

No. 97
STATE OF MICHIGAN
JOURNAL
OF THE
House of Representatives
102nd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2023

House Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, November 9, 2023.

12:01 a.m.

The House was called to order by the Speaker.

The roll was called by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, who announced that a quorum was present.

Aiyash—present	Dievendorf—present	Markkanen—present	Schriver—present
Alexander—present	Edwards—present	Martin—present	Schuette—present
Andrews—present	Farhat—present	Martus—present	Scott—present
Aragona—present	Filler—present	McFall—present	Shannon—present
Arbit—present	Fink—present	McKinney—present	Skaggs—present
Beeler—present	Fitzgerald—present	Meerman—present	Slagh—present
BeGole—present	Fox—present	Mentzer—present	Smit—present
Beson—present	Friske—present	Miller—present	Snyder—present
Bezotte—present	Glanville—present	Morgan—present	St. Germaine—present
Bierlein—present	Grant—present	Morse—present	Steckloff—present
Bollin—present	Green, P.—present	Mueller—present	Steele—present
Borton—present	Greene, J.—present	Neeley—present	Stone—present
Brabec—present	Haadsma—present	Neyer—present	Tate—present
Breen—present	Hall—present	O’Neal—present	Thompson—present
Brixie—present	Harris—present	Outman—present	Tisdell—present
Bruck—excused	Hill—present	Paiz—present	Tsernoglou—present
Bymes—present	Hoadley—present	Paquette—present	VanderWall—present
Carra—present	Hood—present	Pohutsky—present	VanWoerkom—present
Carter, B.—present	Hope—present	Posthumus—present	Wegela—present
Carter, T.—present	Hoskins—present	Prestin—present	Weiss—present
Cavitt—present	Johnsen—present	Price—present	Wendzel—present
Churches—present	Koleszar—present	Puri—present	Whitsett—present
Coffia—present	Kuhn—present	Rheingans—present	Wilson—present
Coleman—present	Kunse—present	Rigas—present	Witwer—present
Conlin—present	Liberati—present	Rogers—present	Wozniak—present
DeBoer—present	Lightner—present	Roth—present	Young—present
DeBoyer—present	MacDonell—present	Schmaltz—present	Zorn—present
DeSana—present	Maddock—present		

e/d/s = entered during session

Rep. Greg VanWoerkom, from the 88th District, offered the following invocation:

“Dear God –

Thank You for being in this space. Thank You for be here in these chambers walking along side of us. Thank You for Your undeserving grace that You show to everyone here and those that are listening.

We ask on this day that You give us wisdom, that You open our minds so we can think clearly and see Your hand. We ask that You continue to provide for us and continue to show Your grace.

Lord, give us peace and understanding and continue to be with us as we make critical decision for our state. In Your name we pray, amen.”

The Speaker called the Speaker Pro Tempore to the Chair.

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rep. Bruck be excused from today’s session.
The motion prevailed.

Third Reading of Bills

House Bill No. 5207, entitled

A bill to establish and allow for the use of assisted reproduction, including surrogacy; to provide for a child conceived, gestated, and born through the use of assisted reproduction, including through surrogacy; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state officers and entities; to provide remedies; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 531

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bymes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette

Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel *Handmaid's tale*. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Bierlein, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I would like to point that despite have numerous members who wanted to speak to this package of bills, the majority limited the minority party to one speech despite the importance of this legislation. Additionally, it is my belief and understanding that this legislation is bad for the state of Michigan, women, and children, and that can be seen in the number of nations who have outlawed the practice of paid surrogacy.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation the removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5208, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2822, 2824, 2831, 2832, and 2891 (MCL 333.2822, 333.2824, 333.2831, 333.2832, and 333.2891), section 2822 as amended by 2017 PA 142, sections 2824, 2831, and 2832 as amended by 1996 PA 307, and section 2891 as amended by 2020 PA 209.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 532

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel

DeBoer
DeBoyer
DeSana

Kunse
Lightner

Roth
Schmaltz

Wozniak
Zorn

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel *Handmaid’s tale*. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation that removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5209, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 15g of chapter XVII (MCL 777.15g), as amended by 2017 PA 259.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 533

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bymes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuetten
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel Handmaid’s tale. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation the removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5210, entitled

A bill to amend 1998 PA 386, entitled “Estates and protected individuals code,” by amending section 2114 (MCL 700.2114), as amended by 2012 PA 160.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 534

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou

Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel Handmaid’s tale. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation the removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5211, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 205, entitled “The paternity act,” by amending sections 1, 4, 4b, and 7 (MCL 722.711, 722.714, 722.714b, and 722.717), section 1 as amended by 2000 PA 31, section 4 as amended by 2014 PA 367, section 4b as added by 1994 PA 388, and section 7 as amended by 2014 PA 364, and by adding section 4c.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 535

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh

BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel *Handmaid’s tale*. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation that removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5212, entitled

A bill to amend 2012 PA 159, entitled “Revocation of paternity act,” by amending the title and sections 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15 (MCL 722.1431, 722.1433, 722.1435, 722.1437, 722.1439, 722.1441, 722.1443, and 722.1445), sections 3 and 5 as amended by 2014 PA 376, section 7 as amended by 2014 PA 368, and sections 13 and 15 as amended by 2016 PA 178.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 536

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bymes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel Handmaid’s tale. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation that removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5213, entitled

A bill to amend 2014 PA 366, entitled “Summary support and paternity act,” by amending section 3 (MCL 722.1493).

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 537

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel Handmaid’s tale. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation the removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5214, entitled

A bill to amend 1996 PA 305, entitled “Acknowledgment of parentage act,” by amending sections 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 (MCL 722.1002, 722.1003, 722.1004, 722.1006, and 722.1007), section 3 as amended by 2014 PA 409, section 6 as amended by 2006 PA 105, and section 7 as amended by 2012 PA 161.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 538

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate

Carter, B.	Hood	O'Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow. It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel Handmaid’s tale. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation the removes those protections.”

House Bill No. 5215, entitled

A bill to amend 2014 PA 365, entitled “Genetic parentage act,” by amending the title and section 5 (MCL 722.1465).

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 539

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine

Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principle of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel *Handmaid’s Tale*. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan. I am not opposed to surrogacy itself.

However, the surrogacy package did not include any safeguards for the exploitation of low-income women.”

Rep. Schmaltz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Surrogacy is already legal in Michigan, and it has brought joy to many couples. My opposition to these bills is not to surrogacy itself. Our current laws recognize that surrogate mothers and the babies they carry need safeguards to protect them from exploitation. Our law helps provide those safeguards by banning compensated surrogacy and the legally binding contracts that come with it. I cannot in good conscience vote for legislation the removes those protections.”

Senate Bill No. 505, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 11d of chapter XVII (MCL 777.11d), as amended by 2023 PA 83.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 540

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Ternoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

“An act to revise, consolidate, and codify the laws relating to criminal procedure and to define the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of courts, judges, and other officers of the court under the provisions of this act; to provide laws relative to the rights of persons accused of criminal offenses and ordinance violations;

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

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Senate Bill No. 570, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," by amending section 31a (MCL 168.31a), as amended by 2018 PA 603.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 541

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O'Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel

DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

“An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act.”

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Senate Bill No. 590, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending section 13 (MCL 168.13) and by adding section 845a.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 542

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell

Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

“An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act,”

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Senate Bill No. 591, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judiciary act of 1961,” by amending sections 4501 and 4545 (MCL 600.4501 and 600.4545).

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 543

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Ternoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine

Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

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

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Senate Bill No. 594, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending section 509ii (MCL 168.509ii), as added by 2018 PA 350.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 544

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh

BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

“An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act,”

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4127, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 234d (MCL 750.234d), as amended by 1994 PA 158.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 545

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bymes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette

Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Steele, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

This bill would ensnare innocent residents who are near a voting poll may unintentionally break the law if they walk or drive within 100’ of a polling location or a drop box. I introduced a substitute (H-5) for HB 4127 which would allow those who are able to carry a weapon to be able to drive, walk, or park within 100’ of a polling location without being in violation of this overreaching law.”

House Bill No. 4128, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 234d (MCL 750.234d), as amended by 1994 PA 158.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 546

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Messages from the Senate

The Speaker laid before the House

House Bill No. 4945, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16m of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16m), as amended by 2023 PA 22.

(The bill was received from the Senate on November 8, with substitute (S-1) and full title inserted, consideration of which, under the rules, was postponed until today, see House Journal No. 96, p. 2414.)

The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-1) made to the bill by the Senate,

The substitute (S-1) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 547**Yeas—58**

Aiyash	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Arbit	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Brabec	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Breen	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Brixie	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Byrnes	Hood	O’Neal	Tisdell
Carter, B.	Hope	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Wegela
Churches	Koleszar	Price	Weiss
Coffia	Kuhn	Puri	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Rheingans	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rogers	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Scott	Young
Edwards	McFall		

Nays—51

Alexander	DeSana	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Filler	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fink	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Fox	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Friske	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Green, P.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Hall	Paquette	VanderWall
Borton	Harris	Posthumus	VanWoerkom
Carra	Hoadley	Prestin	Wendzel
Cavitt	Johnsen	Rigas	Wozniak
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Zorn
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.

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

Third Reading of Bills**House Bill No. 4824, entitled**

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending section 20120a (MCL 324.20120a), as amended by 2018 PA 581.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 548**Yeas—56**

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette

Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4825, entitled

A bill to amend 1986 PA 182, entitled “State police retirement act of 1986,” by amending section 66 (MCL 38.1666), as added by 2018 PA 674.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 549

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schrivver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell

Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4826, entitled

A bill to amend 1969 PA 306, entitled “Administrative procedures act of 1969,” by amending sections 33, 39a, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, and 48 (MCL 24.233, 24.239a, 24.241, 24.242, 24.243, 24.244, 24.247, and 24.248), as amended by 2018 PA 267; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 550

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bymes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

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

The Senate returned, in accordance with the request of the House
Senate Bill No. 374, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act,” by amending sections 658 and 661 (MCL 168.658 and 168.661), as amended by 2023 PA 88.
(The bill was passed on October 4, see House Journal No. 80, p. 1886.)

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 63 be suspended.
The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved to reconsider the vote by which the House passed the bill.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Third Reading of Bills

Senate Bill No. 374, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act,” by amending sections 658 and 661 (MCL 168.658 and 168.661), as amended by 2023 PA 88.
The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Tsernoglou moved to substitute (H-2) the bill.
The motion was seconded and the substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.
The question being on the passage of the bill,
The bill was then passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 551

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff

Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O'Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—53

Alexander	Filler	Maddock	Schriver
Aragona	Fink	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Martin	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Meerman	Smit
Beson	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The question being on agreeing to the title of the bill,

Rep. Aiyash moved to amend the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act,” by amending sections 658 and 661 (MCL 168.658 and 168.661), as amended by 2023 PA 88, and by adding section 847a.

The motion prevailed.

The House agreed to the title as amended.

Second Reading of Bills

Senate Bill No. 613, entitled

A bill to require certain public officers to file annual financial disclosure reports; to create a financial disclosure form; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Rheingans moved to amend the bill as follows:

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

“(vii) Regents of the University of Michigan, members of the board of trustees of Michigan State University, and members of the board of governors of Wayne State University.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Morgan moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, following line 14, by inserting:

“(o) A description of all contracts entered into, or in which the public officer or public officer’s spouse has an interest, with this state.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Arbit moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, following line 3, by inserting:

“(c) “Dependent” means an individual claimed by the public officer or the public officer’s spouse as dependent for federal income tax purposes.” and relettering the remaining subdivisions.

2. Amend page 6, following line 14, by inserting:

“(o) The following information regarding each dependent. For purposes of this subdivision, the public officer may refer to each dependent using the dependent’s first and last initial:

(i) The number of dependents that the public officer and the spouse of the public officer claim for federal income tax purposes.

(ii) The principal activity of each employer of each dependent, if the dependent’s total earned income from the employer equals \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period.

(iii) A list of any real property in which the dependent holds an ownership or other financial interest. For purposes of this subparagraph, the dependent is required to include a real property asset in the report only if that real property has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. A public officer filing a report may exclude the street number of a parcel of real property held by the dependent under this subparagraph.

(iv) Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, a list of each asset and sources of unearned income, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production of income by each dependent with a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. The fair market value for the purpose of listing each asset, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production income under this subparagraph must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index.

(v) Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, a list of any stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities held by each dependent, if the security has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more. The fair market value for the purpose of listing stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities under this subparagraph must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index. For purposes of this act, the dependent is not required to disclose a stock in a widely held investment fund, including, but not limited to, a mutual fund, regulated investment company, pension or deferred compensation plan, or other investment fund if the fund is publicly traded or the assets of the fund are widely diversified.

(vi) A description of any interest each dependent had during the reporting period in a legal entity that conducts business in this state, including the name of the legal entity, if the interest has a book value of \$50,000.00 or more.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Byrnes moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, line 10, after “law” by inserting a comma and “or any gift received from an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity that has a value of \$1,000.00 or more during the reporting period”.

2. Amend page 6, line 12, after “law” by inserting a comma and “or any travel payments received or made on behalf of the public officer from an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity with a value of \$1,000.00 or more during the reporting period”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Coffia moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 2, after “spouse,” by striking out “and”.

2. Amend page 4, line 3, after “spouse” by inserting a comma and “and a description of any interest the public officer’s spouse has in a legal entity that conducts business in this state and the name of that legal entity”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Skaggs moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, following line 14, by inserting:

“(o) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, a list of each asset and sources of unearned income, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production of income by the spouse of the public officer with a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. The fair market value for the purpose of listing each asset, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production income under this subdivision must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index.

(p) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, a list of any stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities held by the public officer’s spouse, if the security has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more. The fair market value for the purpose of listing stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities under this subdivision must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index. For purposes of this subdivision, the spouse of a public official is not required to disclose a stock in a widely held investment fund, including, but not limited to, a mutual fund, regulated investment company, pension or deferred compensation plan, or other investment fund, if the fund is publicly traded or the assets of the fund are widely diversified.

(q) A list of any real property in which the spouse of the public officer holds an ownership or other financial interest. For purposes of this subdivision, the spouse of the public officer is required to include a real property asset in the report only if that real property has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. A public officer filing a report may exclude the street number of a parcel of real property held by the spouse of the public official under this subdivision.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Rheingans moved to amend the bill as follows:

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

“(vii) Members of the state board of education.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Byrnes moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, line 18, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This act does not take effect unless all of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law:

(a) Senate Bill No. 374.

(b) Senate Bill No. 614.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Morgan moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, line 11, after “than” by striking out “\$2,000.00” and inserting “\$10,000.00”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Skaggs moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 1, after “(c)” by striking out “The” and inserting “Beginning January 1, 2028, the”.

2. Amend page 4, line 4, after “(d)” by striking out “Whether” and inserting “Beginning January 1, 2028, whether”.

3. Amend page 5, line 6, after “or” by inserting a comma and “beginning January 1, 2028.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Paquette moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, line 9, after “gifts” by striking out the balance of the line through “law.” on line 10 and inserting “and expenditures for food and beverages paid for or reimbursed by a lobbyist or lobbyist agent.”.

2. Amend page 6, line 11, after “travel” by striking out the balance of the line through “law.” on line 12 and inserting “and expenses paid for or reimbursed by a lobbyist or lobbyist agent.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Paquette moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, following line 3, by inserting:

“(c) “Dependent” means an individual claimed by the public officer or the public officer’s spouse as a dependent for federal income tax purposes.” and relettering the remaining subdivisions.

2. Amend page 6, following line 14, by inserting:

“(o) All of the following information regarding the public officer’s spouse:

(i) The principal activity of each employer of the spouse of the public officer, if the spouse’s total earned income from the employer equals \$50,000.00 or more during that reporting period.

(ii) The source and type of all income, including earned and unearned income received by the spouse of the public officer. For purposes of this subparagraph, the spouse of the public officer is required to include the source of income described under this subparagraph only if the total income from that source equals \$50,000.00 or more during that reporting period.

(iii) A description of each real property or property that the spouse of the public officer has an ownership interest in, including, but not limited to, commercial, industrial, or agricultural buildings. For purposes of this subparagraph, the spouse of the public officer is required to include a real property or property described under this subparagraph in the report only if the real property or property had a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more at any time the real property was held during that reporting period. The street number of a parcel of real property listed under this subparagraph may be excluded from the report.

(iv) A description of any stocks, bonds, commodities, futures, shares in mutual funds, or other forms of securities held by the spouse of the public officer. For purposes of this subparagraph, the spouse of the public officer is required to include a security described under this subparagraph in the report only if the security has a total aggregate fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more on a specified day that is within the final month of the calendar year covered in the reporting period.

(v) A description of any interest the spouse of the public officer had during the reporting period in a legal entity that conducts business in this state, if the interest has a book value of \$50,000.00 or more.

(p) All of the following information regarding the public officer’s dependents:

(i) The number of dependents that the public officer and the spouse of the public officer claim for federal income tax purposes.

(ii) The principal activity of each employer of each dependent of the public officer, if the dependent’s total earned income from the employer equals \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period.

(iii) The source and type of all income, including earned and unearned income received by each dependent of the public officer, if the source of income described under this subparagraph equals \$50,000.00 or more during that reporting period.

(iv) A description of each real property or property that each dependent of the public officer has an ownership interest in, including, but not limited to, commercial, industrial, or agricultural buildings. For purposes of this subparagraph, the dependent is required to include a real property or property described under this subsection only if the real property or property had a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more at any time that the real property or property was held during that reporting period. The street number of a parcel of real property or property listed under this subparagraph may be excluded from the report.

(v) A description of any stocks, bonds, commodities, futures, shares in mutual funds, or other forms of securities held by each dependent of the public officer. For purposes of this subparagraph, each dependent of the public officer is required to include a security described under this subparagraph in the report only if the security has a total aggregate fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more on a specified day that is within the final month of the calendar year covered in the reporting period.

(vi) A description of any interest each dependent of the public officer had during the reporting period in a legal entity that conducts business in this state, if the interest has a book value of \$50,000.00 or more.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Paquette moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 22, after the first “asset” by striking out the comma and “excluding a business asset,”.

2. Amend page 4, line 26, after the first “asset” by striking out the comma and “excluding a business asset,”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Carra moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, following line 17, by inserting:

“Sec. 16. A member of the legislature shall issue a statement of understanding during each reporting period. A statement of understanding issued in accordance with this section must include a statement that

the member's contribution may be used against a candidate for the office of state representative or state senator who is in the same party as the contributing member, if the contributing member transferred money from the leadership fund to the candidate during the reporting period.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Carra moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, following line 17, by inserting:

“Sec. 16. At the beginning of each legislative term, the members of the house of representatives shall vote on the house rules by a record roll call vote.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Carra moved to amend the bill as follows:

1 Amend page 15, following line 17, by inserting:

“Sec. 16. A member of the legislature shall not threaten or expose the private matters of another member who did not vote the same way on a bill as that member.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Carra moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, following line 17, by inserting:

“Sec. 16. A member of the legislature who votes in support of a bill that gives tax breaks to a limited number of individuals and not the general public shall disclose the reasons and motives for the vote.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Carra moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, following line 17, by inserting:

“Sec. 16. If a member of the legislature votes in a certain way on a bill that the member would not have otherwise voted in order to secure the support of other members of the legislature on a bill sponsored by that member or for a position in leadership or a committee, that member must disclose the reason for that vote.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Paquette moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, following line 14, by inserting:

“(o) A list of all travels that are paid for by a person that is not a lobbyist or lobbyist agent because of the public officer's position as a public officer during the reporting period. As used in this subdivision, “person” means an individual, a partnership, a corporation, a limited liability company, an association, an organization, including a nonprofit organization, or other legal entity.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Tyrone Carter moved to substitute (H-3) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-3) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Schuette moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 20, after “period” by striking out the balance of the subdivision and inserting “and indicate whether the amount received from each source is less than \$1,000.00, between \$1,000.00 and \$2,500.00, \$2,500.00 and \$5,000.00, \$5,000.00 and \$15,000.00, \$15,000.00 and \$50,000.00, \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00, or \$100,000.00 and \$1,000,000.00, or \$1,000,000.00 or more.”.

2. Amend page 4, line 23, after “income” by striking out “with a fair market value of \$1,000.00 or more during the reporting period”.

3. Amend page 4, line 24, after “income” by striking out “that exceeds \$200.00”.

4. Amend page 4, line 29, after “\$1,000.00.” by inserting “Both of the following apply under this subdivision:

(i) For purposes of listing each asset, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production of income, the public officer shall indicate whether the fair market value of each asset is less than \$1,000.00, between \$1,000.00 and \$2,500.00, \$2,500.00 and \$5,000.00, \$5,000.00 and \$15,000.00, \$15,000.00 and \$50,000.00, \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00, or \$100,000.00 and \$1,000,000.00, or \$1,000,000.00 or more.

(ii) For purposes of listing each source of unearned income, the public officer shall indicate whether the amount received from each source of unearned income is less than \$1,000.00, between \$1,000.00 and \$2,500.00, \$2,500.00 and \$5,000.00, \$5,000.00 and \$15,000.00, \$15,000.00 and \$50,000.00, \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00, or \$100,000.00 and \$1,000,000.00, or \$1,000,000.00 or more.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Kunse moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 16, line 6, by striking out enacting section 1 and inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This act does not take effect unless all of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law:

- (a) Senate Bill No. 614
- (b) House Bill No. 4264
- (c) House Bill No. 4265
- (d) House Bill No. 4266
- (e) House Bill No. 4267.”

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Schuette moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 1, after “spouse” by inserting “and each immediate family member”.

2. Amend page 4, line 6, after “period.” By inserting “As used in this subsection, “immediate family member” means the public officer’s parent, stepparent, sibling, stepsibling, child, or stepchild.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 614, entitled

A bill to require certain candidates for state elective office to file financial disclosure reports; to create a financial disclosure form; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Byrnes moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, following line 18, by inserting:

“(l) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, a list of each asset and sources of unearned income, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production of income by the spouse of the candidate for office with a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. The fair market value for the purpose of listing each asset, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production income under this subdivision must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index.

(m) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, a list of any stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities held by the spouse of the candidate for office, if the security has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more. The fair market value for the purpose of listing stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities under this subdivision must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index. For purposes of this subdivision, the spouse of the candidate for office is not required to disclose a stock in a widely held investment fund, including, but not limited to, a mutual fund, regulated investment company, pension or deferred compensation plan, or other investment fund, if the fund is publicly traded or the assets of the fund are widely diversified.

(n) A list of any real property in which the spouse of the candidate for office holds an ownership or other financial interest. For purposes of this subdivision, the spouse of the candidate for office is required to include a real property asset in the report only if that real property has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. A public officer filing a report may exclude the street number of a parcel of real property held by the spouse of the candidate for office under this subdivision.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Andrews moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 13, after “office,” by striking out “and”.
2. Amend page 4, line 14, after “spouse” by inserting a comma and “and a description of any interest the spouse of the candidate for office has in a legal entity that conducts business in this state and the name of that legal entity”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Rheingans moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, following line 13, by inserting:

“(vii) Regent of the University of Michigan, member of the board of trustees of Michigan State University, or member of the board of governors of Wayne State University.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Rheingans moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, following line 13, by inserting:

“(vii) State board of education.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Rheingans moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, following line 18, by inserting:

“(f) A list of all gifts and travel payments received or made on behalf of the candidate for office from an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity that have a value of \$1,000.00 or more during the reporting period.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. McKinney moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, following line 14, by inserting:

“(d) “Dependent” means an individual claimed by the candidate for office or the spouse of the candidate for office as a dependent for federal income tax purposes.” and relettering the remaining subdivisions.

2. Amend page 6, following line 18, by inserting:

“(f) The following information regarding each dependent. For purposes of this subdivision, the candidate for office may refer to each dependent using the dependent’s first and last initial:

(i) The number of dependents that the candidate for office and the spouse of the candidate for office claim for federal income tax purposes.

(ii) The principal activity of each employer of each dependent if the dependent’s total earned income from the employer equals \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period.

(iii) A list of any real property in which the dependent holds an ownership or other financial interest. For purposes of this subparagraph, the dependent is required to include a real property asset in the report only if that real property has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. A candidate for office filing a report may exclude the street number of a parcel of real property held by the dependent under this subparagraph.

(iv) Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, a list of each asset and sources of unearned income, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production of income by each dependent with a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more during the reporting period. The fair market value for the purpose of listing each asset, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production income under this subparagraph must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index.

(v) Except as otherwise provided in this subparagraph, a list of any stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities held by each dependent if the security has a fair market value of \$50,000.00 or more. The fair market value for the purpose of listing stocks, bonds, or other forms of securities under this subparagraph must be adjusted for inflation every 4 years using the Detroit Consumer Price Index. For purposes of this act, the dependent is not required to disclose a stock in a widely held investment fund, including, but not limited to, a mutual fund, regulated investment company, pension or deferred compensation plan, or other investment fund, if the fund is publicly traded or the assets of the fund are widely diversified.

(vi) A description of any interest each dependent had during the reporting period in a legal entity that conducts business in this state, including the name of the legal entity, if the interest has a book value of \$50,000.00 or more.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. MacDonell moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 6, following line 18, by inserting:

“(I) A description of all contracts entered into, or in which the candidate for office or spouse of the candidate for office has an interest, with this state.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Morgan moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, line 1, after “than” by striking out “\$2,000.00” and inserting “\$10,000.00”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Byrnes moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 15, line 8, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This act does not take effect unless all of the following bills of the 102nd Legislature are enacted into law:

(a) Senate Bill No. 374.

(b) Senate Bill No. 613.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Skaggs moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 12, after “(c)” by striking out “The” and inserting “Beginning January 1, 2028, the”.

2. Amend page 4, line 15, after “(d)” by striking out “Whether” and inserting “Beginning January 1, 2028, whether”.

3. Amend page 5, line 18, after “or” by inserting a comma and “beginning January 1, 2028,”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Fitzgerald moved to substitute (H-2) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Kunse moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 5, line 2, after “period” by striking out the balance of the subdivision and inserting “and indicate whether the amount received from each source is less than \$1,000.00, between \$1,000.00 and \$2,500.00, \$2,500.00 and \$5,000.00, \$5,000.00 and \$15,000.00, \$15,000.00 and \$50,000.00, \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00, or \$100,000.00 and \$1,000,000.00, or \$1,000,000.00 or more.”.

2. Amend page 5, line 6, after “income” by striking out “with a fair market value of \$1,000.00 or more during the reporting period”.

3. Amend page 5, line 7, after “income” by striking out “that exceeds \$200.00”.

4. Amend page 5, line 12, after “\$1,000.00.” by inserting “Both of the following apply under this subdivision:

(i) For purposes of listing each asset, excluding a business asset, held for investment or production of income, the public officer shall indicate whether the fair market value of each asset is less than \$1,000.00, between \$1,000.00 and \$2,500.00, \$2,500.00 and \$5,000.00, \$5,000.00 and \$15,000.00, \$15,000.00 and \$50,000.00, \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00, or \$100,000.00 and \$1,000,000.00, or \$1,000,000.00 or more.

(ii) For purposes of listing each source of unearned income, the public officer shall indicate whether the amount received from each source of unearned income is less than \$1,000.00, between \$1,000.00 and \$2,500.00, \$2,500.00 and \$5,000.00, \$5,000.00 and \$15,000.00, \$15,000.00 and \$50,000.00, \$50,000.00 and \$100,000.00, or \$100,000.00 and \$1,000,000.00, or \$1,000,000.00 or more.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Schuette moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 12, after “spouse” by inserting “and each immediate family member”.

2. Amend page 4, line 17, after “period.” By inserting “As used in this subsection, “immediate family member” means the public officer’s parent, stepparent, sibling, stepsibling, child, or stepchild.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 615, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 388, entitled “Michigan campaign finance act,” (MCL 169.201 to 169.282) by adding section 44a.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Rheingans moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 1, line 5, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless Senate Bill No. 616 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 616, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 388, entitled “Michigan campaign finance act,” by amending section 44 (MCL 169.244), as amended by 2017 PA 119.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Rheingans moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, line 24, by striking out all of enacting section 1 and inserting:

“Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless Senate Bill No. 615 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 613** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

Senate Bill No. 613, entitled

A bill to require certain public officers to file annual financial disclosure reports; to create a financial disclosure form; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 552

Yeas—59

Aiyash	Filler	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Fink	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Snyder
Bollin	Glanville	Morse	Steckloff
Brabec	Grant	Mueller	Tate
Breen	Green, P.	Neeley	Ternoglou
Brixie	Haadsma	O’Neal	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Hood	Outman	VanWoerkom
Carter, T.	Hope	Pohutsky	Weiss
Cavitt	Hoskins	Posthumus	Wendzel
Churches	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Kuhn	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	Liberati	Rogers	Witwer
Edwards	Lightner	Roth	Young
Farhat	Martus	Schmaltz	

Nays—49

Alexander	Dievendorf	Markkanen	Schuette
Aragona	Fox	Martin	Skaggs
Beeler	Friske	Meerman	Slagh
BeGole	Greene, J.	Miller	Smit
Beson	Hall	Morgan	St. Germaine
Bezotte	Harris	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hill	Paiz	Stone
Borton	Hoadley	Paquette	Thompson
Bymes	Johnsen	Prestin	Tisdell
Carra	Kunse	Rheingans	Wegela
DeBoer	MacDonell	Rigas	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock	Schrivier	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Meerman, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I can’t in good conscience vote for a transparency package that I see as a half measure. Michigan residents and Constituents of the 89th district deserve more transparency from the elected representatives they send to Lansing to work on their behalf. This great experiment we call the United States should continually strive to build trust in those asked to serve.

Michigan voters spoke loud and clear in 2022 when they demanded transparency in our state Legislature. These bills fall short of what the people expect and deserve. We cannot settle for the least amount of accountability possible.”

Reps. Tisdell, Steele, Smit, Harris and Bierlein having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No explanation for Bills 613-616.

In November 2022, Michigan voters approved Ballot Proposal 1, which mandated that the state’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general file annual public financial

disclosure reports starting from 2023. This proposal required the disclosure of various financial details, including assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations, excluding religious, social, and political organizations.

However, the content of Senate Bills 613-616 falls short of the minimum standard for financial disclosures set by the state constitution. The proposed legislation does not align with the expectations or rightful demands of the people of Michigan. It fails to provide the necessary transparency into the finances of elected officials, a transparency that should be pursued voluntarily, regardless of legal mandates. The bills being considered today evade this fundamental responsibility.

These legislative measures do not honor the expressed will of the people, as clearly outlined in Proposal 1 of 2022. As a representative entrusted to voice the concerns of the people, it is my duty to oppose these bills. Therefore, I cast my vote against Senate Bills 613-616.”

Rep. DeBoer, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require

Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility. These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Martin, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Slagh, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 maybe meets the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. However, it is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility. Additionally, it brings in the Secretary of State to put forms together that the Constitution clearly requires from the Legislature.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Paiz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I believe this bill is in need of strengthening amendment(s) to better respond to concerns of the voter-approved Proposal 1 of 2022.”

Rep. Dievendorf, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

We had the opportunity to pass historic ethics reforms that required far reaching and transparent campaign finance disclosure of our public officials. While these bills are passing today to comply with the ballot measure passed last year it doesn’t go nearly far enough.”

Rep. Miller, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am voting no on this bill because I feel this bill is weak. It does not fill the will of the voters.”

Rep. Stone, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I voted NO SB 613, 614, 615, & 616 for the failure of this weak financial disclosure legislation. These bills were taken up at the 11th hour and in the middle of the night. Michigan’s residents do not trust elected officials because they believe elected officials are enriching themselves or making decisions motivated by a conflict of interest. Currently Michigan is considered last in the nation for a lack of transparency around financial disclosure. Voters gave Michigan’s legislature a mandate to adopt financial disclosure legislation in 2022 by adopting Proposal 1 by 61%. Voting NO is a demand that we strengthen these bills with commonsense language.

I have cosponsored the legislation Michigan House Democrats have championed that required much stronger financial disclosures the past 3 legislative terms. Many House members and I voluntarily provided financial disclosure statements before it was ever mandated since we understood the importance of transparency in order to build trust. I voluntarily participated in a policy workgroup for 8 months in order to develop the financial disclosure legislation that Michiganders expect of their leaders. I could NOT support weaker bills that were passed out of the Senate. These bills leave loopholes that a truck could drive through. For example, they fail to account for marital assets, which is a potential way of hiding income and assets. We offered amendments to make this legislation better that were not taken up.

When legislative leaders face investigations and charges for abusing their positions, Michigan legislators must be bold and courageous by raising the bar at the very least to be on par with the many states leading on this policy and congress. Merely passing watered down financial disclosure legislation is not a guarantee that the citizens of Michigan won’t sue the legislature demanding better.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

These Bills never went through the committee process nor crafted with bipartisan support which is ironic since we have an Ethics & Oversight Committee which hasn’t met in months.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative of the people, I must vote no.”

Reps. Beson and Markkanen, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Rheingans, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted against SB613 because this bill as passed does not adhere to the will of the voters of Michigan, who voted to approve ballot language requiring elected state officers to disclose financial items in their personal lives that could influence their votes on legislation, including gifts and travel paid for by non-lobbyist individuals and organizations. In Michigan, when an individual is married, their assets are jointly held with their spouse unless a prenuptial agreement or other legal asset separation agreement was in place at the time of the marriage. Therefore, all assets, investments, properties, businesses, and other financial items in a spouse’s name also benefit the elected official and should also be disclosed. Unfortunately, despite amendments offered to fix this egregious loophole, the bill did not contain those stronger measures when a vote was ordered on SB613.”

Rep. Thompson, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. We have been in session for almost a full year now, and right before we close for the year Dems cram these bills at us at 2am in the morning. Republicans have had bills on this for months and Dems refused to work together. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not even meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency.

These bills as presented fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Hall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Aragona, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. BeGole, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Hill, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am writing to provide an explanation for my votes against House Bills 613, 614, 615 and 616.

In November 2022, the voters of Michigan approved Proposal 22-1. This proposal called for both an increase in the total number of years a member of the Michigan House of Representatives or Michigan Senate could be allowed to serve in their respective chamber and new financial disclosure requirements for elected officials and candidates wishing to serve at the state level. The latter change is of particular importance, as Michigan is currently one of only two states in our nation lacking statutory requirements for financial disclosures from state elected officials.

The package of bills I voted against was introduced to implement these financial disclosure requirements. However, the bills as presented leave significant loopholes in place. If they are not addressed, these loopholes will allow state officials to circumvent the intended purpose of the legislation. Further, amendments that could have strengthened these disclosure provisions and eliminated the loopholes in question were not adopted.

These loopholes include weak reporting requirements for assets held in the names of immediate family members as well as a lack of clear reporting requirements for gifts and travel. I find it particularly concerning that gift and travel disclosures were left out, as these were explicitly called for in the language of Proposal 22-1.

The people of House District 109 believe in the value and importance of transparency in government, and I share that conviction. I will continue working to ensure honesty among Michigan’s elected leaders, and to that end I look forward to opportunities to further strengthen applicable financial disclosure provisions.”

Rep. MacDonell, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I felt that this package of bills could have been much stronger and should have included spousal reporting.”

Rep. Morgan, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Transparency is the cornerstone of a robust democracy, and our constituents deserve to know that their elected officials have their best interests at heart.

Residents across the state overwhelmingly passed Proposal 1 in 2022 to demand better transparency and financial disclosure from their elected officials. Last night’s vote on Senate Bills 613 through 616 fell short of implementing the will of the people. These bills include serious loopholes that allow elected officials and their spouses to cheat the system and hide wrongdoing.

I understand why some of my colleagues voted yes on this legislation, as this legislation is certainly better than the status quo. However, I voted no because I firmly believe that we will only get better results from our elected officials if we have the courage to stand up for what is right.

This package of bills focuses on elected officers and candidates for state offices. In Michigan, when an individual is married, their assets are jointly held with their spouse unless a prenuptial agreement or other legal asset separation agreement was in place at the time of the marriage. Therefore, all assets, investments, properties, businesses, and other financial items in a spouse’s name also benefit the official and candidate and should be disclosed.

Unfortunately, despite amendments offered by a bipartisan list of legislators to fix this egregious loophole, the bill did not contain those stronger measures when a vote was ordered on SB614. Every single amendment was gavelled down without being given a legitimate vote.

I am proud to stand up for true disclosure and transparency in a place where that is not always popular. The people of this state deserve better, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to advocate for stronger language that brings adequate transparency to our government.”

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 614** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

Senate Bill No. 614, entitled

A bill to require certain candidates for state elective office to file financial disclosure reports; to create a financial disclosure form; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 553**Yeas—61**

Aiyash	Filler	Martus	Schmaltz
Andrews	Fink	McFall	Scott
Arbit	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Shannon
Bollin	Glanville	Mentzer	Snyder
Brabec	Grant	Morse	Steckloff
Breen	Green, P.	Mueller	Tate
Brixie	Haadsma	Neeley	Ternoglou
Carter, B.	Hood	O'Neal	VanderWall
Carter, T.	Hope	Outman	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Churches	Koleszar	Posthumus	Wendzel
Coleman	Kuhn	Price	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
DeBoer	Lightner	Rogers	Witwer
Edwards	MacDonell	Roth	Young
Farhat			

Nays—47

Alexander	Dievendorf	Martin	Skaggs
Aragona	Fox	Meerman	Slagh
Beeler	Friske	Miller	Smit
BeGole	Greene, J.	Morgan	St. Germaine
Beson	Hall	Neyer	Steele
Bezotte	Harris	Paiz	Stone
Bierlein	Hill	Paquette	Thompson
Borton	Hoadley	Prestin	Tisdell
Bymes	Johnsen	Rheingans	Wegela
Carra	Kunse	Rigas	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock	Schrivier	Zorn
DeSana	Markkanen	Schuetter	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Meerman, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I can't in good conscience vote for a transparency package that I see as a half measure. Michigan residents and Constituents of the 89th district deserve more transparency from the elected representatives they send to Lansing to work on their behalf. This great experiment we call the United States should continually strive to build trust in those asked to serve.

Michigan voters spoke loud and clear in 2022 when they demanded transparency in our state Legislature. These bills fall short of what the people expect and deserve. We cannot settle for the least amount of accountability possible.”

Reps. Tisdell, Harris and Smit having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Dievendorf, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

We had the opportunity to pass historic ethics reforms that required far reaching and transparent campaign finance disclosure of our public officials. While these bills are passing today to comply with the ballot measure passed last year it doesn’t go nearly far enough.”

Rep. Paiz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I believe this bill is in need of strengthening amendment(s) to better respond to concerns of the voter-approved Proposal 1 of 2022.”

Rep. Stone, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I voted NO SB 613, 614, 615, & 616 for the failure of this weak financial disclosure legislation. These bills were taken up at the 11th hour and in the middle of the night. Michigan’s residents do not trust elected officials because they believe elected officials are enriching themselves or making decisions motivated by a conflict of interest. Currently Michigan is considered last in the nation for a lack of transparency around financial disclosure. Voters gave Michigan’s legislature a mandate to adopt financial disclosure legislation in 2022 by adopting Proposal 1 by 61%. Voting NO is a demand that we strengthen these bills with commonsense language.

I have cosponsored the legislation Michigan House Democrats have championed that required much stronger financial disclosures the past 3 legislative terms. Many House members and I voluntarily provided financial disclosure statements before it was ever mandated since we understood the importance of transparency in order to build trust. I voluntarily participated in a policy workgroup for 8 months in order to develop the financial disclosure legislation that Michiganders expect of their leaders. I could NOT support weaker bills that were passed out of the Senate. These bills leave loopholes that a truck could drive through. For example, they fail to account for marital assets, which is a potential way of hiding income and assets. We offered amendments to make this legislation better that were not taken up.

When legislative leaders face investigations and charges for abusing their positions, Michigan legislators must be bold and courageous by raising the bar at the very least to be on par with the many states leading on this policy and congress. Merely passing watered down financial disclosure legislation is not a guarantee that the citizens of Michigan won’t sue the legislature demanding better.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public

financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

These Bills never went through the committee process nor crafted with bipartisan support which is ironic since we have an Ethics & Oversight Committee which hasn't met in months.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative of the people, I must vote no."

Rep. Slagh, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 maybe meets the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. However, it is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility. Additionally, it brings in the Secretary of State to put forms together that the Constitution clearly requires from the Legislature.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no."

Reps. Beson and Markkanen, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no."

Rep. Rheingans and Wegela, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted against SB614 because this bill as passed does not adhere to the will of the voters of Michigan, who voted to approve ballot language requiring elected state officers to disclose financial items in their personal lives that could influence their votes on legislation, including gifts and travel paid for by non-lobbyist individuals and organizations. SB614 focuses on candidates for state offices, so that those individuals have the same personal public risk as the officers against whom they are running. In Michigan, when an individual is married, their assets are jointly held with their spouse unless a prenuptial agreement or other legal asset separation agreement was in place at the time of the marriage. Therefore, all assets, investments, properties, businesses, and other financial items in a spouse's name also benefit the candidate and should also be disclosed. Unfortunately, despite amendments offered to fix this egregious loophole, the bill did not contain those stronger measures when a vote was ordered on SB614."

Rep. Thompson, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. We have been in session for almost a full year now, and right before we close for the year Dems cram these bills at us at 2am in the morning. Republicans have had bills on this for months and Dems refused to work together. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not even meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency.

These bills as presented fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Hall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency.

These bills as presented fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Aragona, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest

in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. BeGole, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Hill, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am writing to provide an explanation for my votes against House Bills 613, 614, 615 and 616.

In November 2022, the voters of Michigan approved Proposal 22-1. This proposal called for both an increase in the total number of years a member of the Michigan House of Representatives or Michigan Senate could be allowed to serve in their respective chamber and new financial disclosure requirements for elected officials and candidates wishing to serve at the state level. The latter change is of particular importance, as Michigan is currently one of only two states in our nation lacking statutory requirements for financial disclosures from state elected officials.

The package of bills I voted against was introduced to implement these financial disclosure requirements. However, the bills as presented leave significant loopholes in place. If they are not addressed, these loopholes will allow state officials to circumvent the intended purpose of the legislation. Further, amendments that could have strengthened these disclosure provisions and eliminated the loopholes in question were not adopted.

These loopholes include weak reporting requirements for assets held in the names of immediate family members as well as a lack of clear reporting requirements for gifts and travel. I find it particularly concerning that gift and travel disclosures were left out, as these were explicitly called for in the language of Proposal 22-1.

The people of House District 109 believe in the value and importance of transparency in government, and I share that conviction. I will continue working to ensure honesty among Michigan’s elected leaders, and to that end I look forward to opportunities to further strengthen applicable financial disclosure provisions.”

Rep. Martin, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public

financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Morgan, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Transparency is the cornerstone of a robust democracy, and our constituents deserve to know that their elected officials have their best interests at heart.

Residents across the state overwhelmingly passed Proposal 1 in 2022 to demand better transparency and financial disclosure from their elected officials. Last night’s vote on Senate Bills 613 through 616 fell short of implementing the will of the people. These bills include serious loopholes that allow elected officials and their spouses to cheat the system and hide wrongdoing.

I understand why some of my colleagues voted yes on this legislation, as this legislation is certainly better than the status quo. However, I voted no because I firmly believe that we will only get better results from our elected officials if we have the courage to stand up for what is right.

This package of bills focuses on elected officers and candidates for state offices. In Michigan, when an individual is married, their assets are jointly held with their spouse unless a prenuptial agreement or other legal asset separation agreement was in place at the time of the marriage. Therefore, all assets, investments, properties, businesses, and other financial items in a spouse’s name also benefit the official and candidate and should be disclosed.

Unfortunately, despite amendments offered by a bipartisan list of legislators to fix this egregious loophole, the bill did not contain those stronger measures when a vote was ordered on SB614. Every single amendment was gavelled down without being given a legitimate vote.

I am proud to stand up for true disclosure and transparency in a place where that is not always popular. The people of this state deserve better, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to advocate for stronger language that brings adequate transparency to our government.”

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 615** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

Senate Bill No. 615, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 388, entitled “Michigan campaign finance act,” (MCL 169.201 to 169.282) by adding section 44a.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 554

Yeas—61

Aiyash	Filler	Martus	Schmaltz
Andrews	Fink	McFall	Scott
Arbit	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Shannon

Bollin	Glanville	Mentzer	Snyder
Brabec	Grant	Morse	Steckloff
Breen	Green, P.	Mueller	Tate
Brixie	Haadsma	Neeley	Ternoglou
Carter, B.	Hood	O'Neal	VanderWall
Carter, T.	Hope	Outman	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Churches	Koleszar	Posthumus	Wendzel
Coleman	Kuhn	Price	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
DeBoer	Lightner	Rogers	Witwer
Edwards	MacDonell	Roth	Young
Farhat			

Nays—47

Alexander	Dievendorf	Martin	Skaggs
Aragona	Fox	Meerman	Slagh
Beeler	Friske	Miller	Smit
BeGole	Greene, J.	Morgan	St. Germaine
Beson	Hall	Neyer	Steele
Bezotte	Harris	Paiz	Stone
Bierlein	Hill	Paquette	Thompson
Borton	Hoadley	Prestin	Tisdell
Byrnes	Johnsen	Rheingans	Wegela
Carra	Kunse	Rigas	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock	Schrivier	Zorn
DeSana	Markkanen	Schuette	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

“An act to regulate political activity; to regulate campaign financing; to restrict campaign contributions and expenditures; to require campaign statements and reports; to regulate anonymous contributions; to regulate campaign advertising and literature; to provide for segregated funds for political purposes; to provide for the use of public funds for political purposes; to create certain funds; to provide for reversion, retention, or refunding of unexpended balances in certain funds; to require other statements and reports; to regulate acceptance of certain gifts, payments, and reimbursements; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments and state and local officials and employees; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,”

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Meerman, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I can't in good conscience vote for a transparency package that I see as a half measure. Michigan residents and Constituents of the 89th district deserve more transparency from the elected representatives they send to Lansing to work on their behalf. This great experiment we call the United States should continually strive to build trust in those asked to serve.

Michigan voters spoke loud and clear in 2022 when they demanded transparency in our state Legislature. These bills fall short of what the people expect and deserve. We cannot settle for the least amount of accountability possible.”

Reps. Tisdell, Harris and Smit, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Slagh, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 maybe meets the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. However, it is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility. Additionally, it brings in the Secretary of State to put forms together that the Constitution clearly requires from the Legislature.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Paiz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I believe this bill is in need of strengthening amendment(s) to better respond to concerns of the voter-approved Proposal 1 of 2022.”

Rep. Dievendorf, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

We had the opportunity to pass historic ethics reforms that required far reaching and transparent campaign finance disclosure of our public officials. While these bills are passing today to comply with the ballot measure passed last year it doesn’t go nearly far enough.”

Rep. Stone, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I voted NO SB 613, 614, 615, & 616 for the failure of this weak financial disclosure legislation. These bills were taken up at the 11th hour and in the middle of the night. Michigan’s residents do not trust elected officials because they believe elected officials are enriching themselves or making decisions motivated by a conflict of interest. Currently Michigan is considered last in the nation for a lack of transparency around financial disclosure. Voters gave Michigan’s legislature a mandate to adopt financial disclosure legislation in 2022 by adopting Proposal 1 by 61%. Voting NO is a demand that we strengthen these bills with commonsense language.

I have cosponsored the legislation Michigan House Democrats have championed that required much stronger financial disclosures the past 3 legislative terms. Many House members and I voluntarily provided financial disclosure statements before it was ever mandated since we understood the importance of transparency in order to build trust. I voluntarily participated in a policy workgroup for 8 months in order to develop the financial disclosure legislation that Michiganders expect of their leaders. I could NOT support weaker bills that were passed out of the Senate. These bills leave loopholes that a truck could drive through. For example, they fail to account for marital assets, which is a potential way of hiding income and assets. We offered amendments to make this legislation better that were not taken up.

When legislative leaders face investigations and charges for abusing their positions, Michigan legislators must be bold and courageous by raising the bar at the very least to be on par with the many states leading on this policy and congress. Merely passing watered down financial disclosure legislation is not a guarantee that the citizens of Michigan won't sue the legislature demanding better."

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

These Bills never went through the committee process nor crafted with bipartisan support which is ironic since we have an Ethics & Oversight Committee which hasn't met in months.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative of the people, I must vote no."

Reps. Beson and Markkanen, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no."

Rep. Thompson, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. We have been in session for almost a full year now, and right before we close for the year Dems cram these bills at us at 2am in the morning. Republicans have had bills on this for months and Dems refused to work together. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not even meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency.

These bills as presented fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no."

Rep. Hall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency.

These bills as presented fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no."

Rep. Aragona, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no."

Rep. BeGole, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public

financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Hill, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am writing to provide an explanation for my votes against House Bills 613, 614, 615 and 616.

In November 2022, the voters of Michigan approved Proposal 22-1. This proposal called for both an increase in the total number of years a member of the Michigan House of Representatives or Michigan Senate could be allowed to serve in their respective chamber and new financial disclosure requirements for elected officials and candidates wishing to serve at the state level. The latter change is of particular importance, as Michigan is currently one of only two states in our nation lacking statutory requirements for financial disclosures from state elected officials.

The package of bills I voted against was introduced to implement these financial disclosure requirements. However, the bills as presented leave significant loopholes in place. If they are not addressed, these loopholes will allow state officials to circumvent the intended purpose of the legislation. Further, amendments that could have strengthened these disclosure provisions and eliminated the loopholes in question were not adopted.

These loopholes include weak reporting requirements for assets held in the names of immediate family members as well as a lack of clear reporting requirements for gifts and travel. I find it particularly concerning that gift and travel disclosures were left out, as these were explicitly called for in the language of Proposal 22-1.

The people of House District 109 believe in the value and importance of transparency in government, and I share that conviction. I will continue working to ensure honesty among Michigan’s elected leaders, and to that end I look forward to opportunities to further strengthen applicable financial disclosure provisions.”

Rep. Martin, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Morgan, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Transparency is the cornerstone of a robust democracy, and our constituents deserve to know that their elected officials have their best interests at heart.

Residents across the state overwhelmingly passed Proposal 1 in 2022 to demand better transparency and financial disclosure from their elected officials. Last night’s vote on Senate Bills 613 through 616 fell short of implementing the will of the people. These bills include serious loopholes that allow elected officials and their spouses to cheat the system and hide wrongdoing.

I understand why some of my colleagues voted yes on this legislation, as this legislation is certainly better than the status quo. However, I voted no because I firmly believe that we will only get better results from our elected officials if we have the courage to stand up for what is right.

This package of bills focuses on elected officers and candidates for state offices. In Michigan, when an individual is married, their assets are jointly held with their spouse unless a prenuptial agreement or other legal asset separation agreement was in place at the time of the marriage. Therefore, all assets, investments, properties, businesses, and other financial items in a spouse’s name also benefit the official and candidate and should be disclosed.

Unfortunately, despite amendments offered by a bipartisan list of legislators to fix this egregious loophole, the bill did not contain those stronger measures when a vote was ordered on SB614. Every single amendment was gavelled down without being given a legitimate vote.

I am proud to stand up for true disclosure and transparency in a place where that is not always popular. The people of this state deserve better, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to advocate for stronger language that brings adequate transparency to our government.”

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 616** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

Senate Bill No. 616, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 388, entitled “Michigan campaign finance act,” by amending section 44 (MCL 169.244), as amended by 2017 PA 119.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 555

Yeas—62

Aiyash	Filler	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Fink	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Slagh
Bollin	Glanville	Morse	Snyder
Brabec	Grant	Mueller	Steckloff
Breen	Green, P.	Neeley	Tate
Brixie	Haadsma	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, B.	Hood	Outman	VanderWall
Carter, T.	Hope	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Hoskins	Posthumus	Weiss
Churches	Koleszar	Price	Wendzel
Coleman	Kuhn	Puri	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Rogers	Wilson
DeBoer	Lightner	Roth	Witwer
Edwards	MacDonell	Schmaltz	Young
Farhat	Martus		

Nays—46

Alexander	Dievendorf	Martin	Schuette
Aragona	Fox	Meerman	Skaggs
Beeler	Friske	Miller	Smit
BeGole	Greene, J.	Morgan	St. Germaine
Beson	Hall	Neyer	Steele
Bezotte	Harris	Paiz	Stone
Bierlein	Hill	Paquette	Thompson
Borton	Hoadley	Prestin	Tisdel
Byrnes	Johnsen	Rheingans	Wegela
Carra	Kunse	Rigas	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock	Schriver	Zorn
DeSana	Markkanen		

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

“An act to regulate political activity; to regulate campaign financing; to restrict campaign contributions and expenditures; to require campaign statements and reports; to regulate anonymous contributions; to regulate campaign advertising and literature; to provide for segregated funds for political purposes; to provide for the use of public funds for political purposes; to create certain funds; to provide for reversion, retention, or refunding of unexpended balances in certain funds; to require other statements and reports; to regulate acceptance of certain gifts, payments, and reimbursements; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments and state and local officials and employees; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,”

The House agreed to the full title.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Meerman, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I can’t in good conscience vote for a transparency package that I see as a half measure. Michigan residents and Constituents of the 89th district deserve more transparency from the elected representatives they send to Lansing to work on their behalf. This great experiment we call the United States should continually strive to build trust in those asked to serve.

Michigan voters spoke loud and clear in 2022 when they demanded transparency in our state Legislature. These bills fall short of what the people expect and deserve. We cannot settle for the least amount of accountability possible.”

Reps. Tisdel, Harris and Smit, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials’ finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.”

Rep. Paiz, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I believe this bill is in need of strengthening amendment(s) to better respond to concerns of the voter-approved Proposal 1 of 2022. “

Rep. Dievendorf, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

We had the opportunity to pass historic ethics reforms that required far reaching and transparent campaign finance disclosure of our public officials. While these bills are passing today to comply with the ballot measure passed last year it doesn't go nearly far enough.”

Rep. Stone, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I voted NO SB 613, 614, 615, & 616 for the failure of this weak financial disclosure legislation. These bills were taken up at the 11th hour and in the middle of the night. Michigan's residents do not trust elected officials because they believe elected officials are enriching themselves or making decisions motivated by a conflict of interest. Currently Michigan is considered last in the nation for a lack of transparency around financial disclosure. Voters gave Michigan's legislature a mandate to adopt financial disclosure legislation in 2022 by adopting Proposal 1 by 61%. Voting NO is a demand that we strengthen these bills with commonsense language.

I have cosponsored the legislation Michigan House Democrats have championed that required much stronger financial disclosures the past 3 legislative terms. Many House members and I voluntarily provided financial disclosure statements before it was ever mandated since we understood the importance of transparency in order to build trust. I voluntarily participated in a policy workgroup for 8 months in order to develop the financial disclosure legislation that Michiganders expect of their leaders. I could NOT support weaker bills that were passed out of the Senate. These bills leave loopholes that a truck could drive through. For example, they fail to account for marital assets, which is a potential way of hiding income and assets. We offered amendments to make this legislation better that were not taken up.

When legislative leaders face investigations and charges for abusing their positions, Michigan legislators must be bold and courageous by raising the bar at the very least to be on par with the many states leading on this policy and congress. Merely passing watered down financial disclosure legislation is not a guarantee that the citizens of Michigan won't sue the legislature demanding better.”

Rep. St. Germaine, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

These Bills never went through the committee process nor crafted with bipartisan support which is ironic since we have an Ethics & Oversight Committee which hasn't met in months.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative of the people, I must vote no.”

Reps. Beson and Markkanen, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public

financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency. As elected officials, we should strive to achieve transparency whether it is mandated or not. The measures before us today shirk that responsibility.

These bills fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no."

Rep. Thompson, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. We have been in session for almost a full year now, and right before we close for the year Dems cram these bills at us at 2am in the morning. Republicans have had bills on this for months and Dems refused to work together. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not even meet the bare minimum standard for financial disclosures as is written in our state constitution. It is not what the people of Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency.

These bills as presented fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no."

Rep. Hall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Michigan expect or deserve and does not shed the necessary amount of light on elected officials' finances to achieve full transparency.

These bills as presented fail to execute the will of the people as was clearly stated in Proposal 1 of 2022, and for that reason, as a representative for the people, I must vote no.

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no."

Rep. Aragona, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public

financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. BeGole, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan’s legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no.”

Rep. Hill, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am writing to provide an explanation for my votes against House Bills 613, 614, 615 and 616.

In November 2022, the voters of Michigan approved Proposal 22-1. This proposal called for both an increase in the total number of years a member of the Michigan House of Representatives or Michigan Senate could be allowed to serve in their respective chamber and new financial disclosure requirements for elected officials and candidates wishing to serve at the state level. The latter change is of particular importance, as Michigan is currently one of only two states in our nation lacking statutory requirements for financial disclosures from state elected officials.

The package of bills I voted against was introduced to implement these financial disclosure requirements. However, the bills as presented leave significant loopholes in place. If they are not addressed, these loopholes will allow state officials to circumvent the intended purpose of the legislation. Further, amendments that could have strengthened these disclosure provisions and eliminated the loopholes in question were not adopted.

These loopholes include weak reporting requirements for assets held in the names of immediate family members as well as a lack of clear reporting requirements for gifts and travel. I find it particularly concerning that gift and travel disclosures were left out, as these were explicitly called for in the language of Proposal 22-1.

The people of House District 109 believe in the value and importance of transparency in government, and I share that conviction. I will continue working to ensure honesty among Michigan's elected leaders, and to that end I look forward to opportunities to further strengthen applicable financial disclosure provisions."

Rep. Martin, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

No vote explanation: SB 613-616

In November 2022, the Michigan voters approved ballot Proposal 1, a proposal to require Michigan's legislators, governor, lieutenant governor, secretary of state, and attorney general to file annual public financial disclosure reports after 2023. Specifically, the proposal requires disclosure of assets, liabilities, income sources, future employment agreements, gifts, travel reimbursements, and positions held in organizations except religious, social, and political organizations.

What is included in Senate Bill 613-616 does not meet the bare minimum standard for the type of transparency the people of Michigan expect and deserve. I tried to fix this weak legislation with several amendments that would have increased the honesty and integrity of this chamber, but unfortunately good policy lost out to easy politics.

An amendment was offered to give a real, honest look at lawmaker finances by requiring disclosure of personal assets into more specific income levels, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to require disclosure of immediate family members who have a conflict of interest in the work we do, but it was rejected by the Democrat majority. An amendment was offered to tie bar this legislation to the effective and meaningful Republican ethics plan that has been buried in committee. That legislation would add actual teeth to the enforcement of this legislation and a way to actually punish bad actors, but it too was rejected by the Democrat majority.

These bills fall way short of the transparency people expect of their government, and they fall way short of the ethical standard the people deserve. These bills are simply an attempt to check the box required by Proposal 1 and nothing more. I must vote no."

Rep. Morgan, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Transparency is the cornerstone of a robust democracy, and our constituents deserve to know that their elected officials have their best interests at heart.

Residents across the state overwhelmingly passed Proposal 1 in 2022 to demand better transparency and financial disclosure from their elected officials. Last night's vote on Senate Bills 613 through 616 fell short of implementing the will of the people. These bills include serious loopholes that allow elected officials and their spouses to cheat the system and hide wrongdoing.

I understand why some of my colleagues voted yes on this legislation, as this legislation is certainly better than the status quo. However, I voted no because I firmly believe that we will only get better results from our elected officials if we have the courage to stand up for what is right.

This package of bills focuses on elected officers and candidates for state offices. In Michigan, when an individual is married, their assets are jointly held with their spouse unless a prenuptial agreement or other legal asset separation agreement was in place at the time of the marriage. Therefore, all assets, investments, properties, businesses, and other financial items in a spouse's name also benefit the official and candidate and should be disclosed.

Unfortunately, despite amendments offered by a bipartisan list of legislators to fix this egregious loophole, the bill did not contain those stronger measures when a vote was ordered on SB614. Every single amendment was gavelled down without being given a legitimate vote.

I am proud to stand up for true disclosure and transparency in a place where that is not always popular. The people of this state deserve better, and I will continue to work with my colleagues to advocate for stronger language that brings adequate transparency to our government."

Rep. Aiyash moved that House Committees be given leave to meet during the balance of today's session. The motion prevailed.

Quorum Call

Rep. Aiyash questioned the presence of a quorum and moved that the roll be called and printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

The roll was called and the Clerk announced that a quorum was present.

The following is the roll call:

Roll Call No. 556

Yeas—100

Aiyash	Farhat	Martin	Scott
Alexander	Filler	Martus	Shannon
Andrews	Fitzgerald	McFall	Skaggs
Aragona	Fox	McKinney	Slagh
Arbit	Friske	Mentzer	Smit
Beson	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Bierlein	Grant	Morgan	St. Germaine
Bollin	Green, P.	Morse	Steckloff
Borton	Greene, J.	Mueller	Steele
Brabec	Haadsma	Neeley	Stone
Breen	Hall	Neyer	Tate
Brixie	Hill	O’Neal	Thompson
Byrnes	Hoadley	Outman	Tisdell
Carra	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Carter, B.	Hope	Paquette	VanderWall
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Johnsen	Prestin	Wegela
Churches	Koleszar	Price	Weiss
Coffia	Kuhn	Puri	Wendzel
Coleman	Kunse	Rheingans	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Rigas	Wilson
DeBoer	Lightner	Rogers	Witwer
DeBoyer	MacDonell	Schmaltz	Wozniak
Dievendorf	Maddock	Schriver	Young
Edwards	Markkanen	Schuette	Zorn

In The Chair: Pohutsky

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Motions and Resolutions

By unanimous consent the House considered **House Concurrent Resolution No. 10** out of numerical order.

Rep. Aiyash offered the following concurrent resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 10.

A concurrent resolution providing for the final adjournment of the Legislature.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, November 9, 2023, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, 2023, at 11:30 a.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, November 9, 2023, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, 2023, at 11:45 a.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That when the Legislature adjourns on Tuesday, November 14, 2023, it stands adjourned without day.

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,

The concurrent resolution was adopted.

Reps. Steele, Hall, Jaime Greene, Markkanen, Cavitt, Hoadley, Outman, Rigas, Borton, Aragona, DeBoyer, Meerman, Kuhn, Schuette, Kunse, Posthumus and VanderWall offered the following concurrent resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 9.

A concurrent resolution providing for the final adjournment of the Legislature.

Whereas, According to the most recent session schedule for the House of Representatives, it is scheduled to meet until at least December 21, 2023; and

Whereas, According to the most recent session schedule for the Senate, it is scheduled to meet until at least December 14, 2023; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, December 21, 2023, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, December 28, 2023, at 11:30 a.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, December 14, 2023, it stands adjourned until Wednesday, December 28, 2023, at 11:30 a.m.; and be it further

Resolved, That when the Legislature adjourns on Wednesday, December 28, 2023, it stands adjourned without day.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

THIS RESOLUTION IS OFFERED TO COMPLY WITH ARTICLE XI, SECTION 7 OF THE MICHIGAN CONSTITUTION OF 1963.

Reps. DeSana, Friske, Fox, Smit, Maddock, Carra, Rigas and Schriver offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 165.

A resolution directing the impeachment of Dana M. Nessel, Attorney General of the state of Michigan, for corrupt conduct in office.

Whereas, Article XI, Section 7 of the *Michigan Constitution of 1963* states, in part:

The house of representatives shall have the sole power of impeaching civil officers for corrupt conduct in office or for crimes or misdemeanors, but a majority of the members elected thereto and serving therein shall be necessary to direct an impeachment.

; and

Whereas, Dana M. Nessel has failed to satisfy her duties and abused her position as Attorney General. She has failed to charge individuals responsible for submitting “clearly fraudulent” voter registration applications while simultaneously bringing felony charges against individuals who she has indicated do not have the requisite specific intent to have committed the crimes charged. She also improperly inquired about an investigation into a member of her transition team, creating at least the appearance of impropriety; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That Dana M. Nessel, Attorney General of the state of Michigan, is impeached for corrupt conduct in office. The following Articles of Impeachment are adopted by the House of Representatives and shall be exhibited to the Senate:

ARTICLES OF IMPEACHMENT EXHIBITED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE NAME OF ITSELF AND OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN AGAINST DANA M. NESSEL, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, IN MAINTENANCE AND SUPPORT OF ITS IMPEACHMENT AGAINST HER FOR CORRUPT CONDUCT IN OFFICE.

ARTICLE I

Dana M. Nessel, Attorney General of the state of Michigan, has violated her constitutional oath of office by failing to faithfully discharge the duties of her office. Despite the fact that an October 2020 investigation found evidence that an organization submitted clearly fraudulent voter registration applications to the Muskegon City Clerk, Attorney General Nessel has failed to charge those responsible for forging and filing these documents.

Article XI, Section 1 of the *Michigan Constitution of 1963* provides, in part, “All officers, legislative, executive and judicial, before entering upon the duties of their respective offices, shall take and subscribe the following oath or affirmation: I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of this state, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of according to the best of my ability.”

The attorney general is a position entrenched firmly in the history of Western civilization, which at common law possessed a broad array of powers beyond those specifically conferred by statute. An officer of the executive branch, the Attorney General in the state of Michigan has continued this tradition, developing the duties and obligations of this office. In particular, the Attorney General has become the face of law enforcement in this state, with the “responsibility, together with other peace officers, for enforcement of the laws and the preservation of the public peace,” as stated in a 1977 opinion of the Attorney General.

Prior to the November 2020 election, an entity known as GBI Strategies was conducting voter registration activities in Michigan. Ann Meisch, the Muskegon City Clerk, estimated that this group had delivered between 8,000 and 10,000 voter registration forms to the Muskegon City Clerk’s office by mid-October. Meisch discovered numerous irregularities in some of these voter registration applications, including similar handwriting on multiple forms, mismatched signatures, invalid or nonexistent addresses, and incorrect phone numbers. On October 16, Meisch and Deputy Clerk Kimberly Young notified the Muskegon Police Department that election crimes may be taking place and delivered for examination 42 applications the clerks suspected to be fraudulent.

On October 20, Brianna Hawkins, a supervisor at GBI Strategies, delivered an estimated 2,500 additional voter registration forms to the Muskegon City Clerk’s office. Meisch contacted the Muskegon Police Department, and Hawkins was interviewed by the police. Hawkins had been employed by GBI Strategies since August 2020, and she was paid to provide individuals with voter registration forms. GBI Strategies also supplied Hawkins with material resources to assist her in this work, including a rental car and lodging in local hotels. Hawkins initially told investigators that employees of GBI Strategies who went door to door registering residents to vote were paid for each completed voter registration form, but she later claimed these employees received a flat hourly rate.

The Michigan Department of Attorney General and the Muskegon Police Department launched a joint investigation into the alleged voter fraud. On October 21, Tom Fabus, Chief of Investigations for the Michigan Department of Attorney General, asked the Michigan State Police for their assistance in this investigation. Investigators at the Attorney General’s office, the Muskegon Police Department, and the Michigan State Police had several online meetings with representatives from the Michigan Department of State regarding this case.

Irregularities in voter registration forms filed in the Muskegon City Clerk’s office were analyzed and investigated by both a Department of State analyst and a Muskegon Police Department detective. In examining a batch of 18 voter registration applications, the police found that the handwriting on each form was the same; the signatures had similarities; and multiple forms were missing key information, had duplicate last names at different addresses, and contained inaccurate information. The police concluded that some quantity of the voter registration application forms were “clearly fraudulent”; some quantity were “highly suspicious” because they contained erroneous information or were missing key information, such that they merited further follow-up; and some quantity were legitimate.

The Michigan State Police, assisted by members of the Attorney General’s Criminal Investigation Division, also conducted further investigations into GBI Strategies. This enterprise and its predecessors received major funding from political candidates and organizations, with some committees reporting hundreds of thousands or millions of dollars in expenditures where GBI Strategies was the recipient. While this organization was based in Tennessee, materials seized by the police indicate that they were operating in numerous Michigan cities, including Benton Harbor, Flint, Inkster, Muskegon, and Southfield. Job postings indicate that the group may also have been operating in Chicago, Illinois, and Washington, DC.

This case has remained open since the November 2020 election. In March 2021, the reports of the Attorney General's Office, the Michigan State Police, and the Muskegon Police Department were sent to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assist them in a related nationwide investigation. The Michigan State Police have continued to maintain the evidence in this case since that time. No one has been charged by the Attorney General's Office in connection with this investigation.

Attorney General Nessel's failure to bring charges against those responsible for the fraudulent voter registration applications identified in the October 2020 investigation constitutes neglect of duty. She has not faithfully discharged her duties, thus violating her constitutional oath of office and her promise to the people of Michigan, and she has not acted in the best interests of the people of this state.

Wherefore, Dana M. Nessel, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office.

ARTICLE II

The state of Michigan's process for choosing our Electors of President and Vice President is governed by the Michigan Election Law and federal statute. Pursuant to that statute, each party names a slate of Electors, and the slate of Electors nominated by the party whose nominee receives the most votes in the November general election is elected. The Electors meet in the Capitol to cast their votes for the nominees of their political party for President and Vice President, signing a formal certificate to document their votes, copies of which are transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Michigan Secretary of State, the Archivist of the United States, and the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan.

In November 2020, the Michigan Board of State Canvassers certified that the nominees of the Democratic Party for President and Vice President received the greatest number of votes at the November 3, 2020, general election. As such, the Democratic Party's slate of Electors were declared elected, and they met in the Capitol on December 14, 2020, to cast their votes on the official "Certificate of Votes for President and Vice President." However, another 16 individuals, including 14 of the Republican Party's original slate of 16 Electors and two individuals selected to fill vacancies, also assembled as Electors on December 14. They signed a document titled "Certificate of the Votes of the 2020 Electors from Michigan," asserting that they were the Electors of this state, and cast their votes for the Republican nominees for President and Vice President. Both certificates were transmitted to the statutorily required recipients for the official certificate.

In July 2023, Michigan Attorney General Dana M. Nessel charged each of the 16 individuals who signed the "Certificate of the Votes of the 2020 Electors from Michigan" with eight felony counts, including forgery, MCL 750.248, election law forgery, MCL 168.933a, and uttering and publishing, MCL 750.249, as well as conspiracy to commit these offenses. Each of these crimes includes a specific intent element: the conduct must be done with the intent to defraud.

In September 2023, Attorney General Nessel was recorded stating that the individuals she charged genuinely believe that they were in the right and the Republican nominee for President was the real winner of the November 2020 general election. This statement is entirely inconsistent with the Attorney General's decision to charge these individuals; she cannot simultaneously assert that these individuals believed that the Republican nominee actually won the election and that these individuals signed the certificate with the intent to defraud. Attorney General Nessel's own statements indicate that her decision to charge these 16 individuals was an abuse of her position, constituting corrupt conduct in office.

Wherefore, Dana M. Nessel, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office.

ARTICLE III

On July 13, 2022, in an article published in *The Detroit News*, it was alleged that Traci Kornak, the legal guardian of an individual living at an assisted living facility, had improperly billed an insurance company for care provided to her ward.

Joe LeBlanc, now-former chief executive of the facility known as The Village of Heather Hills, alleged that Kornak had used the facility's taxpayer identification number and federal employer identification number without their permission, and that she falsely indicated that the individual providing these services – later revealed to be Kornak's daughter – was an employee of the facility. The article stated that, over the course of two years, Kornak billed the insurance company nearly 50,000 dollars for this care.

Attorney General Dana M. Nessel immediately expressed interest in this article, asking members of her staff whether this was something they should investigate and requesting that they keep her updated on the matter. In response to Nessel's interest, the Financial Crimes Section of the Criminal Investigation Division of the Department of Attorney General began an investigation into Kornak.

During this investigation, Scott Teter, Division Chief of the Financial Crimes Division, became concerned about a conflict of interest presented by the past professional relationship between Nessel and Kornak. In 2018, Kornak assisted with Nessel's transition into office after she was elected Attorney General. Teter believed that "it would create the appearance of impropriety for AG Nessel to access information about this investigation." "Specifically, if the Department of Attorney General declined to seek charges against the suspect, it might appear that the professional relationship between Attorney General Nessel and Traci Kornak had influenced the investigation." Therefore, he asked "for a conflict wall to be established preventing Attorney General Nessel from being provided or accessing any information related to this investigation." The notice establishing this conflict wall was distributed to all staff members in the Department of Attorney General on September 7, 2022.

As of December 2022, this conflict wall was still active. In a December 2 email, employees were reminded to "[e]xclude Attorney General Dana Nessel from access to the . . . files in this matter." On December 5, employees assigned to the case discussed closing the case, but an employee was still reviewing the matter. That same day, however, Aubrey Sargent, Chief of Investigations of the Criminal Investigations Division, emailed four reports on the Kornak case to Attorney General Nessel, in seeming disregard of the conflict wall.

On December 6, Attorney General Nessel emailed Sargent and Solicitor General Fadwa Hammoud about this case. Nessel stated that Kornak had contacted her seeking the documents from the investigation, because the allegations against her were holding up a potential judicial appointment for Kornak in Kent County. Nessel communicated her belief that Kornak "wants to be able to assert that the claims made . . . were never substantiated by our investigation and the case is closed." Nessel also wrote: "There is some urgency to the matter in that she needs to supply this information by the week's end." The following day, Nessel forwarded the reports on the Kornak investigation to Chief Deputy Attorney General Christina Grossi.

While closing this investigation was being considered by members of the Department of Attorney General's staff in late September 2022 and was discussed again on December 2, the investigation was not formally closed until at least December 19, when the staff member assigned to the matter wrote a memorandum where he "recommend[ed] closing this investigation." This phrasing indicates that the investigation was officially still open before that date. Thus, the investigation was closed well after the Attorney General had communicated with staff on the case about Kornak's urgent interest in being able to report that the investigation had been closed. There is no way to know what influence this had on the staff member's December 19 recommendation to close the investigation.

Attorney General Nessel created at least the appearance of impropriety by communicating with staff members involved in the investigation of Kornak, Nessel's former associate, before the investigation was formally closed. Regardless of whether Nessel's actions breached the particular terms of the conflict wall, she should not have contacted staff members assigned to the matter in order to communicate Kornak's interest in having the investigation closed quickly so that she could secure a judicial appointment. Writing that "[t]here is some urgency to the matter" could have put pressure on Nessel's employees to close the file quickly, without further review.

Wherefore, Dana M. Nessel, by such conduct, warrants impeachment and trial, and removal from office.

; and be it further

Resolved, That in accordance with Article XI, Section 7 of the *Michigan Constitution of 1963*, the House of Representatives will proceed with the election of three members from its own body whose duty it shall be to prosecute such impeachment and that these members are authorized and empowered to prepare and present the Articles of Impeachment adopted by this resolution.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reps. Fink, Alexander, Bezotte, Bollin, Fox, Haadsma, Paiz, Rheingans and Wilson offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 166.

A resolution to declare November 10, 2023, as Marine Corps Day in the state of Michigan.

Whereas, The United States Marine Corps was founded on November 10, 1775, in Tun Tavern, Philadelphia to augment naval forces in the Revolutionary War, prior to the founding of the United States; and

Whereas, The greatest weapon on earth is the Marine and his rifle; and

Whereas, The Marine Corps motto *Semper Fidelis*, Latin for “Always Faithful”, reflects an eternal and collective commitment to success in battle, the progress of our Nation, and the steadfast loyalty each Marine has to the Marines they fight alongside; and

Whereas, The Marines have exemplified the highest standards of honor, courage, and commitment, and continue to forge this legacy of bravery and selfless dedication to our nation and its Constitution today; and

Whereas, Marines have exhibited exemplary bravery and sacrifice in defense of our freedoms in countless battles throughout our nation’s history; and

Whereas, The nickname “Devil Dog” was bestowed upon the Marines by German soldiers at the Battle of Belleau Wood in June of 1918 due to the menacing appearance of Marines as they attacked a hill occupied by German forces; and

Whereas, The fighting spirit of each and every Marine continues to flourish and ensure the defense of our nation against enemies both foreign and domestic; and

Whereas, The steadfast commitment, courage, and sacrifice of United States Marines have made the Marine Corps an indispensable force in defending freedom, safeguarding the nation, and upholding the principles of ordered liberty; and

Whereas, November 10, 2023, will mark the 248th anniversary of the founding of the United States Marine Corp; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That members of this legislative body declare November 10, 2023, as Marine Corps Day in the state of Michigan. We commemorate the United States Marine Corps, wish all Marines a happy 248th birthday, and express our deepest gratitude for the unwavering service and sacrifice of the Marines.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Reps. McKinney, Rheingans, Hill, Paiz, Young, McFall, Edwards, Coleman, Wilson, Andrews, Morgan, Dievendorf, Brixie, Snyder, Liberati, Morse, Tsernoglou, Mentzer, Scott, Martus, O’Neal, Byrnes and Hood offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 167.

A resolution in support of federal legislation, HR 4052, to enable the creation of a National Infrastructure Bank.

Whereas, In its 2021 report card, the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) reported that the United States received a grade of C- regarding the current state of its infrastructure. There remains a two point five trillion dollar investment gap that has continuously grown over the past decade. ASCE estimates that by 2039, this continued underinvestment in critical infrastructure across the country will cost our nation ten trillion dollars in GDP, more than three million jobs, and over two trillion dollars in exports; and

Whereas, As of 2023, the ASCE has also scored Michigan’s infrastructure with a grade of C-, matching the general state of infrastructure disrepair nationwide. Many of Michigan’s roads remain in appalling condition. The ASCE has rated approximately thirty-three percent of Michigan’s one-hundred and twenty thousand miles of paved roadways in poor condition, forty-two percent in fair condition, and a mere twenty-five percent in good condition. Wayne County, as just one example, has reported nearly sixty percent of its roads to be in poor condition. Finally, eleven percent of Michigan’s bridges have been deemed structurally deficient, higher than the national average of seven-and-one-half percent. These poor infrastructure conditions cost Michigan motorists, collectively, billions of dollars each year in wasted time and fuel, traffic crashes and injuries, and vehicle degradation; and

Whereas, The Detroit Public Schools Community District is in a state of dilapidated repair and likely requires over one billion dollars to restore. These schools are suffering from inoperable boilers, corroded plumbing fixtures, cracking exterior walls, leaking roofs, and faulty electrical panels known to be fire hazards. At least one hundred schools have current capital needs. In September 2018, the drinking water in fifty-seven of the eighty-six tested Detroit schools were found to have elevated levels of both copper and lead; and

Whereas, Housing insecurity predates the pandemic and remains a pressing concern for Michiganders across the state. There remains a shortage of two-hundred thousand affordable and available rental homes for low-income renters. In 2019, more than ten thousand Detroit residents experienced homelessness, including two-thousand three-hundred and twenty-six who were chronically homeless. Of course, COVID-19 exacerbated this crisis. In January of 2021 alone, more than three-thousand five hundred Detroiters requested rental payment assistance; and

Whereas, The United States Congress's introduction of HR 4052, The National Infrastructure Bank Act, which would create a new National Infrastructure Bank, presents a tremendous opportunity for acquiring funding to remedy Michigan's infrastructure problems. This legislation would create a five trillion dollar bank for the purpose of, in pertinent part, "facilitate[ing] efficient, long-term financing of infrastructure projects." This bank would not require additional federal spending or the imposition of new federal taxes, instead being financed entirely by repurposing existing Department of the Treasury debt; and

Whereas, The National Infrastructure Bank Act is modeled on the establishment of previous banks utilized to build much of our nation's infrastructure. Similar banks were employed under Presidents George Washington, James Madison, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. With the resources consolidated and deployed by virtue of the most recent iteration of a national bank, President Roosevelt was able to bring our nation out of the Great Depression and lead us to victory in the Second World War; and

Whereas, A new National Infrastructure Bank will help finance all of Michigan's infrastructure needs. This bank, as described in HR 4052, would exist solely to build infrastructure, generate jobs, and battle poverty. Funding from this bank would be used to fix bridges, roads, schools, and drinking water systems; build affordable housing units; and install broadband across the nation. The bank would finance new rail and mass transportation projects, connecting Michigan to high-speed rail corridors in the Midwest and dramatically increasing manufacturing in our state. Funds would be used to hire and train many Michiganders who lost their jobs during the COVID-19 pandemic; and

Whereas, Support for a National Infrastructure Bank is widespread across our state and the nation. At least twenty-one state legislatures have introduced or passed resolutions of support for HR 4052 or previously-introduced legislation on the topic. Local-level municipal bodies across the nation have also expressed support, including: Detroit City Council, Dearborn Heights City Council, Highland Park City Council, Inkster City Council, Hamtramck City Council, Romulus City Council, Redford Township Council, Cleveland City Council, Pittsburgh City Council, Chicago City Council, Providence RI City Council, Philadelphia City Council, New York City Council, Toledo City Council, Akron City Council, and many more. National organizations that endorse the establishment of National Infrastructure Bank include: the Public Banking Institute, the National Black Caucus of State Legislators, the National Congress of Black Women, the National Hispanic Caucus, the National Latino Farmers and Ranchers, the Asian Pacific Legislators, the National Association of Counties, the US High Speed Rail Association, the American Sustainable Business Council, the National Association of Minority Contractors, the National Federation of Federal Employees, and many others; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we support federal legislation, HR 4052, to enable the creation of a National Infrastructure Bank; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Governor, and the Michigan congressional delegation.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reps. Johnsen, Aragona, Bierlein, BeGole, Rigas, St. Germaine, Phil Green and Bezotte offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 168.

A resolution to affirm that the State of Michigan recognizes the importance of and commits to promoting the ethical and responsible manufacturing practices in the production of electric vehicles and solar panels.

Whereas, Public Law No. 117-78, otherwise known as the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act (UFLPA), was adopted by Congress in 2021 with overwhelming bipartisan support following national concerns regarding the use of forced labor in China's Xinjiang region to produce large lithium-ion batteries manufactured to power electric vehicles, including in the mining of materials by Uyghurs and other Muslim

minorities. The federal government also recognizes that polysilicon, a critical component in the production of approximately 95% of the world's solar panels, is produced by these same minority populations. Nearly half of global polysilicon production comes from the Xinjiang region. Under the UFLPA, there is a rebuttable presumption that any product manufactured in whole or in part in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region was produced by forced labor. The State of Michigan recognizes the inhumane treatment of what is estimated to be at least 100,000 Uyghur Muslims who are subjected to forced labor in the Xinjiang region; and

Whereas, The use of inhumane labor conditions in the manufacturing of lithium-ion batteries is not limited to the treatment of Uyghurs in the Xinjiang region. Michigan also recognizes that 60% of the world's cobalt production is the result of forced labor – including oppressive child labor – notably through cobalt ore mined in dangerous conditions. We recognize the inhumane treatment of an estimated 40,000 child laborers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo who supply cobalt to China that is used in the manufacturing of lithium-ion batteries. The United States Department of Labor has also recently recognized that “downstream products containing lithium-ion batteries may be produced with an input produced with child labor, such as electric cars,” which we unequivocally condemn; and

Whereas, In May of 2023, the United States Department of Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service issued a notice of proposed rulemaking announcing restrictions on the application of newly created tax credits for electric vehicles, stipulating that starting “in 2024, an eligible clean vehicle may not contain any battery components that are manufactured by a foreign entity of concern, and beginning in 2025, an eligible clean vehicle may not contain any critical materials that were extracted, processed, or recycled by a foreign entity of concern.” Further, the Department of Treasury has proposed interpreting certain provisions of the CHIPS and Science Act, Public Law No. 117-168, to define any company subject to China's jurisdiction a “foreign entity of concern,” thereby preventing federal tax credits from supporting sales of electric vehicles made with battery components from Chinese entities; and

Whereas, The members of this legislative body condemn the use of forced labor in the manufacturing of components and materials used in electric vehicles and solar panels, including those sourced from Xinjiang, China. In furtherance of that condemnation, the State of Michigan affirms its support of the UFLPA and calls upon the sister branches of our state government, as well as our federal government, to enforce its provisions. We must also strive to ensure that electric vehicles and solar panels sold within the borders of our state have been manufactured in compliance with ethical labor practices and with recognition of basic human rights. We recognize the use of forced labor is repugnant and deplorable, violates basic human rights, constitutes unacceptable discrimination, and damages free and fair competition. It is the social responsibility of individuals worldwide to ensure that forced and child labor not be used in the production and manufacturing of goods and services, which we affirm our commitment to today; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we affirm that the State of Michigan recognizes the importance of and commits to promoting the ethical and responsible manufacturing practices in the production of electric vehicles and solar panels; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of the United States Department of Treasury, the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, and the Michigan congressional delegation.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Rep. Aiyash moved to reconsider the vote by which the House adopted **House Concurrent Resolution No. 10.**

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

(The concurrent resolution was adopted earlier today, see today's Journal, p. 2476.)

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 71 be suspended and the concurrent resolution be considered at this time.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,

The concurrent resolution was adopted.

The Speaker laid before the House

House Resolution No. 164.

A resolution to declare November 2023 as Adoption Awareness Month in the state of Michigan.

(For text of resolution, see House Journal No. 96, p. 2414.)

(The resolution was introduced and postponed for the day on November 8, see House Journal No. 96, p. 2414.)

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Rep. Posthumus moved that Reps. Fink, Bezotte and Meerman be excused temporarily from today's session.

The motion prevailed.

Messages from the Senate

House Bill No. 5048, entitled

A bill to amend 1974 PA 263, entitled "An act to permit counties to impose and collect an excise tax on persons engaged in the business of providing rooms for dwelling, lodging, or sleeping purposes to transient guests; to provide for the disposition of the revenues thereof; and to prescribe penalties," by amending the title and sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 (MCL 141.861, 141.862, 141.863, 141.864, 141.866, and 141.867), section 2 as amended by 2004 PA 118, section 4 as amended by 2014 PA 284, and section 7 as amended by 1989 PA 13, and by adding section 2a.

The Senate has amended the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 4, line 4, after "**that**" by striking out "**local unit of government**" and inserting "**county**".

The Senate has passed the bill as amended and ordered that it be given immediate effect.

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the amendment made to the bill by the Senate,

The amendment was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 557

Yeas—68

Aiyash	Edwards	Martus	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McFall	Shannon
Aragona	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Skaggs
Arbit	Glanville	Mentzer	Snyder
Bierlein	Grant	Miller	Steckloff
Brabec	Green, P.	Morgan	Stone
Breen	Haadsma	Morse	Tate
Brixie	Hill	Neeley	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Hood	O'Neal	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Hope	Paiz	VanWoerkom
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Wegela
Churches	Johnsen	Posthumus	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Wendzel
Coleman	Kunse	Puri	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Rheingans	Wilson
DeBoer	MacDonell	Rigas	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martin	Rogers	Young

Nays—38

Alexander	Filler	Markkanen	Schuette
Beeler	Fox	Mueller	Slagh
BeGole	Friske	Neyer	Smit
Beson	Greene, J.	Outman	St. Germaine
Bollin	Hall	Paquette	Steele
Borton	Harris	Prestin	Thompson
Carra	Hoadley	Roth	Tisdell
Cavitt	Kuhn	Schmaltz	Wozniak

DeBoyer
DeSana

Lightner
Maddock

Schriver

Zorn

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

Second Reading of Bills

House Bill No. 4360, entitled

A bill to amend 1988 PA 57, entitled “An act to provide for the incorporation by 2 or more municipalities of certain authorities for the purpose of providing emergency services to municipalities; to provide for the powers and duties of authorities and of certain state and local agencies and officers; to provide for certain condemnation proceedings; to provide for fees; to provide for the levy of property taxes for certain purposes; to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes, and other evidences of indebtedness; and to prescribe penalties and provide remedies,” by amending section 2 (MCL 124.602).

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Local Government and Municipal Finance,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Brabec moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on its immediate passage.

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

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

House Bill No. 4360, entitled

A bill to amend 1988 PA 57, entitled “An act to provide for the incorporation by 2 or more municipalities of certain authorities for the purpose of providing emergency services to municipalities; to provide for the powers and duties of authorities and of certain state and local agencies and officers; to provide for certain condemnation proceedings; to provide for fees; to provide for the levy of property taxes for certain purposes; to authorize the issuance of bonds, notes, and other evidences of indebtedness; and to prescribe penalties and provide remedies,” by amending section 2 (MCL 124.602).

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 558

Yeas—76

Aiyash
Alexander
Andrews
Arbit
BeGole
Beson
Bollin
Brabec
Breen
Brixie
Byrnes
Carter, B.
Carter, T.

Dievendorf
Edwards
Farhat
Fitzgerald
Glanville
Grant
Haadsma
Harris
Hill
Hood
Hope
Hoskins
Koleszar

Martus
McFall
McKinney
Mentzer
Miller
Morgan
Morse
Mueller
Neeley
Neyer
O’Neal
Paiz
Pohutsky

Scott
Shannon
Skaggs
Snyder
St. Germaine
Steckloff
Stone
Tate
Thompson
Tsernoglou
VanderWall
VanWoerkom
Wegela

Cavitt	Kunse	Prestin	Weiss
Churches	Liberati	Price	Whitsett
Coffia	Lightner	Puri	Wilson
Coleman	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Conlin	Markkanen	Rogers	Young
DeBoer	Martin	Schmaltz	Zorn

Nays—30

Aragona	Fox	Maddock	Schuette
Beeler	Friske	Outman	Slagh
Bierlein	Green, P.	Paquette	Smit
Borton	Greene, J.	Posthumus	Steele
Carra	Hall	Rigas	Tisdell
DeBoyer	Hoadley	Roth	Wendzel
DeSana	Johnsen	Schrivver	Wozniak
Filler	Kuhn		

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Second Reading of Bills

House Bill No. 4676, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 203, entitled “Foster care and adoption services act,” by amending section 8b (MCL 722.958b), as added by 2018 PA 489.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Families, Children and Seniors,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Young moved to substitute (H-2) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Young moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4677, entitled

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

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Families, Children and Seniors,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Young moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4678, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1281c.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Edwards moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4579, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3476 (MCL 500.3476), as amended by 2020 PA 97.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Price moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4580, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” by amending section 105h (MCL 400.105h), as added by 2020 PA 101.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Health Policy,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Brabec moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4213, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” by amending section 105h (MCL 400.105h), as added by 2020 PA 101.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Committee on Health Policy,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Morse moved to substitute (H-2) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Morse moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4131, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3476 (MCL 500.3476), as amended by 2020 PA 97.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Committee on Health Policy,

The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Rogers moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 1, line 8, after “of” by striking out “**an affiliated provider contract**” and inserting “**a contract between the insurer and an affiliated provider or a third-party vendor**”.

The motion prevailed and the amendment was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Liberati moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 169, entitled

A bill to amend 1947 PA 336, entitled “An act to prohibit strikes by certain public employees; to provide review from disciplinary action with respect thereto; to provide for the mediation of grievances and the holding of elections; to declare and protect the rights and privileges of public employees; to require certain provisions in collective bargaining agreements; to prescribe means of enforcement and penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to make appropriations,” (MCL 423.201 to 423.217) by adding section 11a.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Wozniak moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

“(4) A representative shall not provide employment and contact information it receives under subsection (1) to any person. If employment and contact information provided to a representative

under subsection (1) are stolen from the representative or leaked by the representative, the representative shall, for 2 years beginning on the date of the theft or leak, pay for identity theft protection for each public employee affected by the theft or leak.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Kunse moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, line 11, by striking out the balance of the subsection.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Kunse moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 1, line 4, after “11” by inserting “if the public employee elects to provide the public employee’s information under subsection (4)”.

2. Amend page 2, line 3, after “representative” by inserting “who elect to provide the information under subsection (4)”.

3. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

“(4) A public employee may, by submitting a written request to the public employee’s public employer, elect to provide the public employee’s employment and contact information to a representative as provided for under subsection (1).”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Kunse moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

“(4) A representative that receives a public employee’s employment and contact information under subsection (1) shall not use the information to do either of the following:

(a) Persuade the public employee to become a member of the representative.

(b) Request dues or service fees from the public employee if the public employee is not a member of the representative.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Kunse moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

“(4) Every 90 days, a bargaining representative shall provide to each public employee in the bargaining unit that the bargaining representative represents the following statement in writing: “Under the United States Supreme Court decision *Janus v AFSCME, Council 31*, ___US___; 138 S Ct 2448 (2018), it is a violation of a public employee’s First Amendment free speech rights for a public-sector bargaining representative to extract agency fees or union security fees from the public employee unless the public employee consents.”.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Bierlein moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

“(4) For purposes of this section, “public employer” means this state.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Bierlein moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 1, line 2, after “shall” by inserting a comma and “subject to subsection (4),”.

2. Amend page 1, line 5, after “shall” by inserting a comma and “subject to subsection (4),”.

3. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

“(4) If an officer of a bargaining representative described in subsection (1) is convicted of sexual assault or fraud, for 10 years immediately following the conviction, a public employer shall not provide the employment and contact information of any of its public employees to the bargaining representative and the bargaining representative shall not accept or otherwise receive employment and contact information from the public employer.”.

(5) A bargaining representative that violates subsection (4) is subject to a civil fine equal to the amount of all dues or fees the bargaining representative collected from the public employees of the public employer during the 5-year period immediately preceding the date of the violation. The prosecutor of the county in which the violation occurred or the attorney general may bring an action to collect the fine. A fine collected must be deposited in the general fund.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Wilson moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 148, entitled

A bill to amend 1969 PA 224, entitled “An act to license and regulate dealers in and research facilities using dogs and cats for research purposes; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 12 (MCL 287.392) and by adding sections 11a and 12a.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Wilson moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Senate Bill No. 149, entitled

A bill to amend 1969 PA 224, entitled “An act to license and regulate dealers in and research facilities using dogs and cats for research purposes; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,” by amending the title and sections 1 and 7 (MCL 287.381 and 287.387) and by adding section 8a.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Committee on Agriculture,

The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Wilson moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4325, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending section 8905a (MCL 324.8905a), as amended by 2014 PA 549.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed amendments previously recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, Environment, Tourism and Outdoor Recreation (for amendments, see House Journal No. 81, p. 1909),

The amendments were adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Scott moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

Comments and Recommendations

Rep. Wilson moved that the following remarks be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Rep. Coleman:

“Thank you, Madame Speaker.

Colleagues, my name is Kevin Coleman. I was born 40 years ago to a nurse from Detroit and an auto worker from Dearborn. I never planned to run for office. Politics and the political world was not even on my radar.

But about thirteen years ago my cousin asked me to attend a Westland city council meeting with him and quickly my world changed. I started to volunteer on our festival committee and helped to raise money for a veteran’s memorial. I helped elect some local school board members. Volunteered on their campaigns. Next thing I knew, I was a candidate for city council. Little by little, my hobby became a calling to public service.

Eventually, it led me here to our state Capitol, where I am standing before you today. Something I never expected. Voters gifted me with the chance to make a difference, and for that, I’ll be forever grateful. When I first starting this adventure in public service, way back then, I had no idea where it would lead.

And I certainly didn't know it would lead me to this big, beautiful, people's house here in our state Capitol in Lansing. Much of the time when I walk in the room, you'll see me looking up and admiring this beautiful place. This chamber's vast elegance and history. Thinking about the many great leaders who have walked these floors before me and serve this great state. What a blessing it has been to work in such an amazing institution the last five years.

I believe I have made a difference.

I'm proud to have helped cut taxes for our seniors and protect our most vulnerable residents, passed pro worker legislation, restoring good wages for workers, expanding healthcare. I am proud to be the founding member of the Taiwan friendship caucus. Bringing back millions of dollars to my district for key projects – roads, schools, infrastructure, public safety, and it's been something I will never forget.

Before I leave this chamber today, I want to thank some people. First, I would like to thank the citizens of the 25th house district – Wayne, Westland, Dearborn Heights and Canton.

I want to thank my parents. My mother Becky who gave me all the love in the world. My dad Jim who always pushed me to work hard and do better. My cousin Peter who's been really my political right hand for many years.

I will tell you something, I'm in my third term and back in my first term I was approached by the late great Isaac Robinson. A friend to many of us who we all dearly miss.

He said, 'hey, I know you've been staying at the hotel here during our late nights. Why don't you come check out this house we have a room you might want to rent?'

I didn't really know what I was getting into, but I made some really lasting friendships with the guys that stayed there. My dear friend Tyrone Carter, Rich Steenland, Wendell Byrd. And I made a best friend and brother Alex Garza. Appreciate all your love and support.

I'm fortunate to have made many friends here, and I could go up and down the rows on both sides of the aisle. My seat mate Tullio Liberati, Nate Shannon, Will Snyder, Z.

There are dozens of people in this room who mean a lot to me on both sides of the aisle. Timmy Beson, Greg Markkanen, Pauline... We've had friendships and it means a lot to me. Brenda Carter. You've had my back and you are a true friend. Love you. I want to thank my staff Chris Trubac and Ian Mays, who were with me my first two terms. They kept me onboard and they kept me going. They served our district with a lot of hard work.

I will always appreciate it.

Chris Wardell and Faith Norwood who have been with me this third term. Great friends, hard workers – they have served our district well. The many interns who have served our office. I appreciate all your hard work and hope you had a great experience here.

Coffiann and our policy staff. Our caucus staff. All the people that work here. I appreciate everything you do. The sergeants for keeping us all safe. Thank you for all your work.

Of course, I have to give a shout-out to our leader Speaker Tate. You've shown great leadership for our state, and I will be looking forward to seeing all the work you do moving forward.

Governor Whitmer and Lt. Governor Garland Gilchrist. Landmark leadership and it has been an honor to work with you in the legislature and it's been a great opportunity.

I also want to talk about the leaders of our caucus.

Going back, leader Gregg and Donna Lasinski. It was great to work with you. A lot of great memories. Former Speaker Wentworth has been a friend and somebody I admire as well.

I just want to say I am forever grateful for the opportunity to serve and make my mark here and make a difference on behalf of the people of I represent. It has been a tremendous honor and a blessing to work here.

I know that I'll be a better person walking out the door today than when I walked in five years ago. I know my district is in better shape today than before I became a rep. And I just want to say to the next representative who, God willing, will be in this seat serving District 25 soon. I wish you nothing but the best. I'll be here for you if I can ever be of assistance.

God bless the state of Michigan and God bless America. Thank you, colleagues."

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Motions and Resolutions

Reps. McKinney, Hood, Hoskins, Liberati, Snyder, McFall, Edwards, Andrews, Puri, Scott, Tyrone Carter, Haadsma, Witwer, Brenda Carter, Young, Wilson, Neeley, Paiz, Koleszar, O'Neal, Brabec, Wegela, Martus, Churches, Aiyash, Breen, Farhat, Whitsett, Fitzgerald, Hill and Rheingans offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 169.

A resolution to commemorate the 50th anniversary of hip hop.

On August 11, 1973, Clive “DJ Kool Herc” and his sister Cindy Campbell threw a “Back to School Jam” to raise money for new school clothes in the recreation room of their apartment on 1520 Sedgwick Avenue in the Bronx, New York; and

Whereas “DJ Kool Herc” introduced an innovative style of disk jockeying called the Merry Go Round that engaged the b-boys and b-girls (Breakers) with the master of ceremonies; and

Whereas, This style would inspire the quick mix theory created by GrandMaster Flash which engaged the “Emcees” in those elements along with Graffiti and knowledge of self, the desire for peace in the notorious gang riddled streets of the Bronx NY cobbled together and presented by Afrika Bambaataa and the Zulu Nation formed what was later to be known as “Hip-Hop” and the titles of “disk jockey” and “master of ceremonies” would be abbreviated to “DJ” and “MC” respectively; and

Whereas, Over the past 50 years, hip hop has become a culture, a life-style, woven into American culture not only through music, but also fashion, art, film, and dance; and

Whereas, Hip-hop as an art form was created through Black ingenuity and is a part of not only African-American culture, but American culture; and

Whereas, Blues from the Mississippi Delta to Memphis, Tennessee, jazz from New Orleans, Louisiana, gospel from Chicago, Illinois, and soul from Detroit, Michigan, created the foundation from which hip-hop emerged; and

Whereas, Since its origins, hip-Hop has evolved and grown over half a century because of its ability to adapt to the people and region in which it is reimagined; and

Whereas, In New York City, hip-hop’s birthplace, east coast hip-hop has produced artists and personalities such as the Run-D.M.C, Dougie Fresh, Fab 5 Freddie, LL Cool J, Grandmaster Caz, Sha Rock, Krs One, Rakim, Public Enemy, Notorious B.I.G., Nas, Jay-Z, 50 Cent, A Tribe Called Quest and the Wu-Tang Clan; and

Whereas, Artists like Ice T, Dr. Dre, Snoop Dogg, Ice Cube, Tupac, and more recently Nipsey Hussle emerged in California’s west coast with G-Funk, which originally spurred out of the Watts riots in the late 1960s; and

Whereas, Bass and trap music originated in southern cities like Atlanta, Georgia, and Memphis, Tennessee with artists such as Project Pat, Three 6 Mafia, Outkast, T.I., Ludacris and Future; and

Whereas, Midwestern cities like Chicago, Illinois, and St. Louis, Missouri, have produced artists such as Nelly and Common, Michigan has produced Jeffrey Daniel, Slum Village, MC Breed, Eminem, New Concept, Dj Spinny Spin, The Other Brothers, Leroy J.Barrett III, Head Debiase, Steven Malcolm, Proof and D12, Black Cal, Pofani, Scoot B, “O.W.”, Funk Mont, Wizdom Selah, Melinda Still MsNana Lara, Macaroni Davis, AGO, Kash Doll, Piper Carter, Jaime “Addverse” Wilkins, Ozay Moore, Mr.1204, Dj Butter, Dave “Unk Funk” Cain, Tony “Tempo T” Tate, Hardcore Detroit, 616 Teknique, Circle Junkeez, Esham, Detroit’s Most Wanted, Prince Vince, Insane Clown Posse, Merciless Amir, Athletic Mic League, Man Wolf, Dj Eminent, Rick Chyme, Clear Soul Forces, Chilla Pertilla, Brady Gozza, Supa Emcee, Miz Korona, Detroit Dj Rush, Hatari Brooks, Mike Fresh, Pastor Moe, TC Real, Marcus “Jack Frost” Dunham, Jessica Care Moore, The Black Opera, The Honorable CNote, Helluva, Rick Williams, Ty Mopkins, Elzhi, Joe Walker, Sid Swift, Iceman JA, Awesome Dre, The KMC Cru, Jumbo, Tekh Togo, Shadow, The Dayton Family, Ro Spit, One Be Lo, Shorty Ty, Ben “Showtime” Mcliechey, Lee Cadena, Dj Gooset Brown Hornet, Dj Tony Funkmaster Jackson, Moe Mccoy, Wayne 616, Dj Len Swann, Dj Butcher, Dj Los, D.A. the Grandvillain, Pastor Troy Evans, Izy Dope, Dirt Sound, Dj Rush The Guillotine, Troy Ceaser, Queen Koffee, Rhun Girl Run, Smiley, Bronze Nazereth, Sixman, Euro K, Royce Da 5’9, Apollo Brown, Guilty Simpson, Phat Kat, 5Ela, Mr. Cliffnotes, Brian Piccolo, Alex “The Promoter” Thomas, Jerry Flynn, Julius Justice, Jeffrey Valentine, Dr.Khalid El-Hakim, Mike Gagliardo, Black Milk, Gunrule TV, Willie The Kid, La the Darkman, Governor Slugwell HipHop and HellRazor Robert S who have brought their respective regional influences to the mainstream; and

Whereas, Hip-hop’s spread has mixed cultures and traditions from the slowed down style of Texas artists like UGK and Scarface, to the rhythmic beats of Miami, Florida, bass made popular by Uncle Luke and The 2 Live Crew, to the Latin influence and energy of artists like Pitbull; and

Whereas, Bounce originated in New Orleans, Louisiana, in the 1980s, and has elevated thanks to artists such as Juve- nile, Magnolia Shorty, and Big Freedia who is recognized as the “Queen of Bounce” and has helped to elevate the subgenre to the national stage thanks to collaborations with Beyonc e and other mainstream artists like Rihanna incorporating the fast tempo sound into their work; and

Whereas, New school hip-hop continues to dominate the music industry selling out concert venues and stadiums with artists like Kendrick Lamar, J. Cole, Megan Thee Stal- lion, Nicki Minaj, Cardi B, Lil Wayne, Migos, Big Sean, 2 Chainz, Drake, Lotto, GloRilla, and Ice Spice; and

Whereas, Artists like Sha Rock, Roxanne Shante, Sparky D, MC Lyte, Queen Latifah, Lil’ Kim, Foxy Brown, Lisa “Left Eye” Lopes, Salt-N-Pepa, Lauryn Hill, and Missy Elliot pioneered female rap, moving hip-hop away from being a male-dominated genre; and

Whereas, Music producers such as, J. Dilla, Timbaland, and Kanye West (YE) have transcended Hip-Hop with their own styles of creativity, instrumentation, and deep musical knowledge; Whereas film directors and producers like John Singleton, Spike Lee, Rick Famuyiwa, and Yvette Lee Bowser have brought Hip-Hop and Black culture to the big screen with hit movies and TV shows like Poetic Justice, Boyz n the Hood, School Daze, Brown Sugar, and A Different World; and

Whereas, Fashion designers like Dapper Dan, Maurice Malone, April Walker (Walker Wear), Sean Combs (Sean John), Kanye West (Yeezy), and Virgil Abloh (Off-White) have brought hip-hop and Black culture to the runways of New York, Paris, and Milan; and

Whereas, Hip-hop has always been about telling a story, whether it be a story of pain and struggle, love and romance, religion, or politics; and

Whereas, Hip-hop has always been a creative mouthpiece for all people to share their own individual realities; and

Whereas, Hip-hop has provided outlets for people all over the world to include extracurricular activities, youth counseling, analytical thinking, entertainment, employment; and

Whereas, Hip-hop has had an immense economic impact, and, as an industry, generates more than a billion dollars annually, further creating opportunities for economic mobility and wealth creation for Black people in the United States; and

Whereas, Hip-hop has evolved as a platform to advocate for social, political, and economic needs of all people, including environmental justice, education, healthcare, and voting rights; now, therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the members of this legislative body commemorate the 50th anniversary of hip-hop.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the Committee on Regulatory Reform be discharged from further consideration of **House Bill No. 4072**.

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

The bill was placed on the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Second Reading of Bills

House Bill No. 4072, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled "Michigan vehicle code," by amending section 654 (MCL 257.654).

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Motions and Resolutions

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the Committee on Regulatory Reform be discharged from further consideration of **Senate Bill No. 466**.

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

The bill was placed on the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Second Reading of Bills

Senate Bill No. 466, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled "Public health code," by amending section 12606a (MCL 333.12606a), as amended by 2022 PA 168.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4928, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 682, 741, 742, 743, 907, 908, and 909 (MCL 257.682, 257.741, 257.742, 257.743, 257.907, 257.908, and 257.909), section 682 as amended by 2021 PA 50, sections 741 and 743 as amended by 2006 PA 298, section 742 as amended by 2008 PA 171, section 907 as amended by 2023 PA 40, and section 909 as amended by 2000 PA 94.

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Shannon moved to substitute (H-1) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Shannon moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4929, entitled

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

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Tyrone Carter moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

House Bill No. 4930, entitled

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

The bill was read a second time.

Rep. Shannon moved to substitute (H-1) the bill.

The motion prevailed and the substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Tyrone Carter moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Third Reading of Bills

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4579** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

House Bill No. 4579, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3476 (MCL 500.3476), as amended by 2020 PA 97.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 559

Yeas—57

Aiyash
Andrews

Farhat
Fitzgerald

McFall
McKinney

Scott
Shannon

Arbit	Glanville	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Grant	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Green, P.	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young
Edwards			

Nays—50

Alexander	Filler	Martin	Schuette
Aragona	Fox	Meerman	Slagh
Beeler	Friske	Mueller	Smit
BeGole	Greene, J.	Neyer	St. Germaine
Beson	Hall	Outman	Steele
Bierlein	Harris	Paquette	Thompson
Bollin	Hoadley	Posthumus	Tisdell
Borton	Johnsen	Prestin	VanderWall
Carra	Kuhn	Rigas	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kunse	Roth	Wendzel
DeBoer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock	Schriver	Zorn
DeSana	Markkanen		

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4580** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4580, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” by amending section 105h (MCL 400.105h), as added by 2020 PA 101.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 560

Yeas—58

Aiyash	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Arbit	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Brabec	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Breen	Green, P.	Morse	Stone

Brixie	Haadsma	Neeley	Tate
Byrnes	Hill	O'Neal	Thompson
Carter, B.	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Pohutsky	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Price	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Puri	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Rheingans	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rogers	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Scott	Young
Edwards	McFall		

Nays—49

Alexander	Filler	Markkanen	Schriver
Aragona	Fox	Martin	Schuette
Beeler	Friske	Meerman	Slagh
BeGole	Greene, J.	Mueller	Smit
Beson	Hall	Neyer	St. Germaine
Bierlein	Harris	Outman	Steele
Bollin	Hoadley	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Johnsen	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Kuhn	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kunse	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Lightner	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4213** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

House Bill No. 4213, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled "The social welfare act," by amending section 105h (MCL 400.105h), as added by 2020 PA 101.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 561

Yeas—75

Aiyash	DeBoer	Markkanen	Rheingans
Alexander	Dievendorf	Martin	Rogers
Andrews	Edwards	Martus	Scott
Arbit	Farhat	McFall	Shannon
Beeler	Filler	McKinney	Skaggs
BeGole	Fitzgerald	Meerman	Snyder
Bierlein	Glanville	Mentzer	Steckloff
Bollin	Grant	Miller	Stone

Brabec	Green, P.	Morgan	Tate
Breen	Haadsma	Morse	Thompson
Brixie	Hill	Neeley	Tisdell
Byrnes	Hoadley	Neyer	Tsernoglou
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Wegela
Carter, T.	Hope	Outman	Weiss
Cavitt	Hoskins	Paiz	Whitsett
Churches	Koleszar	Paquette	Wilson
Coffia	Liberati	Pohutsky	Witwer
Coleman	Lightner	Price	Young
Conlin	MacDonell	Puri	

Nays—32

Aragona	Greene, J.	Posthumus	Smit
Beson	Hall	Prestin	St. Germaine
Borton	Harris	Rigas	Steele
Carra	Johnsen	Roth	VanderWall
DeBoyer	Kuhn	Schmaltz	VanWoerkom
DeSana	Kunse	Schrivver	Wendzel
Fox	Maddock	Schuette	Wozniak
Friske	Mueller	Slagh	Zorn

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4131** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4131, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3476 (MCL 500.3476), as amended by 2020 PA 97.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 562

Yeas—72

Aiyash	Dievendorf	McFall	Shannon
Alexander	Edwards	McKinney	Skaggs
Andrews	Farhat	Mentzer	Snyder
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Miller	St. Germaine
BeGole	Glanville	Morgan	Steckloff
Beson	Grant	Morse	Stone
Bollin	Green, P.	Neeley	Tate
Brabec	Haadsma	Neyer	Thompson
Breen	Hill	O’Neal	Tisdell
Brixie	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Hope	Pohutsky	Wegela
Carter, B.	Hoskins	Price	Weiss

Carter, T.	Koleszar	Puri	Whitsett
Churches	Kunse	Rheingans	Wilson
Coffia	Liberati	Rogers	Witwer
Coleman	Lightner	Roth	Wozniak
Conlin	MacDonell	Schmaltz	Young
DeBoer	Martus	Scott	Zorn

Nays—35

Aragona	Fox	Markkanen	Schrivier
Beeler	Friske	Martin	Schuette
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Meerman	Slagh
Borton	Hall	Mueller	Smit
Carra	Harris	Outman	Steele
Cavitt	Hoadley	Paquette	VanderWall
DeBoyer	Johnsen	Posthumus	VanWoerkom
DeSana	Kuhn	Prestin	Wendzel
Filler	Maddock	Rigas	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4676** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

House Bill No. 4676, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 203, entitled “Foster care and adoption services act,” by amending section 8b (MCL 722.958b), as added by 2018 PA 489.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 563**Yeas—104**

Aiyash	Edwards	Martin	Schuette
Alexander	Farhat	Martus	Scott
Andrews	Filler	McFall	Shannon
Aragona	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Skaggs
Arbit	Fox	Meerman	Slagh
Beeler	Glanville	Mentzer	Smit
BeGole	Grant	Miller	Snyder
Beson	Green, P.	Morgan	St. Germaine
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Morse	Steckloff
Bollin	Haadsma	Mueller	Steele
Borton	Hall	Neeley	Stone
Brabec	Harris	Neyer	Tate
Breen	Hill	O’Neal	Thompson
Brixie	Hoadley	Outman	Tisdell
Bymes	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Carter, B.	Hope	Paquette	VanderWall

Carter, T.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Johnsen	Posthumus	Wegela
Churches	Koleszar	Prestin	Weiss
Coffia	Kuhn	Price	Wendzel
Coleman	Kunse	Puri	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Rheingans	Wilson
DeBoer	Lightner	Rigas	Witwer
DeBoyer	MacDonell	Rogers	Wozniak
DeSana	Maddock	Roth	Young
Dievendorf	Markkanen	Schmaltz	Zorn

Nays—3

Carra	Friske	Schriver
-------	--------	----------

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4677** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4677, entitled

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

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 564

Yeas—104

Aiyash	Edwards	Martin	Schuette
Alexander	Farhat	Martus	Scott
Andrews	Filler	McFall	Shannon
Aragona	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Skaggs
Arbit	Fox	Meerman	Slagh
Beeler	Glanville	Mentzer	Smit
BeGole	Grant	Miller	Snyder
Beson	Green, P.	Morgan	St. Germaine
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Morse	Steckloff
Bollin	Haadsma	Mueller	Steele
Borton	Hall	Neeley	Stone
Brabec	Harris	Neyer	Tate
Breen	Hill	O’Neal	Thompson
Brixie	Hoadley	Outman	Tisdell
Byrnes	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Carter, B.	Hope	Paquette	VanderWall
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Johnsen	Posthumus	Wegela
Churches	Koleszar	Prestin	Weiss
Coffia	Kuhn	Price	Wendzel
Coleman	Kunse	Puri	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Rheingans	Wilson

DeBoer	Lightner	Rigas	Witwer
DeBoyer	MacDonell	Rogers	Wozniak
DeSana	Maddock	Roth	Young
Dievendorf	Markkanen	Schmaltz	Zorn

Nays—3

Carra	Friske	Schriver
-------	--------	----------

In The Chair: Pohutsky
The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4678** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4678, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” (MCL 380.1 to 380.1852) by adding section 1281c.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 565

Yeas—104

Aiyash	Edwards	Martin	Schuette
Alexander	Farhat	Martus	Scott
Andrews	Filler	McFall	Shannon
Aragona	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Skaggs
Arbit	Fox	Meerman	Slagh
Beeler	Glanville	Mentzer	Smit
BeGole	Grant	Miller	Snyder
Beson	Green, P.	Morgan	St. Germaine
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Morse	Steckloff
Bollin	Haadsma	Mueller	Steele
Borton	Hall	Neeley	Stone
Brabec	Harris	Neyer	Tate
Breen	Hill	O’Neal	Thompson
Brixie	Hoadley	Outman	Tisdell
Bymes	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Carter, B.	Hope	Paquette	VanderWall
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Johnsen	Posthumus	Wegela
Churches	Koleszar	Prestin	Weiss
Coffia	Kuhn	Price	Wendzel
Coleman	Kunse	Puri	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Rheingans	Wilson
DeBoer	Lightner	Rigas	Witwer
DeBoyer	MacDonell	Rogers	Wozniak
DeSana	Maddock	Roth	Young
Dievendorf	Markkanen	Schmaltz	Zorn

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 169** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

Senate Bill No. 169, entitled

A bill to amend 1947 PA 336, entitled “An act to prohibit strikes by certain public employees; to provide review from disciplinary action with respect thereto; to provide for the mediation of grievances and the holding of elections; to declare and protect the rights and privileges of public employees; to require certain provisions in collective bargaining agreements; to prescribe means of enforcement and penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to make appropriations,” (MCL 423.201 to 423.217) by adding section 11a.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 567

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—51

Alexander	Filler	Markkanen	Schuette
Aragona	Fox	Martin	Slagh
Beeler	Friske	Meerman	Smit
BeGole	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Beson	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana	Maddock	Schrivier	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **House Bill No. 4325** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4325, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending section 8905a (MCL 324.8905a), as amended by 2014 PA 549.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 568

Yeas—103

Aiyash	Edwards	Martus	Schuette
Alexander	Farhat	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Filler	McKinney	Shannon
Aragona	Fitzgerald	Meerman	Skaggs
Arbit	Fox	Mentzer	Slagh
Beeler	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
BeGole	Grant	Morgan	St. Germaine
Beson	Green, P.	Morse	Steckloff
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Mueller	Steele
Bollin	Haadsma	Neeley	Stone
Borton	Hall	Neyer	Tate
Brabec	Harris	O’Neal	Thompson
Breen	Hill	Outman	Tisdell
Brixie	Hoadley	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Hood	Paquette	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Hope	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Posthumus	Wegela
Cavitt	Johnsen	Prestin	Weiss
Churches	Koleszar	Price	Wendzel
Coffia	Kuhn	Puri	Whitsett
Coleman	Kunse	Rheingans	Wilson
Conlin	Liberati	Rigas	Witwer
DeBoer	Lightner	Rogers	Wozniak
DeBoyer	MacDonell	Roth	Young
DeSana	Markkanen	Schmaltz	Zorn
Dievendorf	Martin	Schrivver	

Nays—4

Carra	Friske	Maddock	Smit
-------	--------	---------	------

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 466** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Senate Bill No. 466, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 12606a (MCL 333.12606a), as amended by 2022 PA 168.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 569**Yeas—101**

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Alexander	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Andrews	Filler	Meerman	Skaggs
Aragona	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Slagh
Arbit	Glanville	Miller	Smit
Beeler	Grant	Morgan	Snyder
BeGole	Greene, J.	Morse	St. Germaine
Beson	Haadsma	Mueller	Steckloff
Bierlein	Hall	Neeley	Steele
Bollin	Harris	Neyer	Stone
Borton	Hill	O'Neal	Tate
Brabec	Hoadley	Outman	Thompson
Breen	Hood	Paiz	Tisdell
Brixie	Hope	Paquette	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Hoskins	Pohutsky	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Johnsen	Posthumus	VanWoerkom
Carter, T.	Koleszar	Prestin	Wegela
Cavitt	Kuhn	Price	Weiss
Churches	Kunse	Puri	Wendzel
Coffia	Liberati	Rheingans	Whitsett
Coleman	Lightner	Rigas	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rogers	Witwer
DeBoer	Markkanen	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Martin	Schmaltz	Young
DeSana	Martus	Schuette	Zorn
Dievendorf			

Nays—6

Carra	Friske	Maddock	Schriver
Fox	Green, P.		

In The Chair: Pohutsky

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

“An act to protect and promote the public health; to codify, revise, consolidate, classify, and add to the laws relating to public health; to provide for the prevention and control of diseases and disabilities; to provide for the classification, administration, regulation, financing, and maintenance of personal, environmental, and other health services and activities; to create or continue, and prescribe the powers and duties of, departments, boards, commissions, councils, committees, task forces, and other agencies; to prescribe the powers and duties of governmental entities and officials; to regulate occupations, facilities, and agencies affecting the public health; to regulate health maintenance organizations and certain third party administrators and insurers; to provide for the imposition of a regulatory fee; to provide for the levy of taxes against certain health facilities or agencies; to promote the efficient and economical delivery of health care services, to provide for the appropriate utilization of health care facilities and services, and to provide for the closure of hospitals or consolidation of hospitals or services; to provide for the collection and use of data and information; to provide for the transfer of property; to provide certain immunity from liability; to regulate

and prohibit the sale and offering for sale of drug paraphernalia under certain circumstances; to provide for the implementation of federal law; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide for sanctions for violations of this act and local ordinances; to provide for an appropriation and supplements; to repeal certain acts and parts of acts; to repeal certain parts of this act; and to repeal certain parts of this act on specific dates.”

The House agreed to the full title.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Second Reading of Bills

Senate Bill No. 185, entitled

A bill to amend 1947 PA 336, entitled “An act to prohibit strikes by certain public employees; to provide review from disciplinary action with respect thereto; to provide for the mediation of grievances and the holding of elections; to declare and protect the rights and privileges of public employees; to require certain provisions in collective bargaining agreements; to prescribe means of enforcement and penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to make appropriations,” by amending section 1 (MCL 423.201), as amended by 2014 PA 414.

The bill was read a second time.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.
The motion prevailed.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

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

Senate Bill No. 185, entitled

A bill to amend 1947 PA 336, entitled “An act to prohibit strikes by certain public employees; to provide review from disciplinary action with respect thereto; to provide for the mediation of grievances and the holding of elections; to declare and protect the rights and privileges of public employees; to require certain provisions in collective bargaining agreements; to prescribe means of enforcement and penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to make appropriations,” by amending section 1 (MCL 423.201), as amended by 2014 PA 414.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 570

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bymes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—51

Alexander	Filler	Markkanen	Schuette
Aragona	Fox	Martin	Slagh
Beeler	Friske	Meerman	Smit
BeGole	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Beson	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana	Maddock	Schrivver	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 5148, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 2829 and 2882 (MCL 333.2829 and 333.2882), section 2829 as amended by 1992 PA 248 and section 2882 as amended by 2020 PA 209.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 571**Yeas—99**

Aiyash	Farhat	McFall	Shannon
Alexander	Filler	McKinney	Skaggs
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Meerman	Slagh
Aragona	Fox	Mentzer	Smit
Arbit	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
BeGole	Grant	Morgan	St. Germaine
Beson	Green, P.	Morse	Steckloff
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Mueller	Steele
Bollin	Haadsma	Neeley	Stone
Borton	Hall	Neyer	Tate
Brabec	Hill	O’Neal	Thompson
Breen	Hoadley	Outman	Tisdell
Brixie	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Bymes	Hope	Pohutsky	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Hoskins	Posthumus	VanWoerkom
Carter, T.	Johnsen	Prestin	Wegela
Cavitt	Koleszar	Price	Weiss
Churches	Kuhn	Puri	Wendzel
Coffia	Kunse	Rheingans	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Rigas	Wilson
Conlin	Lightner	Rogers	Witwer

DeBoer	MacDonell	Roth	Wozniak
DeSana	Markkanen	Schmaltz	Young
Dievendorf	Martin	Schuetter	Zorn
Edwards	Martus	Scott	

Nays—8

Beeler	DeBoyer	Harris	Paquette
Carra	Friske	Maddock	Schriver

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 5149, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 288, entitled “Probate code of 1939,” by amending sections 27a, 27b, 67, and 68 of chapter X (MCL 710.27a, 710.27b, 710.67, and 710.68), sections 27a and 68 as amended by 2012 PA 385, section 27b as added by 1994 PA 208, and section 67 as amended by 1994 PA 373, and by adding section 27c to chapter X.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 572

Yeas—99

Aiyash	Farhat	McFall	Shannon
Alexander	Filler	McKinney	Skaggs
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Meerman	Slagh
Aragona	Fox	Mentzer	Smit
Arbit	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
BeGole	Grant	Morgan	St. Germaine
Beson	Green, P.	Morse	Steckloff
Bierlein	Greene, J.	Mueller	Steele
Bollin	Haadsma	Neeley	Stone
Borton	Hall	Neyer	Tate
Brabec	Hill	O’Neal	Thompson
Breen	Hoadley	Outman	Tisdell
Brixie	Hood	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Bymes	Hope	Pohutsky	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Hoskins	Posthumus	VanWoerkom
Carter, T.	Johnsen	Prestin	Wegela
Cavitt	Koleszar	Price	Weiss
Churches	Kuhn	Puri	Wendzel
Coffia	Kunse	Rheingans	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Rigas	Wilson
Conlin	Lightner	Rogers	Witwer
DeBoer	MacDonell	Roth	Wozniak
DeSana	Markkanen	Schmaltz	Young
Dievendorf	Martin	Schuetter	Zorn
Edwards	Martus	Scott	

Nays—8

Beeler	DeBoyer	Harris	Paquette
Carra	Friske	Maddock	Schriver

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Wilson moved that **House Bill No. 4928** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

House Bill No. 4928, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 682, 741, 742, 743, 907, 908, and 909 (MCL 257.682, 257.741, 257.742, 257.743, 257.907, 257.908, and 257.909), section 682 as amended by 2021 PA 50, sections 741 and 743 as amended by 2006 PA 298, section 742 as amended by 2008 PA 171, section 907 as amended by 2023 PA 40, and section 909 as amended by 2000 PA 94.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 573

Yeas—81

Alexander	Filler	McFall	Skaggs
Andrews	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Slagh
Aragona	Glanville	Mentzer	Snyder
Arbit	Grant	Miller	St. Germaine
BeGole	Green, P.	Morgan	Steckloff
Beson	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bierlein	Harris	Mueller	Tate
Borton	Hill	Neeley	Thompson
Brabec	Hood	Neyer	Tisdell
Breen	Hope	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Brixie	Hoskins	Paiz	VanderWall
Byrnes	Johnsen	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Carter, B.	Koleszar	Price	Weiss
Carter, T.	Kuhn	Puri	Wendzel
Coffia	Kunse	Rheingans	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Rogers	Wilson
Conlin	Lightner	Schmaltz	Witwer
DeBoer	MacDonell	Schuette	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Martin	Scott	Young
Dievendorf	Martus	Shannon	Zorn
Edwards			

Nays—26

Aiyash	Farhat	Markkanen	Rigas
Beeler	Fox	Meerman	Roth
Bollin	Friske	Outman	Schriver

Carra
Cavitt
Churches
DeSana

Greene, J.
Hall
Hoadley
Maddock

Paquette
Posthumus
Prestin

Smit
Steele
Wegela

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The question being on agreeing to the title of the bill,

Rep. Wilson moved to amend the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 682, 741, 742, 907, and 909 (MCL 257.682, 257.741, 257.742, 257.907, and 257.909), section 682 as amended by 2021 PA 50, section 741 as amended by 2006 PA 298, section 742 as amended by 2008 PA 171, section 907 as amended by 2023 PA 40, and section 909 as amended by 2000 PA 94.

The motion prevailed.

The House agreed to the title as amended.

Rep. Wilson moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Wilson moved that **House Bill No. 4929** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

House Bill No. 4929, entitled

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

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 574

Yeas—79

Alexander
Andrews
Aragona
Arbit
BeGole
Beson
Bierlein
Borton
Brabec
Breen
Brixie
Byrnes
Carter, B.
Carter, T.
Coffia
Coleman
Conlin
DeBoer
Dievendorf
Edwards

Filler
Fitzgerald
Glanville
Grant
Green, P.
Haadsma
Harris
Hill
Hood
Hope
Hoskins
Johnsen
Koleszar
Kuhn
Kunse
Liberati
Lightner
MacDonell
Martin
Martus

McFall
McKinney
Mentzer
Miller
Morgan
Morse
Mueller
Neeley
Neyer
O’Neal
Paiz
Pohutsky
Price
Puri
Rheingans
Rogers
Schmaltz
Schuette
Scott
Shannon

Skaggs
Slagh
Snyder
Steckloff
Stone
Tate
Thompson
Tisdell
Tsernoglou
VanderWall
VanWoerkom
Weiss
Wendzel
Whitsett
Wilson
Witwer
Wozniak
Young
Zorn

Nays—28

Aiyash
Beeler
Bollin

DeSana
Farhat
Fox

Maddock
Markkanen
Meerman

Rigas
Roth
Schriver

Carra	Friske	Outman	Smit
Cavitt	Greene, J.	Paquette	St. Germaine
Churches	Hall	Posthumus	Steele
DeBoyer	Hoadley	Prestin	Wegela

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Wilson moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Wilson moved that **House Bill No. 4930** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

House Bill No. 4930, entitled

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

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 575

Yeas—80

Alexander	Filler	McFall	Skaggs
Andrews	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Slagh
Aragona	Glanville	Mentzer	Snyder
Arbit	Grant	Miller	St. Germaine
BeGole	Green, P.	Morgan	Steckloff
Beson	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Bierlein	Harris	Mueller	Tate
Borton	Hill	Neeley	Thompson
Brabec	Hood	Neyer	Tisdell
Breen	Hope	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Brixie	Hoskins	Paiz	VanderWall
Byrnes	Johnsen	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Carter, B.	Koleszar	Price	Weiss
Carter, T.	Kuhn	Puri	Wendzel
Coffia	Kunse	Rheingans	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Rogers	Wilson
Conlin	Lightner	Schmaltz	Witwer
DeBoer	MacDonell	Schuette	Wozniak
Dievendorf	Martin	Scott	Young
Edwards	Martus	Shannon	Zorn

Nays—27

Aiyash	DeSana	Maddock	Rigas
Beeler	Farhat	Markkanen	Roth
Bollin	Fox	Meerman	Schriver
Carra	Friske	Outman	Smit
Cavitt	Greene, J.	Paquette	Steele
Churches	Hall	Posthumus	Wegela
DeBoyer	Hoadley	Prestin	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Wilson moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Senate Bill No. 441, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending sections 44508, 44524, 47325, 47327, and 47333 (MCL 324.44508, 324.44524, 324.47325, 324.47327, and 324.47333), sections 44508, 47325, and 47333 as added by 1995 PA 57, section 44524 as amended by 2012 PA 249, and section 47327 as amended by 2020 PA 385.

(The bill was read a third time and postponed temporarily on November 8, see House Journal No. 96, p. 2391.)

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Morgan moved to substitute (H-1) the bill.

The motion was seconded and the substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was then passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 576

Yeas—87

Aiyash	Edwards	McKinney	Schuette
Alexander	Farhat	Meerman	Scott
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Shannon
Arbit	Glanville	Miller	Skaggs
BeGole	Grant	Morgan	Snyder
Beson	Green, P.	Morse	Steckloff
Bierlein	Haadsma	Mueller	Steele
Bollin	Harris	Neeley	Stone
Borton	Hill	Neyer	Tate
Brabec	Hood	O’Neal	Thompson
Breen	Hope	Outman	Tisdell
Brixie	Hoskins	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Koleszar	Pohutsky	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Kuhn	Posthumus	Wegela
Carter, T.	Kunse	Prestin	Weiss
Cavitt	Liberati	Price	Whitsett
Churches	Lightner	Puri	Wilson
Coffia	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Coleman	Markkanen	Rigas	Wozniak
Conlin	Martin	Rogers	Young
DeBoer	Martus	Roth	Zorn
Dievendorf	McFall	Schmaltz	

Nays—20

Aragona	Filler	Hoadley	Slagh
Beeler	Fox	Johnsen	Smit
Carra	Friske	Maddock	St. Germaine
DeBoyer	Greene, J.	Paquette	VanWoerkom
DeSana	Hall	Schrivver	Wendzel

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Wilson moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Messages from the Senate

House Bill No. 4476, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled "The Michigan penal code," (MCL 750.1 to 750.568) by adding section 147c.

The Senate has substituted (S-4) the bill.

The Senate has passed the bill as substituted (S-4) and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Rep. Wilson moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-4) made to the bill by the Senate,

The substitute (S-4) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 577

Yeas—89

Aiyash	Filler	Martus	Schuette
Andrews	Fitzgerald	McFall	Scott
Arbit	Glanville	McKinney	Shannon
BeGole	Grant	Meerman	Skaggs
Beson	Green, P.	Mentzer	Snyder
Bierlein	Haadsma	Miller	St. Germaine
Bollin	Hall	Morgan	Steckloff
Borton	Harris	Morse	Steele
Brabec	Hill	Mueller	Stone
Breen	Hoadley	Neeley	Tate
Brixie	Hood	Neyer	Thompson
Bymes	Hope	O'Neal	Tisdell
Carter, B.	Hoskins	Outman	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Johnsen	Paiz	VanderWall
Cavitt	Koleszar	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Churches	Kuhn	Prestin	Wegela
Coffia	Kunse	Price	Weiss
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Whitsett
Conlin	Lightner	Rheingans	Wilson
DeBoer	MacDonell	Rogers	Witwer
Dievendorf	Markkanen	Roth	Young
Edwards	Martin	Schmaltz	Zorn
Farhat			

Nays—18

Alexander	DeSana	Paquette	Slagh
Aragona	Fox	Posthumus	Smit
Beeler	Friske	Rigas	Wendzel
Carra	Greene, J.	Schrivier	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock		

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

House Bill No. 4387, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16g of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16g), as amended by 2020 PA 50.
The Senate has substituted (S-1) the bill.
The Senate has passed the bill as substituted (S-1) and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.
The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.
Rep. Wilson moved that Rule 42 be suspended.
The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.
The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-1) made to the bill by the Senate,
The substitute (S-1) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 578

Yeas—107

Aiyash	Edwards	Martin	Schuette
Alexander	Farhat	Martus	Scott
Andrews	Filler	McFall	Shannon
Aragona	Fitzgerald	McKinney	Skaggs
Arbit	Fox	Meerman	Slagh
Beeler	Friske	Mentzer	Smit
BeGole	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Beson	Grant	Morgan	St. Germaine
Bierlein	Green, P.	Morse	Steckloff
Bollin	Greene, J.	Mueller	Steele
Borton	Haadsma	Neeley	Stone
Brabec	Hall	Neyer	Tate
Breen	Harris	O’Neal	Thompson
Brixie	Hill	Outman	Tisdel
Bymes	Hoadley	Paiz	Ternoglou
Carra	Hood	Paquette	VanderWall
Carter, B.	Hope	Pohutsky	VanWoerkom
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Posthumus	Wegela
Cavitt	Johnsen	Prestin	Weiss
Churches	Koleszar	Price	Wendzel
Coffia	Kuhn	Puri	Whitsett
Coleman	Kunse	Rheingans	Wilson
Conlin	Liberati	Rigas	Witwer
DeBoer	Lightner	Rogers	Wozniak
DeBoyer	MacDonell	Roth	Young
DeSana	Maddock	Schmaltz	Zorn
Dievendorf	Markkanen	Schriver	

Nays—0

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

House Bill No. 4477, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 16g of chapter XVII (MCL 777.16g), as amended by 2020 PA 50.

The Senate has substituted (S-1) the bill.

The Senate has passed the bill as substituted (S-1) and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Rep. Wilson moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-1) made to the bill by the Senate,

The substitute (S-1) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 579

Yeas—88

Aiyash	Farhat	Martin	Schuette
Andrews	Filler	Martus	Scott
Arbit	Fitzgerald	McFall	Shannon
BeGole	Glanville	McKinney	Skaggs
Beson	Grant	Meerman	Slagh
Bierlein	Green, P.	Mentzer	Snyder
Bollin	Haadsma	Miller	Steckloff
Borton	Hall	Morgan	Steele
Brabec	Harris	Morse	Stone
Breen	Hill	Mueller	Tate
Brixie	Hoadley	Neeley	Thompson
Byrnes	Hood	Neyer	Tisdell
Carter, B.	Hope	O'Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Outman	VanderWall
Cavitt	Johnsen	Paiz	VanWoerkom
Churches	Koleszar	Pohutsky	Wegela
Coffia	Kuhn	Prestin	Weiss
Coleman	Kunse	Price	Whitsett
Conlin	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
DeBoer	Lightner	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	MacDonell	Rogers	Young
Edwards	Markkanen	Schmaltz	Zorn

Nays—19

Alexander	DeSana	Paquette	Smit
Aragona	Fox	Posthumus	St. Germaine
Beeler	Friske	Rigas	Wendzel
Carra	Greene, J.	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Maddock	Schriver	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 4695, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” by amending sections 570, 662, 668b, 674, 736b, 736c, 736d, 736e, 795b, and 797a (MCL 168.570, 168.662, 168.668b, 168.674, 168.736b, 168.736c, 168.736d, 168.736e, 168.795b, and 168.797a), section 570 as amended by 2017 PA 113, section 662 as amended by 2022 PA 219, section 668b as added by 2018 PA 614, section 674 as amended by 2018 PA 120, sections 736b, 736c, 736d, and 736e as amended by 2018 PA 190, section 795b as amended by 1990 PA 109, and section 797a as amended by 1996 PA 583, and by adding sections 8, 720a, 720b, 720c, 720d, 720e, 720f, 720g, 720h, 720i, and 720j.

The Senate has substituted (S-2) the bill.

The Senate has passed the bill as substituted (S-2) and amended the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “An act to reorganize, consolidate, and add to the election laws; to provide for election officials and prescribe their powers and duties; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state departments, state agencies, and state and local officials and employees; to provide for the nomination and election of candidates for public office; to provide for the resignation, removal, and recall of certain public officers; to provide for the filling of vacancies in public office; to provide for and regulate primaries and elections; to provide for the purity of elections; to guard against the abuse of the elective franchise; to define violations of this act; to provide appropriations; to prescribe penalties and provide remedies; and to repeal certain acts and all other acts inconsistent with this act,” amending sections 674 and 720j (MCL 168.674 and 168.720j), section 674 as amended and section 720j as added by 2023 PA 81.

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Rep. Wilson moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-2) made to the bill by the Senate,

The substitute (S-2) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 580

Yeas—56

Aiyash	Edwards	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Skaggs
Brabec	Glanville	Miller	Snyder
Breen	Grant	Morgan	Steckloff
Brixie	Haadsma	Morse	Stone
Byrnes	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Carter, B.	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rogers	Young

Nays—51

Alexander	Filler	Markkanen	Schuette
Aragona	Fox	Martin	Slagh
Beeler	Friske	Meerman	Smit
BeGole	Green, P.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Beson	Greene, J.	Neyer	Steele
Bierlein	Hall	Outman	Thompson
Bollin	Harris	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kunse	Roth	Wozniak
DeBoyer	Lightner	Schmaltz	Zorn
DeSana	Maddock	Schrivver	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title as amended.

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

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

Motions and Resolutions

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 71 be suspended and the resolution be considered at this time.
The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

Reps. Martin, Conlin, Fitzgerald, Fox, Rheingans and Wilson offered the following resolution:

House Resolution No. 170.

A resolution to recognize the service and sacrifices of Michigan Veterans on Veterans Day, November 11th, 2023.

Whereas, The Michigan House of Representatives recognizes the immeasurable bravery, dedication, and sacrifices made by the veterans of the State of Michigan; and

Whereas, The Michigan Veterans Affairs Agency reports that nearly 568,000 veterans reside in Michigan; and

Whereas, Michigan's veterans have fought on behalf of their country in every major conflict the United States has engaged in since the Civil War, in which Michigan provided the greatest number of men per capita to the Union forces; and

Whereas, The selfless service and unwavering commitment exhibited by these veterans have played a pivotal role in upholding the values of freedom and security cherished by the people of Michigan and the entire nation; and

Whereas, On this solemn occasion of Veterans Day, the Michigan House of Representatives pays tribute to the valiant men and women who have served in the United States Armed Forces, displaying extraordinary courage in defense of our nation and its principles; and

Whereas, Michigan's veterans represent a diverse tapestry of individuals from all different parts of the state uniting under the common purpose of protecting our country's freedoms; and

Whereas, These esteemed veterans have demonstrated resilience, fortitude, and sacrifice, often leaving behind their families and risking their lives in the name of duty, honor, and service to our great nation; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Michigan House of Representatives, that on this Veterans Day, the House offers its heartfelt gratitude and recognition to the veterans of Michigan for their outstanding service, bravery, and commitment to defending the freedoms and liberties cherished by all citizens; and, be it further

Resolved that a copy of this resolution be duly prepared and presented to The American Legion Department of Michigan and the Veterans of Foreign Wars Department of Michigan as a statement of the profound respect and gratitude of the Michigan House of Representatives and its citizens.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Announcement by the Clerk of Printing and Enrollment

The Clerk announced that the following Senate bills had been received on Wednesday, November 8:

Senate Bill Nos. 44 45 480

The Clerk announced that the following bills had been reproduced and made available electronically on Wednesday, November 8:

Senate Bill Nos. 642 643 644 645 646

The Clerk announced that the following Senate bills had been received on Thursday, November 9:

Senate Bill Nos. 482 493 501

Reports of Standing Committees

The Committee on Natural Resources, Environment, Tourism and Outdoor Recreation, by Rep. Pohutsky, Chair, reported

House Bill No. 4359, entitled

A bill to repeal 2016 PA 389, entitled "An act to preempt local ordinances regulating the use, disposition, or sale of, prohibiting or restricting, or imposing any fee, charge, or tax on certain containers," (MCL 445.591 to 445.593).

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

The bill and substitute were referred to the order of Second Reading of Bills.

Favorable Roll Call

To Report Out:

Yeas: Reps. Pohutsky, Hill, Shannon, Arbit, McFall and Paiz

Nays: Reps. Martin, Prestin and Schriver

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The following report, submitted by Rep. Pohutsky, Chair, of the Committee on Natural Resources, Environment, Tourism and Outdoor Recreation, was received and read:

Meeting held on: Thursday, November 9, 2023

Present: Reps. Pohutsky, Hill, Shannon, Arbit, McFall, Paiz, Martin, Prestin and Schriver

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The following report, submitted by Rep. Rogers, Chair, of the Committee on Health Policy, was received and read:

Meeting held on: Thursday, November 9, 2023

Present: Reps. Rogers, Whitsett, Brenda Carter, Haadsma, Neeley, Glanville, Coffia, Conlin, Farhat, Fitzgerald, Miller, Rheingans, VanderWall, Filler, Mueller, VanWoerkom, Roth, Schmaltz and Thompson

Messages from the Senate

House Bill No. 4082, entitled

A bill to amend 2001 PA 142, entitled "Michigan memorial highway act," (MCL 250.1001 to 250.2092) by adding section 23b.

The Senate has passed the bill and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 4126, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled "Michigan vehicle code," by amending section 627 (MCL 257.627), as amended by 2022 PA 52.

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

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 4129, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled "Michigan election law," (MCL 168.1 to 168.992) by adding section 931b.

The Senate has passed the bill and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 4197, entitled

A bill to amend 2008 PA 551, entitled "Uniform securities act (2002)," (MCL 451.2101 to 451.2703) by amending the title, as amended by 2014 PA 355, and by adding article 5A.

The Senate has passed the bill and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 4320, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” (MCL 750.1 to 750.568) by adding section 145h.

The Senate has passed the bill and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 4897, entitled

A bill to amend 1951 PA 51, entitled “An act to provide for the classification of all public roads, streets, and highways in this state, and for the revision of that classification and for additions to and deletions from each classification; to set up and establish the Michigan transportation fund; to provide for the deposits in the Michigan transportation fund of specific taxes on motor vehicles and motor vehicle fuels; to provide for the allocation of funds from the Michigan transportation fund and the use and administration of the fund for transportation purposes; to promote safe and efficient travel for motor vehicle drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians, and other legal users of roads, streets, and highways; to set up and establish the truck safety fund; to provide for the allocation of funds from the truck safety fund and administration of the fund for truck safety purposes; to set up and establish the Michigan truck safety commission; to establish certain standards for road contracts for certain businesses; to provide for the continuing review of transportation needs within the state; to authorize the state transportation commission, counties, cities, and villages to borrow money, issue bonds, and make pledges of funds for transportation purposes; to authorize counties to advance funds for the payment of deficiencies necessary for the payment of bonds issued under this act; to provide for the limitations, payment, retirement, and security of the bonds and pledges; to provide for appropriations and tax levies by counties and townships for county roads; to authorize contributions by townships for county roads; to provide for the establishment and administration of the state trunk line fund, local bridge fund, comprehensive transportation fund, and certain other funds; to provide for the deposits in the state trunk line fund, critical bridge fund, comprehensive transportation fund, and certain other funds of money raised by specific taxes and fees; to provide for definitions of public transportation functions and criteria; to define the purposes for which Michigan transportation funds may be allocated; to provide for Michigan transportation fund grants; to provide for review and approval of transportation programs; to provide for submission of annual legislative requests and reports; to provide for the establishment and functions of certain advisory entities; to provide for conditions for grants; to provide for the issuance of bonds and notes for transportation purposes; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies and officials; to provide for the making of loans for transportation purposes by the state transportation department and for the receipt and repayment by local units and agencies of those loans from certain specified sources; to investigate and study the tolling of roads, streets, highways, or bridges; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending sections 12 and 13b (MCL 247.662 and 247.663b), section 12 as amended by 2020 PA 152.

The Senate has passed the bill.

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

House Bill No. 4942, entitled

A bill to authorize the state administrative board to convey state-owned property in Ingham County to the house of representatives; to prescribe conditions for the conveyance; to provide for powers and duties of state agencies and departments concerning the property and the conveyance; and to provide for disposition of revenue derived from the conveyance.

The Senate has passed the bill.

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

House Bill No. 4346, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 267, entitled “Open meetings act,” by amending section 3a (MCL 15.263a), as amended by 2021 PA 54.

The Senate has passed the bill and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Concurrent Resolution No. 10.

A concurrent resolution providing for the final adjournment of the Legislature.

(For text of concurrent resolution, see today’s Journal, p. 2476.)

The Senate has adopted the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Clerk for record.

Senate Bill No. 482, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending sections 13809 and 13810 (MCL 333.13809 and 333.13810), as added by 1990 PA 21.

The Senate has passed the bill.

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

Senate Bill No. 493, entitled

A bill to amend 1975 PA 46, entitled “An act to create the office of the legislative corrections ombudsman; to prescribe the powers and duties of the office, the ombudsman, the legislative council, and the department of corrections; and to provide remedies from administrative acts,” by amending the title and sections 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 (MCL 4.351, 4.352, 4.354, 4.355, 4.356, 4.357, 4.358, 4.359, 4.360, 4.361, 4.362, 4.363, and 4.364), sections 1, 6, 7, and 10 as amended by 1998 PA 318, sections 4, 5, 8, 9, and 13 as amended by 2018 PA 571, section 11 as amended by 1995 PA 197, and section 12 as amended by 1982 PA 170.

The Senate has passed the bill.

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

Senate Bill No. 501, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 722 (MCL 257.722), as amended by 2018 PA 274.

The Senate has passed the bill.

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

Explanation of “No” Votes

Rep. Lightner, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 4605 and 4606**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

These bills take away from general fund and start a new fund out of the sales tax. This does nothing for county public safety, our sheriff’s departments unless they contract with township or city police. These need to be more open for counties to be able to access more of this money so they can use it for county wide policing.”

Rep. Smit, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of **House Bill No. 4605**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I have consistently supported additional funding for our brave law enforcement officers, because making our local community safer and protecting victims will always be a top priority for me at the Capitol. We need more police on the streets, and those officers need the right tools to stay safe and fight crime effectively. My local law enforcement officers need new recruits, new equipment, safer vehicles, and more reliable personal protection. House Bill 4605 does not give them those tools. I am voting no because far too much of our limited funding bypasses our police in this bill and is instead funneled to the governor’s healthcare bureaucracy. There, that money could be used for a whole host of social justice programs that completely ignore our law enforcement. Efforts to clarify that ambiguity and dedicate that funding to actual public safety efforts were rejected. We need a real commitment to public safety and very clear spending bills that spend our public safety dollars on our top priorities. Without that, I cannot support this bill.”

Reps. Markkanen and Smit, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of **Senate Bill Nos. 271, 273, 502, and 519** made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on Senate Bills 271, 273, 502, and 519 because this legislation will increase monthly electric bills for Michigan families and make our state’s energy grid far less reliable. As families struggle with high inflation and cold weather, they need affordability and reliability. They deserve to know that the heat will kick on when they flip the switch and that they can afford to pay the utility bill at the end of the month. Instead, these bills force Michigan to close existing power plants and build out expensive and experimental technologies to replace them.

Those increased costs will be passed on to Michigan families in the form of higher rates they cannot afford. The bills even go so far as to eliminate existing caps on rate increases, allowing utility companies to charge unlimited amounts and raise monthly electric bills as much as they want.

The unreliable solar arrays and wind farms will also make our existing issues with grid reliability even worse. Local utility companies already struggle to keep the lights on when it snows, when it rains, when there is thunder, or when the wind blows. Moving Michigan further onto a grid overly reliant on perfect weather conditions will lead to spoiled food, dark rooms, and shivering children. It is a recipe for disaster.

Michigan families deserve lower monthly electric bills and more reliable service. These bills deliver neither of those things and actually make things worse for all of us on both fronts. For these reasons, I cannot and will not support these bills.”

Rep. Markkanen, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5123 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add thousands of square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Smit, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120 and 5121 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add thousands of square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns.

Under House Bill 5120 and 5121, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Kuhn, having reserved the right to explain his nay vote pertaining to **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5121 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add thousands of square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns.

Under House Bills 5120-5121, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents' concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills."

Rep. Kuhn, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **Senate Bill No. 273**, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on Senate Bill 273 because this legislation will increase monthly electric bills for Michigan families and make our state's energy grid far less reliable. As families struggle with high inflation and cold weather, they need affordability and reliability. They deserve to know that the heat will kick on when they flip the switch and that they can afford to pay the utility bill at the end of the month. Instead, these bills force Michigan to close existing power plants and build out expensive and experimental technologies to replace them.

Those increased costs will be passed on to Michigan families in the form of higher rates they cannot afford. The bill even goes so far as to eliminate existing caps on rate increases, allowing utility companies to charge unlimited amounts and raise monthly electric bills as much as they want.

The unreliable solar arrays and wind farms will also make our existing issues with grid reliability even worse. Local utility companies already struggle to keep the lights on when it snows, when it rains, when there is thunder, or when the wind blows. Moving Michigan further onto a grid overly reliant on perfect weather conditions will lead to spoiled food, dark rooms, and shivering children. It is a recipe for disaster.

Michigan families deserve lower monthly electric bills and more reliable service. This bill delivers neither of those things and actually make things worse for all of us on both fronts. For these reasons, I cannot and will not support this bill."

Rep. Hall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5123 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents' concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state's unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents' concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills."

Rep. Hall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **Senate Bill Nos. 271, 273, 502, and 519** made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on Senate Bills 271, 273, 502, and 519 because this legislation will increase monthly electric bills for Michigan families and make our state's energy grid far less reliable. As families struggle with high inflation and cold weather, they need affordability and reliability. They deserve to know that the heat will kick on when they flip the switch and that they can afford to pay the utility bill at the end of the month. Instead, these bills force Michigan to close existing power plants, effectively ban natural gas, and build out expensive and experimental technologies to replace them.

Those increased costs will be passed on to Michigan families in the form of higher rates they cannot afford. The bills even go so far as to eliminate existing caps on rate increases, allowing utility companies to charge unlimited amounts and raise monthly electric bills as much as they want.

The unreliable solar and wind farms will also make our existing issues with grid reliability even worse. Local utility companies already struggle to keep the lights on when it snows, when it rains, when there is thunder, or when the wind blows. Moving Michigan further onto a grid overly reliant on perfect weather conditions will lead to spoiled food, dark rooms, and shivering children. It is a recipe for disaster.

Michigan families deserve lower monthly electric bills and more reliable service. These bills deliver neither of those things and actually make things worse for all of us on both fronts. For these reasons, I cannot and will not support these bills.”

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5207 and 5215**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am deeply troubled by these proposed surrogacy laws for Michigan, particularly the provision for selective reduction. As a parent of a child with a genetic condition, I understand the complexities of life, but I firmly believe that every child, regardless of their genetic makeup, deserves the chance to live and thrive.

House Bills 5207-5215 raise significant ethical and moral concerns. Under these bills, selective reduction – the act of mandating a mother to abort a baby based on genetic traits or any other reason deemed unfit – would become a reality. This, in my view, is nothing short of genocide, an atrocity we should never allow.

It also must not be lost on us that those who will be hurt most by these bills are poor and often uneducated women. Mandating a mother to terminate a pregnancy based on genetic conditions, sex, or how many are in the womb is a direct violation of the fundamental principal of humanity. By allowing selective reduction, we are treading down a dangerous path of eugenics, where certain lives are deemed more valuable than others based on genetic traits. We cannot allow children to be created just to become medical waste. This kind of discrimination has no place in a just and compassionate society.

Regardless of the circumstances, contractually forcing a mother to abort a child against her will inflicts immeasurable emotional and mental trauma. It undermines the very essence of motherhood, which is about unconditional love and acceptance. And again, who are these surrogate mothers? Usually poor and often undereducated women.

Once we accept selective reduction for specific genetic traits, where do we draw the line? This sets a dangerous precedent, opening the door to further restrictions on the lives of people deemed unacceptable by society.

This legislation robs women of their autonomy and the right to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly what Margaret Atwood warned about in her 1985 Novel *Handmaid’s tale*. In Gilead, women have few rights and are strictly controlled by the government. They are categorized based on their social roles, and the Handmaids are valued only for their ability to bear children.

Under these bills, women signing contracts would have few rights and would be controlled by the beholder of their contract.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Reps. Jaime Greene and Aragona, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of **Senate Bill Nos. 271, 273, 502, and 519** made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on Senate Bills 271, 273, 502, and 519 because this legislation will increase monthly electric bills for Michigan families and make our state’s energy grid far less reliable. As families struggle with high inflation and cold weather, they need affordability and reliability. They deserve to know that the heat will kick on when they flip the switch and that they can afford to pay the utility bill at the end of the month. Instead, these bills force Michigan to close existing power plants, effectively ban natural gas, and build out expensive and experimental technologies to replace them.

Those increased costs will be passed on to Michigan families in the form of higher rates they cannot afford. The bills even go so far as to eliminate existing caps on rate increases, allowing utility companies to charge unlimited amounts and raise monthly electric bills as much as they want.

The unreliable solar and wind farms will also make our existing issues with grid reliability even worse. Local utility companies already struggle to keep the lights on when it snows, when it rains, when there is thunder, or when the wind blows. Moving Michigan further onto a grid overly reliant on perfect weather conditions will lead to spoiled food, dark rooms, and shivering children. It is a recipe for disaster.

Michigan families deserve lower monthly electric bills and more reliable service. These bills deliver neither of those things and actually make things worse for all of us on both fronts. For these reasons, I cannot and will not support these bills.”

Rep. Aragona, having reserved the right to explain his nay vote pertaining to **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5123 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state’s unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Jaime Greene, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I vehemently oppose House Bills 5120-5123, which strip our local communities of their right to determine their fate concerning large-scale solar and wind energy projects. These bills delegate the power to approve such projects to the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC), a three-member board appointed by the governor, making them unaccountable to the people of Michigan.

When the MPSC inevitably approves projects against the wishes of local communities, residents will have no means to hold these commission members accountable for their decisions. This undermines our local decision-making authority and challenges the essence of democracy itself. Despite widespread public outcry against wind and solar projects, these bills disregard the concerns expressed by people and local governments. This centralized approach is driven by the state’s ambitious yet unaffordable and unreliable goal of achieving 100% clean energy by 2040.

House Bills 5120-5123 empower the MPSC to impose projects on communities without considering residents’ concerns. These unelected officials could reshape our entire electric grid according to far-left policies, leaving the people of Michigan without any means to challenge their decisions.

Furthermore, these bills not only erode local control but also lead to increased energy costs and reduced reliability. I stand against these bills as it is my responsibility to safeguard our local decision-making authority, ensuring that the voices of our residents are not silenced in the face of powerful interests.”

Rep. BeGole, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5123 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state’s unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Steele, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5123 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state’s unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040. The misnomer is that these solar panel companies will have to go to the Township first, however if they are not allowed they can go directly go to this bureaucratic board and bypass locals-

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. BeGole, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **Senate Bill Nos. 271, 273, 502, and 519** made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on Senate Bills 271, 273, 502, and 519 because this legislation will increase monthly electric bills for Michigan families and make our state’s energy grid far less reliable. As families struggle with high inflation and cold weather, they need affordability and reliability. They deserve to know that the heat will kick on when they flip the switch and that they can afford to pay the utility bill at the end of the month. Instead, these bills force Michigan to close existing power plants, effectively ban natural gas, and build out expensive and experimental technologies to replace them.

Those increased costs will be passed on to Michigan families in the form of higher rates they cannot afford. The bills even go so far as to eliminate existing caps on rate increases, allowing utility companies to charge unlimited amounts and raise monthly electric bills as much as they want.

The unreliable solar and wind farms will also make our existing issues with grid reliability even worse. Local utility companies already struggle to keep the lights on when it snows, when it rains, when there is thunder, or when the wind blows. Moving Michigan further onto a grid overly reliant on perfect weather conditions will lead to spoiled food, dark rooms, and shivering children. It is a recipe for disaster.

Michigan families deserve lower monthly electric bills and more reliable service. These bills deliver neither of those things and actually make things worse for all of us on both fronts. For these reasons, I cannot and will not support these bills.”

Rep. Tisdell, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state’s unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Tisdell, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **Senate Bill Nos. 271, 273, 502, and 519** made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on Senate Bills 271, 273, 502, and 519 because this legislation will increase monthly electric bills for Michigan families and make our state’s energy grid far less reliable. As families struggle with high inflation and cold weather, they need affordability and reliability. They deserve to know that the heat will kick on when they flip the switch and that they can afford to pay the utility bill at the end of the month. Instead, these bills force Michigan to close existing power plants, effectively ban natural gas, and build out expensive and experimental technologies to replace them.

Those increased costs will be passed on to Michigan families in the form of higher rates they cannot afford. The bills even go so far as to eliminate existing caps on rate increases, allowing utility companies to charge unlimited amounts and raise monthly electric bills as much as they want.

The unreliable solar and wind farms will also make our existing issues with grid reliability even worse. Local utility companies already struggle to keep the lights on when it snows, when it rains, when there is thunder, or when the wind blows. Moving Michigan further onto a grid overly reliant on perfect weather conditions will lead to spoiled food, dark rooms, and shivering children. It is a recipe for disaster.

Michigan families deserve lower monthly electric bills and more reliable service. These bills deliver neither of those things and actually make things worse for all of us on both fronts. For these reasons, I cannot and will not support these bills.”

Rep. Bierlein, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state’s unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Bollin, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5123 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state’s unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid unaffordable and less reliable. The people of Michigan have no ability to hold the MPSC accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Rep. Bierlein, Martin, Harris and Bollin, having reserved the right to explain their protest against the passage of **Senate Bill Nos. 271, 273, 502, and 519** made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on Senate Bills 271, 273, 502, and 519 because this legislation will increase monthly electric bills for Michigan families and make our state’s energy grid far less reliable. As families struggle with high inflation and cold weather, they need affordability and reliability. They deserve to know that the heat will kick on when they flip the switch and that they can afford to pay the utility bill at the end of the month. Instead, these bills force Michigan to close existing power plants, effectively ban natural gas, and build out expensive and experimental technologies to replace them.

Those increased costs will be passed on to Michigan families in the form of higher rates they cannot afford. The bills even go so far as to eliminate existing caps on rate increases, allowing utility companies to charge unlimited amounts and raise monthly electric bills as much as they want.

The unreliable solar and wind farms will also make our existing issues with grid reliability even worse. Local utility companies already struggle to keep the lights on when it snows, when it rains, when there is thunder, or when the wind blows. Moving Michigan further onto a grid overly reliant on perfect weather conditions will lead to spoiled food, dark rooms, and shivering children. It is a recipe for disaster.

Michigan families deserve lower monthly electric bills and more reliable service. These bills deliver neither of those things and actually make things worse for all of us on both fronts. For these reasons, I cannot and will not support these bills.”

Reps. Harris and Hoadley, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of **House Bill Nos. 5120 and 5121**, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

HBs 5120-5123 strip control away from local communities concerning the construction of large-scale solar and wind energy projects.

These bills give the unelected Michigan Public Service Commission the sole authority to permit large solar and wind construction. The three-member board is made up of unelected bureaucrats appointed by the governor, and the governor is publicly supporting a plan to add almost 17,000 square miles of new wind and solar farms in rural communities.

People throughout the state have turned out in droves to voice their thoughts about wind and solar projects planned in their communities. In many cases, local boards and commissions have put a tremendous amount of work into crafting zoning ordinances and master plans after listening to their residents’ concerns. These bills ignore the concerns voiced by people and local governments around our state, because stripping away local control is the only way to ensure Michigan is able to reach our state’s unaffordable and unreliable energy goal of 100% clean energy by 2040.

Under House Bill 5120-5123, the MPSC will force the projects on local communities with little regard for residents’ concerns. These unelected commission members could remake our entire electric grid with far-left policy as their goal and the people of Michigan would have no ability to hold them accountable.

For these reasons, I cannot support these bills.”

Introduction of Bills

Reps. Snyder, Tyrone Carter, McFall, Liberati, Coleman, Mentzer, Rheingans, Martus, Glanville, Steckloff, Breen, Fitzgerald, Witwer, Conlin, McKinney, Hood, Kunse, Brenda Carter, Arbit, Tsernoglou, Johnsen, Aragona, Harris, Young, Morgan, Neeley, Grant, Mueller, Wegela, Scott, Rogers, O’Neal, Weiss, Haadsma, Koleszar, Skaggs, Outman, Bierlein, Beson, Rigas, Cavitt, St. Germaine, Steele, Neyer, Farhat, Hoadley, Jaime Greene, DeBoyer, Borton, BeGole, Whitsett, Aiyash, MacDonell and Puri introduced

House Bill No. 5306, entitled

A bill to designate the Karner blue butterfly as the official butterfly of the state of Michigan.

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

Reps. Brabec, Conlin and Morgan introduced

House Bill No. 5307, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3114 (MCL 500.3114), as amended by 2019 PA 21.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Insurance and Financial Services.

Reps. Conlin, Brabec and Morgan introduced

House Bill No. 5308, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3107c (MCL 500.3107c), as added by 2019 PA 22.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Insurance and Financial Services.

Reps. Bierlein and Alexander introduced

House Bill No. 5309, entitled

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending section 627a (MCL 257.627a), as amended by 2016 PA 446.

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

Reps. Beeler, Cavitt, Smit, Maddock, Schriver, DeSana, Fox, Wozniak, Outman, Harris, Bezotte, Bierlein, Alexander, Friske, Carra, Aragona, Schuette, Kunse, Prestin, BeGole, Rigas, Borton, Hoadley, Neyer, Markkanen, Bollin, Meerman, Hall, Lightner, Posthumus, St. Germaine, Beson, Bruck, Paquette, Thompson, Slagh, Jaime Greene and Johnsen introduced

House Bill No. 5310, entitled

A bill to amend 1984 PA 431, entitled “The management and budget act,” by amending sections 114 and 261 (MCL 18.1114 and 18.1261), section 114 as amended by 2001 PA 61 and section 261 as amended by 2020 PA 174, and by adding section 261g.

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

Reps. St. Germaine, Roth, Rigas, Alexander, DeBoyer, Schmaltz, Steele, Borton, Thompson, Kunse, Martin, Markkanen, Jaime Greene and Cavitt introduced

House Bill No. 5311, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 3, entitled “An act to provide for the regulation and control of public and certain private utilities and other services affected with a public interest within this state; to provide for alternative energy suppliers; to provide for licensing; to include municipally owned utilities and other providers of energy under certain provisions of this act; to create a public service commission and to prescribe and define its powers and duties; to abolish the Michigan public utilities commission and to confer the powers and duties vested by law on the public service commission; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the continuance, transfer, and completion of certain matters and proceedings; to abolish automatic adjustment clauses; to prohibit certain rate increases without notice and hearing; to qualify residential energy conservation programs permitted under state law for certain federal exemption; to create a fund; to encourage the utilization of resource recovery facilities; to prohibit certain acts and practices of providers of energy; to allow for the securitization of stranded costs; to reduce rates; to provide for appeals; to provide appropriations; to declare the effect and purpose of this act; to prescribe remedies and penalties; and to repeal acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 1 (MCL 460.1).

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

Reps. Brenda Carter, Arbit, Byrnes, Brabec, Hood, Conlin, Morse, Rheingans, Young and Breen introduced

House Bill No. 5312, entitled

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 3406d (MCL 500.3406d), as amended by 2016 PA 276.

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Insurance and Financial Services.

Reps. Steckloff, Arbit, Byrnes, Brabec, Hood, Conlin, Morse, Rheingans, Young, Brenda Carter and Breen introduced

House Bill No. 5313, entitled

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

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

Reps. Steckloff, Arbit, Byrnes, Brabec, Hood, Conlin, Morse, Rheingans, Young, Brenda Carter and Breen introduced

House Bill No. 5314, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled “Public health code,” by amending section 5431 (MCL 333.5431), as amended by 2002 PA 691.

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

Reps. Steckloff, Arbit, Byrnes, Brabec, Hood, Conlin, Morse, Rheingans, Brenda Carter, Young and Breen introduced

House Bill No. 5315, entitled

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

The bill was read a first time by its title and referred to the Committee on Insurance and Financial Services.

Reps. Steckloff and Arbit introduced

House Bill No. 5316, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 2156 (MCL 600.2156).

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

Reps. Arbit and Steckloff introduced

House Bill No. 5317, entitled

A bill to amend 1846 RS 158, entitled “Of offences against chastity, morality and decency,” by amending section 27 (MCL 752.527), as amended by 1991 PA 145.

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

Reps. Steckloff and Arbit introduced

House Bill No. 5318, entitled

A bill to amend 1846 RS 171, entitled “Of county jails and the regulation thereof,” by amending section 3 (MCL 801.3).

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

Reps. Arbit and Steckloff introduced

House Bill No. 5319, entitled

A bill to amend 1846 RS 83, entitled “Of marriage and the solemnization thereof,” by amending sections 7 and 16 (MCL 551.7 and 551.16), section 7 as amended by 2014 PA 278 and section 16 as amended by 2006 PA 419.

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

Rep. Wilson introduced

House Bill No. 5320, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending section 8121 (MCL 600.8121), as amended by 2018 PA 6.

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

Rep. Kuhn introduced

House Bill No. 5321, entitled

A bill to provide for the reduction of the salaries of certain legislative staffs during certain periods; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

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

Reps. Phil Green, Aragona, Bierlein, Johnsen, BeGole, Rigas, St. Germaine and Jaime Greene introduced **House Bill No. 5322, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 270, entitled “Michigan strategic fund act,” (MCL 125.2001 to 125.2094) by adding section 7c.

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

Reps. Aragona, Bierlein, Johnsen, BeGole, Rigas, St. Germaine, Phil Green and Jaime Greene introduced **House Bill No. 5323, entitled**

A bill to amend 1984 PA 431, entitled “The management and budget act,” by amending sections 114, 115, 241c, 261, 305, and 404 (MCL 18.1114, 18.1115, 18.1241c, 18.1261, 18.1305, and 18.1404), section 114 as amended by 2001 PA 61, section 115 as amended by 2018 PA 389, section 241c as added by 2016 PA 527, section 261 as amended by 2020 PA 174, and sections 305 and 404 as amended by 1999 PA 8, and by adding section 261g.

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

Reps. Wendzel, Aragona, Bierlein, Johnsen, BeGole, St. Germaine, Phil Green and Jaime Greene introduced

House Bill No. 5324, entitled

A bill to amend 1984 PA 431, entitled “The management and budget act,” by amending sections 213 and 215 (MCL 18.1213 and 18.1215), section 213 as amended by 2006 PA 269 and section 215 as amended by 1988 PA 504.

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

Reps. Bierlein, Aragona, Johnsen, BeGole, St. Germaine, Phil Green and Jaime Greene introduced **House Bill No. 5325, entitled**

A bill to amend 2000 PA 489, entitled “Michigan trust fund act,” by amending section 2 (MCL 12.252), as amended by 2023 PA 174, and by adding section 3b.

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

Reps. Aragona, Wozniak, BeGole, DeBoyer, Roth, St. Germaine, McKinney and Shannon introduced **House Bill No. 5326, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 5735 and 8511 (MCL 600.5735 and 600.8511), section 5735 as amended by 2004 PA 105 and section 8511 as amended by 2014 PA 124.

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

Reps. Rogers, Mentzer, McFall, Haadsma, Alexander, Wozniak, Morgan, Andrews, Fitzgerald, Rheingans, Glanville, Paiz, Wilson and VanderWall introduced

House Bill No. 5327, entitled

A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” by amending section 303 (MCL 436.1303), as amended by 2018 PA 154.

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

Reps. Wilson, Breen, Edwards, Dievendorf, Hope, Tsernoglou, Andrews, Rheingans and Rogers introduced

House Bill No. 5328, entitled

A bill to amend 1992 PA 234, entitled “The judges retirement act of 1992,” by amending section 714 (MCL 38.2664), as amended by 2002 PA 95.

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

Rep. Posthumus moved that Rep. Wozniak be excused temporarily from today’s session.
The motion prevailed.

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

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 148** be placed on its immediate passage.
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Senate Bill No. 148, entitled

A bill to amend 1969 PA 224, entitled “An act to license and regulate dealers in and research facilities using dogs and cats for research purposes; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 12 (MCL 287.392) and by adding sections 11a and 12a.

The bill was read a third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Morse moved to substitute (H-3) the bill.

The motion was seconded and the substitute (H-3) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was then passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 581

Yeas—63

Aiyash	Farhat	McKinney	Roth
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Mentzer	Scott
Aragona	Glanville	Miller	Shannon
Arbit	Grant	Morgan	Skaggs
Brabec	Greene, J.	Morse	Snyder
Breen	Haadsma	Mueller	Steckloff
Brixie	Hill	Neeley	Stone
Bymes	Hood	O’Neal	Tate
Carter, B.	Hope	Outman	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Paiz	Wegela
Churches	Koleszar	Pohutsky	Weiss
Coffia	Liberati	Price	Whitsett
Coleman	MacDonell	Puri	Wilson
Conlin	Martin	Rheingans	Witwer
Dievendorf	Martus	Rigas	Young
Edwards	McFall	Rogers	

Nays—43

Alexander	DeSana	Lightner	Slagh
Beeler	Filler	Maddock	Smit
BeGole	Fox	Markkanen	St. Germaine
Beson	Friske	Meerman	Steele
Bierlein	Green, P.	Neyer	Thompson
Bollin	Hall	Paquette	Tisdell
Borton	Harris	Posthumus	VanderWall
Carra	Hoadley	Prestin	VanWoerkom
Cavitt	Johnsen	Schmaltz	Wendzel
DeBoer	Kuhn	Schrivver	Zorn
DeBoyer	Kunse	Schuetter	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Aiyash moved that **Senate Bill No. 149** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

Senate Bill No. 149, entitled

A bill to amend 1969 PA 224, entitled “An act to license and regulate dealers in and research facilities using dogs and cats for research purposes; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,” by amending the title and sections 1 and 7 (MCL 287.381 and 287.387) and by adding section 8a.

The bill was read a third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Rep. Morse moved to substitute (H-4) the bill.

The motion was seconded and the substitute (H-4) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

The bill was then passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 582

Yeas—67

Aiyash	Farhat	Mentzer	Shannon
Andrews	Fitzgerald	Miller	Skaggs
Aragona	Glanville	Morgan	Snyder
Arbit	Grant	Morse	St. Germaine
Brabec	Haadsma	Mueller	Steckloff
Breen	Hill	Neeley	Stone
Brixie	Hood	O’Neal	Tate
Byrnes	Hope	Outman	Tisdell
Carter, B.	Hoskins	Paiz	Tsernoglou
Carter, T.	Koleszar	Pohutsky	VanderWall
Churches	Liberati	Prestin	Wegela
Coffia	MacDonell	Price	Weiss
Coleman	Markkanen	Puri	Whitsett
Conlin	Martin	Rheingans	Wilson
DeBoer	Martus	Rigas	Witwer
Dievendorf	McFall	Rogers	Young
Edwards	McKinney	Scott	

Nays—39

Alexander	DeSana	Kuhn	Schriver
Beeler	Filler	Kunse	Schuette
BeGole	Fox	Lightner	Slagh
Beson	Friske	Maddock	Smit
Bierlein	Green, P.	Meerman	Steele
Bollin	Greene, J.	Neyer	Thompson
Borton	Hall	Paquette	VanWoerkom
Carra	Harris	Posthumus	Wendzel
Cavitt	Hoadley	Roth	Zorn
DeBoyer	Johnsen	Schmaltz	

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the title of the bill.
Rep. Aiyash moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of
Motions and Resolutions

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 71 be suspended and the concurrent resolution be considered at this time.
The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

Rep. Haadsma offered the following concurrent resolution:
House Concurrent Resolution No. 11.

A concurrent resolution to authorize the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules to meet during the interim between sessions to consider waiving session days.

Whereas, Section 35 of the Administrative Procedures Act of 1969, MCL 24.235, creates the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. That section provides that the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules “may meet . . . during an interim between sessions”; and

Whereas, Under section 45a of the Administrative Procedures Act of 1969, MCL 24.245a, the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules has 15 session days in which to consider a proposed rule after receiving a notice of transmittal from an agency proposing a rule under section 45(2), MCL 24.245(2). However, the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules may waive any remaining session days under section 45a(1)(d); now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, pursuant to section 35 of the Administrative Procedures Act of 1969, the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules is authorized to meet during the interim between sessions to consider waiving session days pursuant to section 45a(1)(d).

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,
The concurrent resolution was adopted.

Messages from the Senate

House Bill No. 5141, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 388, entitled “Michigan campaign finance act,” by amending section 47 (MCL 169.247), as amended by 2015 PA 269, and by adding section 59.

The Senate has substituted (S-1) the bill.

The Senate has passed the bill as substituted (S-1) and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-1) made to the bill by the Senate,

The substitute (S-1) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 583

Yeas—60

Aiyash	Conlin	Martus	Schuette
Alexander	Dievendorf	McFall	Scott
Andrews	Edwards	McKinney	Shannon
Arbit	Farhat	Mentzer	Skaggs
BeGole	Fitzgerald	Miller	Snyder
Bierlein	Glanville	Morgan	Steckloff
Brabec	Grant	Morse	Stone
Breen	Haadsma	Neeley	Tate
Brixie	Hill	O’Neal	Tsernoglou

Byrnes	Hood	Paiz	Wegela
Carter, B.	Hope	Pohutsky	Weiss
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Price	Whitsett
Churches	Koleszar	Puri	Wilson
Coffia	Liberati	Rheingans	Witwer
Coleman	MacDonell	Rogers	Young

Nays—46

Aragona	Friske	Martin	Schriver
Beeler	Green, P.	Meerman	Slagh
Beson	Greene, J.	Mueller	Smit
Bollin	Hall	Neyer	St. Germaine
Borton	Harris	Outman	Steele
Carra	Hoadley	Paquette	Thompson
Cavitt	Johnsen	Posthumus	Tisdell
DeBoer	Kuhn	Prestin	VanderWall
DeBoyer	Kunse	Rigas	VanWoerkom
DeSana	Lightner	Roth	Wendzel
Filler	Maddock	Schmaltz	Zorn
Fox	Markkanen		

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

House Bill No. 5143, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 388, entitled “Michigan campaign finance act,” by amending section 2 (MCL 169.202), as amended by 2001 PA 250.
The Senate has substituted (S-1) the bill.
The Senate has passed the bill as substituted (S-1) and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.
The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.
Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 42 be suspended.
The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.
The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-1) made to the bill by the Senate,
The substitute (S-1) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 584

Yeas—61

Aiyash	Dievendorf	McFall	Schuette
Alexander	Edwards	McKinney	Scott
Andrews	Farhat	Mentzer	Shannon
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Miller	Skaggs
BeGole	Glanville	Morgan	Snyder
Bierlein	Grant	Morse	Steckloff
Brabec	Haadsma	Mueller	Stone
Breen	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Brixie	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Carter, B.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss

Carter, T.	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Churches	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Coffia	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Coleman	Martus	Rogers	Young
Conlin			

Nays—45

Aragona	Friske	Markkanen	Schriver
Beeler	Green, P.	Martin	Slagh
Beson	Greene, J.	Meerman	Smit
Bollin	Hall	Neyer	St. Germaine
Borton	Harris	Outman	Steele
Carra	Hoadley	Paquette	Thompson
Cavitt	Johnsen	Posthumus	Tisdell
DeBoer	Kuhn	Prestin	VanderWall
DeBoyer	Kunse	Rigas	VanWoerkom
DeSana	Lightner	Roth	Wendzel
Filler	Maddock	Schmaltz	Zorn
Fox			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

House Bill No. 5145, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 11d of chapter XVII (MCL 777.11d), as amended by 2023 PA 83.

The Senate has substituted (S-1) the bill.

The Senate has passed the bill as substituted (S-1) and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the substitute (S-1) made to the bill by the Senate,

The substitute (S-1) was concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 585

Yeas—58

Aiyash	Dievendorf	McFall	Scott
Alexander	Edwards	McKinney	Shannon
Andrews	Farhat	Mentzer	Skaggs
Arbit	Fitzgerald	Miller	Snyder
Bierlein	Glanville	Morgan	Steckloff
Brabec	Grant	Morse	Stone
Breen	Haadsma	Neeley	Tate
Brixie	Hill	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Hood	Paiz	Wegela
Carter, B.	Hope	Pohutsky	Weiss
Carter, T.	Hoskins	Price	Whitsett
Churches	Koleszar	Puri	Wilson

Coffia
Coleman
Conlin

Liberati
MacDonell
Martus

Rheingans
Rogers

Witwer
Young

Nays—48

Aragona
Beeler
BeGole
Beson
Bollin
Borton
Carra
Cavitt
DeBoer
DeBoyer
DeSana
Filler

Fox
Friske
Green, P.
Greene, J.
Hall
Harris
Hoadley
Johnsen
Kuhn
Kunse
Lightner
Maddock

Markkanen
Martin
Meerman
Mueller
Neyer
Outman
Paquette
Posthumus
Prestin
Rigas
Roth
Schmaltz

Schriver
Schuette
Slagh
Smit
St. Germaine
Steele
Thompson
Tisdell
VanderWall
VanWoerkom
Wendzel
Zorn

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

House Bill No. 5144, entitled

A bill to amend 1954 PA 116, entitled “Michigan election law,” (MCL 168.1 to 168.992) by adding section 932f.

The Senate has amended the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 8, by inserting:

“(e) If the media was generated by editing an existing image, audio, or video, the media includes a citation directing the viewer or listener to the original source from which the unedited version of the existing image, audio, or video was obtained.”.

2. Amend page 5, line 14, by striking out the balance of the bill and inserting:

“(iii) Was produced by artificial intelligence as that term is defined in section 2 of the Michigan campaign finance act, 1976 PA 388, MCL 169.202.

Enacting section 1. This amendatory act does not take effect unless House Bill No. 5143 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

The Senate has passed the bill as amended and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The Speaker announced that pursuant to Rule 42, the bill was laid over one day.

Rep. Aiyash moved that Rule 42 be suspended.

The motion prevailed, 3/5 of the members present voting therefor.

The question being on concurring in the amendments made to the bill by the Senate,

The amendments were concurred in, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays, as follows:

Roll Call No. 586

Yeas—61

Aiyash
Alexander
Andrews
Arbit
BeGole

Dievendorf
Edwards
Farhat
Fitzgerald
Glanville

McFall
McKinney
Mentzer
Miller
Morgan

Schuette
Scott
Shannon
Skaggs
Snyder

Bierlein	Grant	Morse	Steckloff
Brabec	Haadsma	Mueller	Stone
Breen	Hill	Neeley	Tate
Brixie	Hood	O’Neal	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Hope	Paiz	Wegela
Carter, B.	Hoskins	Pohutsky	Weiss
Carter, T.	Koleszar	Price	Whitsett
Churches	Liberati	Puri	Wilson
Coffia	MacDonell	Rheingans	Witwer
Coleman	Martus	Rogers	Young
Conlin			

Nays—45

Aragona	Friske	Markkanen	Schriver
Beeler	Green, P.	Martin	Slagh
Beson	Greene, J.	Meerman	Smit
Bollin	Hall	Neyer	St. Germaine
Borton	Harris	Outman	Steele
Carra	Hoadley	Paquette	Thompson
Cavitt	Johnsen	Posthumus	Tisdell
DeBoer	Kuhn	Prestin	VanderWall
DeBoyer	Kunse	Rigas	VanWoerkom
DeSana	Lightner	Roth	Wendzel
Filler	Maddock	Schmaltz	Zorn
Fox			

In The Chair: Pohutsky

The House agreed to the full title.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of
Motions and Resolutions

Rep. Aiyash moved that when the House adjourns today it stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, at 11:30 a.m.
The motion prevailed.

Messages from the Senate

House Bill No. 4230, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 390, entitled “An act to regulate the time and manner of payment of wages and fringe benefits to employees; to prescribe rights and responsibilities of employers and employees, and the powers and duties of the department of labor; to require keeping of records; to provide for settlement of disputes regarding wages and fringe benefits; to prohibit certain practices by employers; to prescribe penalties and remedies; and to repeal certain acts and parts of acts,” by amending section 7 (MCL 408.477), as amended by 2015 PA 15.
The Senate has passed the bill.
The bill was referred to the Clerk for enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor.

House Bill No. 4234, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 388, entitled “Michigan campaign finance act,” by amending sections 4, 6, 11, 54, 55, and 57 (MCL 169.204, 169.206, 169.211, 169.254, 169.255, and 169.257), sections 4, 6, 54, and 55 as amended by 2019 PA 93, section 11 as amended by 2017 PA 119, and section 57 as amended by 2015 PA 269.

The Senate has passed the bill and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The House agreed to the full title.

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

House Bill No. 4276, entitled

A bill to amend 1939 PA 280, entitled “The social welfare act,” (MCL 400.1 to 400.119b) by adding sections 105i and 105j.

The Senate has passed the bill and pursuant to Joint Rule 20, inserted the full title.

The House agreed to the full title.

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

To the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

House Bill No. 4457, entitled

A bill to designate June 19 of each year as Juneteenth.

The Senate has passed the bill.

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

Rep. Filler moved that the House adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 7:25 p.m.

The Speaker Pro Tempore declared the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, at 11:30 a.m.

RICHARD J. BROWN

Clerk of the House of Representatives