB is as tired as we all are. But as the clerks are reading the bills, it is really highlighting the typos and the errors as these bills are being crammed through. Our institution should be so much better than this. I won't be support any bills filled with typos and errors and perhaps we should be reading all of the bills at this point.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Huizenga's statement is as follows:

My amendment aims to protect the personal data of our state's youngest workers. If we are going mandate a state-run registry, the least we can do is protect that data. According to the Attorney General's website, on

average, there is a new identity theft victim in the United States every two seconds. Protecting this sensitive information should be a priority, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.  
I ask my colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on my amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5400, entitled**

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 5, line 4, after “(c)” by striking out “**by not more than 20%**”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Singh moved that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 5, line 27, after “**that**” by striking out the balance of the subdivision and inserting “**the conduct will cause harm to another.**”.

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 5, following line 24, by inserting:

“(11) **The act of intentionally or unintentionally referencing or referring to another individual by using pronouns that are perceived to be incorrect or nonpreferred by that individual does not constitute a hate crime.**” and renumbering the remaining subsection.

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 5, following line 24, by inserting:

“(11) **An individual who makes a false report of a violation of this section is subject to prosecution as provided under section 411a.**” and renumbering the remaining subsection.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 697**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Recess

Senator Moss moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 7:49 a.m.

7:56 a.m.

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

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. 698

Yeas—20

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

Nays—18

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:  
“An act to revise, consolidate, codify, and add to the statutes relating to crimes; to define crimes and prescribe the penalties and remedies; to provide for restitution under certain circumstances; to provide for the competency of evidence at the trial of persons accused of crime; to provide immunity from prosecution for certain witnesses appearing at criminal trials; to provide for liability for damages; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act,”  
The Senate agreed to the full title.

### Protest

Senator McBroom, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5400 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

First I’d like to express my appreciation for how well this bill has been improved over its introduction, especially with the definition of true intent. These are significantly good improvements to this legislation. However, I want to draw members’ attention to one area of the bill that I do believe continues to be exceptionally problematic, and that’s on page 4, subsection (5), where it talks about how a prosecuting attorney can utilize previous offenses in the sentencing of a new offense. With all the opportunities that people who are trapped in the judiciary process find themselves, especially those who are poor, with bad attorneys, bad public defenders, who might accept a plea deal that they shouldn’t have taken, it says very specifically in (5)(b) that a transcript of a prior plea-taking would stand as a just reason to increase the sentence this time.

I think many of us have heard from our constituents, maybe even from family members, about how they were forced into taking a plea deal that they’ve regretted their whole life because it was laid out before them: either take the plea deal and get out of here in a couple months or a year, or risk going to trial and being put away for ten years. The person says, But I’m innocent, and the attorney says, You’re not going to prove that. Your best option is to take the plea deal, eat the time, get out, and get on with your life. Now all of a sudden, that very same plea deal could be what gets them a sentencing enhancement. They’re not even allowed to plead this to a jury. It’s done without a jury. It’s done upon the recommendation of the prosecutor and the judge’s discretion.

I think this is a really huge oversight in what otherwise has really been a dramatically improved bill. I have to recommend we vote “no” on this legislation.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

Thank you, Madam President, I guess I’m going to speak to all of the amendments, one after another.

The first amendment will strike the “not more than 20 percent.” This is in regards to the court’s ability to reduce a penalty. Why would we not allow a court to have the ability to reduce to a lower level if the circumstances deem appropriate? It seems to me that the court’s ability to reduce penalties if the defendant can sense as a, as it says in the section, could be very important in certain cases, and I don’t think it is wise to rule it out as this section does.

Number two, the amendment will change the definition of “reckless disregard” back to what it was in the S-1 version of a previous version of this bill. In talking with attorneys, I believe this is the language that is far stronger and more constitutional because it does not infringe upon the First Amendment. The language in the S-1, which I request here as well, reads “‘Reckless disregard’ means to consciously disregard a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the conduct will cause harm to another.” This language comes directly from the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling in *Counterman v. Colorado* where the justices said that a definition is the appropriate mens rea, or intent. The language in this current version reads “‘Reckless disregard’ means a consciously disregarding a substantial or unjustified risk that a statement will be viewed as threatening violence.” The difference here is in statement versus conduct, and in harm compared to threatening violence. Attorneys that I have talked to have all demonstrated that statement, “threatening violence” lacks the mens rea, or intent, that the Supreme Court ruled in *Counterman v. Colorado*. They also said that the harm implies the action did, or would have resulted in, the physical endangerment, whereas threatening violence is far more debatable and subject to personal interpretation.

The third amendment will again re-insert language that was in the S-1 version of a former version of this bill. The S-1 inserted a section which determined that intentional or unintentional reference to someone’s incorrect pronoun is not a hate crime. I think this is a very important addition which helped to mitigate the concerns that arose from similar, earlier legislation this year. A simple misuse of pronouns, even if accidental, when taken in concert with revised definition of “reckless disregard,” will be mistaken enough to justify in the prosecution of a hate crime. If the intent of this legislation is not to infringe upon the right to free speech, and only to prosecute those who knowingly or intentionally assault or batter another because of their association with a particular group or identity, then this language is key to offering the free speech protections which are needed.

The last amendment will add an additional section to clarify that someone who makes a false allegation under this act is subject to the prosecution under the law. To be clear, it is illegal to falsely accuse someone of a crime, falsely assert that a crime has been committed against you. However, there are countless cases of false allegation, especially regarding hate crimes, that were not followed up with prosecution. I believe this amendment will clarify that the misuse of this act by means of a false allegation is wrong and far from the intent of this act. Thank you, I hope you will support my amendments.

Senator Moss’ statement is as follows:

I want to lead off responding to some comments earlier about this bill, specifically around pronouns which is where some of the biggest fallacies of the intentions of this bill have come about. I honestly believe if we had a resolution to declare that the sky is blue, the Senator from the 23rd District would moan about pronouns. In this bill, I truly want to show and demonstrate what is a hate crime under the definitions of this bill. You all should know because we just read the bill publicly for everybody. In the bill, hate crimes against protected classes would include using force or violence against an individual, causing bodily harm to an individual, stalking an individual, or destroying an individual’s property. That has nothing to do with usage of pronouns.

The reality is, that many of you know, that the Jewish community here in this state, across this country, as many other communities are experiencing a rise in hate. If somebody came up to me today and said, “F you, I hate all Jews,” and punched me in the face, they would get two years. If they went to my car afterwards and took a pen out of it, they would get five years. There is this imbalance there and the idea is that a hate crime doesn’t just terrorize an individual, but it terrorizes a whole community.

One of my closest friends is Jordan Acker and what Jordan and his family have suffered through this past year, is atrocious. First his place of business, which is located in my community, was vandalized. That place of business is right off an Orthodox Jewish neighborhood in Southfield and it has a ripple effect that causes a whole community to be unsafe. Then just within the last month, as his daughters were sleeping in their home, of course he and his wife were at home asleep, vandals came and vandalized his home with spray paint and then threw two mason jars of urine through the window. This terrorizes the community of Huntington Woods with not an insignificant Jewish population as well. Our Jewish Federation building, on October 7, obviously a very meaningful date in the Jewish community, we woke up in the morning to find that vandals had hit that building as well.

This is terrorizing to the Jewish community in Metro Detroit and prosecutors are asking for enhanced tools to reduce that terror and hate. This bill is supported by the Prosecutors Association of Michigan, made up of all 83 counties’ prosecutors, Republicans and Democrats. I’ll leave with this, I’ve had friends on both sides of the aisle talk to me about all of these events over the last year and a half and have expressed genuine concern for my personal welfare and the welfare of my community and have asked, “What can we do about it?” This bill is what you can do about it. I urge a “yes” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5401, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16g of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16g), as amended by 2023 PA 278.

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. 699**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—17**

Albert	Hauck	Lauwers	Runestad
Bellino	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis

Bumstead  
Daley  
Damoose

Huizenga  
Johnson

Nesbitt  
Outman

Victory  
Webber

Excused—0

Not Voting—1

Lindsey

In The Chair: Geiss

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

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

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5164, entitled**

A bill to create the call center jobs retention act; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to impose certain duties on certain employers; and to prescribe civil sanctions.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 2, line 5, after “(1)” by striking out “An” and inserting “Except as otherwise provided in subsection (2), an”.

2. Amend page 2, following line 18, by inserting:

“(2) An employer that engages in an activity described in subsection (1)(a) or (b) is not required to comply with subsection (1) if the employer is in compliance with the worker adjustment and retraining notification act, 29 USC 2101 to 2109, for that activity.” and renumbering the remaining subsection.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 700**

**Yeas—19**

Albert  
Bellino

Hauck  
Hoitenga

Lindsey  
McBroom

Santana  
Theis

Bumstead	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson	Outman	Webber
Damoose	Lauwers	Runestad	

Nays—19

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

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. 701

Yeas—20

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

Nays—18

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

This amendment ensures that businesses already in compliance with federal regulations will not be subjected to additional regulations under this new Michigan law. Businesses are already required to report lay-offs and they are fulfilling that requirement. My amendment would prevent burdensome regulations for those already meeting federal standards. I ask for a “yes” vote on my amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5165, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled “Michigan strategic fund act,” (MCL 125.2001 to 125.2094) by adding section 15.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was defeated, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 702**

**Yeas—19**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—1**

Santana

In The Chair: Geiss

**Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 8:26 a.m.

9:16 a.m.

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

Senator Singh moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was defeated.  
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. 703**

**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

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

“An act relating to the economic development of this state; to create the Michigan strategic fund and to prescribe its powers and duties; to transfer and provide for the acquisition and succession to the rights, properties, obligations, and duties of the job development authority and the Michigan economic development authority to the Michigan strategic fund; to provide for the expenditure of proceeds in certain funds to which the Michigan strategic fund succeeds in ownership; to provide for the issuance of, and terms and conditions for, certain notes and bonds of the Michigan strategic fund; to create certain boards and funds; to create certain permanent funds; to exempt the property, income, and operation of the fund and its bonds and notes, and the interest thereon, from certain taxes; to provide for the creation of certain centers within and for the purposes of the Michigan strategic fund; to provide for the creation and funding of certain accounts for certain purposes; to impose certain powers and duties upon certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to make certain loans, grants, and investments; to provide penalties; to make an appropriation; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 5164 and 5165 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of House Bill No. 5164 be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

This is an interesting bill package. This is one we actually had a hearing in the Senate Labor Committee. House Bill No. 5164 will create a requirement that would make a call center employer have to give notification if they were going to move elsewhere—basically a notification for lay-offs. There was a threshold, I think it was 30 percent, if I remember correctly. If they were going to move 30 percent or more of their call centers, then they would have to provide some type of notification. Ok, so I guess that sounds ok. I don’t know what makes call centers so much more unique than any other industry. Well, then come to find out

there is a federal WARN Act that I wasn't aware of and I kind of did a cursory overlap to see how much this WARN Act overlaps with the call center. They seem to overlap almost perfectly so I don't really see the purpose of House Bill No. 5164. I also found it really interesting that LEO was opposed to it because in my experience in the Legislature, I've often found that bureaucrats want more authority but they don't want more responsibility. In this case, they didn't take it. They would have gotten more FTEs. They would have gotten more authority. I can only speculate, I presume they see this as a waste of their time. They didn't give an explanation as to why they are opposed, but it's not very often that a department has opposed a bill in front of a Democratic majority committee. So that was pretty telling. That's way outside of the norm that I've seen so far in this two years.

House Bill No. 5164, I think, has no merit whatsoever. When I asked in committee if there was some type of genesis. This idea had to come from somewhere. We're not that creative of human beings where we can just fabricate call center bills out of nowhere. Something must have happened. There must be some giant need; something happened. Well, apparently some call center moved multiple terms ago; a member came up with an idea this would be a good idea. They didn't get it done, then another member picked it up after that member was out of the Legislature and they couldn't get it done. I don't remember all the details. This was a few weeks ago and I have twins so I can't remember everything anymore. So, there was never any explanation as to what made call centers so special. The genesis didn't really didn't even make that much sense as to this being a huge problem that would necessitate us staying up this late; spending this much time deliberating. So, House Bill No. 5164 doesn't make any sense.

House Bill No. 5165, I was interested in this one. After seeing how terrible the SOAR program has been and how terrible we've been at incentives, how much I've learned about how government can't do incentives. I was on track for this one, I was tracking. Basically this bill says if you have an incentive, you leave, your call center goes away out of the state, your incentive goes away—it's a claw back. Now, that is interesting. I like the idea, but let's see if there is any merit to it. So, basically we need to questions to be answered if we're going to decide if this bill has any merit. The first one: Does the Michigan Strategic Fund currently have any contracts with any call centers? The second question: If they do, and this is a big if. I don't even know how many call centers we have in this state. I would be really interested to know if we have any large call centers at all, I'm not aware of any. I would be really interested to see what percentage of our state—if you added up all the jobs in the state, how many of them are worked at call centers and where does it rank in industries? Where do call centers rank, you know. There is usually an argument whether agriculture or automotive the number one. I think call centers might be the bottom, it might be the last. I could be wrong about that, I don't have any data, but no data was provided in order to make any such claim. So, the second question was—it is pretty common in just standard boilerplate contracts—if you're going to do an incentive, you don't live up to your end of the bargain, we're going to claw that money back.

I used to, when I worked at the Bureau of Investments, work on legal documents like this and we were always limited partner, if the general partner didn't live up to their end of the obligations between the four corners of the page, we would get our money back. We took care of the pensioners, we had a fiduciary responsibility and I couldn't believe that the lawyers at the Michigan Strategic Fund or MEDC would be this negligent to not have such common boilerplate claw back provisions that even some entry level analyst at the Michigan Bureau of Investments would have known of.

I asked those two questions and I didn't get any answers so I went and spoke to some representatives from the MEDC after and they did not really seem—again this is an opinion, I don't want to put words in their mouth. It would have been nice if somebody was able to come and testify so we could have gotten something official, so I'm conjecturing and speculating here, but they didn't seem all excited about this bill. They did oppose the bill, by the way, so I don't think it is completely unfounded with what my perception was of their reaction. I said, we didn't get anything publicly, but can you, do you know off the cuff, could you find an answer for me, do we have any contracts with call centers? And, they said no. Well, that's interesting. Well, if you did have any, would you have had any clawback provisions in them? Well, they really didn't answer that question because it didn't seem necessary since they don't have any. Anyway, it seems to be a huge waste of time for everybody, especially all of us right now.

All that being said, if this is a big nothing burger, why would you care to come put a card of opposition in? The best I could figure was that there are some businesses—like I have a business in my district, a large manufacturer. They have a call center, just a small portion of their business. They are a large manufacturer, but they work directly with contractors. They don't sell at retailers. If they have a contractor that has an emergency at 3 a.m. for their product, they want to make sure that somebody is there because they take extreme pride in the products they offer. If there is some type of meltdown with their product, they want the contractor to be able to call at 3 a.m. and they want someone that knows how to answer this. So, they'll have, I don't know, 10-15 employees that are working on the call center, and they have a couple thousand employees that work in the manufacturing part. I think the MEDC concerned that if we had this provision in place these types of large manufacturers are going to walk away from some types of incentives because of some small call center provision that really is innocuous and not germane really at all to the business or the incentives that we would be trying to do.

I could go on for these reasons and a lot more because I feel like these bills are a complete waste of everybody’s time, most importantly the taxpayers time who are paying for us to be here tonight. I’m a “no” on these bills. I urge my colleagues to be a “no” as well.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4095, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308d.

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. 704**

**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

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

“An act to provide a system of public instruction and elementary and secondary schools; to revise, consolidate, and clarify the laws relating to elementary and secondary education; to provide for the organization, regulation, and maintenance of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to prescribe rights, powers, duties, and privileges of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to provide for the regulation of school teachers and certain other school employees; to provide for school elections and to prescribe powers and duties with respect thereto; to provide for the levy and collection of taxes; to provide for the borrowing of money and issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to establish a fund and provide for expenditures from that fund; to make appropriations for certain purposes; to provide for and prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, the state board of education, and certain other boards and officials; to provide for licensure of boarding schools; to prescribe penalties; 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. 4096, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308c.

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. 705

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

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

“An act to provide a system of public instruction and elementary and secondary schools; to revise, consolidate, and clarify the laws relating to elementary and secondary education; to provide for the organization, regulation, and maintenance of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to prescribe rights, powers, duties, and privileges of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to provide for the regulation of school teachers and certain other school employees; to provide for school elections and to prescribe powers and duties with respect thereto; to provide for the levy and collection of taxes; to provide for the borrowing of money and issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to establish a fund and provide for expenditures from that fund; to make appropriations for certain purposes; to provide for and prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, the state board of education, and certain other boards and officials; to provide for licensure of boarding schools; to prescribe penalties; 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. 5549, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1308e.

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. 706

Yeas—24

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

Nays—14

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

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 a system of public instruction and elementary and secondary schools; to revise, consolidate, and clarify the laws relating to elementary and secondary education; to provide for the organization, regulation, and maintenance of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to prescribe rights, powers, duties, and privileges of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to provide for the regulation of school teachers and certain other school employees; to provide for school elections and to prescribe powers and duties with respect thereto; to provide for the levy and collection of taxes; to provide for the borrowing of money and issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to establish a fund and provide for expenditures from that fund; to make appropriations for certain purposes; to provide for and prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, the state board of education, and certain other boards and officials; to provide for licensure of boarding schools; to prescribe penalties; 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. 5659, entitled

A bill to amend 2018 PA 548, entitled “Comprehensive school safety plan act,” by amending the title and section 3 (MCL 28.803) and by adding section 6; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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. 707

Yeas—26

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

Nays—12

Bellino	Damoose	Lindsey	Outman
Bumstead	Hauck	McBroom	Runestad
Daley	Hoitenga	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 create the comprehensive school safety plan act; to create the school safety commission and provide for its powers and duties; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities; and to prohibit divulging certain information and prescribe penalties,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5660, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 6, 1241, and 1310a (MCL 380.6, 380.1241, and 380.1310a), section 6 as amended by 2016 PA 192, section 1241 as added by 2018 PA 549, and section 1310a as amended by 2016 PA 532; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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. 708**

**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

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

“An act to provide a system of public instruction and elementary and secondary schools; to revise, consolidate, and clarify the laws relating to elementary and secondary education; to provide for the organization, regulation, and maintenance of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to prescribe rights, powers, duties, and privileges of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to provide for the regulation of school teachers and certain other school employees; to provide for school

elections and to prescribe powers and duties with respect thereto; to provide for the levy and collection of taxes; to provide for the borrowing of money and issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to establish a fund and provide for expenditures from that fund; to make appropriations for certain purposes; to provide for and prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, the state board of education, and certain other boards and officials; to provide for licensure of boarding schools; to prescribe penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

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

- House Bill No. 5956
- House Bill No. 5022
- House Bill No. 6144
- House Bill No. 6145
- House Bill No. 6146
- House Bill No. 6088
- House Bill No. 4675
- House Bill No. 4485
- House Bill No. 4900
- House Bill No. 4901

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 5956, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 3406jj.

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. 709

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

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

“An act to revise, consolidate, and classify the laws relating to the insurance and surety business; to regulate the incorporation or formation of domestic insurance and surety companies and associations and the admission of foreign and alien companies and associations; to provide their rights, powers, and immunities and to prescribe the conditions on which companies and associations organized, existing, or authorized under this act may exercise their powers; to provide the rights, powers, and immunities and to prescribe the conditions on which other persons, firms, corporations, associations, risk retention groups, and purchasing groups engaged in an insurance or surety business may exercise their powers; to provide for the imposition of a privilege fee on domestic insurance companies and associations and the state accident fund; to provide for the imposition of a tax on the business of foreign and alien companies and associations; to provide for the imposition of a tax on risk retention groups and purchasing groups; to provide for the imposition of a tax on the business of surplus line agents; to provide for the imposition of regulatory fees on certain insurers; to provide for assessment fees on certain health maintenance organizations; to modify tort liability arising out of certain accidents; to provide for limited actions with respect to that modified tort liability and to prescribe certain procedures for maintaining those actions; to require security for losses arising out of certain accidents; to provide for the continued availability and affordability of automobile insurance and homeowners insurance in this state and to facilitate the purchase of that insurance by all residents of this state at fair and reasonable rates; to provide for certain reporting with respect to insurance and with respect to certain claims against uninsured or self-insured persons; to prescribe duties for certain state departments and officers with respect to that reporting; to provide for certain assessments; to establish and continue certain state insurance funds; to modify and clarify the status, rights, powers, duties, and operations of the nonprofit malpractice insurance fund; to provide for the departmental supervision and regulation of the insurance and surety business within this state; to provide for regulation over worker’s compensation self-insurers; to provide for the conservation, rehabilitation, or liquidation of unsound or insolvent insurers; to provide for the protection of policyholders, claimants, and creditors of unsound or insolvent insurers; to provide for associations of insurers to protect policyholders and claimants in the event of insurer insolvencies; to prescribe educational requirements for insurance agents and solicitors; to provide for the regulation of multiple employer welfare arrangements; to create an automobile theft prevention authority to reduce the number of automobile thefts in this state; to prescribe the powers and duties of the automobile theft prevention authority; to provide certain powers and duties upon certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to provide for an appropriation; to repeal acts and parts of acts; and to provide penalties for the violation of this act,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protest**

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5956 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

Not having sufficient time to conduct due diligence, I will be voting “no.”

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5022, entitled**

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” by amending sections 254, 675, 813, 831, and 839 (MCL 206.254, 206.675, 206.813, 206.831, and 206.839), as added by 2021 PA 135.

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. 710**

**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

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

“An act to meet deficiencies in state funds by providing for the imposition, levy, computation, collection, assessment, reporting, payment, and enforcement by lien and otherwise of taxes on or measured by net income and on certain commercial, business, and financial activities; to prescribe the manner and time of making reports and paying the taxes, and the functions of public officers and others as to the taxes; to permit the inspection of the records of taxpayers; to provide for interest and penalties on unpaid taxes; to provide exemptions, credits, rebates, and refunds of the taxes; to create certain funds; to provide for the expenditure of certain funds; to impose certain duties and requirements on certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to prescribe penalties for the violation of this act; to provide an appropriation; 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. 6144, entitled**

A bill to amend 1935 PA 59, entitled “An act to provide for the public safety; to create the Michigan state police, and provide for the organization thereof; to transfer thereto the offices, duties and powers of the state fire marshal, the state oil inspector, the department of the Michigan state police as heretofore organized, and the department of public safety; to create the office of commissioner of the Michigan state police; to provide for an acting commissioner and for the appointment of the officers and members of said department; to prescribe their powers, duties, and immunities; to provide the manner of fixing their compensation; to provide for their removal from office; and to repeal Act No. 26 of the Public Acts of 1919, being sections 556 to 562, inclusive, of the Compiled Laws of 1929, and Act No. 123 of the Public Acts of 1921, as amended, being sections 545 to 555, inclusive, of the Compiled Laws of 1929,” (MCL 28.1 to 28.16) by adding section 5a.

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. 711**

**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 Hoitenga, Lindsey, Bellino and Lauwers, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 6144.

Senators Hoitenga and Lindsey moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Hoitenga’s statement is as follows:

We all want to see a reduction in violence, but the notion that destroying confiscated firearms will somehow lead to a safer society is a liberal fallacy. While Democrats continue their obsession with chipping away at the Second Amendment, the focus should be on addressing the root causes of violence. There is no need to remove the discretion currently held by law enforcement officers regarding how to handle firearms and their possession through buyback programs. We can and should trust our law enforcement professionals to do their job. I ask you to join me in defending our Second Amendment rights, and I ask for your “no” vote on these bills.

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

This is an egregious attack on the Second Amendment and I think it’s also illuminating because it’s pretty common to hear Democrats nowadays when they’re talking to cameras or addressing the topic of firearms and Second Amendment rights to make suggestions like, We’re not anti-gun, it’s just certain guns, or it’s certain things they want to accomplish or prevent types of violence, but I don’t think I’ve ever seen a bill that makes it more crystal clear, that all that rhetoric is gone, anybody who supports this is obviously anti-gun to the core. Instead of having a buyback program and then some thoughtful process after that of what happens next, this creates a requirement that these firearms must be destroyed.

Then it goes on. If you weren’t clear, not just the firearm, they have to check afterward to make sure the components of the firearm were destroyed. What does destruction mean? I think if you look at this bill and you wonder about the people who wrote it and you want to make sure you’re in compliance, you should be really serious about this. Do you have to melt it down? Break it down to its molecular components? Make sure every trace of the firearm no longer exists in the universe? What are they looking for here?

As I said, this is viciously anti-gun and anti-Second Amendment. I urge a “no” vote.

Senator Lauwers’ statement is as follows:

I voted “no” on House Bill No. 6144 because while the bill aims to enhance public safety through the disposal of firearms obtained via a gun buyback program, it overlooks the critical considerations that could provide greater benefits to our communities. Specifically, a lack of options for law enforcement use. The bill mandates the destruction of the firearms acquired through the buyback. This fails to consider the potential for some firearms, especially high-quality or functional ones, to be repurposed for law enforcement. Allowing these resources to support public safety efforts could be a more efficient use of taxpayer dollars.

Secondly, the missed opportunities for revenue, preventing the resale of these firearms removes a potential source of funding that could support gun safety, education, victim assistance programs, or other community safety initiatives. Responsible resale through licensed dealers with appropriate safeguards could strike a balance between safety and resourcefulness.

Third, environmental impact. The destruction of firearms and their components raises concerns about environmental consequences. There is no provision in the bill to ensure the destruction process is environmentally sustainable, leaving a gap between responsible disposal practices.

Fourth, ineffective in addressing root causes of gun violence. The bill focuses solely on disposal of firearms, does not address the root causes of gun violence, or offer comprehensive solutions to prevent it. More robust legislation that includes mental health support, crime prevention programs, and education initiatives would better serve public safety.

For these reasons, I cannot and did not support House Bill No. 6144.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 6145, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 372, entitled “An act to regulate and license the selling, purchasing, possessing, and carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices; to prohibit the buying, selling, or carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices without a license or other authorization; to provide for the forfeiture of firearms and electro-muscular disruption devices under certain circumstances; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide immunity from civil liability under certain circumstances; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to prohibit certain conduct against individuals who apply for or receive a license to carry a concealed pistol; to make appropriations; to prescribe certain conditions for the appropriations; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act,” by amending section 14 (MCL 28.434), as amended by 2010 PA 295.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.

The motion prevailed.

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

**Roll Call No. 712**

**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:

**House Bill No. 6146, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 239 (MCL 750.239), as amended by 2010 PA 294.

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. 713**

**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

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

“An act to revise, consolidate, codify, and add to the statutes relating to crimes; to define crimes and prescribe the penalties and remedies; to provide for restitution under certain circumstances; to provide for the competency of evidence at the trial of persons accused of crime; to provide immunity from prosecution for certain witnesses appearing at criminal trials; to provide for liability for damages; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Theis and McBroom, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 6146 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 Theis’ statement is as follows:

I’m voting “no” on House Bill No. 6146 because, while the bill provides clarity on the disposition of forfeited firearms, it introduces several areas of concern that could have unintended consequences.

It has insufficient oversight for alternate disposal methods. The bill grants broad discretion to the director of the Department of State Police to dispose of firearms by any other lawful manner. This provision lacks specificity and accountability measures, which could lead to inconsistent application or unintended misuse

of the discretion. Notification challenges—the requirement to notify the owner of a lost or stolen firearm, while well-intentioned, could pose administrative and operational challenges. Determining ownership and ensuring timely notification may strain law enforcement resources and delay the process of firearm disposition. It provides liability concerns. While the bill provides immunity from civil liability for the State Police when disposing of firearms in compliance with the law, it does not address potential situations where errors in compliance could lead to disputes or backlash.

And there’s the missed opportunity for broader reforms. Frankly, this just misses the whole point. Why do we have the problem in the first place? We’re certainly not going to be getting rid of all the guns we have, so perhaps figuring out how to handle a mental health crisis might be a better approach.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, reading this bill, I’m struck by what I can only see as a significant inconsistency in state policy when it comes to what we do with forfeited property and how we treat an asset, essentially. Rather than utilizing this to the benefit of the local police, the State Police, or the state itself and its taxpayers, we’re simply destroying valuable property. Previously, under current law, there’s discretion given to them but under this, they have to destroy the firearm. This doesn’t make a lot of sense in a situation where we have something valuable, especially since some of the guns out there are exceptionally valuable and can be well over five figures in value. Why would we do this? Why would we turn a blind eye to helping our local police department with this asset and allowing them to sell it to a collector or to other individuals who are willing to pay high prices for these things? This doesn’t seem like a good use of our time or resources and I encourage a “no” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 6088, entitled**

A bill to amend 1986 PA 196, entitled “Public transportation authority act,” by amending sections 8, 18, and 29 (MCL 124.458, 124.468, and 124.479), sections 8 and 18 as amended by 2006 PA 175.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Webber offered the following amendments:

- 1. Amend page 6, line 12, after “of” by striking out “1,100,000” and inserting “1,500,000”.
- 2. Amend page 6, line 16, after “of” by striking out “1,100,000” and inserting “1,500,000”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 714**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.  
The motion prevailed.  
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 715**

**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

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:  
“An act to authorize the formation of public transportation authorities with certain general powers and duties; to provide for the withdrawal of certain local entities from public transportation authorities; to authorize certain local entities to levy property taxes for public transportation service and public transportation purposes; to protect the rights of employees of existing public transportation systems; to provide for the issuance of bonds and notes; to provide for the pledge of taxes, revenues, assessments, tax levies, and other funds for bond or note payment; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state agencies; to validate taxes authorized before July 10, 1986, elections held before July 10, 1986, and bonds and notes issued before July 10, 1986; to provide for transfer of certain tax revenue and certain powers, rights, duties, and obligations; to authorize condemnation proceedings; to grant certain powers to certain local entities; to validate and ratify the organization, existence, and membership of public transportation authorities created before July 10, 1986 and the actions taken by those public transportation authorities and by the members of those public transportation authorities; and to prescribe penalties and provide remedies.”  
The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Johnson, Runestad and Nesbitt under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 6088.  
Senator Johnson moved that the statement she made during the discussion of the bill be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”  
The motion prevailed.

Senator Johnson's statement is as follows:

This is a bill to take away the voice of the people. This bill would make people pay for a service they do not want and they do not use. Voters decided to opt out of the transit services in these communities. Many of these communities run their own transit systems that offer more services to residents for far less money, such as Livonia that runs the Livonia Community Transit System. This system is a fraction of the cost that offers personalized services including scheduled rides for residents to services like doctor appointments, physical therapy, shopping, and other amenities. Passing this bill will go against the will of the voters and force residents in these communities to pay far more in taxes. It is simply unnecessary as these communities have found ways to better serve their own resident transit needs. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting no on this bill.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

This proposed amendment to the public transportation authority act is outrageous and poses a significant threat to the financial well-being of Oakland County residents and businesses. The bill forces Oakland County to join the Transportation Tax Authority despite strong opposition from a great many residents, businesses and property owners. It empowers the authority to levy a property tax of up to five mills for 25 years, placing an enormous and unjust financial burden on the property owners. The funds can support massive fixed guideway project like rail systems. These initiatives are unlikely to benefit almost all of Oakland County residents. Instead the resources will be funneled disproportionately toward Detroit with little return for those footing the bulk of the cost, Oakland County. This additional tax will worsen the financial pressures of property owners already struggling to afford their homes amid skyrocketing costs. Higher taxes will drive businesses and residents out of Oakland County and the region undermining economic stability and growth. The Democratic machine proponents of this bill will have the backing of the massive, aggressive, multi-million dollar advertising campaigns funded by the Detroit stakeholders, the billionaires and all these vendors that stand to benefit financially. The public, as always, with these big, multi-billion dollar tax projects will be subjected to relentless advertising barrage with little to no resources available for the opposing point of view to reach the voters. This is how the Democrats deceive the taxpayers every time in Southeastern Michigan. Detroit already suffers from some of the highest tax rates in the nation. Property taxes are exploding in both Wayne and Oakland counties creating an unsustainable financial environment. Continued tax increases will accelerate the exodus of businesses and residents potentially plunging Detroit into another financial crisis akin to its bankruptcy with Southeastern Michigan following suit with all of these taxes the Democrats just keep pouring in on us. This bill is just another attempt to drain Oakland County's property owners of the hard earned resources it disproportionately benefits Detroit and a handful of municipalities while inflicting long-term financial harm on the majority of Oakland County residents and businesses. We must stand against this harmful legislation and expose deceitful, well-funded Democratic propaganda machine that will attempt to convince voters that it is their interest. Protect taxpayers and reject this bill and stop the exploitation of Oakland County property owners.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

Just in case anybody has failed to notice, it's right around 10:30 a.m. in the morning. Special shout out to the few dozen people that are still watching. Could be a few more, could be a few less, as some have probably went to sleep, woken back up, dozed off again, I'm sure they'll awaken for my brilliant speech now.

The Democratic majority continues to bring up votes that could have been addressed all year. Anytime this year. Instead, over the last two years, what has been prioritized? Two billion dollars of corporate welfare spending for the largest multinational corporations. \$670 million dollar raid to the teacher pension fund. Raising the income tax on all Michigan workers. Passing hundreds of pages of legislation without hearings, without debates, without discussions.

As a reminder, this is serving as my "no" vote explanation, especially on bills that suffocate the small businesses and working people of this state. And now you bring before us a bill that would force Michigan taxpayers to be part of a regional authority that some municipalities want no part of. You're removing the ability for them to make self-determination for themselves. The big boys will come in and tell them what they need to do. How much they need to pay, how much in taxes they need to pay. At 10:30 in the morning, after 24-and-a-half hours of session. Not only that, you're allowing communities under this authority to force them to pay more taxes, even if they vote "no". So after your House counterparts lost absolute control of this chamber, and had to close up shop, you bring it in here before us, expected to carry their water. Much like you're forcing taxpayers in Livonia, Independence Township, Clarkston, and all the other communities that would love to, or have, said "no", to shoulder the burden of something that they don't want. No thank you, I'll opt out.

I ask if any of you have gotten a bingo off their card yet. Thank you.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Webber’s statement is as follows:

I rise to request your support for my amendment. The amendment is simple. It merely would allow voters in Oakland County communities to maintain autonomy and opt out of transit tax votes approved in neighboring Wayne County. For nearly 40 years, property owners in northern Oakland County have had the ability to opt out of paying additional taxes on transit systems that do not benefit their communities. It is important for these communities to retain their voice so they are not forced to subsidize service they do not receive.

I ask for a “yes” vote on my amendment to continue providing Oakland County residents with the ability to opt out.

**Point of Order**

Senator Singh raised the Point of Order that the debate is not germane to the bill.  
The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, ruled that the debate is not germane to the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4675, entitled**

A bill to amend 2003 PA 258, entitled “Land bank fast track act,” by amending sections 4, 13, and 14 (MCL 124.754, 124.763, and 124.764).

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. 716**

**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

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

“An act to provide for the creation of land bank fast track authorities to assist governmental entities in the assembly and clearance of title to property in a coordinated manner; to facilitate the use and development of certain property; to promote economic growth; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain authorities; to provide for the creation and appointment of boards to govern land bank fast track authorities and to prescribe their powers and duties; to authorize the acquisition, maintenance, and disposal of interests in real and

personal property; to authorize the conveyance of certain properties to a land bank fast track authority; to authorize the enforcement of tax liens and the clearing or quieting of title by a land bank fast track authority; to provide for the distribution and use of revenues collected or received by a land bank fast track authority; to prescribe powers and duties of certain public entities and state and local officers and agencies; to authorize the transfer and acceptance of property in lieu of taxes and the release of tax liens; to exempt property, income, and operations of a land bank fast track authority from tax; to extend protections against certain liabilities to a land bank fast track authority; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protest**

Senator Daley, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4675 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Daley’s statement is as follows:

I’ll be voting “no” on this bill because it undermines local authority and imposes undue burdens on communities while granting excessive powers to land banks. Specifically, it erodes local control. The bill centralizes specific powers within land banks, diminishing the role on oversight of local governments, by granting land banks the ability to act independently of local ordinances and regulations. It removes critical checks and balances that safeguard community interests. It gives excessive tax exemptions, the provision exempting land banks and their operations from all taxes, special assessments and user fees, strips local governments of vital revenue streams needed to fund essential services.

This places an undue burden on local taxpayers who must compensate for the loss. It also undermines local zoning and land use authorities by broadly exempting land banks from local zoning and land use controls, the bill threatens the ability of communities to manage growth, development, and the character of their neighborhoods. This disregard for local planning undermines the principles of self-governance. It is vague on the conflict of interest policies. While the bill mandates a code of ethics and conflict of interest disclosures for land bank directors and employees, it lacks detailed enforcement mechanisms, or accountability standards, leaving room for potential misuse or abuse of power. Broad and unchecked powers, the bill’s language allows land banks to operate with complete control over transferred properties, akin to private property owners. This broad authority risks mismanagement and disconnects land banks from the public accountability expected of governmental entities.

House Bill No. 4675 shifts power away from local communities, and imposes new financial and administrative burdens on them, while creating an environment ripe for inefficiency and overreach. For these reasons I cannot support the legislation, and urge my colleagues to join me in voting “no” on House Bill No. 4675.

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

**House Bill No. 4901**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4901, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 5451 (MCL 600.5451), as amended by 2012 PA 451.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.

The motion prevailed.

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

**Roll Call No. 717**

**Yeas—21**

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

Nays—17

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

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.

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

**House Bill No. 4485**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4485, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 24 of chapter VII (MCL 767.24), as amended by 2018 PA 182.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**House Bill No. 4900**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4900, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 4011, 4012, 4015, 4031, 4061a, 6023, 6027, 6059, and 6104 (MCL 600.4011, 600.4012, 600.4015, 600.4031, 600.4061a, 600.6023, 600.6027, 600.6059, and 600.6104), section 4011 as amended and section 4061a as added by 1994 PA 346, section 4012 as amended by 2015 PA 14, and section 6023 as amended by 2012 PA 553, and by adding sections 4001a, 4032, 4033, 6001a, 6023b, 6023c, 6023d, 6023e, 6023f, and 6023g.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, assumed the Chair.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Johnson offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 11, line 16, after “(b)” by striking out the balance of the subdivision and inserting “**Whichever of the following is applicable:**
- (i) **If the debtor’s garnishable earnings for the week are less than \$1,925.00, 15% of the earnings.**
  - (ii) **If the debtor’s garnishable earnings for the week are \$1,925.00 or more, 25% of the earnings.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,  
Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.  
The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.  
The Senators being equally divided (yeas 19; nays 19), the Lieutenant Governor voted “nay.”  
The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving and the Lieutenant Governor not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 718**

**Yeas—19**

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

**Nays—19**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.  
The motion prevailed.  
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 719**

**Yeas—22**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

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 President pro tempore, Senator Moss, resumed the Chair.

### **Protests**

Senator Nesbitt, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4900.

Senator Nesbitt’s statement is as follows:

Let me get this right, the majority party is silencing a member of the minority talking about the bill at hand. Talking about the history of garnishment, the history of debtors and creditors and how its important today and having good credit markets are important today. Breaking the rules of the Senate just to continue on your far left agenda items being pushed through, this partisan agenda. What a shame. Mr. President, I would expect more from this body than trying to silence the voice of somebody who is trying to explain how bad these bills are, the legislation that was voted on. This will be my “no” vote explanation.

Senators Daley, Theis and Bellino, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 4900 and 4901.

Senator Daley’s statement, in which Senator Theis concurred, is as follows:

While I understand the intent of these reforms, these bills swing the pendulum too far in the wrong direction. Ultimately these changes will drive up the cost of these banking services for users, and limit the availability of loan and deposit products. This is a direct conflict with the reported purpose of the bill, to alleviate the burden of debt and judgment collections, especially for low-income residents. I ask that my colleagues join me in voting “no” this legislation.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

While these bills are attempting to provide relief to debtors, they set dangerous precedent that undermines financial accountability, create inequities, and harm small business and the broader economy. Specifically, limits on debt collection. This legislation specifically raises exemptions for garnishment and bankruptcy proceedings, making most consumer debt practically uncollectable. This proportionately impacts small business and contractors, many of whom rely on timely payments for services to maintain their operations.

Number two, creation of an unequal class of consumers. By establishing a class of individuals who, despite having assets or income, are shielded from repaying debt, the bill fosters inequities. This undermines the trust and functionality of Michigan’s credit system, which relies on accountability to ensure credit availability.

Number three, the harm to small business. The bill fails to balance protection for debtors with the rights of creditors, particularly small business, which may never recover debt owed to them. And I know this for a fact, sir, the last couple years that I owned my store, I had to write off \$2,700 that were owed to me in garnishments. I was never going to get it. This could lead to increased financial security for these businesses and discourage economic activity, and I had garnishments to my store because of theft and vandalism. Never got repaid.

Number four, increased costs for consumers. The broad protections outlined in the bill will likely result in reduced credit availability and increased costs for borrowers. When credit faces higher risk of non-payment, they often respond by raising interest rates or tightening credit qualifications, disproportionately affecting working families.

Number five, undermining Michigan's credit-based economy. The bills risk disrupting Michigan's credit-based economy by making it more challenging for creditors to recover legitimate debts. This could have far-reaching consequences, including reduced confidence in lending and increased economic inefficiencies. While I understand the intent to safeguard families' basic needs during financial hardship, House Bill Nos. 4900 and 4901 go way too far in protecting assets without requiring debt repayment. A more balanced approach is needed to ensure more debtors and creditors are treated fairly. For these reasons, I cannot support this legislation.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Johnson's statement is as follows:

I rise in support of my amendment to House Bill No. 4900. I greatly appreciate the work of my colleague from the 15th District on this issue, and I supported the passage of the Senate bill on this same topic. The aim of this legislation is to prevent particularly lower-income Michigan residents from having their entire bank accounts zeroed out by garnishment. While I believe firmly that people must be accountable for their debts, this legislation puts important bumpers on the garnishment process, to protect vulnerable individuals and brings Michigan in line with protections offered in the majority of other states.

However, as written, the bill before us would reduce the percent of earnings that are eligible for garnishment on all earners, not just those that are low-income. My amendment would continue to reduce the percentage of wages that can be garnished from debtors, with earnings that are less than \$100,000 annually, but would restore the current 25 percent limit for wages that are eligible for garnishment for those who earn in excess of \$100,000 a year. I feel that it's a reasonable compromise and ask for my colleagues' support on this amendment.

Senator Irwin's statement is as follows:

I rise with some measure of disappointment to ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment today, but I want to stress that I am eager and interested in working with the Senator from the 24th District, because I think that her words were right on today, in saying that the goal of this legislation is to make sure that we protect people from overaggressive debt collection and that we particularly protect people who are low-income, and who need those resources to get to their jobs so they can continue to pay their debts. So I want to acknowledge the good work that the Senator from the 24th District has done, and the good dialogue we've had, and my commitment to continue working with her to continue to improve this law in the future.

Senator Lindsey asked and was granted unanimous consent to make a statement.

### Point of Order

Senator Singh raised the Point of Order that the speaker needs to keep to the content of the bill.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, ruled that the speaker needs to keep to the content of the policies of the bill.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to consideration of the following bill:

#### **House Bill No. 4485, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled "The code of criminal procedure," by amending section 24 of chapter VII (MCL 767.24), as amended by 2018 PA 182.

(This bill was read a third time earlier today. See p. 2247.)

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. 720

Yeas—27

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

Nays—11

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

The Senate agreed to the full title.

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

**House Bill No. 5887**

**House Bill No. 5888**

The motion prevailed.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, resumed the Chair.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5887, entitled**

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” (MCL 750.1 to 750.568) by adding section 213b.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.

The motion prevailed.

**Points of Order**

Senator Lauwers raised the Point of Order that he requests House Bill No. 5887 be read in full, as is his constitutional prerogative.

Senator Singh raised the Point of Order that the motion is no longer debatable.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, ruled that Senator Lauwers’ Point of Order is rejected. The Majority Floor Leader moved the previous question, which was ordered without objection, after which Senator Lauwers entered the Point of Order and attempted to make a motion within that Point of Order—that motion is out of order inside of a Point of Order after the previous question had been called.

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

**Roll Call No. 721**

**Yeas—37**

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

**Nays—1**

Daley

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

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

“An act to revise, consolidate, codify, and add to the statutes relating to crimes; to define crimes and prescribe the penalties and remedies; to provide for restitution under certain circumstances; to provide for the competency of evidence at the trial of persons accused of crime; to provide immunity from prosecution for certain witnesses appearing at criminal trials; to provide for liability for damages; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts inconsistent with or contravening any of the provisions of this act,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5888, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16/ of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16/), as amended by 2016 PA 150.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.

The motion prevailed.

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

**Roll Call No. 722**

**Yeas—38**

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

**Nays—0**

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

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

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

The Senate agreed to the full title.

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

**House Bill No. 6166**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 6166, entitled**

A bill to amend 1980 PA 383, entitled “Convention and tourism marketing act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 141.883).

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.

The motion prevailed.

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

**Roll Call No. 723**

**Yeas—23**

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

**Nays—15**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

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

“An act relating to the promotion of convention business and tourism in this state and the major metropolitan areas of this state; to provide for tourism and convention marketing programs in major metropolitan areas through nonprofit convention and tourist bureaus; to provide for imposition and collection of assessments on the owners of transient facilities to support tourism and convention marketing programs; to provide for the disbursement of the assessments; to establish the oversight functions and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state employees; and to prescribe remedies and penalties,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Johnson, Theis, Bellino, Runestad and Albert under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 6166.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Johnson’s statement, in which Senator Theis concurred, is as follows:

Keep trying to raise taxes. Keep trying to raise them more. I will keep getting up and giving “no” vote explanations on the floor. Go ahead and double taxes on hotel rooms, if that is what you choose, but I know the longer we stay here, it’s the people of Michigan who lose. Raising taxes throughout the day and night, will give all your constituents such a terrible fright. But I guess that is how a lame duck goes, but as for me, I’m going to keep voting “no.”

If a certain Governor wants to be President, I would stop passing bills pissing off residents.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

Detroit is on a great renaissance. It has come so far since I worked for St. Vincent DePaul from 1987 to 1994. And who would imagine one day the Lions would be leading their division? One of the top teams talked about all the time. And what a wonderful season the Tigers had at the end—telling us we had baseball again in Michigan when they were bad for a long, long time. The Red Wings are competitive right now. Every game they are fighting for it—and we also have a basketball team. The reopening of the central station is a wonderful thing and the city's first population growth since 1950.

Detroit is truly on a comeback. Let's not stifle this growth by creating barriers that discourage visitors from experiencing the wonderful opportunities this great city has to offer. I ask for a "no" vote on this bill.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

This bill proposes an amendment to the convention and tourism marketing act to increase the assessments on room charges and facilities in Detroit, Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties, aiming to fund marketing programs. Specifically, it would empower the marketing entity to raise the assessment from 2 up to 4 percent.

Once again, like we have been seeing from the Democrats in this record breaking 26-plus hours, this legislation again seeks to divert Oakland County dollars to fund the Visit Detroit program managed by the Wayne County-based bureau. This program is projected to generate an additional \$18 million in tax revenue, much of which is going to come out of the backs of the Oakland County taxpayers' pockets. The bill effectively redirects funds from Oakland County residents and businesses to benefit Wayne County's marketing entity. It's disproportionately focused on Wayne County, ensuring that Oakland County taxpayers will receive very little return on their contributions.

As we have seen before, the Democrats collaborate with the big, large vendor operations, the Detroit billionaires' massive advertising campaigns. These campaigns are designed to mislead Oakland County payers into believing that this bill will benefit them. In reality, it enriches only those who back the legislation. The \$18 million in new tax revenue will flow into the pockets of the select few, while Oakland County residents bear the financial burden. These groups spend generously on misleading advertising to maximize their profits fifty-fold over what they spend in the millions, they get in taxpayer dollars.

This bill is yet another clear attempt to exploit Oakland County taxpayers for the benefit of Detroit interests. Although it is a program framed to promote regional tourism, it is essentially a cash grab for those with political connections and deep pockets. Oakland County taxpayers must not be deceived by the inevitable flood of false advertising that is going to come from this bill. This legislation prioritizes special interests over fairness, further burdening the residents and businesses who are already contributing more than they receive. This is essential to reject this harmful, exploitative bill.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

My colleague had a wonderful poem, and it inspired me. Many of you may not realize this, because my last name is German, but I'm actually mostly Irish. So I thought I'd come up with a nice limerick, short and sweet, to explain my no-vote explanation:

A new tax is here

The folks of Wayne will cheer

Why must everyone get taxed?

Poor Oakland and Macomb get waxed

I may just shed a tear

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

**House Bill No. 4854**

**House Bill No. 5695**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4854, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled "The revised school code," (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1300.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.

The motion prevailed.

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

**Roll Call No. 724**

**Yeas—27**

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

**Nays—10**

Albert	Hoitenga	Nesbitt	Runestad
Bellino	Lauwers	Outman	Theis
Daley	Lindsey		

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—1**

Johnson

In The Chair: President

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

“An act to provide a system of public instruction and elementary and secondary schools; to revise, consolidate, and clarify the laws relating to elementary and secondary education; to provide for the organization, regulation, and maintenance of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to prescribe rights, powers, duties, and privileges of schools, school districts, public school academies, intermediate school districts, and other public school entities; to provide for the regulation of school teachers and certain other school employees; to provide for school elections and to prescribe powers and duties with respect thereto; to provide for the levy and collection of taxes; to provide for the borrowing of money and issuance of bonds and other evidences of indebtedness; to establish a fund and provide for expenditures from that fund; to make appropriations for certain purposes; to provide for and prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, the state board of education, and certain other boards and officials; to provide for licensure of boarding schools; to prescribe penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Lindsey and Bellino, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4854.

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

One of my colleagues asked, What does this bill do? I’ll try to give my best—as I understand it, this bill is going to compel all of the schools to make sure that Native American individuals are permitted to wear traditional regalia and to bring traditional objects to ceremonies of honor, which on its face doesn’t seem that controversial. But I had an experience recently in my own district with a school where a student who was graduating had already completed most of the process necessary to enlist in the United States military. He was engaging with some of the leadership of the school there about going to the graduation ceremony and certain other components of what happens as they finish out the last year of school, and found out that

the code their school had adopted said that unlike some other schools, that he was not allowed to wear anything signifying that he had already completed his enlistment into the Army as I understand it. You know, he was quite upset about this, and understandably so. A lot of community members were engaged on it, but what it demonstrated to me is that, I think the right place for these decisions to be made are at those schools. If they believe—if a school board believes that its right to have things that don’t necessarily have to do with the educational process be present at these ceremonies of honor, by all means they may. I think something like this is probably going to become more of a focal point, especially if they know they have students who may want to do this. The school I was talking about for instance, may revise that policy as they realize more students may be interested in joining the military. That was something that was special for that person.

Obviously, we were reading about some of the reasoning behind this bill, and one of the examples that was given is that this was from an outside group who was advocating for this so it wasn’t anything I knew, but the group was saying that many tribes consider eagles and their feathers to be sacred, and they may be so highly revered that eagle feathers represent honesty, truth, majesty, strength, courage, wisdom, power, and freedom, and that federal law and policy has long recognized this religious importance. I don’t think anybody’s going to dispute the significance to that individual. The question just becomes, Must we mandate for all of our schools that that has to become a part of the ceremonies at our educational institutions?

I would suggest that before we take steps like this, we get back to the basics and try to actually have our schools provide a good education for these individuals before they get to that graduation point or whatever the ceremony may be. Look back over the last couple of years of the massive failures during the COVID era, the shutdowns, the learning loss, the mental health challenges that kids are facing from those, and then we also look at just generally the trajectory of the education policy that has been adopted here in the state of Michigan by this majority, undoing accountability standards, making it so that parents can’t look easily at their schools and know how they’re performing, getting rid of standards, making sure kids can read by third grade. And this is why we’re here? I think we broke 24 hours a while ago, and we’re here focusing on this.

Again, everyone in this chamber agrees we should be respectful of people’s cultural traditions, the things they find important. But how about before we take the time on the Senate floor to mandate that every school allow people to bring these culturally-significant symbols to their ceremonies of honor, how about we get back to the basics? How about we focus on teaching? How about we get our educational standards up in Michigan? Thank you, and I appreciate everyone who voted “no” on this bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lauwers’ statement is as follows:

I’m so appreciative that we could have that reading of the bill, but I still find myself asking questions. Can someone just tell me what this bill does?

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5695, entitled**

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding section 109p.

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. 725**

**Yeas—35**

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

**Nays—3**

Bellino

McBroom

Theis

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

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

“An act to protect the welfare of the people of this state; to provide general assistance, hospitalization, infirmary and medical care to poor or unfortunate persons; to provide for compliance by this state with the social security act; to provide protection, welfare and services to aged persons, dependent children, the blind, and the permanently and totally disabled; to administer programs and services for the prevention and treatment of delinquency, dependency and neglect of children; to create a state department of social services; to prescribe the powers and duties of the department; to provide for the interstate and intercounty transfer of dependents; to create county and district departments of social services; to create within certain county departments, bureaus of social aid and certain divisions and offices thereunder; to prescribe the powers and duties of the departments, bureaus and officers; to provide for appeals in certain cases; to prescribe the powers and duties of the state department with respect to county and district departments; to prescribe certain duties of certain other state departments, officers, and agencies; to make an appropriation; to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on specific dates,”

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. 5695.

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:

Mr. President, while this is meritorious in many regards, and I’m certain it helps many communities, it leaves out the small rural non-governmental entities which are suffering right now very badly, particularly with the failure of the Department of Corrections to properly pay them. We are in desperate straits in numerous areas of the Upper Peninsula where the failure to pay is happening, and we’ve got to solve this problem. This bill, unfortunately, misses the mark, and that’s why I voted “no.”

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

**House Bill No. 6052**

**House Bill No. 6053**

**House Bill No. 5551**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 6052, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 570, 795b, and 797a (MCL 168.570, 168.795b, and 168.797a), as amended by 2023 PA 81.

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. 726**

**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: President

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

“An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Johnson and McBroom, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 6052.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Johnson’s statement is as follows:

This bill will strip away and remove the requirement for some certain ballots used in our state’s elections to be sequentially numbered. This is an important security and integrity measure that absolutely should not be removed. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting no on this bad bill that strips away election integrity.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

This bill seems, yet again, to be a solution to a problem that’s not well demonstrated. We just had an election go by. We used our early-voting centers, as is provided by law. I used one of these early-voting centers, where ballots are printed on demand, in the view of clerks and other election officials, and upon completion of the ballot, placed directly into a tabulator. But what we propose here now is that we also allow ballots be printed on demand somewhere else, where it doesn’t require there to be a tabulator, at least under the reading that I’m seeing. And then, on top of that, there’s no ability to check then to make sure that the poll book matches the number of the ballot, because these ballots are no longer numbered.

Why? What is the problem? Where did we have the need for this? Because we didn't have a committee hearing on it, that I can remember, I'm not aware of what the need is. And so I voted "no" because it just doesn't seem like there was a big problem out in the countryside with this issue, and now we've potentially created a problem of keeping our ballots straight, and making sure that the books line up and balance, and unbalanced books are always a bad sign in an election and create additional havoc. That's why I voted "no."

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 6053, entitled**

A bill to amend 1969 PA 161, entitled "An act to regulate the filing of certain actions involving elections," by amending section 1 (MCL 691.1031); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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. 727**

**Yeas—23**

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

**Nays—15**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5551, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," by amending sections 22c and 24b (MCL 168.22c and 168.24b), section 22c as added by 1995 PA 261.

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. 728**

**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: President

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

“An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protests**

Senators Johnson and McBroom, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5551.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Johnson’s statement is as follows:

This bill would prohibit certain individuals from serving on the state or county boards of canvassers. Those individuals would lose this ability if they committed certain, what the bill calls, “election related offenses.” So, what is an election related offense in this bill? It includes not only serious crimes that would exclude individuals from membership on a board of canvassers, which I would actually support. But this bill, that received no hearing in the Senate, includes the definition of election related offenses, such things as a challenger making a challenge indiscriminately without good cause. So a subjective determination by a clerk or an election inspector about whether the challenge is good, under this bill, could disqualify someone from serving on a board of canvassers.

This is simply not right. This bill goes too far and doesn’t have appropriate checks and balances or due process in excluding individuals from these bodies which serve a vital role in certifying our state’s election results. I ask my colleagues to join me in voting “no” on this bill.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, this bill is just a prime example of the tragedy. As one of my colleagues mentioned earlier, there’s a lot in this bill that’s good and meritorious. There’s certainly numerous crimes that may be committed against the election code for which a person should not be allowed to become a Board of Canvassers member. However, I didn’t have time to look up every single section that’s in this list. I don’t know what each of these particular crimes being referenced are. There’s just a big list of them and that time—I tried during the reading while I followed along, but there’s just too much to get through.

But right at the very top of the list, one of those crimes is to have falsely filled out an affidavit of identity—something that has happened to numerous legislators, former legislators, those who are running for office, because they made some simple mistake, they misunderstood a campaign finance issue or some other silly mistake, and we already know what’s happened to those people. They’ve been completely banned from running for office that particular cycle. One mistake—not even necessarily malicious or intentional—has disqualified people from the ballot. It appears that that’s exactly what also happens here.

Now, perhaps I’m wrong. If we’d had an opportunity to have a committee hearing, I could have gotten that straightened out, and perhaps we would have negotiated that that one’s probably unnecessary to have on this list. It’s just unfortunate that that opportunity never came along, and that’s why I voted “no.”

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

**House Bill No. 4605**

**House Bill No. 4606**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4605, entitled**

A bill to amend 1933 PA 167, entitled “General sales tax act,” by amending section 25 (MCL 205.75), as amended by 2023 PA 20.

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Chang offered the following substitute:  
Substitute (S-2).

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 729**

**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: President

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

“An act to provide for the raising of additional public revenue by prescribing certain specific taxes, fees, and charges to be paid to the state for the privilege of engaging in certain business activities; to provide, incident to the enforcement thereof, for the issuance of licenses to engage in such occupations; to provide

for the ascertainment, assessment and collection thereof; to appropriate the proceeds thereof; and to prescribe penalties for violations of the provisions of this act.”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

### Protest

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4605 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

I’d like to explain to the people at home what just happened. It’s kind of a technical gamesmanship that just happened. We just substituted language—so the language that came over from the House, if we were to pass it clean with no changes, it could be enrolled and sent straight to the Governor’s desk for a signature. Since we just substituted it with new language, it needs to go back to the House for a concurrence vote, and after we saw about, roughly 20 hours ago or so, it doesn’t look like the House is going to be coming back anytime soon.

A couple of things that could mean. It could mean they could be trying to get the House to come back to take up other votes, that’s one alternative. Another alternative is that it’s just trying to kill this whole bill, which is a huge disappointment, because this is \$100 million that was allocated in the budget for public safety initiatives throughout our state, throughout all of our communities.

Some are going to point to the city of Detroit. Yeah, the city of Detroit got a lot, I think they were actually capped, so other local units of government proportionally would have gotten more. It’s just a disappointment. I can’t help but think there’s some other political gamesmanship as to why, because the person who I commonly have heard has been associated with championing this legislation made an announcement recently that may have lost favor with my colleagues across the aisle—not everybody, but some of them, enough to influence how this could possibly go.

I didn’t love exactly how this legislation was written. I have a lot of small town communities in my district. A lot of them were going to get, from what was estimated to me, anywhere from \$4,000 to \$11,000 for this grant. The grant was going to be distributed based on some type of proportion of the violent crime that was in that community. Well, I live near the city of Lowell—let’s take them for example. Let’s say they got \$5,000. They don’t really have a grant writer who they have on staff to try and get a \$5,000 grant, so it would have been really burdensome. I would have liked to have tried to work on it, maybe with the bill sponsor or the committee that it was in, to try to maybe have a streamlined process for smaller communities—maybe under a certain threshold, maybe under a population or a dollar amount threshold where they could have just gotten a grant without really having to go through—and they could have used it for certain purposes. That’s something—even if I would have voted “yes” on this, knowing that it wasn’t perfect and I could have worked on it next term, but it’s just really disappointing because now we had something where we could have done something that would have really helped our communities and helped our communities be safer, and now I’m going to have to be a “no” on it because the bill is effectively dead.

I’m just really disappointed. I kind of hope we can maybe reflect and maybe go back—there’s got to be a way where we can put the clean language back in. It’d be nice if we could do that, because this political gamesmanship is actually maybe making our communities less safe.

Thank you, Mr. President, I urge a “no” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

#### **House Bill No. 4606, entitled**

A bill to amend 2000 PA 489, entitled “Michigan trust fund act,” by amending the title and section 2 (MCL 12.252), the title as amended by 2005 PA 232 and section 2 as amended by 2023 PA 174, and by adding sections 11a and 11b.

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Chang offered the following substitute:  
Substitute (S-2).

The question being on the adoption of the substitute,  
Senator Cherry offered the following amendment to the substitute:

1. Amend page 6, line 21, after “(7)” by striking out the balance of the line through “(5).” on line 24 and inserting “**The certified list under subsection (5) must include all violent crimes reported to the department of state police and must only represent the geographical areas of each county, village, and township. The certified list under subsection (5) must only include cities, villages, or townships.**”.

The amendment to the substitute was adopted.  
The substitute as amended 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. 730**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to create certain funds; to provide for the allocation of certain revenues among certain funds and for the operation, investment, and expenditure of certain funds; and to impose certain duties and requirements on certain state officials,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

**Protest**

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4606 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

I do apologize, I genuinely forgot to mention one aspect of this bill as to why it’s really killing it with the way the budget was constructed. If you go back, I believe the budget we passed this year was Public Act No. 121 of 2024, and in section 959 it’s dealing with this. There was \$100 million that was allocated for these specific funds that we’re discussing. I’m not going to read the whole paragraph, but the last sentence here says, “Revenue appropriated under this section must not be spent or otherwise distributed unless both of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law: (a) House Bill No. 4605. (b) House Bill No. 4606.”

It’s a really important point because I’ve been here long enough, I hear the spin and—if we could just get people confused, they’ve won. So if somebody says the money is still there, that argument is flawed and it just won’t work because the money is going to lapse. This specific \$100 million is tied specifically to this 102nd Legislature, and while our fiscal year is on a different calendar year, our term ends in a few days, and there’s just nothing we can do. So if we don’t get these two specific bill numbers done in this specific calendar year, the \$100 million lapses and there would have to be a new supplemental and a whole new process to get these funds out there. Basically, we’d be starting from square zero and it’s really frustrating. I would appreciate a “no” vote on this.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills:  
**House Bill No. 5651**  
**House Bill No. 5652**  
**House Bill No. 5653**  
**House Bill No. 5829**  
**House Bill No. 5636**  
The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:  
**House Bill No. 5651, entitled**  
A bill to amend 2000 PA 489, entitled “Michigan trust fund act,” by amending sections 7 and 8 (MCL 12.257 and 12.258), section 7 as amended by 2023 PA 139 and section 8 as amended by 2014 PA 504.  
The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Singh moved that the previous question be ordered.  
The motion prevailed.  
The bill was passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 731**

**Yeas—22**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

Pursuant to Joint Rule 20, the full title of the act shall be inserted to read as follows:  
“An act to create certain funds; to provide for the allocation of certain revenues among certain funds and for the operation, investment, and expenditure of certain funds; and to impose certain duties and requirements on certain state officials.”  
The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5652, entitled**

A bill to amend 2003 PA 296, entitled “Michigan early stage venture investment act of 2003,” by amending sections 7, 31, and 33 (MCL 125.2237, 125.2261, and 125.2263), section 7 as amended by 2015 PA 192 and section 31 as amended by 2015 PA 193.

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. 732**

**Yeas—22**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to promote investment in certain businesses; to promote economic development in this state; to provide for a Michigan early stage venture investment corporation; to prescribe the powers and duties of a Michigan early stage venture investment corporation; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain public officers and departments; to establish the Michigan early stage venture investment fund and other funds; to provide for tax credits and incentives; to authorize certain investments; to provide for the expiration of the fund; to provide or allow for appropriations; and to provide penalties and remedies,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5653, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled “Michigan strategic fund act,” by amending sections 88b, 88f, and 88h (MCL 125.2088b, 125.2088f, and 125.2088h), section 88b as amended by 2014 PA 505, section 88f as amended by 2012 PA 221, and section 88h as amended by 2012 PA 145, and by adding section 88u.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 11, line 28, after “**section.**” by inserting “**The fund shall not utilize the Michigan innovation fund program to provide support to the People’s Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party.**”.

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

Senator Theis offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 14, following line 25, by inserting:

**“(h) A grant agreement must include a provision that requires the recipient of the grant to have and maintain an employee workforce that is comprised of at least 75% of employees who are residents of this state.”.**

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

Senator Lauwers offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 12, line 3, after **“September 30,”** by striking out **“2054,”** and inserting **“2030,”**.

2. Amend page 15, line 6, by striking out **“2054.”** and inserting **“2029.”**.

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 733**

**Yeas—22**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act relating to the economic development of this state; to create the Michigan strategic fund and to prescribe its powers and duties; to transfer and provide for the acquisition and succession to the rights, properties, obligations, and duties of the job development authority and the Michigan economic development authority to the Michigan strategic fund; to provide for the expenditure of proceeds in certain funds to which the Michigan strategic fund succeeds in ownership; to provide for the issuance of, and terms and conditions for, certain notes and bonds of the Michigan strategic fund; to create certain boards and funds; to create certain permanent funds; to exempt the property, income, and operation of the fund and its bonds and notes, and the interest thereon, from certain taxes; to provide for the creation of certain centers within and for the purposes of the Michigan strategic fund; to provide for the creation and funding of certain accounts for certain purposes; to impose certain powers and duties upon certain officials, departments, and authorities of this state; to make certain loans, grants, and investments; to provide penalties; to make an appropriation; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

### Protests

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill Nos. 5651, 5652, and 5653.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

A recurring theme in this Legislature over the past couple of years is a failure to learn from past mistakes. These bills to create the so-called Michigan Innovation Fund are a step backward and a return to a policy already proven to be an abject failure. Yet again, we are reverting to government-run programs that cost taxpayers without an adequate return on their investment.

Our state had a program called the Venture Michigan Fund that was established back in 2003. It had goals very similar to what is proposed in this legislation. This is a fund that keeps getting brought up no matter where I go. When I was Appropriations chair in the House, I saw budget requests from the Governor's office to the tune of tens of millions of dollars to pay for the Venture Michigan Fund to purchase the remaining outstanding liability backed by tax vouchers. I was told at the time, I could either agree to fork over the money now or I could fork over more money later. It was a lose-lose proposition for the Michigan taxpayer.

This budget request from mine was not the first experience I had with this fund. It was also brought up when I worked at the state's Bureau of Investments. It was then I learned of this highly convoluted fund that was created by Lansing politicians with a goal of funding Michigan start-ups through venture capital. I asked at the time if it had been successful and I didn't get a lot of positive feedback.

I later learned the Venture Michigan Fund flopped. According to an Auditor General report from 2018, the \$450 million borrowed and nearly \$215 million invested by the Venture Michigan Fund helped support the creation of about 734 jobs as of December 2015. There were also two companies that the fund invested in that shortly thereafter moved out of Michigan—resulting in a loss of 100 jobs.

Everything I experienced in my work with the Legislature and as an analyst at the Bureau of Investments leads me to conclude this fund has a high likelihood of failure—for a multitude of reasons. Two factors are the biggest. First, these are risky assets. Venture capital investing focuses on early stage companies with unproven products and business models. Quite often, you have an entrepreneur with an interesting or promising product, but they have little experience in bringing products to market. On top of that, there is the risk that the innovation will fail altogether when brought to market. Most venture capital funds hope for a small number of "home run" investments will make the bank, maybe one to three out of an overall dozen investments. The success rate is low and one needs to be really good in this space to make a living out of picking winners. To say the least, this is a risky asset class, and as I have indicated before, the state has a record of failure in this space.

The second and arguably biggest point is this: This is not the state's money—it's taxpayers' money. Managers that operate in private venture capital at least have an alignment of interest when making investments. If they pick a loser, they will lose as well—and if they pick enough losers, nobody will invest in them again in the future. This is not so with these tax dollars. It is relatively easy to lose someone else's money compared to when losing one's own. When politics and investing mix, it is not an efficient market. Deals will be made based on talking points and press releases—not on long term return on investment. Just look at the past performance of this fund and judge for oneself.

Now, it is a fact that some Republicans have supported this proposal. I can understand where they are coming from. I used to hold a more optimistic viewpoint of the state getting involved in economic development. I used to view it as sort of a necessary evil. You could say I thought it was not ideal, however, if other governments were doing it, we would miss out on opportunities by abstaining. I thought if perhaps we came up with a process that provided oversight and prudently filtered projects based on merit, it might work. However, I learned from past experience. I have seen that there is simply no way to accomplish a prudent government-run incentive program. At the end of the day, it is centralized planning and no technocratic board or committee is going to be as efficient letting people keep their own money and investing it where there is actually a market need. To put it more simply—Michigan taxpayers would see a better benefit if we simply lowered their taxes and let them keep their own money.

I will end by saying this. I hope we can learn from past mistakes. I encourage my colleagues to abandon the failed policies laid out in this plan and vote "no."

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Theis’ statement is as follows:

The amendment is very simple. If this new fund is intended to assist Michigan companies, and if we mean Make it in Michigan and it’s not simply a snappy motto, we should ensure that companies who benefit from these funds do in fact employ Michiganders. My amendment requires that any recipient of funding have at least 75 percent of their employees based in Michigan. I ask for your support.

Senator Lauwers’ statement is as follows:

My amendment proposes sunseting this program in 2030, rather than 2054, to assess its effectiveness. A lot can change in 20 years, as we have all experienced. Who could have predicted the leading industries of today two decades ago? Twenty years ago, AI was only conceived in the movie *Terminator*. And 20 years from now, I’ll be 81 years old, and I don’t think innovation will look like it does today. Too often, this body pushes policies for the sake of generating headlines without sufficient evaluation of whether they achieve their intended outcomes or not. I ask colleagues to join me in voting “yes” on this amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5829, entitled**

A bill to amend 1964 PA 208, entitled “An act to grant scholarships to students enrolled in postsecondary education institutions; and to provide for the administration of the scholarship program,” by amending sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 5a, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 (MCL 390.972, 390.973, 390.974, 390.975, 390.975a, 390.976, 390.977, 390.978, 390.979, and 390.980), sections 3 and 4 as amended by 2021 PA 40, section 5 as amended by 1986 PA 270, sections 6, 8, and 9 as amended by 1980 PA 500, and section 7 as amended by 2004 PA 181; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

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. 734**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to grant scholarships to students enrolled in postsecondary education institutions; and to provide for the administration of the scholarship program,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 5636, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2811, 2823, 17101, 20104, 20106, and 20161 (MCL 333.2811, 333.2823, 333.17101, 333.20104, 333.20106, and 333.20161), section 2811 as amended by 1998 PA 332, section 17101 as added by 2016 PA 417, section 20104 as amended by 2022 PA 187, section 20106 as amended by 2017 PA 167, and section 20161 as amended by 2023 PA 138, and by adding sections 2823a and 22224c and part 207.

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. 735**

**Yeas—21**

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

**Nays—17**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

“An act to protect and promote the public health; to codify, revise, consolidate, classify, and add to the laws relating to public health; to provide for the prevention and control of diseases and disabilities; to provide for the classification, administration, regulation, financing, and maintenance of personal, environmental, and other health services and activities; to create or continue, and prescribe the powers and duties of, departments, boards, commissions, councils, committees, task forces, and other agencies; to prescribe the powers and duties of governmental entities and officials; to regulate occupations, facilities, and agencies affecting the public health; to regulate health maintenance organizations and certain third party administrators and insurers; to provide for the imposition of a regulatory fee; to provide for the levy of taxes against certain health facilities or agencies; to promote the efficient and economical delivery of health care services, to provide for the appropriate utilization of health care facilities and services, and to provide for the closure of hospitals or consolidation of hospitals or services; to provide for the collection and use of data and information; to provide for the transfer of property; to provide certain immunity from liability; to regulate and prohibit the sale and offering for sale of drug paraphernalia under certain circumstances; to provide for the implementation of federal law; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide for sanctions for violations of this act and local ordinances; to provide for an appropriation and supplements; to repeal certain acts and parts of acts; to repeal certain parts of this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on specific dates,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

**Resolutions**

Senator Singh moved that rule 3.204 be suspended to permit immediate consideration of the following concurrent resolution:

**Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23**

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

Senator Singh offered the following concurrent resolution:

**Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 23.**

A concurrent resolution to provide for the final adjournment of the legislature.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate adjourns on December 20, 2024, it stands adjourned until December 30, 2024, at 11:30 a.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That when the House of Representatives adjourns on December 19, 2024, it stands adjourned until December 31, 2024, at 1:30 p.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That when the Legislature adjourns on December 31, 2024, it stands adjourned without day.

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,

The concurrent resolution was adopted.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Motions and Communications**

Senator Singh moved that when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned until Monday, December 30, at 11:30 a.m., and that when the Senate adjourns on Monday, December 30, it stand adjourned without day.

The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

**Statements**

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

I can't guarantee what I'm going to say right now, Madam President, I may break out in song and dance, who knows? When I first started writing this, I wrote yesterday on social media, but I know it was a couple days ago, on social media, in a half-brained statement, our Attorney General made one of the most bizarre and ignorant statements of her career. She threatened to criminally fine legislators for not showing up and voting. Now, there was a lot of swirl in that thing they call social media, but the first thing I saw that struck my eye was a statement that said it would be a progressive, tough-on-crime Attorney General to call two Black women criminals for taking a principled stand on behalf of Black people. That's an off-the-rails statement, Madam President.

That's not the first off-the-rails statement or thought the Attorney General has had. I remember one of her first edicts, she wrote D.C. and said, Please keep the wolf on the endangered species list—although it's not in Wisconsin and Minnesota, where the states manage the wolves. Wisconsin and Minnesota don't have the wolf problems we have, and we'll talk about that later. She did this after a former employee told us that we knew the DNR was cooking the books about how many wolves there were per acre in the U.P. They said there were 600 to 700 wolves total in the U.P., but longtime residents and wildlife experts knew that it could be almost double, but they knew it wasn't 600 or 700. But let's just say, Madam President, for the sake of the DNR being perfectly honest, 600 or 700 wolves in the U.P. is more wolves per mile than any state in the Union. We know that's a low number. So what we're doing is we're telling people we don't care. I remember in 2019, a member once suggested, maybe they trap a small pack, take it down to eastern Washtenaw County or western Wayne County, down to the border, and let them live among the people and see how the people like living amongst an apex predator.

Finally, I urge everybody in Michigan to read Andrew Fink's response to the Attorney General's statement—her egregious statement on social media. It lays out how our Attorney General must have written this at an MSU football game while being wheeled out on a wheelchair.

Senator Brinks' statement is as follows:

Colleagues, two years ago I stood here on the first day of session with a few requests. I asked that we work together to identify the common causes, shared struggles, and the ways that we can lift up the people in all of our communities. I asked that we decide together that we would not run from our problems but run toward solutions. I asked that we agree to share ideas, to engage in healthy debate, and to work with one another in good faith. By those metrics and many more, we all have a lot to feel proud of.

Our list of successes is not short, and I want to remind all of us of some of the highlights before we close out this term. We put historic resources into school funding—yes, including mental health and school safety. We funded free school breakfasts and lunches, expanded Pre-K, and increased our competitiveness for good teachers. We made major investments in our water infrastructure.

We repealed no-stricter-than-federal and implemented childhood lead testing and filter first in schools. Thanks to the hard work of the people in this room, Michigan now has some of the best-in-nation clean and renewable energy policies. We made major improvements in access to health care by requiring mental health parity, establishing universal dental screenings for kids, covering new forms of chemotherapy, expanding coverage of telehealth appointments, and more.

Colleagues, we went from being a chamber that wouldn't even acknowledge Pride Month, to one that affirms LGBTQ peoples' right to live freely and openly. We stood up for women's rights, repealing the 1931 abortion ban, passing the reproductive health act, cutting red tape for families using surrogacy, and we assured women that we have their backs if, when, and how they decide to have children.

Our state is a safer place due to background checks, red-flag laws, safe storage, and other gun violence prevention measures. And yes, we led on pocketbook issues too. We phased out the retirement tax, quintupled the income tax credit, re-envisioning brownfield redevelopment, and making higher education more attainable for everyone. We accomplished all of this and more, so much more. And in doing so, we have made Michigan a national leader in pragmatic policymaking.

Colleagues, there is no workplace quite like this. The range of issues we work on and the responsibility that we have to our constituents can create immense pressure. It also makes it an immense honor to do this work. Only those who have sat in these seats and walked in our shoes can understand exactly what that means, but I see every single one of you and I appreciate everything that you do.

In that spirit, I have a couple of thank yous. Starting with Secretary Oberlin and Session Staff, clerks, and the IT team, I know that long before we arrive, and long after we're gone for the day, you are here making everything work for us—thank you. To Todd Cook and all of the wonderful staff in the Business Office that make up the finance, information services, HR, and facilities departments—you are utmost professionals and I am thankful for everything you do behind the scenes to make this a great place to do the work of the people. To the Senate Police, I have so much gratitude for what you do to keep this building a safe and welcoming place to work—thank you. I want to thank the central staff in both caucuses, the policy, legal, comms, information services, and caucus services staff—you put out an incredible volume of work and you don't often get the recognition that you deserve. And I want to especially thank all of the Democratic Central Staff on my team, who are always ready to go the extra mile for me and for our members.

Colleagues, we know that none of us could do this work without our individual office staff—constituent casework, district events, bill drafting and negotiations, functioning schedules—you do it all, and it is all incredibly important. I am incredibly grateful to my Capitol office staff, who are here for me every single day in so many ways that most people will never know—thank you. And a special thanks to Kathleen Farhat, my chief of staff, you are a mad genius and a warrior for the cause. Every time you hop off your desk treadmill and say, I have an idea, we know it's going to be something good and we better listen.

Members, I want to thank each of you for the work that you do and the way that you do it. To my fellow caucus members, I am so proud to serve alongside each and every one of you, and I really mean that. Senator Nesbitt, while we may not always agree on what should be done, what we have managed to do—mostly—is maintain decorum, encourage healthy debate, find bipartisanship where we can, and keep the bullshit to a minimum.

We all know that next year will look a little bit different, and I know some of you are really excited about that change. I, for one, am a little bit concerned about the instability and chaos we may see coming out of Washington, but I do have faith that even in divided government, Michigan leaders of all stripes can come together in our shared commitment to our constituents.

As long as I remain in this chamber, I pledge to the people of Michigan that we are going to be in your corner. My commitment remains the same as it was on day one. I will work with anyone who comes to the table in good faith in search of real solutions for real problems.

Colleagues, on that note, I hope you are able to take some time to rest, to reflect, and to enjoy time with family and your loved ones. Merry Christmas; happy holidays; and I can't wait to see you again, right here, in the new year. Thank you.

### **Announcements of Printing and Enrollment**

The Secretary announced the enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor on Thursday, December 19, for her approval the following bills:

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 205 at 9:30 a.m.**

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 206 at 9:32 a.m.**

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 207 at 9:34 a.m.**

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 248 at 9:36 a.m.**

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 237 at 9:38 a.m.**

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 515 at 9:40 a.m.**

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 516 at 9:42 a.m.**

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 517 at 9:44 a.m.**

Senator McDonald Rivet moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 3:03 p.m.

In pursuance of the order previously made, the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Monday, December 30, 2024, at 11:30 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN  
Secretary of the Senate

