

No. 56
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
101st Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2021

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Wednesday, June 16, 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—excused
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 Eric Nesbitt of the 26th District offered the following invocation:

Lord, thank You for the opportunity for each of us to be here today to represent the people of our districts and the state of Michigan. We are each unique with our own perspectives and priorities, with the same common goals of making life better for the people we have the privilege to represent. May Your wisdom shine through in our decisions and may Your grace and patience shine through in our interactions. I pray we keep working for improvement and that the results serve the people of Michigan well, both now and into the future. Thank You for Your guidance, strength, and generosity. May we exhibit these virtues of goodness and effectiveness in our daily lives and our roles in the Senate.

In His holy name I pray. Amen

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

Senator Runestad entered the Senate Chamber.

Motions and Communications

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

Senator Lauwers moved that Senator Barrett be excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

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

Senator Bullock entered the Senate Chamber.

Messages from the Governor

The following message from the Governor was received:

Date: June 15, 2021
Time: 1:02 p.m.

To the President of the Senate:

Sir—I have this day approved and signed

Enrolled Senate Bill No. 437 (Public Act No. 27), being

An act to amend 2007 PA 36, entitled "An act to meet deficiencies in state funds by providing for the imposition, levy, computation, collection, assessment, reporting, payment, and enforcement of taxes on certain commercial, business, and financial activities; to prescribe the powers and duties of public officers and state departments; to provide for the inspection of certain taxpayer records; to provide for interest and penalties; to provide exemptions, credits, and refunds; to provide for the disposition of funds; to provide for the interrelation of this act with other acts; and to make appropriations," by amending section 437 (MCL 208.1437), as amended by 2017 PA 217.

(Filed with the Secretary of State on June 15, 2021, at 2:20 p.m.)

Respectfully,
Gretchen Whitmer
Governor

Recess

Senator Lauwers moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair. The motion prevailed, the time being 10:07 a.m.

11:31 a.m.

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

During the recess, Senators Geiss, Theis and Shirkey entered the Senate Chamber.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senator McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 539, entitled

A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled “The general property tax act,” by amending section 7b (MCL 211.7b), as amended by 2013 PA 161.

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

Senator McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 540, entitled

A bill to amend 2014 PA 86, entitled “Local community stabilization authority act,” by amending section 17 (MCL 123.1357), as amended by 2020 PA 196.

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

Senator McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 541, entitled

A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled “The general property tax act,” (MCL 211.1 to 211.155) by adding section 7c.

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

Senator Hollier introduced

Senate Bill No. 542, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending sections 1311b and 1311d (MCL 380.1311b and 380.1311d), section 1311b as amended by 2012 PA 620 and section 1311d as added by 1999 PA 23.

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

Senators VanderWall and Hertel introduced

Senate Bill No. 543, entitled

A bill to amend 1963 PA 125, entitled “An act to provide for the incorporation, supervision, and regulation of nonprofit dental care corporations; to prescribe the functions of the commissioner of insurance as to such corporations; to provide for the imposition of a regulatory fee; and to prescribe penalties for violations of this act,” by amending section 1 (MCL 550.351), as amended by 1990 PA 129.

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

Senator Barrett introduced

Senate Bill No. 544, 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 the title and sections 2 and 2a (MCL 28.292 and 28.292a), the title as amended by 2002 PA 553, section 2 as amended and section 2a as added by 2020 PA 306.

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

Senator Theis introduced

Senate Bill No. 545, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending section 1166 (MCL 380.1166), as amended by 2016 PA 391, and by adding section 1166b.

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

Senator Chang entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator VanderWall introduced

Senate Bill No. 546, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 2891 (MCL 333.2891), as amended by 2020 PA 209, and by adding section 2891a.

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

House Bill No. 4240, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 4708 (MCL 600.4708), as amended by 2014 PA 333.

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 Judiciary and Public Safety.

House Bill No. 4241, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 625n (MCL 257.625n), as amended by 2010 PA 155.

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 Judiciary and Public Safety.

House Bill No. 4380, entitled

A bill to create certain funds; to create a Michigan military and veteran services support fund board and prescribe its powers and duties; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities.

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. 4694, entitled

A bill to amend 1962 PA 174, entitled “Uniform commercial code,” by amending sections 9520, 9521, and 9525 (MCL 440.9520, 440.9521, and 440.9525), section 9520 as amended by 2008 PA 383, section 9521 as amended by 2012 PA 88, and section 9525 as amended by 2016 PA 229.

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 Insurance and Banking.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Messages from the House

Senate Bill No. 155, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 17703, 17708, 17751, and 17757 (MCL 333.17703, 333.17708, 333.17751, and 333.17757), section 17703 as amended by 2016 PA 528, section 17708 as amended by 2020 PA 4, section 17751 as amended by 2020 PA 136, and section 17757 as amended by 2016 PA 383, and by adding section 17744f.

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.
Senator Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The question being on the motion to give the bill immediate effect,
Senator Lauwers moved the further consideration of the bill be postponed for today.
The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 156, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” (MCL 500.100 to 500.8302) by adding section 3406v.
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.
Senator Lauwers moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The question being on the motion to give the bill immediate effect,
Senator Lauwers moved the further consideration of the bill be postponed for today.
The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 440, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 22224b.
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 concurred in, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.
The Senate agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Secretary for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

Senate Bill No. 37, entitled

A bill to make, supplement, and adjust appropriations for various state departments and agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2021; to provide for certain conditions on appropriations; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.
The House of Representatives has substituted (H-1) the bill.
The House of Representatives has passed the bill as substituted (H-1) and ordered that it be given immediate effect.
Pending the order that, under rule 3.202, the bill be laid over one day,
Senator Lauwers moved that the rule be suspended.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on concurring in the substitute made to the bill by the House,
The substitute was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 271

Yeas—35

Alexander	Geiss	McBroom	Schmidt
Ananich	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
Daley	MacDonald	Santana	

Nays—0

Excused—1

Barrett

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

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 McBroom 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:

Senate Bill No. 303, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 523, 813, and 829 (MCL 168.523, 168.813, and 168.829), section 523 as amended by 2018 PA 129 and sections 813 and 829 as amended by 2018 PA 603.

Senate Bill No. 304, entitled

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

House Bill No. 4641, entitled

A bill to amend 1992 PA 147, entitled “Neighborhood enterprise zone act,” by amending section 11 (MCL 207.781), as amended by 2020 PA 3.

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:

Senate Bill No. 285, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 759, 759a, 759b, and 761 (MCL 168.759, 168.759a, 168.759b, and 168.761), sections 759 and 761 as amended by 2020 PA 302 and section 759a as amended by 2012 PA 523.

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.

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

Senate Bill No. 251, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 46701, 47309, 47311, and 47315 (MCL 324.46701, 324.47309, 324.47311, and 324.47315), as added by 1995 PA 57.

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.

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

Senate Bill No. 360, entitled

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled "Income tax act of 1967," (MCL 206.1 to 206.713) by adding sections 279 and 678.

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.

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

Senate Bill No. 361, entitled

A bill to amend 1966 PA 346, entitled "State housing development authority act of 1966," by amending the title and section 22 (MCL 125.1422), the title as amended by 2004 PA 280 and section 22 as amended by 2012 PA 327, and by adding section 22e.

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.

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

Senate Bill No. 362, entitled

A bill to provide for the establishment of attainable housing districts in certain local governmental units; to provide for the exemption from certain taxes; to levy and collect a specific tax upon the owners of certain qualified facilities; to provide for the disposition of the tax; to provide for the obtaining and transferring of an exemption certificate and to prescribe the contents of those certificates; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officials; and to provide penalties.

Substitute (S-2).

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

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

Senate Bill No. 364, entitled

A bill to amend 1992 PA 147, entitled "Neighborhood enterprise zone act," by amending sections 2 and 3 (MCL 207.772 and 207.773), section 2 as amended by 2020 PA 3 and section 3 as amended by 2008 PA 204.

Substitute (S-2).

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

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

Senate Bill No. 422, entitled

A bill to provide for the establishment of residential housing districts in certain local governmental units; to provide for the exemption from certain taxes; to levy and collect a specific tax upon the owners of certain qualified residential facilities; to provide for the disposition of the tax; to provide for the obtaining and transferring of an exemption certificate and to prescribe the contents of those certificates; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officials; and to provide penalties.

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.

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

Senate Bill No. 432, entitled

A bill to amend 1966 PA 346, entitled “State housing development authority act of 1966,” by amending section 15a (MCL 125.1415a), as amended by 1994 PA 363. Substitute (S-2).

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

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

Senate Bill No. 285

Senate Bill No. 303

Senate Bill No. 304

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

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4015, entitled

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

The 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. 272

Yeas—35

Alexander	Geiss	McBroom	Schmidt
Ananich	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
Daley	MacDonald	Santana	

Nays—0

Excused—1

Barrett

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 prohibit certain methods, acts, and practices in trade or commerce; to prescribe certain powers and duties; to provide for certain remedies, damages, and penalties; to provide for the promulgation of rules; to provide for certain investigations; and to prescribe penalties,”
The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4123, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 5301, 5403, and 5405 (MCL 324.5301, 324.5403, and 324.5405), section 5301 as amended by 2012 PA 560 and sections 5403 and 5405 as added by 1997 PA 26.

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. 273

Yeas—35

Alexander	Geiss	McBroom	Schmidt
Ananich	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
Daley	MacDonald	Santana	

Nays—0

Excused—1

Barrett

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 protect the environment and natural resources of the state; to codify, revise, consolidate, and classify laws relating to the environment and natural resources of the state; to regulate the discharge of certain substances into the environment; to regulate the use of certain lands, waters, and other natural resources of the state; to protect the people’s right to hunt and fish; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies and officials; to provide for certain charges, fees, assessments, and donations; to provide certain appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,”

The Senate agreed to the full title.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 285, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 759, 759a, 759b, and 761 (MCL 168.759, 168.759a, 168.759b, and 168.761), sections 759 and 761 as amended by 2020 PA 302 and section 759a as amended by 2012 PA 523, and by adding section 760a.

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. 274

Yeas—19

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

Nays—16

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

Excused—1

Barrett

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Moss, Brinks, McCann, Bullock, Bayer, Ananich, Hollier, Alexander, Santana, McMorrow, Wojno, Polehanki, Hertel, Geiss, and Chang under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 285.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Moss’ statement, in which Senators Brinks, McCann, Bullock, Bayer, Ananich, Hollier and Alexander concurred, is as follows:

Who asked for this? Who asked for this? I can tell you who didn’t ask for this—the people on the front lines safeguarding our democracy ensuring free and fair elections, the Michigan County Clerks Association, the Michigan Municipal Clerks Association, nonpartisan entities, have opposed this bill. Specifically, this bill, among the methods that you would require of voters to include with their absentee voter ballot application is a photocopy of their ID, their Michigan driver license number, their Michigan personal ID card number, or the last four digits of their Social Security number—the last four digits of their Social Security number. A clerk doesn’t even have access to a voter’s Social Security number. It’s not required to be in the Qualified Voter File, so you’re going to have people surrender personal information to someone who has nothing that they’re able to do with it. I know proponents of this bill like security breaches—just like what happened on January 6—but this bill continues to leave Michigan voters more vulnerable and not less. It’s stunning that you think you have a product here that is going to assist with election administration when it’s fully rejected by the very good people who are administering elections here in the state of Michigan.

I can tell you who did ask for this—people who were deceived, people who were lied to, people who were lied to by the former President about the integrity of our election, and that lie was amplified by eleven members of this chamber who sent an appeal to Congress on January 5 not to count our votes. But it wasn't an actual appeal—you didn't back up that letter with data or statistics because there is none. It only appealed to insurrectionists on the very next day, and that's who's leading this charge here, Mr. President. I've heard this circular logic for a few months here from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that Senate Republicans are introducing these measures to respond to citizens who don't have faith in our elections, but they're the reasons that our citizens don't have faith in our elections, not the elections themselves.

The best response to those people is not to put forward Senate Bill No. 285, the best response to those people is to tell them the truth. Our 2020 election here in Michigan was under the microscope unlike any other election in this country. All 83 boards of county canvassers affirmed the integrity of our election. The Board of State Canvassers certified this election. The Republican members of this Legislature conducted oversight hearings for more than a month after the election. None of this turned up any credible claims or credible evidence whatsoever of pervasive criminal fraud in our election. Those were your committee hearings.

Leaders lead, but instead of debunking this lie about our election, you have chosen to double down. We already have a voter ID law here in the state of Michigan. It works. 522,000 people in my county—in Oakland County—voted absentee in 2020. No cases of ID fraud. All my clerks asked for of us was for more time to process those ballots. Instead you want to add more onto their election workload to handle 522,000 pieces of personal information you're asking voters to surrender for people who don't even have a reason to have that information. This bill does not make it easier to conduct an election. It does not make it more secure here in Michigan. It just feeds the same lies that propelled the January 6 insurrection. When you talk about restoring the integrity of our democracy, it is you who is contributing to the same factors that are eroding it.

Senator Santana's statement, in which Senator Bayer concurred, is as follows:

No justice, no peace. What do we want? Justice. When do we want it? Now. Those are the words of Black people who marched on Washington demanding civil rights and voting rights during the 60s. Today those are the words of Black people who cried out in anger and frustration because we are still having the same debates of 1965. In 2021, we are still fighting for equality under the law. Why? Because as soon as we got the right to vote there were those who immediately started developing ways to take it away from us. These bills are particularly egregious because we are living in a time when Jim Crow esquire has figured out new ways to oppress us.

When we cannot win in court—the court of law—of course, we take it to the ballot. We organize and elect those who can best represent us. Now you want to suppress the vote so you can stay in power. Those of you who are sponsoring this legislation and who will ultimately go with this garbage we label and criticize—you will not like what you're going to be called. And those of you who can't understand why you are being called something you don't like, let me put it into context for you right now. At a time when it was commonplace to lynch Black people, deny the vote to Black people, and discriminate against Black people, we still went to Washington and demanded that the federal government give us the civil rights and voting rights. They continued to push that movement until we got the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Black people traveled from the South. Many of them who could not stop to use the bathroom because it was against the law. They could not stop to eat at a restaurant because it was against the law to serve them. Many of them who could not rest at a hotel because it was against the law to stop. But they traveled to Washington anyway. Because of those Black people who traveled and sacrificed for us in 1964 and 1965 is why Black women like me can stand here today to vote against this injustice of 2021.

This bill package is not about voter integrity. It is not about preventing fraud. It is not about ensuring the security of our election. And this is not about preventing foreign interference. This is about being scared of losing an election because of what brother Malcolm said: "We are not outnumbered, we are outorganized." Well that is the election that scares you because Democrats, with a strong support of Black votes, outorganized you and got that fool out of the White House. And you are still mad about it.

To give it more historical context on this voter ID, here are some interesting facts as well that you should take note of. When we voted for Johnson, there was no voter ID. When we voted for Nixon, there was no voter ID. When we voted for Ford, there was no voter ID. When we voted for Carter, there was no voter ID. When we voted for Reagan, there was no voter ID. And when we voted for Bush, there was no voter ID. When we voted for Clinton, there was no voter ID. Bush again, no voter ID. Obama runs for office, now you want to start checking IDs. Trump becomes your candidate, you force voter ID laws when there is no proof of widescale voter fraud. Trump lost, you believed the big lie and engaged in treason at the U.S. Capitol.

And now you want to change the rules because you realized that the demographics of America are changing and your base is out of control. So now you want to change the rules and add barriers so that people who look like me get frustrated and decide not to vote.

That's your new political strategy to stay in power. For an entire year, all we heard was Republicans throughout the state—it's freedom and liberty; patriotism; the Second Amendment; an American flag and bald eagles—and yet here we are watching this so-called patriotism and defenders of freedom disenfranchise American voters. Take that yellow flag off of your walls because this is not freedom. This is legislative terrorism from tyrants with a misguided understanding of the Constitution and the spirit of 1776. The only things missing from these bills are the literacy tests and the official count for the number of bubbles on a bar of soap.

Senator McMorrow's statement is as follows:

As one of my colleagues mentioned, one of the forms of ID that would be required in this bill is the use of a Social Security number, which is not something that the clerks currently have access to. Taking that out of this bill, that leaves us with a Michigan driver license number, a Michigan personal ID card, or a copy of your ID. Unlike many people in this room, when bills like this come up I call my clerks. I called my clerks at 10:30 last night; they love hearing from me. They don't get to go to bed. I asked about this bill and I said, Who's going to be most impacted by this? My clerks said seniors. Seniors in our districts, seniors in our community who after their driver license expires, don't renew it. Seniors who may not be able to leave their homes, not be able to get to the polls, seniors who have for years and years and years relied on absentee voting to be able to cast their ballot.

Beyond seniors, I know stories from my clerks who have organized with their churches, who have found homeless members of our community and made sure to reach out to them to make sure they can fulfill the right they have just as you and I do—to vote. This would create another hurdle, this would require that they get an ID.

Now, let's go in. I know voter ID polls really well—there's a reason that this bill is the one that is moving first—the Senate Majority Leader has said on record that brushing off some concerns with bills like this, that if the issue is people having ID, then let's just make sure that everybody has an ID. OK. Well, the Secretary of State recently asked for \$25 million to clear the backlog just of issues related to the COVID-19 pandemic of people renewing their licenses or registrations, and that was rejected by this body, and I see nothing in this bill or any other similar bills that are moving ahead of time that would ensure that every single Michigan resident 18 years of age and older can have a free ID. If we want to entertain that conversation, if we want to put the resources behind it, if we're going to consider outreach to our elderly, our seniors, our vulnerable, and the homeless, to make sure everybody can have an ID, we can have that conversation.

But until that conversation and the resources necessary are put up, what this bill would do is tell those seniors, tell the homeless, tell the vulnerable, who do not have an ID, that you are not allowed to vote, that you do not have the same right that the rest of us have to vote in every single one of our elections.

The Heritage Foundation—which for those who may not be familiar is an organization that wrote many of these bills—keeps a database of voter fraud throughout the country. Since 2007, there have been 12 cases of voter fraud in the state of Michigan. Not 12 million, not 12,000, not 1,200, 12. What problem is this looking to solve other than to disenfranchise the vulnerable, the elderly, the homeless, and the people who have every right to vote that you and I do? We cannot vote on these bills in good conscience and just brush off, Well, we'll make sure everybody has an ID, if this Legislature continues the trend of saying we support something without funding it, without actually doing the work to make sure we will fulfill these promises.

I will continue to stand up against these bills because every single person in our state has the right to vote. Our elections are secure, our clerks are some of the hardest-working people in our state, and we deserve to stand behind them.

Senator Wojno's statement, in which Senator Polehanki concurred, is as follows:

I stand to oppose this legislation that is before us today. Being a former municipal clerk for 11 years, I was very fortunate to oversee a period when we valued a person's democratic right to vote, providing more access for people to vote. In 2020 we had an historic turnout in that election. Instead, we're here today creating additional hurdles for our constituents. This legislation shows a lack of respect to the many people who have worked so hard to create a more transparent elective process. Our first and true purpose as elected officials should be to extend the promise of our democracy to as many people as possible and to guarantee that all Michiganders have better access to the ballot box. I have deep concerns on how this bill package will affect seniors, people of color, and Michiganders with disabilities. Many seniors like to vote in person, but others are not able to stand in line for hours and no-reason absentee voting lets them cast their ballots from home and we need to continue to provide that for them. These additional rules and regulations around absentee

ballots and provisional ballots are needlessly complicated and convoluted. As a former clerk I've never seen such an attempt to put road blocks up for people who are trying to vote. I call on all of you right now. If you've never worked as an election inspector or an AV counting board or have seen how absentee applications are processed in conjunction with the Qualified Voter File, then you are truly doing a disservice to the citizens of this state by supporting these bills.

Senator Hertel's statement is as follows:

Colleagues, here we go again, voting on another bill to try to solve another nonexistent problem. This bill is not about voter ID. We already have a voter ID law. For those in the cheap seats I will say again, we already have voter ID in Michigan, but this is not about that. All this bill does is make a political statement to somebody's base and increase the likelihood of identity theft in our state. In what world do you believe that citizens want to give their Social Security numbers in order to vote? Is there any sign of ridiculous more of what this body has become than trying to solve a nonexistent fraud problem by putting people at risk for actual fraud? When a company calls and asks for my Social Security number, I get nervous. When the government calls and asks for my Social Security number, I get terrified. As a public official, we have a responsibility and a duty to tell our constituents—both those whom we share their political views and those who we don't—the truth, even when political rhetoric muddies those waters. But you have chosen to continue adding fuel to that fire that has proven to have increasingly dangerous consequences not just for our democracy but for our literal safety. We have had hearings and hearings and more hearings and audits. What did we find? Voter fraud is not an issue in Michigan, period, but you are stoking the deepest fears about our fundamental democracy and pushing the big lie that has divided the nation to the point of insurrection, and your only response is to double down. To deny the insurrection we saw in front of our own eyes, but insists the big lie that has repeatedly been proven false. To make it harder for people to actively participate in our democracy, to change rules, to move the goalposts, so that you can win this game.

You know, the right likes to talk about liberal snowflakes and participation trophies, but I can't think of a better example of fragility than trying to change the rules of an election because you don't like the outcome. Maybe if you could win on your own merit, maybe if you can't win on that merit, maybe you deserve to lose. In this state, voters spoke loud and clear in 2018. The citizens of this state wanted a more fair and transparent process for voting in elections in our state. Voters adopted a proposal that made voting more accessible, and the ability to get rid of political gerrymandering because it was so clearly meant to keep one party in power. Those who are about to lose because they can't gerrymander and those who are about to lose because they can't win a fair game will now go back to the drawing board and try to change the rules one more time to stack the deck in their favor.

When we serve in this body, when you sit here in these chairs, you represent all the people in your district—not just the Republicans, not just the Democrats—and your biggest job—the oath of office you take—is sworn to protect the Constitution and the rights guaranteed in there. These bills that are an attempt to subvert that will for your own political interest, I ask that you vote “no.”

Senator Geiss' statement, in which Senator Chang concurred, is as follows:

While the substitute language has changed from the original version of this bill as written, it remains egregious and harmful to voters and adds additional, unnecessary, cumbersome, time-consuming work for clerks and election officials.

The updated version of Senate Bill No. 285 that is before us removes the requirement for a physical copy of ID to be included with an AV ballot application and instead it would require an applicant for an AV ballot to provide either a Michigan driver's license number, Michigan personal ID card number, last four digits of your Social Security number—which we've already heard why is detrimental—or present or attach a copy of your ID for election purposes.

Why are we requiring an applicant for an absentee ballot to provide sensitive information with their application, thus potentially opening themselves up to malfeasance from bad actors? Not the clerks, mind you. And while it is an option to provide a photocopy of one's government-issued ID, whether that ID is a driver's license issued under the Michigan Vehicle Code; an official state personal ID card issued under Michigan law; a current driver's license issued by another state; a current state personal ID card issued; a current U.S. passport or federal government-issued photo ID card; a current military photo ID card; a current tribal photo ID card; a current student photo ID card issued by a high school in this state or an accredited institution of higher learning located in this state, interestingly enough, your voter registration card is not among the things you can use. This option of providing a copy of one of these forms of government-issued ID creates a de facto poll tax and that is among the most harmful of the many problematic issues Senate Bill No. 285 has.

Now let me provide some history of poll tax use in this country, which, as we are in the week leading up to Juneteenth, is especially appropriate and a relevant lesson.

In the United States, a poll tax is the requirement to pay a fee to vote in an election and it has a long, sordid history. Poll taxes essentially disenfranchise impoverished and minoritized people, often one-in-the-same. The alternate methods in this bill for proof of identity as an absentee voter do not make up for, compensate, or otherwise negate or mollify the fact that within this very piece of legislation is language enshrining into law the ability to allow a poll tax.

Now payment of a poll tax was required in order for a citizen to cast a ballot in federal or state elections. Regulations on poll taxes varied by state and even between or across municipalities within a state. In fact, poll taxes in some form occurred in most states for longer than three centuries. Poll taxes were most egregiously used, however, after the Civil War during Reconstruction and the era of Jim Crow. This is well-documented in highly respectable places such as the Library of Congress. Now stay with me because this is all relevant, so I hope you're listening.

Poll taxes were used so ham-handedly during Reconstruction because in 1870 Congress passed the Fifteenth Amendment and it reads, "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." So all of the previously enslaved Black men—remember, white women still wouldn't be able to vote for another 50 years and Black women not for nearly another entire century—would be able to vote just like white men—the same white men and their families who held Black men and their ancestors and children captive for generations—but there was that poll tax issue that remained. In order to vote you needed some kind of cash to pay the poll tax. No money, no ability to pay the poll tax, and therefore no ability to vote. One couldn't even be on the voter rolls without a record of having paid the poll tax the preceding year. To us this is a foreign concept because today, except for the elders who were still around during Jim Crow, it is free for us to register to vote and you only have to register to vote once in your state of permanent residence. Anyone who has ever moved to another state knows this.

Anyway, during Reconstruction and Jim Crow's reign of terror, the no cash, no payment of the poll tax, no ability to vote created a problem for newly-impoverished, formerly human-owning white men who after the Civil War lost assets of land, crops, and human capital of enslaved Black people performing free labor. Only those persons exempt from paying the poll tax were those men whose grandfathers were able to vote prior to establishment of the Fifteenth Amendment and this, folks, is why it's important to read all the fine print on anything you're going to sign or take an oath on. How did the authorities know if one's grandfather voted? By the records of the payment of his poll taxes in the years with prior elections.

So the right to vote, even though in text wasn't simply a condition of citizenship, non-servitude, and equal protection as the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments assert and grant—it was also a purchase—a condition of cash flow and privilege of patrilineage. Guess whose grandfathers weren't eligible to vote prior to 1870? Recently-emancipated, formerly-enslaved Black people. That's who. Now this went on for decades, and throughout the entire nation. In fact, Michigan itself—Michigan, this pleasant peninsula—didn't abolish its poll taxes despite having fought for the Union during the Civil War, until 1915. And other northern states until as late as the 30s and in parts of the South well into the 1960s. And poll taxes weren't considered unconstitutional for federal elections until 1964, when the Twenty-Fourth Amendment was ratified, a year before the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Now let me remind this body that the Twenty-Fourth Amendment is specifically about federal elections. But a year after the Voting Rights Act, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections* that under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, states could not levy a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in state and local elections. Let me repeat that so that it's heard. Under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, states couldn't levy a poll tax as a prerequisite for voting in state and local elections. This bill, Senate Bill No. 285—which allows that a voter who chooses to vote by absentee ballot to also have the option to submit a photocopy of their government-issued ID with their ballot—makes it such that if that specific voter chooses that option, they must incur an additional cost in order to cast their ballot. Remember, having to pay a fee, no matter how nominal or optional in order to vote, is constitutionally prohibited. It costs additional money to make the photocopy and that is a fee. If you have your own printer and ink and cartridges and paper that cost you money, it is a fee. In a nutshell, creating an additional financial requirement of voters—even an optional one in order to cast one's ballot—is essentially a poll tax and would be an unconstitutional resurrection of Jim Crow, who should remain dead and buried.

As I said earlier, the alternate methods in Senate Bill No. 285 for proof of identity as an absentee voter do not make up, compensate, or otherwise negate or mollify the fact that within this very piece of legislation is language enshrining into law the ability to allow a poll tax. And permitting a poll tax, in any form optional or not, is in direct violation of both the Fourteenth and Twenty-Fourth Amendments of the Constitution of

these United States. And just because the legislation doesn't explicitly name the option for a voter to provide that photocopy with their government-issued ID in order to secure an absentee ballot with the penalization—on top of that being provided a provisional absentee ballot that is not counted on Election Day—that doesn't make that option not fail to be a poll tax when it serves the same or similar function.

Now yesterday we all participated in a ceremony honoring those who upheld, protected, and defended the Constitution from enemies both foreign and domestic and who paid the ultimate sacrifice in doing so. Twenty-nine months ago, we took oaths to uphold the Constitution. But here we are, on the precipice of voting on a piece of legislation that is counter to both democracy and the Constitution. And if this body passes this bill, this body cements itself as being willing to be a domestic enemy of the Constitution. I prefer not to be an enemy of the Constitution or of democracy.

And for that reason, I will be voting "no" and I urge others to join me in rebuking and denouncing this unconstitutional summoning of Jim Crow and in doing so to uphold, protect, and defend the Constitution and democracy.

Senator Ananich's statement is as follows:

It appears that 44 percent of this body understands that we have voter ID already in this state. That's a stat about as useless as the percent in the polling you gave us earlier. I wasn't planning on mentioning this, but I'm really glad the previous speaker as the time was finishing up came down to the point that I think all of us know this is about. You brought up that Proposals 2 and 3 benefited us because people actually get to vote and as you mentioned, you know this legislation is nothing more than an attempt to have fewer voters and the voters you want to have vote. I'm glad you finally admitted it. It took four-and-a-half minutes, but I knew if we waited long enough you'd come to that conclusion.

One of the previous speakers mentioned you have to have an ID to get a fishing license. You have to have an ID to buy alcohol. You have to have ID to get a cable bill, to fly on a plane, to get a marriage license. I do want to point out there are differences between privileges and rights. We have a right to vote in this country. You may not like that, but that's something our forefathers and everyone since then has agreed upon. I want to make another point regarding those issues exactly. When I get a fishing license and I show my ID, when I cast my reel I don't show my ID again to the fish. When I get married and get my marriage certificate, when I come home from work I don't say, Hey, I'm still married to you, let me show you my ID. That's what these bills would do. You want to have hoop after hoop after barrier after barrier because you no longer have ideas that people like. That's fine. We'll see if people stand for that.

I rise today to give my "no" vote explanation. I wasn't planning on speaking on this bill but the last couple speakers made me realize that some things need to be said.

I never thought I would see the day that Michigan Republicans would use tax dollars to force citizens to get a government ID. The constituents of their own party who use life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as a battle cry should take note of the Senators here today ready to support legislation to mandate Michiganders must obtain and submit government-issued identification in order to exercise their right to vote. What's next, showing their Social Security card, a national ID card, their blood type, semen sample? God only knows what you guys will come up with next.

Republicans supporting this legislation are the same people who believe the right to keep and bear arms free from government regulation but not for citizens to exercise their right to vote without turning over their personally-identifiable information via the mail, subjecting themselves to increased risk for identity theft and worse. What's even more concerning, as I've said before, is that Michigan already has an ID requirement regarding voting. So what do these bills really do? I believe it's our responsibility to be truth-tellers and today my Republican colleagues are perpetuating a lie. Instead of using their platform as elected leaders to share facts, they're continuing to embrace a myth of a stolen election because it polls well. Republicans in Michigan have seen their ability to control redistricting slip through their fingers. Years of grassroots efforts to dismantle a system that allowed those in power to keep themselves in power has come to an end. Republican majorities can no longer draw gerrymandered maps that favor their candidates, but they struck gold with a message of voter ID laws. It appeals to the honesty in Americans and the fear of stolen elections, and Republicans are manipulating it to keep themselves in power.

If Republicans are challenging your right to vote, what's to stop them from mandating and controlling other aspects of life? This is a thinly-veiled attempt to monitor those who vote and to control the outcome of elections. I realize there may be people who are comfortable with those currently in power now controlling the outcome of elections, but will that always be the case? I am deeply concerned about the use of this legislation to discourage voters from participating in elections and disenfranchising groups of citizens simply to keep Republicans in control. I'm also concerned about the way this legislation can be weaponized to harm all citizens. I ask those who support these bills to consider whether they really want to be part of a plan where citizens fully submit to the will of a few elected individuals who are more concerned about ensuring their place in office than serving their country.

Senators Johnson, Hertel, McBroom, Theis and Bayer 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 to ask my colleagues to join me in supporting Senate Bill Nos. 285, 303, and 304. These bills would help to ensure the security and fairness of our elections. Requiring voters to verify their identity with ID is the best way to protect the 'one person, one vote' standard. There is strong bipartisan support for these commonsense election integrity measures. In fact, a statewide poll of Michigan registered voters conducted by the Detroit Regional Chamber just three weeks ago showed that 79.7 percent of voters support a requirement for individuals to present a government-issued ID when voting. This includes over 83 percent of independent voters, as well as 58 percent of those who identified themselves as strong Democrats. Beyond voting, ID is an essential part of everyday life for most Americans. We must show ID for many things in our lives, including getting on an airplane, opening a bank account, buying alcohol, or even applying for a fishing license online. The vast majority of Michigan residents already have driver's licenses or a state ID, and our state already offers free state IDs to many residents, including individuals over 65 years of age; those who are legally blind; veterans; anyone who is homeless; and anyone who is receiving state aid.

I appreciate the commitment of the Majority Leader to expand access even further for anyone who still needs a state ID. I would also like to thank the sponsors' offices for their hard work on this legislation. My colleague from the 22nd District listened to feedback from stakeholders and removed the requirement for absentee voters to provide a physical copy of their driver's license or state ID—instead voters can simply write down their driver's license number or state ID number, or the last four digits of their social security number on their absentee ballot application. And I want to clarify again, there is no requirement for a photocopy of a license or any ID in this bill. There seems to be some confusion with some of the comments that were made. The federal government requires the same thing when one registers to vote by mail. This bill is a mirror of what the federal government requires when one registers to vote by mail. This makes it much more convenient for absentee voters not having to supply a photocopy while still providing local clerks with the information they need to verify a voter's identity.

Senate Bill No. 304 would also allow a voter who comes to the polls and forgets their ID to vote a provisional ballot so that they are not disenfranchised, and it would give them six additional days to return to their local clerk's office with their ID so that their vote will be counted. I feel this legislation provides safeguards for voters and it also enhances the integrity of our elections, and I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting these very important bills.

Senator Hertel's statement is as follows:

I'm sorry that the previous speaker did not hear what I said earlier. I understand—I always assume I'm loud enough, but apparently wasn't. I assume that also because of their background, they know the answer to this but, again, voter ID laws are already laws in Michigan so you can poll it but the poll is asking people that they already support what's actually already law. I assume that everyone in this room—because, you know, we're all elected officials—knows that voter ID laws already exist in Michigan. Go beyond that and ask people, for example, their Social Security number does not exist in Michigan, and I guess you could poll that and see what the results would be. I'm guessing it would be a little different.

I'd also like to remind those who understand the voting process and were part of our election process in the past that we don't have the Social Security numbers in the Qualified Voter File for people to check anyway. You're asking for something that won't actually help with fraud, except for ID fraud that might be committed on those people.

Again, I don't know what we're doing here today, but I don't think the poll was accurate or matters.

Senator McBroom's first statement is as follows:

I think it's critical to point out that in this debate that goes on that things have not been static, things have not been unchanged. Proposals 2 and 3 changed things and removed certain obligations that when you vote absentee the first time, that you have to have shown yourself in person. That's gone now. To the previous speaker's notation that we already have voter ID, that's not entirely correct and that's what this bill sets out to correct is the idea that we have voter ID for voting in-person, but we don't have it now for someone who wants to register by mail and then vote by mail. They don't have to. On top of that, all of this talk about no mechanism for Social Security numbers or no mechanism for handling these things, and yet that's already the requirement to register by mail. That's already what's required to be doing. This isn't remaking things. Now, when I brought this up in committee discussion, people said, See, there you go. Now you don't have to do it again because it's already being done. Nobody is trying to undo what was already required but the insinuation or the direct comment was that since it's already been done, it doesn't have to be done and yet

we don't allow that to happen for any of our other forms of ID. You don't get to get your driver's license at 16 years old and go the rest of your life without ever checking back in. You don't get to never have another photograph taken, you don't get to never have your eyes checked again, it is an ongoing process. Sure, you utilize the system, the federal system at the front end with either providing a copy or providing the numbers that are there and to say, OK, you are now perfectly registered forever and there's no additional checks. It doesn't seem reasonable to many of us. To some of you, it does seem reasonable but this should be a conversation that can happen and a debate that can happen without necessarily creating enormous pejoratives and finger-pointing and a determination that some people are willing to follow the Constitution and some aren't and some are racially biased and some are Communists—it's just all ridiculous name-calling that's not very productive to having a good debate. I've had many good conversations with our current Secretary of State who insists—and I believe—wants everyone to have as quick and easy access to the ballot as possible. That's what we should all be striving for. That's why we worked on these, that's why we tweaked these, but I also have to say to the folks who keep coming into committee and saying this is going to create a problem, show me where that problem's been created already. We had these same claims when the current voter ID law that's not sufficient anymore was put in place. Where are the cases of suppression? Where are the cases of suppression in other states that are doing this? Where are those witnesses? Why weren't they brought to committee? Instead, we just hear it's going to. We hear a lot about how there was only this little bit of fraud and therefore nothing else is needed, but just because you can say we caught this amount of fraud isn't somehow compelling proof that there wasn't more that wasn't caught. That's really a mischaracterization and a bit of a red herring.

Finally, to just continue to harp on this idea that, Oh, you're just the sore losers. Both parties are very guilty of being sore losers. There's no monopoly on sore losership around this place, and there's no monopoly on either party wanting to work election policy to its own end. Don't pretend that the Democratic Party wasn't real happy about Proposals 2 and 3 or see them as a great boon to their future opportunities. I don't see these bills as setting up a partisan divide, I don't see them as being directly partisan, and neither does the polling demonstrate that the public considers them to be something that are going to benefit one side or the other. Both sides are going to benefit because one vote will count.

Senator McBroom's second statement is as follows:

I'd just like to take exception to the previous speaker's characterization of what I said in the final part of my statement. That is incorrect, that is not what I said, and I'll expect an apology.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

I rise today in support of Senate Bill No. 285 to deter and avoid election fraud by doing something that most of us do to buy cold medicine, to buy alcohol if we look young enough, that of course is showing our ID. Fundamental changes happened in 2018 when the voters approved Proposal 3 which included no-reason absentee voting. This, combined with the effects of the pandemic, resulted in record absentee voting in 2020. This historic shift from in-person voting to by-mail or to drop boxes requires us to review the process and to ensure it's secure and reliable.

One glaring loophole is that current law does not require proof of identity to request an absentee ballot via the mail. Although it's important to note our Secretary of State does require both ID and the last four digits of your Social Security number in order to request that ballot online. And yes, she does have access to that. With the convenience of online services and the increased use of mail-in applications due to the Secretary of State's mass mailing of ballot applications, it is now possible for an individual to register to vote, to apply for a ballot, to receive the ballot, to fill it out, and to send the ballot back without ever seeing the inside of a clerk's office or a voting location.

Senate Bill No. 285 simply requires the voter to provide reasonable proof of identity when completing their absentee ballot applications. This could be a driver's license, it could be a Social Security number—the last four digits—copy of a state ID, and I must say I absolutely love the idea of having a photo on our voter registration card and providing that at no cost to our voters. An individual could also present proper identification for election purposes in-person as has already been mentioned to their local clerk as they turn in their absentee ballot application. Requiring identification verification is a simple but critical step to ensure the integrity of our election process moving forward. It's not creating a personal security risk, it's not voter suppression, it's not an undue burden. As a matter of fact, across the globe ID is required to vote, in many, many countries—including nearly all African and Latin countries. The last four digits of the Social Security number is already available to our Secretary of State by law in order to verify identity, and this bill actually makes that a point making it allowable to our clerks so that they can use it for ID.

You're right, it is overwhelmingly popular among our voters that they should, in fact, verify their identification before they vote. It's required as we said for the rights of things like a marriage license, to register property, to purchase alcohol, to open a bank account, and to buy a house or rent an apartment. I've

even had to use my ID for access to social media. You need an ID to adopt a pet, and then as I said cold medications. Scare tactics and misrepresentations of this bill won’t convince the more-than 70 percent of voters who believe that we should in fact be showing our ID in order to exercise this right for one man, one vote.

Mr. President, I ask for support of this simple bill that treats absentee voters the same as in-person voters while helping us to ensure the integrity of our election process for years to come.

Senator Bayer’s statement is as follows:

Just one simple comment in rebuttal actually, the current law does validate absentee voters. It works perfectly fine, that’s why we have such a low record of fraud in Michigan. I know this for a fact because when my husband changed—after a stroke, he could no longer sign his absentee ballot application request, the way he signed it in the past. His signature no longer matched the signature on file with the clerk. The process that the clerks have used all these years and will continue to use is checking the signature on the application to see if it matches the signature on the ballot. My husband’s signature did not match and they called the signature on record and said the signature on record does not match the signature on the application, and we went in and had to change it in person and show who he was to make sure it matched. That proves that the system we have in place today works. Clerks notice when there’s something wrong and they take care of it. That simple.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 303, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 523, 813, and 829 (MCL 168.523, 168.813, and 168.829), section 523 as amended by 2018 PA 129 and sections 813 and 829 as amended by 2018 PA 603.

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. 275

Yeas—19

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

Nays—16

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

Excused—1

Barrett

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Irwin and Brinks, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 303.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Irwin’s statement, in which Senator Brinks concurred, is as follows:

We aren’t here to create a voter ID law because we already have one. We are here because when more people participate in our elections, it’s bad for this gerrymandered majority. These bills seek to prevent some valid voters from casting their ballots in Michigan, because some voters do struggle to get a valid ID. We’ve got people who were born a long time ago; maybe citizens from other countries who struggle to get birth certificates; maybe they were born in the Jim Crow South and can’t get access to their birth certificates. We’ve got homeless people. We’ve got folks who don’t drive. We’ve got seniors who don’t immediately renew their driver’s license. And those people are going to be told when they get to the front of the line at their voting place that they can’t vote that day or that they can vote a provisional ballot that might be counted later if they can make it down to the clerk’s office. Some voters will just forget their ID. Some folks will show up at the polls who are valid voters—they are who they say they are—and they won’t have their identification. They might have to drive home a long distance, particularly voters who live in rural areas. And they are going to have questions. And when they question their poll workers, when they have that negotiation—when frustrated people who show up to exercise their right to vote get to the front of that line and try to cast their vote and are told that they cannot vote—they are going to have questions. They are going to be frustrated. And you know what else is going to happen? The people behind them in that line are going to have to wait longer. Some of those people who are going to have to wait longer have children at home. They have jobs they have to get back to. And some of those people, like we’ve seen too many times here in the state of Michigan, are going to leave that line and they are not going to be able to cast their vote. Their vote is going to be effectively suppressed by this legislation.

And it reminds me of a sad truth that exists here in the state of Michigan, which is that our voting rights are not equal. In some communities you walk into the precinct and you have to wait a long time to vote. In other communities you can walk right in. It’s breezy, it’s easy. That is wrong. That should be the issue that we’re seeking to fix here today. We should be working on trying to make voting easy and accessible and equal for everyone, not working on bills like this that create a bureaucratic nightmare for our poll workers, that create arguments and frustrations at the front of the line that make people wait longer. We don’t want long lines. We don’t want bureaucratic nightmares. Why are we subjecting our citizens to that in ways that suppress their vote? I’m a “no.”

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 304, entitled

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

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. 276

Yeas—19

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

Nays—16

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

Excused—1

Barrett

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senator Hollier, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 304 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 Hollier’s statement is as follows:

I rise to give my “no” vote explanation. I know this seems like the least controversial of the very controversial bills that we have had today; but six days are not a lot of time to fix the kind of issues that we see with provisional ballots.

I will start simply with my grandmother. My grandmother is 98 years old and I say it every chance I get because it is such a blessing. When she was born in the United States of America, she was not born a citizen. One, because she was Native American; but two, because that is what her birth certificate said. She has two older brothers, the eldest on his birth certificate it said, ‘white’. The middle brother it said, ‘colored,’ because that is what people called us at the time. They had the same parents. Her brothers—one was just a little fairer than the other; and she was just in-between. So a doctor, at birth, made that distinction, and it was relevant for her entire life. She never had to sit in the back of the bus because she was an Indian. She never had to do those kinds of things because that is what the official paperwork said.

My mother’s birth certificate, and all kinds of things, were set up incorrectly. So depending upon what space, she often has to provide additional documentation because some systems see her has one age and some systems see her as another.

As we talk about the amount of time it takes to correct these very real issues where I go and talk to seniors, who don’t have an accurate birth certificate because they were born at a time where people did not care to issue them one, because it made them more mobile; because it gave them more flexibility. I represent a district and a host of people where accurate documentation is critically lacking and in a time where we are coming out of a pandemic, where it is even more difficult, we are asking people who may or may not have literacy challenges to fill out extremely complicated documents.

So if any of you have filled out a provisional ballot I am grateful that I have not to this point. But, I have certainly been very close to where my ID has been just about expired or I lost a wallet just before and was able to get another piece or able to show other ID in a space where I can just file an affidavit, literally have lost a wallet and not had ID, then headed out to vote. But, I vote in person at a precinct in the neighborhood that I have lived in my entire life. They can say, Hey, Adam and I can say, Hey, Ms. Johnson, how’s it going? She says, Hey I know you and that is fine.

What we are talking about doing would change that. It would say that I would need to go back and get those kinds of documentations. I have been filling out employment paperwork one day and literally my license expired, somehow my passport had expired, and I didn’t have anything in there. They were like, Your military ID is not on the list of approved things because you need two forms of ID. As we talk about the details and these spaces, what we should be talking about here is saying that you have more time to correct these issues, right? If I fill out a provisional ballot and the person who the election challenger, or whatever, doesn’t seal it properly, you know what happens to my ballot? I get credit for voting. I will say that again, credit for voting. The person/people I went to go vote for do not get the benefit of my ballot. They do not call me and say, Hey, you know, so all those people you worked so hard about, they didn’t get your ballot. It just says I voted, and so I would think that my ballot was counted.

I would think that my ballot was counted, even though it hadn't been. When we are talking about provisional ballots, right now some states have less than one-hundred of them because they make it easier to vote. Some states have 100,000. Do we really want to live in a state where we have 500,000 to 1 million provisional ballots because people messed up for whatever reason, right. They go to the wrong precinct in a location—this may just be a Detroit thing—but there are often places where you have multiple polling locations in one spot. The church behind my house used to be one of them; going to the wrong spot and then handing in your provisional ballot when they could have directed you across the hall. And then God forbid, they don't seal it right. God forbid you don't sign something and date it. You don't get six days to correct those errors. You get six days to bring back documents that you may or may not have needed. Things that could have been addressed on the front end.

Provisional ballots are meant to ensure that we are able to correct administrative issues and that is not what this does, but it could be. This could be an avenue to correct those things and to give people an opportunity to fix real issues like, Hey, you know the seal was not right on your ballot because we know what number it was, please come back in and do that. But we don't want to make it easier or that is not what this is designed to do is to make it easier, but it could be. This is an opportunity for us to fix problems and we are creating even more. That is the travesty of these discussions, is there are a lot of people whose ballots won't be counted, on both sides because they are older, because they did not have the right documents, because God forbid somebody else made a mistake that they didn't have anything to do with.

So either we are going to decide to lean in towards voters or we aren't. But I can tell you this discussion would be very different if we were talking about firearm sales, of which you do not have to have an ID to purchase between an individual going in those kind of spaces and we talk about that as though it is to protect your 2nd Amendment Right. But the most fundamental right we have is to vote; to exercise democracy. It should be easy. It should be so easy, and we should correct everything. We should take every opportunity to correct every error and give you a chance to correct every error by letting you vote early, by letting them process them, by letting them go back and say, Hey ma'am or sir you made a mistake, let's fix that. But no, what we do is say, Oh, yes, sorry, we are just not going to count that; we will give you credit; we will give you the gold star so you don't miss an election; we just won't count any of the people; your ballot just won't count, but we will make sure you know that you are a conscience voter.

That doesn't mean anything for me. That doesn't mean anything for the voters I represent. It doesn't mean anything to make sure that we are taking care of people: service members, young people, those are the people who mess up on their first elections; seniors and we should be giving them space to fix it, not saying, Hey you have this quick turnaround to do so, because hey if you vote on a Tuesday, they are saying by Monday you need to have all this fixed. A lot of people have to go back to work, they have other things and clerks are extremely busy.

So you do not necessarily have six real full days to get in and talk to the clerk to get this fixed. I hope that my colleagues will change their minds.

Senators Polehanki, Santana, McMorrow, Bullock, Geiss, Alexander, Hertel, Bayer, Moss, Chang and Hollier, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 303 and 304.

Senators Polehanki, Bayer and Chang moved that the statements they made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 303 be printed as their reasons for voting "no."

The motion prevailed.

Senator Polehanki's statement, in which Senators Santana, McMorrow, Bullock, Geiss, Alexander and Hertel concurred, is as follows:

Together these bills would strike down Michigan's decades-long voter ID law that provides voters with the option to sign an affidavit in place of showing a photo ID at the polls. Mr. President, you know and I know that Michigan already has a voter ID law and it works. In fact, over 250 audits of the 2020 election prove that it works. The 2020 election was the most secure in modern history, despite every effort thus far to prove otherwise.

So, if we already have a working law on the books, it begs the question, What's the real motivation behind these bills? Well, it all stems from one man who is not happy with the outcome of his election. One man who demands his supporters believe his big lie. And many of his supporters believe. And these supporters tell their representatives, Do something, and so here we are. With these bills, I watch as my Republican colleagues deceive the public about the integrity of our elections, undo the secure voter ID requirements that have worked for decades, and strategically push through legislation that would make it harder—not easier—for Michiganders to vote.

But why make it harder to vote? To what end? Well, you can look no further than the Senator from the 16th District for that explanation. He said, and I quote, “a big turnout in Michigan doesn’t necessarily accrue to my interests.” In other words, when voter turnout is high, his party loses elections. That’s what this is about—suppressing voter turnout to win elections.

Mr. President, I will echo the pleas of our Secretary of State. We can’t allow disinformation to define reality. We have to shine a light on the truth. The future of our democracy is at stake. Nothing less.

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

Senate Bill Nos. 303 and 304 and the previous bill, Senate Bill No. 285, the first bill addressed and attacked our right to vote absentee. These two bills attack our other option which is to vote in person, so we’re carefully making sure that these three bills as a package attack all of our means of voting. This is a problem for very many Michigan voters. You’ve already heard a lot of the reasons behind this, but this is about discrimination—it’s discrimination against people of different parts of our community, it’s discrimination against people with disabilities, seniors who have physical issues and cannot get to the polls, every time you ask someone to have to go back there again, you know very well that the intent is that they won’t go back because it’s too hard. If you’ve ever been in an exercise to act as if you have a disability and try to go somewhere, try to go to the polls and vote, you will see how difficult it is, especially if you live in one of these places where the voting, you could be in line for hours. The odds of them finding the time and the resources to go back are low. It discriminates against people who don’t drive or don’t have access to transportation. It discriminates against people who are homeless and other reasons why that we already heard we don’t have the documentation that’s specifically required. It really, in the largest sense, discriminates against everyone in Michigan who works during the day, who can’t take time off work twice to go back to their clerk’s office or who work in Lansing and live two hours away and can’t get there in time. This discriminates against all hard-working Michiganders.

These anti-voter bills will ensure that many Michigan votes do not count. The bills continue to propagate the big lie and here, these are coming in from groups outside the state of Michigan working to keep people across the country from voting. We are too smart for this here; Michigan is too smart for this. We don’t have an election fraud problem. Every lawsuit of the many lawsuits that were brought in Michigan around the 2020 election has failed. Every audit has shown that we had more voters than ever before in the history of this state and less problems. Election officials, constitutional lawyers, constitutional scholars, historians, everyone agrees, you can read this everywhere today, yesterday, and next week—this is the single biggest attack on the democracy of this country that we have ever seen in the history of America, and we’re bringing it here into Michigan. We’ve got to keep this dangerous nonsense out of our state. Vote “no” on these bills.

Senator Chang’s statement, in which Senator Hollier concurred, is as follows:

I would guess that a number of you may have attended naturalization ceremonies before. And if you have, you know how incredibly moving they are. You can see how happy and joyful the families are and how proud they are to become American citizens.

My parents became naturalized citizens in 1984. My mom took her oath of citizenship on July 4—Independence Day—at Hart Plaza in Detroit and remembers vivid details, like she normally does. She remembers Senator Levin giving a speech and she remembers the gun salute, in addition to of course taking her oath. My older sister was there with her. My dad became a naturalized citizen on April 16 earlier that year. And my mom remembers that when she first voted in this country on November 6, 1984—I was there with her—my parents both voted for the first time at the high school.

I’ve been to numerous naturalization ceremonies over the years, oftentimes to help register those brand new U.S. citizens to vote. Every year I also work with my partners at the local and federal level, and the International Institute of Metro Detroit to hold a citizenship day where we help people to fill out the citizenship application. And the very first reason presented on the slide show about the benefits of becoming a citizen is the ability for citizens to vote. Having registered so many people over the years to vote who have just officially become citizens, I can tell you that it is amazing to see the joy and the happiness that people have when they not only become a citizen, but then are able to register to be able to participate in our great democracy. There truly are not words to describe those moments.

Some of these individuals fled countries where their governments were corrupt or where there was no democracy at all, so they are excited about the opportunity to finally have a say in their government—a say in what happens in their lives. This is at the very core of who we are as a nation. It is this democracy and our ideals of opportunity and access that we must continue to defend. I am disappointed that our chamber continues to push forward legislation that makes it harder to vote and harder to participate in our democracy. Making it harder for our seniors, people with disabilities, people who are poor—and yes, our communities of color—to vote is wrong. By eliminating the affidavit option and forcing people to submit multiple

additional documents so that their provisional ballot can be counted days after the election, you are saying to these seniors—these vulnerable people; these voters—that their voice does not matter. Adding barriers that will limit voter participation runs counter to our values, the American values that brought people like my parents came here believing in and the values that civil rights leaders bled for to ensure voting rights for all of our future generations. Let's make it crystal clear—these bills make it harder to vote and are based on a lie. I hope that someday soon in this chamber we can acknowledge that our elections are secure, as proven by hundreds of audits and that our work should be to strengthen and increase access to our democracy, not work to suppress it.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Johnson's statement is as follows:

My father was an immigrant to this country and I want to clarify that I went, or I sent executive staff from the Secretary of State's office, to the naturalization ceremonies to both help new citizens register to vote and get an ID or driver's license. We worked with the Department of Corrections so that when people were released, they could get both. We took our mobile office and started in the U.P. and came all the way down through the state, going to colleges to make sure those students would have an opportunity to register to vote. These are all very important tasks of the Secretary of State and they have been done and I sure hope they still are because we do need to make sure people can register and vote in a way that's secure and fair.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Statements

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Brinks' statement is as follows:

Oftentimes in this chamber, deliberations can be consumed by partisanship and discord that impedes what we were sent here by our constituents to do. However, in the case of Senate Bill No. 440, which received immediate effect today, the qualities of cooperation and bipartisanship have prevailed, and I think that's worth noting. We were able to work together to look at all possible solutions, and to move forward regardless of the delicate political terrain that we had to walk through, because there was a real human benefit to be gained. The pilot program created by Senate Bill No. 440 will run concurrently along the certificate of need—CON—process that has already begun, and allow BAMF Health to move forward now, softening the impact that the pandemic has had on their timeline. And to be very clear, the qualifications for the pilot program are the same standards set by the CON workgroup involved in this project, and BAMF Health will still have to gain certificate-of-need approval once the new standards are adopted, most likely later this year. I will look back with pride on our bipartisan and bicameral efforts to bring everyone to the table, and in a transparent way, find a solution to a problem for which no one was at fault. This path forward was a good compromise, preserving the integrity of the CON process while meeting the immediate need to move forward with lifesaving innovation expediently. It shows what can be accomplished when we actually listen to each other. I'd specifically like to show my appreciation for my colleague, the Senator from the 35th District, Senator VanderWall, for being an early supporter and a partner in bringing this incredible opportunity to West Michigan. I'd also like to thank the legislative and executive branch staff members, and our partners at MDHHS, who went above and beyond to work with us on the language of the bill, so that we could lessen the pandemic's impact on this project. This technology will revolutionize treatment for cancer, starting immediately, with the potential for promising interventions in Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, mental health disorders, and more. This is a truly unique endeavor, as the only other place in the world to currently offer this treatment is in Germany. I'm honored that I could play a role in bringing this to Senate District 29, and to people all over who will benefit from this incredible innovation. I'm grateful to every member of this chamber for their unanimous support of this bill. Together, we are bringing hope to countless people, and I'm very proud of that.

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Tuesday, June 15:

House Bill Nos. 4240 4241 4380 4694

