

No. 78
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
101st Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2021

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, October 7, 2021.

10:00 a.m.

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Paul Wojno of the 9th District offered the following invocation:

Lord, we seek Your help with our legislative affairs this morning. We ask for Your hand of blessing on this session day. Bless our Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and all those who serve as elected officials. Bless our health care providers, first responders, educators, and everyone who continues to serve others before themselves. May You provide comfort to those who are sick, who have lost a loved one, or face persecution during this time because of their race, ethnicity, or orientation.

We ask that You would guide and direct the Senate in productivity, respect for one another, and agreement in providing safety and security for the citizens of our state. Amen.

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

Senators Schmidt and Runestad entered the Senate Chamber.

Motions and Communications

Senator Chang moved that Senators Ananich, Geiss and Hollier be temporarily excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

Senators Hollier and Geiss entered the Senate Chamber.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Resolutions

Senator Lauwers moved that rule 3.204 be suspended to permit immediate consideration of the following concurrent resolution:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 19

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

Senator Shirkey offered the following concurrent resolution:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 19.

A concurrent resolution of tribute offered as a memorial for Donald Bishop, former member of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Whereas, It is with great sorrow that the members of the Michigan Legislature learned about the passing of Donald Bishop. He will be remembered as a dedicated public servant and champion for his constituents in Oakland County and the people of the state of Michigan; and

Whereas, Born and raised in Michigan, Donald Bishop received his bachelor's degree in political science from Oberlin College in Ohio before serving in the U.S. Army. Later, he received his law degree from the Detroit College of Law; and

Whereas, Donald Bishop was first elected to the Michigan House of Representatives in 1966 where he served two terms before being elected to the Michigan Senate in 1970 where he served six terms. In the House, Donald Bishop served as a member of the Appropriations Committee and the committees on Colleges and Universities, Private Corporations, and Towns and Counties; and

Whereas, In the Senate, Donald Bishop served in several leadership positions, including as Senate Republican Whip and Minority Floor Leader. He chaired the Corporations and Economic Development Committee and was the vice chair of the Judiciary and Commerce committees. Senator Bishop was also a member of the committees on Labor, Congressional Reapportionment, and Joint Administrative Rules. In addition to his committee work, Donald Bishop was an invaluable member of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Financial Institutions, the Michigan Commission on Criminal Justice, and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Law; and

Whereas, Donald Bishop was a dedicated legislator, admired by his constituents, friends, family, and colleagues. Upon his passing, we offer our condolences to his family and friends. Donald Bishop's contributions to the Legislature and our state will be remembered; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we offer this expression of our highest tribute to honor the memory of Donald Bishop, a member of the House of Representatives from 1967 to 1970 and the Senate from 1971 to 1982; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Bishop family as evidence of our lasting esteem for his memory.

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,

The concurrent resolution was adopted by a unanimous standing vote of the Senate.

Senator Lauwers moved that rule 3.204 be suspended to name the entire membership of the Senate and the Lieutenant Governor as co-sponsors of the concurrent resolution.

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

Senator Ananich entered the Senate Chamber.

A moment of silence was observed in memory of Donald E. Bishop, former member of the House of Representative and the Senate.

Senators McMorro and Shirkey 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:

On behalf of the greater Rochester community, a community that we have shared in service nearly 50 years apart, I want to extend my condolences to the family and friends of the late state Senator Donald Bishop. Today's tribute presentation covers much about Senator Bishop's character, service, and legacy. So in my role, I want to extend my deepest gratitude to the family for your service to our community and to our state. I think as everyone in this room knows, when we put our names on a ballot, it becomes a family affair—whether they're ready for it or not. We know that it means odd hours and many evenings and weekends out in the community or away from home. And it's a tremendous sacrifice that the closest to us enable people like Senator Bishop to have been fully present in his role on behalf of the people who trusted him to represent them.

While many of us know the impact Senator Bishop had on his son, Mike Bishop, his impact went well beyond just one party or a group of people we consider our supposed "side". In a 2016 interview with WDET, Congresswoman Debbie Dingell shared that Donald was one of her mentors in a joint interview she gave sitting beside Mike. There's no greater indicator of who a person was than the impact they made on others. And that comes directly from the family that surrounds them every day. Thank you to the entire Bishop family, and please accept our deepest thoughts, condolences, and gratitude.

Senator Shirkey's statement is as follows:

At this time I rise to remember and honor a valued former Representative and Senator, Don Bishop. In the chamber, I'm joined by Representative Mark Tisdell, and he is here because he represents that area as well. Speaker Wentworth sends his regards as well.

In May this year we lost a dedicated public servant. Don is remembered as a generous and deeply thoughtful man who gave 16 valuable, precious years of his life to serve in the Legislature of Michigan. He was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1966 where he served two terms, and then finished his service in the Legislature with two terms in the Senate. While in the House he served in many capacities—Appropriations Committee, Committee on Colleges and Universities, and other leadership positions. While in the Senate, he fulfilled many leadership positions and quickly established himself as a leader in the Senate. In addition to his committee work, Don Bishop was an invaluable member of the Governor's Advisory Commission on Financial Institutions, the Michigan Commission on Criminal Justice, and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. In addition to his service in the Legislature, Don proudly served in the U.S. Army after graduating from college. His example of service was profound and I'm confident his example inspired his only son Mike to follow in his footsteps.

Don is remembered well for his service, but he's probably even better remembered as a loving husband to Nancy and a devoted father to his five children Rebecca, Susan, Judith, Martha, and Michael. In addition to the titles of husband and father, he was also a grandfather to eleven grandchildren and a great-grandfather to three great-grandsons. He considered his family his life's greatest accomplishment. His loss is felt by all who knew him and we are eternally grateful for his unselfish service.

Recess

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:14 a.m.

10:21 a.m.

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

Senator Lauwers moved that the Senate return to the order of Messages from the House.
On which motion Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 1/5 of the members present voting therefor.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 371**Yeas—20**

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

Nays—16

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

Excused—0**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

The Senate returned to the order of

Messages from the House**Senate Bill No. 280, entitled**

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," by amending sections 471 and 477 (MCL 168.471 and 168.477), as amended by 2018 PA 608.

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

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect,

The recommendation was not concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving not voting therefor.

The Senate agreed to the full title.

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

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

Senate Bill No. 304

The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 304, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," by amending sections 523a, 813, and 829 (MCL 168.523a, 168.813, and 168.829), as amended by 2018 PA 603.

(This bill was returned from the House on Thursday, June 24 with a House substitute (H-1), immediate effect and title amendment, and was laid over under the rules. See Senate Journal No. 59, p. 1047.)

The question being on concurring in the substitute made to the bill by the House, Senator VanderWall offered the following substitute to the House substitute: Substitute (S-3).

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

The question being on concurring in the House substitute as substituted,

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

Roll Call No. 372

Yeas—20

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

Nays—16

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Protests

Senators Ananich, Geiss, Hertel, Alexander, Hollier, Wojno, Bullock, McCann, Brinks, Polehanki, McMorrow, Bayer, Santana, Moss and Chang, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against concurring in the House substitute as substituted to Senate Bill No. 304.

Senators Ananich and Geiss moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the substitute be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

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

I was going to respond to my good friend but it made so little sense that I don’t see any purpose in it.

There’s been talk the last two days—and we’ll continue to talk—about voter integrity. I’d like to remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we ran under the standards which you are now attacking, so if you are suggesting that the integrity of your election was not to a high enough standard, I’d be more than happy to drop off a box on your desk, you can resign, and we can all move forward with those of us who believe that integrity was in place in the 2020 and 2018 elections. You guys have been in charge for 40 years. If you think the last 40 years were so full of fraud and things of that nature, I’m happy to go back and erase all those decisions you made over the last 40 years. I think it would be good for the state either way. I think we have to get to the point where we deal with reality. The election was secure. Our laws work. You don’t need to pretend that they don’t in order to cater to some base or because the President lost. The election is over with. It’s time to move on.

Senator Geiss' statement, in which Senators Hollier and Bullock concurred, is as follows:

I'd like to remind everybody here and our constituents in this state that Senate Bill No. 304 and others like it—Senate Bill No. 304 is one of over 300 pieces of legislation introduced in 48 states. It's the exact same language in many cases. This isn't about guardrails in Michigan or flaws with our election system, which is a national model for security and safety and access to the ballot, because if it was about Michigan-specific issues with elections, we would be aiming to make the voting process more efficient. We'd be listening to what the clerks have been asking for since Proposal 3 was adopted and voted on by the people, and adopted and became part of our State Constitution. We'd be doing that instead of this nonsense, which the Heritage Foundation—one of their chief operating officers—admitted to creating this language. They even quipped they couldn't believe it was so easy. This is the same language that is being used across this nation from sea to shining sea to make it more difficult for people to vote, and that is an abomination and we should not be taking any part in that process. This is disgusting and despicable and we should be better than that because that's not what we were sent here to do. We were sent here to help the residents of this state in all matters, and that includes being able to exercise their freedom to vote, not trying to put up obstacles and barriers to it. This is a bunch of malarkey. We really need to stop this and do the actual business of the people we were sent here to do.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Horn's statement is as follows:

I rise in support of the remaining voter integrity bills. I was delighted to read this morning a quote from my dear friend and colleague across the aisle which read "I think we can all agree, we learned a lot about the importance of voting today". I did not miss the irony of his admonishment however, it is indeed important to vote. I wish we could have. I absorbed and reflected on the passionate and exhaustive speeches as we were reminded that "no" vote speeches had no time constraints. Even the speakers commented on their own exhaustion.

We also discovered that when my Democratic colleagues don't like the idea of voting for voter integrity they choose to close the polling place early. Fortunately, under same-day registration, the majority floor-leader can post these voter integrity bills on the ballot board once again. It is my hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will respect my right to vote today and that we can agree that voter integrity is indeed a worthwhile cause. With that Mr. President, I hope my colleagues aren't offended by my free speech and don't object to the words, my words, as I ask for them to be recorded in today's journal.

Senator McBroom's first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, this is two days in a row that we've heard the ridiculous summation and dismissal of election reforms by somehow creating the false comparison that to vote "yes" on reforming current law is tantamount to saying what's gone on in previous law is all bad and that those who vote "no" are saying current law is all good. If that's the case, the motion yesterday to adjourn should have been a motion to adjourn sine die. If that's the case, why'd you even run for office? You think the laws are all great right now? You don't believe in reform? Maybe you're against speed limits. Don't drive the speed limit anymore then, right? That's just a ridiculous comparison and summation.

I'll also point out my questions yesterday still stand. If you don't believe we should have some guardrails in place, what guardrails would you like to have? Because you attack the ones we had at the last election, you come up now and say, I'm real happy with the guardrails we have, we don't need to make any changes, even though that same party voted "no" on the current laws we have 20 years ago. Glad to hear you're now happy with them. Maybe in 20 years you'll be happy with the ones that are being suggested today. But to continually beat this drum that says, somehow by suggesting we need to change the laws, you're invalidating your own election is nonsense. If that's the case, we could never vote for any reforms whatsoever.

Senator Hertel's statement is as follows:

I would like to remind the body that nothing can happen without a majority of the votes, so the idea that we are the ones who adjourned yesterday is a little funny considering that several of your own members also voted to adjourn. I guess you could say they weren't paying attention, or they didn't know what they were voting on, but it seems to be the responsibility of every person in this building. So, I guess you talk to them and ask them what their reasoning was.

That being said, beyond that, this idea that we need to somehow change our voting system to make it harder for people and the question for that is "why?" The only reason you can say that reason is, is to question the last election. There is no reason that we have to make changes after the last election because it was the most free and secure election in the history of America, proven by several people. So, there are lots of reasons to improve lots of laws and we can debate as to what those are. But there is no reason that improvement is needed here.

The only reason that we are trying to change this is because of the false, big lie that the election didn't have integrity. These laws don't add integrity to our election, they make it harder for people to be a part of it. Which, I would argue, that makes the election less integral. So, when you ask what new guardrails I'll support, what I would say is what you're forgetting in all of that is that most of the laws we ran under the last election weren't decided by us, they were decided by the people. The people took the power back. The people said enough is enough. The people said that no reason for absentee voting makes absolute sense. The people decided that they wanted to end gerrymandering. The people decided they wanted to take the power back from this Legislature because they were tired of this body trying to make it more difficult to be a part of the democratic process; this body trying to control who actually wins elections instead of the people actually deciding who wins elections. The people decided that. Who you are upset about are not the legislators from 20 years ago, you're mad at the people. You're mad that they decided they wanted free and fair elections. You're mad that they decided they wanted gerrymandering to end. You're mad because they decided they wanted a fair game. They want, at the end of the day, that they get to choose who to send to this body and not a bunch of people who are already in this body. They decided they wanted integrity in their elections. So, they changed the rules and the laws to accomplish that. And I support the people's actual choice on those issues.

There is no question of integrity in the last election. There is no reason to change it and that's why we are voting "no."

Senator McBroom's second statement is as follows:

I'd like to also respond to make it very clear, these policies, this bill, and other bills we've been discussing and being referenced, are not new ideas. Just as I said yesterday—

It's been alleged that the cause of this bill is to believe in the "Big Lie", or what's characterized as the "Big Lie", although there's lots of big lies that might be characterized. And, I want to make it clear that the Senate Committee on Oversight adopted a report that specifically says those things aren't true. And beyond that it also discovered numerous problems that occurred in the last election and one of my colleagues just said—just a little bit ago—to say that the election was the most perfect one ever, maybe it was the most perfect one ever, but it wasn't flawless, it wasn't perfect, there were problems. There are causes for reforms, there's causes for reforms that have been suggested for decades and not just suggested since last November, but have existed for a long period of time. I think it is dramatically unfair to accuse members of this body, particularly those of us voting "yes" as being supporters of something that we already voted in my committee to say we are not supporters of. I object to that characterization of why I am voting "yes" today.

Senator Polehanki's statement is as follows:

I joined the following organizations who are opposed to Senate Bill No. 304 in voting "no" on Senate Bill No. 304 today—the Secretary of State, the Michigan Municipal League, the Michigan Association of County Clerks, the Michigan Association of Municipal Clerks, Self-Advocates of Michigan, Oakland County Clerks Association, the Michigan Democratic Party, the ACLU, All Voting is Local, Voters Not Politicians, Promote the Vote, League of Women Voters, Michigan League for Public Policy, Michigan Association for Justice, the National Association of Social Workers in Michigan, the Homeless Action Network of Detroit, the Michigan Coalition Against Homelessness, the Michigan State Employee Retirees Association, the Michigan Anti-Defamation League, American Association of University Women, the NAACP, the LDF, and the Michigan League of Conservation Voters. I would encourage any of my colleagues from across the aisle to stand up now and list any organizations that support this bill.

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

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

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

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

House Bill No. 5007, 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 sections 2 and 2a (MCL 28.292 and 28.292a), section 2 as amended and section 2a as added by 2020 PA 306.

Substitute (S-1).

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

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

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

House Bill No. 5007

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 Lauwers moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bill:

House Bill No. 5007

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 5007, 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 sections 1, 2, and 2a (MCL 28.291, 28.292, and 28.292a), section 1 as amended and section 2a as added by 2020 PA 306 and section 2 as amended by 2021 PA 73.

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

- 1. Amend page 15, line 8, after “**2022**,” by inserting “**and upon sufficient appropriation**.”

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 373

Yeas—16

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

Senator Ananich offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 23, line 16, by striking out all of enacting section 2.

Senator Chang requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

Roll Call No. 374

Yeas—16

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

Nays—20

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 375

Yeas—20

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

Nays—16

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

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Hertel, McMorrow, Moss, Bayer, Polehanki, Brinks, McCann, Santana, Geiss, Bullock, Chang, Alexander, Hollier and Wojno, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 5007.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Hertel’s statement is as follows:

I rise to regretfully give my “no” vote explanation. If either of the amendments had passed, both had been passed, I would certainly be willing to support this bill. But I would say for all of you that rail against socialism, is there anything more socialistic than giving everyone something for free and also refusing to pay for it? For those of you that talk about democracy, is there anything more ridiculous than offering to give somebody something for free as long they’re willing to vote for your other draconian rules that will make it harder for people to vote in the process—to use the state’s money to pay off getting what you want. So, simple, this week we are going to, in this body, vote to hand everybody something for free and then also vote to refuse to pay for it in the budget. Sounds good.

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

I first want to respond to the continued questions from our good colleague from the 38th District asking what election integrity measures we would support. I would say, unequivocally, the ones we currently have. I’d like to state again for the record that we don’t have to debate this in theory. We have data to back it up. The Heritage Foundation maintains a database of election fraud throughout the country and since 2007, has found 12 total cases of documented election fraud in the state of Michigan, which is an average of less than one per year. We also had record turnout in the 2020 election, and I think that should say to all of us that these security measures work. They are encouraging turnout and overwhelmingly preventing election fraud.

Moving on to House Bill No. 5007, the last time I spoke up in this chamber about Senate Bill No. 303 I did ask that until we consider ensuring that every resident of the state of Michigan has a free ID, we should not consider that bill. First of all, I want to say thank you for taking this step in that direction. However, without sufficient funding that does not guarantee that first, every single resident of the state of Michigan has a free ID, but I want to go a step further. In April of this year, our good colleague from the 16th District wrote an op-ed that appeared in the *Detroit News* which contained a number of ideas for ensuring that everybody in the state of Michigan has access to a state ID. Those ideas included allowing all high schoolers to receive a state ID upon receiving their high school diploma. It also included allowing people to receive a state ID at banks or libraries. It also included the idea of creating mobile satellite Secretary of State offices to help reach people in hard-to-reach places where they are. These are all excellent ideas that this body should absolutely support and fund fully. Going on in this op-ed, our colleague said, and I quote, “As leaders we have an obligation to do all we can to identify and remove government-created obstacles for all Michigan citizens in their pursuit of happiness,” and I could not agree more, especially given that this bill is tied to Senate Bill No. 303, we should all stand against them because they do nothing but create government-created obstacles that get in the way of all Michigan citizens in their pursuit of happiness.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator McMorrow's statement is as follows:

My amendment to this bill is very simple. It would amend page 15, line 8 and states that beginning January 2022 and following that by inserting, "and upon sufficient appropriation" the secretary of state shall not charge a fee for etc., etc. This very simple amendment would just ensure that we fund this bill appropriately and I ask for my colleagues support.

Senator Stamas' first statement is as follows:

While I appreciate the good Senator's amendment, at this time I would ask my colleagues to vote "no." The Governor has made it very clear in policy bills that she will not support the appropriation portion of that. While I'd be happy to work with them and put the dollars in there, the Governor has made it clear that she would not support that. I would ask my colleagues for a "no" vote on this.

Senator Ananich's statement is as follows:

My amendment is very simple. It would break the tie-bar to Senate Bill No. 303. If this bill is truly about making IDs more accessible, we should let it stand on its own merit rather than tying it to a toxic bill that is designed to make it harder for people to vote. If we're not going to fund it, if we're going to tie-bar it to a bill that makes it harder for people to vote, I have to ask what the motive is here. Is it really about getting people IDs, or is it about perpetuating the "Big Lie"? It seems pretty clear to me. I ask for your support and that my remarks be printed in the record, and I hope I didn't offend anyone's delicate sensibilities.

Senator Stamas' second statement is as follows:

I just rise to speak to House Bill No. 5007 and ensure the good Senator from the 13th District that while we did not support the amendment, we do support the funding of this and I look forward to her support of this.

Recess

Senator Lauwers moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 11:06 a.m.

11:24 a.m.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senator McBroom introduced
Senate Bill No. 682, entitled

A bill to create the office of rural development within the department of agriculture and rural development; and to prescribe the powers and duties of the office of rural development, the deputy of the office of rural development, and certain state departments and officials.

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

Senator MacDonald introduced
Senate Bill No. 683, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 288, entitled "Probate code of 1939," by amending sections 3 and 5 (MCL 712A.3 and 712A.5), section 3 as amended by 2019 PA 109 and section 5 as amended by 1996 PA 409.

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

House Bill No. 4075, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 62, entitled "An act to authorize the director of the department of state police to promulgate a uniform traffic code; to authorize a city, township, or village to adopt the uniform traffic code by reference without publication in full; and to prescribe criminal penalties and civil sanctions for violation of the code," by amending section 1 (MCL 257.951), as amended by 2006 PA 297.

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

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

House Bill No. 4076, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 220, entitled "Persons with disabilities civil rights act," (MCL 37.1101 to 37.1607) by adding section 102a.

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

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

House Bill No. 5003, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled "Natural resources and environmental protection act," by amending sections 3104, 3110, 3118, 3120, 4104, 11135, 11153, 30104, 30109, 32312, and 32513 (MCL 324.3104, 324.3110, 324.3118, 324.3120, 324.4104, 324.11135, 324.11153, 324.30104, 324.30109, 324.32312, and 324.32513), section 3104 as amended by 2018 PA 518, sections 3110, 4104, 11135, and 11153 as amended by 2017 PA 90, and sections 3118, 3120, 30104, 30109, 32312, and 32513 as amended by 2019 PA 84.

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

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

House Bill No. 5041, entitled

A bill to amend 1973 PA 116, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of children through the licensing and regulation of child care organizations; to provide for the establishment of standards of care for child care organizations; to prescribe powers and duties of certain departments of this state and adoption facilitators; to provide penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts," by amending sections 1, 3h, and 11 (MCL 722.111, 722.113h, and 722.121), section 1 as amended by 2020 PA 6 and section 3h as added and section 11 as amended by 2017 PA 257.

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

House Bill No. 5042, entitled

A bill to amend 1973 PA 116, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of children through the licensing and regulation of child care organizations; to provide for the establishment of standards of care for child care organizations; to prescribe powers and duties of certain departments of this state and adoption facilitators; to provide penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts," by amending sections 1, 5c, and 5m (MCL 722.111, 722.115c, and 722.115m), section 1 as amended by 2020 PA 6, section 5c as amended by 2017 PA 256, and section 5m as added by 2017 PA 258.

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

House Bill No. 5043, entitled

A bill to create family child care networks; to prescribe the powers and duties of state departments and agencies; and to provide resources to child care providers.

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

House Bill No. 5044, entitled

A bill to provide for infant and toddler child care contracts; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments and agencies; and to provide resources for certain child care providers.

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

House Bill No. 5045, entitled

A bill to amend 1973 PA 116, entitled "An act to provide for the protection of children through the licensing and regulation of child care organizations; to provide for the establishment of standards of care for child care organizations; to prescribe powers and duties of certain departments of this state and adoption facilitators; to provide penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts," by amending section 11b (MCL 722.121b), as amended by 2017 PA 258.

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

House Bill No. 5046, entitled

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

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

House Bill No. 5047, entitled

A bill to amend 1973 PA 116, entitled “An act to provide for the protection of children through the licensing and regulation of child care organizations; to provide for the establishment of standards of care for child care organizations; to prescribe powers and duties of certain departments of this state and adoption facilitators; to provide penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 3g (MCL 722.113g), as amended by 2017 PA 257.

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

House Bill No. 5048, entitled

A bill to amend 1973 PA 116, entitled “An act to provide for the protection of children through the licensing and regulation of child care organizations; to provide for the establishment of standards of care for child care organizations; to prescribe powers and duties of certain departments of this state and adoption facilitators; to provide penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” (MCL 722.111 to 722.128) by adding section 8e.

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

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Families, Seniors, and Veterans.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, resumed the Chair.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

General Orders

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

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

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and without amendment, the following bills:

House Bill No. 4712, entitled

A bill to amend 2007 PA 36, entitled “Michigan business tax act,” by amending section 437 (MCL 208.1437), as amended by 2021 PA 27.

Senate Bill No. 645, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 504, 524, 556, and 1311g (MCL 380.504, 380.524, 380.556, and 380.1311g), sections 504 and 556 as amended by 2011 PA 277, section 524 as amended by 2018 PA 619, and section 1311g as amended by 2018 PA 42.

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

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

House Bill No. 4295, entitled

A bill to amend 2016 PA 281, entitled “Medical marijuana facilities licensing act,” by amending section 402 (MCL 333.27402), as amended by 2018 PA 582.

Substitute (S-1).

The following is the amendment to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole:

1. Amend page 3, line 25, after “The” by striking out the balance of the line through the first “and” on line 26.

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

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

Senate Bill No. 664, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending sections 6, 21f, 101, and 163 (MCL 388.1606, 388.1621f, 388.1701, and 388.1763), sections 6, 21f, and 101 as amended by 2021 PA 48 and section 163 as amended by 2021 PA 15.

Substitute (S-1).

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Shirkey’s statement is as follows:

Thank you, Mr. President, I think. I’m getting tired of this—people across this beautiful state, our nation, now poaching some fantastic people—but my entire career, I’ve never stood in front of somebody advancing their careers, and so we’re going to celebrate one more time. Today we say goodbye and best wishes to a very special member of our policy team. Joining us today, in the Gallery, is Christine’s mom and dad, Mike and Jodi. Thank you for being here. And I would be remiss in not also acknowledging Dan Dundas, a former key part of our policy team, and he has a special memory and fondness for Christine as well.

Our deputy director of the Senate Majority Policy Office, Christine Simon, will be leaving the Senate for greener pastures, or something along the lines of black pavement, as she continues to grow in her career and expertise. As everybody here knows, Christine has served our Republican Caucus, and this Legislature, with exceptional compassion, integrity and dedication. She is known for her quick wit, and extensive expertise that has manifested on occasion to properly put just about anybody in their proper place. Anyone who has worked with Christine has found her knowledgeable and full of forward-thinking ideas. She has been a tremendous help to Senators Barrett and Schmidt, in particular, on transportation policy and budget, as well as Senator Stamas and our budget team for her time as deputy budget director.

Christine is a quiet expert, whose voice has often proven to be far more impactful than it might initially sound. She is disarming in the way she inquires and questions and raises the quality of the conversation, regardless of the topic, and regardless of who’s involved. Christine’s passion is always centered around serving others and helping them accomplish their goals. She has not just been an outstanding member of our staff, she’s been a loyal friend and thoughtful mentor to her fellow colleagues. She takes special pride in her meaningful relationships that she has forged in the Legislature, and in Lansing, and those who have had the pleasure to work with her can attest to that, including me. She has used her tremendous knowledge of state government and its operations to benefit this chamber and the citizens of Michigan. Her creative approach to policy development and dedication to this body has driven us all to be our best, all of us to be our best.

We have no doubt that success will continue on her road ahead. I have been proud to call Christine a valued member of our team. Not only that, I’m a bit envious, and, selfishly, a bit sad as well. I’m envious as to where she’s going, both of the company, and for her—for the company because of the asset that they are now gaining, and for her because I know she is going to be like a kid at Christmas in this new endeavor. And a bit sad, selfishly, because I no longer have the opportunity to work with you and learn from you. So we congratulate you, Christine, on your many accomplishments, and wish you the very best on this next leg of your career advancement. And colleagues, I’m asking you to please join me in thanking her for her passionate service, and wishing Christine the very, very best.

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

Senate Bill No. 645

Senate Bill No. 664

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

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

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

House Bill No. 4364

House Bill No. 4366

House Bill No. 4365

Senate Bill No. 645

Senate Bill No. 664

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4364, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 221 and 310 (MCL 257.221 and 257.310), section 221 as amended by 2020 PA 93 and section 310 as amended by 2020 PA 304.

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. 376

Yeas—36

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

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect,

The recommendation was concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

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. 4366, 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 2020 PA 94.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 377

Yeas—36

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

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect,

The recommendation was concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

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.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4365, 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 2020 PA 306.

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. 378

Yeas—36

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

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The question being on concurring in the committee recommendation to give the bill immediate effect, The recommendation was concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor. The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 645, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 504, 524, 556, and 1311g (MCL 380.504, 380.524, 380.556, and 380.1311g), sections 504 and 556 as amended by 2011 PA 277, section 524 as amended by 2018 PA 619, and section 1311g as amended by 2018 PA 42.

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. 379

Yeas—36

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

Nays—0

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:

Senate Bill No. 664, entitled

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending sections 6, 21f, 101, and 163 (MCL 388.1606, 388.1621f, 388.1701, and 388.1763), sections 6, 21f, and 101 as amended by 2021 PA 48 and section 163 as amended by 2021 PA 15.

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. 380

Yeas—36

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

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of
Resolutions

Senator Lauwers moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 84

The motion prevailed.

Senate Resolution No. 84.

A resolution to designate October 2021 as Michigan Library Appreciation Month.

(This resolution was offered on Wednesday, October 6 and consideration postponed. See Senate Journal No. 76, p. 1648.)

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

Senators Daley, Barrett, Bumstead, Victory, Bizon, Outman, Lauwers, McBroom, Runestad, Horn, Theis, Johnson, Stamas, Nesbitt, VanderWall, Shirkey, LaSata, MacDonald, Zorn and Schmidt offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 85.

A resolution to urge the United States Congress to oppose unnecessary and harmful changes to Internal Revenue Service reporting requirements for Michigan's financial institutions.

Whereas, The U.S. Department of Treasury has proposed requiring financial institutions to report financial account information for accounts with a gross flow threshold or fair market value of \$600 or more. The proposal calls for financial institutions to report gross inflows and outflows with a breakdown for physical cash, transactions with foreign accounts, and transfers to and from another account with the same owner. It would apply to business and personal accounts, including bank, loan, and investment accounts at those financial institutions subject to the proposed requirement; and

Whereas, There are very real concerns over data privacy and security if this proposed Internal Revenue Service reporting requirement, or a similar requirement, is put in place. Keeping member and customer account information private and secure is among the primary goals of all financial institutions in Michigan and this proposal could jeopardize the security of accounts and personal information. As we have seen, numerous government data breaches have occurred in recent years. Moreover, the proposal constitutes an invasion of consumer privacy; and

Whereas, Financial institutions throughout our state and country are already subject to many burdensome regulations that increase costs, damage customer relations, and otherwise hurt these businesses. The adoption of this extensive and intrusive financial reporting proposal would deepen that burden for Michigan's community-based and other financial institutions; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the United States Congress to oppose unnecessary and harmful changes to Internal Revenue Service reporting requirements for Michigan's financial institutions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, and the chairs of the United States Senate Committee on Finance and United States House Committee on Ways and Means.

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

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

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

Senator Lauwers moved that further consideration of the resolution be postponed for today.

The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Statements

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Santana's statement is as follows:

Yesterday one of my colleagues across the aisle talked about his service to our county, and we are greatly appreciative for that. But today I rise just to express my concern of how we as Senators address this body, especially as it pertains to our freedom and liberties, that we also so enjoy. We have many veterans in this chamber, who have served this country around the world and domestically, who have fought on the front lines to lead many into battle, and also have encountered many terrorists as well. I have a husband and also a chief of staff who I respect, and their service to our country, and quite frankly, neither of them have ever cared to share their battles that they have faced to protect those freedoms and liberties that we often care for.

So as this body continues to move forward, let us be mindful that when we get up to this microphone, to speak about these freedoms and liberties that we care so much about, and that many veterans in this chamber, who we don't know what their service has been to our country, that we don't speak with rhetoric that dictates that we are the only ones in this chamber who have served this country and have seen what freedom and liberties have been protected by those individuals.

As we go into Veterans Day, I want to make sure that we thank everyone in this chamber for their service, no matter when they have served our country, and that we think about how we say those words, and how those words come across to those individuals who have also served this country as well. I would like my remarks printed in the journal, and I would hope that, as we continue to move forward, that we continue to think about how we say things, and how those words matter.

Senator Barrett's statement is as follows:

First I'd like to start by just saying I stand by the remarks I made yesterday. I don't take lightly any of the statements we make here and I think it's a very, significant disservice to both our constituents, the 10 million people of the state of Michigan, and in all of us here in this body to present an argument against a policy bill that is being called legislative terrorism. That's just a complete and total exaggeration, and again, I will reiterate my own life experience to substantiate that.

But really, I wanted to rise today to point out earlier in the discussion about the passage of the election integrity bills that we brought up, it was made referenced by Senator's, I think, from the 23rd and 27th districts as well as others, sort of suggesting that we can never improve on the laws that we already have and I wanted to point out that we have already taken legislative steps to change election law in terms past. After the 2016 election, I personally introduced legislation, House Bill No. 5644 of 2018, that was passed and signed into law by then-Governor Rick Snyder that became Public Act No. 127 of 2018, that did a simple thing, it required use of paper ballots here in Michigan for all of our elections.

After the 2016 election I observed, like many others, that a number of states around the country had electronic voting machines that were touch screen, digital in nature that did not provide an actual record of how a vote had taken place. I felt it was important for any contested, any contested election, anything going forward that we, at the very least, have a paper record of the election. Now, that bill passed nearly unanimously, it had one "no" vote in the house at the time and it passed unanimously in the Senate. Every single legislator in this chamber today, who was an elected legislator then, voted in favor of that bill. It didn't pass with any fireworks or fanfare and that was at a time where I think we could have reasonable discussions about how we perform our elections going forward.

Of course in 2018 the voters of Michigan amended our constitution to significantly change election law. And, subsequent to that, our Secretary of State broke the law in Michigan to completely throw away any type of signature verification on absentee ballots that came back in our state at a time when an overwhelming number of people were voting by absentee ballot. So, election law is a continuously moving target and it's a continuously changing dynamic, that we need to observe what happens and then make changes and not be ridiculed or accused of making changes for some nefarious reason.

It was also stated that the 2020 election was the most secure election in history. I don't know by what metric we can claim that unless you're saying you have knowledge of exactly how much insecurity there was in previous elections or the relative level of insecurity in the 2020 election. I know that's a talking point that's thrown out, but again, I just wanted to put on the record again that every member in this chamber who was an elected Representative or Senator in the 2017-2018 term of the Legislature voted in support of Public Act No. 127 of 2018.

Senator Hertel's statement is as follows:

Apparently I need to clarify to the good Senator from the 24th District that I was not saying we can't improve our election laws. What I was saying was that the bills in front of us were not an improvement. Certainly if we can find ways to agree to make laws better, all for it, but I believe that's about actually allowing more people in the process, not less. I disagree with that.

As for the concern about hyperbole on the floor of the Senate, suggesting that an elected official broke the law in order to cheat in an election may be an example of that. Or standing up on the floor and saying that you're willing to go to jail and replace somebody else as was done earlier this year would be an example of that. I can think of lots of hyperbolic talk on the floor of the Senate that many, many people have made.

Just to be clear, again, we can certainly change laws. I would just think we'd want to make them better and have more people as part of the process, not try to actually make it harder for people to be part of our democracy. That was my opposition to the bill.

Senator McMorrow's statement is as follows:

I'd first like to thank our colleague from the 24th District for legislation in the past that created paper ballots. I think that is an excellent measure of security we have in the state of Michigan to know that we have a hard copy record of every single vote that takes place throughout the state of Michigan, that has been used in over 250 audits of the 2020 election, and that's very very good public policy.

Now in regard to the comment that we can't improve on current election law, I'd like to again state for the record that there are 12 total documented cases of election fraud from 2007 to today, an average of less than one per year, which indicates to me that our system is working. However, our clerks asked us ahead of the 2020 election to pass legislation to allow for additional time to process absentee ballots in response to the will of the people, who ruled in 2018 via the ballot to expand access to absentee voting. I think that is an excellent way for us to listen to our election experts and improve our election processes and as we look to do that, I would just ask that we look at data and research. We have all of the research and information we know to feel confident that our elections are secure, and this very body spent months investigating additional claims that went beyond those confirmed cases of election fraud and found that there was no evidence to support those claims.

Senator Hollier's statement is as follows:

I rise to speak about Indigenous Peoples' Day. It will be this upcoming Monday and obviously we will not be in session between now and then, so I wanted to take the opportunity to thank and highlight my colleague, Senator Irwin, for introducing Senate Bill No. 221 to formally recognize Indigenous Peoples' Day on Monday. It is a holiday that is incredibly important to me, and many of you, as we talk about the involvement and impact of native cultures in Michigan and across the country.

It was first created in 1977 and is the result of some work at the UN, but the first state to adopt it was South Dakota. This is not a bashing of liberal things, this is not a political issue, it is about recognizing the diversity of our culture, recognizing the people that so often are not a part of the normal narrative of our state politics. We only think of them when we think about rivers and lakes or communities, the names, the counties. We don't think about the people that still live. We don't think about the culture that they impact today. That is what Indigenous Peoples' Day is about.

I'm really excited and have been proud to have worked with Councilwoman Raquel Castañeda-López, who in her first term got the city of Detroit to recognize the first Monday in October as Indigenous Peoples' Day. It is something we should be doing as a state. It is something I know that your constituents would be interested in doing. As a native person, a member of the Muscogee Creek Nation, it is really important to me. It is really important to my ancestry. It is an opportunity for us to talk about that heritage; to talk about the experiences we've had. My grandmother, who is alive today, will be 99 next year, and our very first conversation post pandemic when we sat down was her telling me about how her mother was sent away to an Indian boarding school and she didn't teach her language because that was one of the main reasons they existed.

The Canadian government is grappling with their history of boarding schools and how so many children were lost; so much language and culture was lost. Monday is about recognizing that our culture is valuable, that people see it. That it is not just the native people you see on TV, but we're not extinct, and it's not just casinos. Indigenous Peoples' Day is important and it is time as a state we recognize and honor those Indigenous People and not just think of them as the tribes, and the casino, and those kinds of spaces. Not just think about the rivers and counties that are named after them, but think about the real people today who are still trying to practice our culture and live in a way, in a country and state that recognizes and values our experiences here.

I ask that my colleagues support Senator Irwin's bill for Indigenous Peoples' Day; and that you go out and celebrate with your constituents, your friends and neighbors Monday the Indigenous people that lived in your community before your ancestors moved and settled there, but also still do, and the continued impact they have on our community and our lives.

Senator Geiss' statement is as follows:

I know everyone here knows about the Council of State Governments, and that we're a member of the Council of State Governments—all of us are—and I just wanted to take a moment to welcome and honor the latest CSG BILLD fellow—that is the Bowhay Institute for Legislative Leadership Development—and if I may break decorum because he joins several of us who are former BILLD fellows. I know normally we only say things by district number, if I may break decorum to say names if that is OK?

Senator Bullock is the latest BILLD fellow, and he joins several of us who are former BILLD fellows who were BILLD fellows in the past, starting with Senator Horn in 2007, Senator Schmidt in 2009, Senator Nesbitt in 2012, myself in 2015, Senator Runestad in 2016, and Senator Santana in 2019. There are many other BILLD fellows from Michigan but we're the ones currently serving in this chamber. Could we get a round of applause for Senator Bullock becoming the latest BILLD fellow from the Michigan Senate?

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Thursday, October 7:

House Bill Nos. 4075 4076 5003 5041 5042 5043 5044 5045 5046 5047 5048

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Wednesday, October 6, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

Senate Bill Nos. 675 676 677 678 679 680 681

House Bill Nos. 5368 5369 5370 5371 5372 5373 5374 5375

Committee Reports

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

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

The meeting scheduled on Wednesday, October 6, 2021, at 3:00 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building, did not have a quorum present.

Scheduled Meetings

Economic and Small Business Development – Thursday, October 14, 12:00 noon, Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-1721

Finance – Wednesday, October 13, 12:30 p.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5312

State Drug Treatment Court Advisory Committee – Tuesday, October 19, 10:00 a.m., Legislative Council Conference Room, 3rd Floor, Boji Tower (517) 373-0212

Senator LaSata moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 12:09 p.m.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 12, 2021, at 10:00 a.m.

MARGARET O'BRIEN
Secretary of the Senate