

No. 55  
STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**Journal of the Senate**  
102nd Legislature  
REGULAR SESSION OF 2023

---

---

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, June 8, 2023.

10:00 a.m.

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

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

Albert—present  
Anthony—present  
Bayer—present  
Bellino—present  
Brinks—present  
Bumstead—present  
Camilleri—present  
Cavanagh—present  
Chang—present  
Cherry—present  
Daley—present  
Damoose—present  
Geiss—present

Hauck—present  
Hertel—present  
Hoitenga—present  
Huizenga—present  
Irwin—present  
Johnson—present  
Klinefelt—present  
Lauwers—present  
Lindsey—present  
McBroom—present  
McCann—present  
McDonald Rivet—present  
McMorrow—present

Moss—present  
Nesbitt—present  
Outman—present  
Polehanki—present  
Runestad—present  
Santana—present  
Shink—present  
Singh—present  
Theis—present  
Victory—present  
Webber—present  
Wojno—present

Senator Joseph N. Bellino, Jr. of the 16th District offered the following invocation:

My Creator, I am now willing that You should have all of me, good and bad. I pray that You remove from me every single defect of character which stands in the way of my usefulness to my fellows. Grant me strength as I go out there and do Your bidding. Amen.

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

### Motions and Communications

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

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

The following communications were received and read:  
Office of the Senate Majority Leader

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Hertel, Senator Klinefelt, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative Morgan, Representative Wilson, and Representative Cavitt as conferees for HB 4244.  
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Shink, Senator Santana, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative Wilson, Representative Weiss, and Representative Lightner as conferees for HB 4245.  
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Shink, Senator Santana, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative O'Neal, Representative McKinney, and Representative Slagh as conferees for HB 4247.  
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Cavanagh, Senator Santana, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative Skaggs, Representative Brixie, and Representative Schuette as conferees for HB 4281.  
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Cherry, Senator Shink, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative Brixie, Representative Martus, and Representative Borton as conferees for HB 4289.  
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Cherry, Senator Shink, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative Brixie, Representative Martus, and Representative Borton as conferees for HB 4290.  
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Cherry, Senator Bayer, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative Brabec, Representative Hood, and Representative Bollin as conferees for HB 4292.  
If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

June 7, 2023

I appoint Senator Santana, Senator McDonald Rivet, and Senator Bumstead to join Representative Morse, Representative Martus, and Representative Phil Green as conferees for HB 4310.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely  
Winnie Brinks  
Senate Majority Leader

The communications were referred to the Secretary for record.

Senators Johnson and Santana entered the Senate Chamber.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, assumed the Chair.

Senator Camilleri entered the Senate Chamber.

The following communication was received:

Department of State

Administrative Rules  
Notice of Filing

March 21, 2023

In accordance with the requirements of Section 46 of Act No. 306 of the Public Acts of 1969, being MCL 24.246, and paragraph 16 of Executive Order 1995-6, this is to advise you that the Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules filed Administrative Rule #2020-131-LR (Secretary of State Filing #23-03-09) on this date at 3:14 p.m. for the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs entitled, "Unarmed Combat."

These rules take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State unless adopted under section 33, 44, or 45a(9) of the administrative procedures act of 1969, 1969 PA 306, MCL 24.233, 24.244, or 24.245a. Rules adopted under these sections become effective 7 days after filing with the Secretary of State.

Sincerely,  
Jocelyn Benson  
Secretary of State  
Lashana Threlkeld, Departmental Supervisor  
Office of the Great Seal

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

The following communication was received:

Office of Senator Sue Shink

May 26, 2023

I respectfully request to be added as a cosponsor to Senate Bill 352 "Next of Kin" special registration vehicle plate.

Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Sue Shink  
State Senator  
14th District

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bill, now on Committee Reports, be placed on the General Orders calendar for consideration today:

**House Bill No. 4555**

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

**Introduction and Referral of Bills**

Senator Brinks entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Bellino introduced

**Senate Bill No. 380, entitled**

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending section 101 (MCL 388.1701), as amended by 2022 PA 144.

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

Senators Runestad, Johnson, Bellino, McBroom, Daley, Bumstead, Damoose, Lindsey and Webber introduced

**Senate Bill No. 381, entitled**

A bill to regulate political activity; to require certain state officials to file certain reports; to prescribe penalties and civil sanctions; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state officers and entities.

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

Senators Geiss and Chang entered the Senate Chamber.

Senators Chang, Cavanagh, Bayer, Geiss, Wojno, Cherry, Shink, Irwin, Moss, Santana and Camilleri introduced

**Senate Bill No. 382, entitled**

A bill to facilitate access to state services by individuals with limited English proficiency; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; and to provide for biennial reports concerning equal language access.

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

Senators Cavanagh, Chang, Bayer, Geiss, Wojno, Cherry, Shink, Irwin, Moss, Santana and Camilleri introduced

**Senate Bill No. 383, entitled**

A bill to provide for the statewide coordination of equal language access to state services by individuals with limited English proficiency; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; and to establish a process for submitting complaints and obtaining remedies for lack of equal language access and for denials of equal access based on one’s national origin.

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

**House Bill No. 4420, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” (MCL 760.1 to 777.69) by adding section 21b to chapter XVI.

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

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

**House Bill No. 4421, entitled**

A bill to amend 1985 PA 87, entitled “William Van Regenmorter crime victim’s rights act,” by amending sections 8, 38, and 68 (MCL 780.758, 780.788, and 780.818), as amended by 2012 PA 457.

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

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

**House Bill No. 4422, entitled**

A bill to amend 1985 PA 87, entitled “William Van Regenmorter crime victim’s rights act,” by amending sections 61 and 61a (MCL 780.811 and 780.811a), section 61 as amended by 2018 PA 370 and section 61a as amended by 2005 PA 184.

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

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

**House Bill No. 4423, entitled**

A bill to amend 1985 PA 87, entitled “William Van Regenmorter crime victim’s rights act,” by amending sections 15, 43, and 75 (MCL 780.765, 780.793, and 780.825), as amended by 2018 PA 153.

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

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

**House Bill No. 4516, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 389, entitled “An act to provide for the prevention and treatment of domestic and sexual violence; to develop and establish policies, procedures, and standards for providing domestic and sexual violence assistance programs and services; to declare the powers and duties of the Michigan domestic and sexual violence prevention and treatment board; to establish a domestic violence prevention and treatment fund and provide for its use; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to prescribe immunities and liabilities of certain persons and officials; and to prescribe penalties for violations of this act,” by amending section 1 (MCL 400.1501), as amended by 2018 PA 281.

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

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**General Orders**

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

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

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

**House Bill No. 4555, entitled**

A bill to designate June 12 of each year as Women Veterans Recognition Day.

The bill was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Motions and Communications**

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

**House Bill No. 4555**

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

**Resolutions**

Senator Singh moved that rule 3.204 be suspended to permit immediate consideration of the following resolutions:

**Senate Resolution No. 58****Senate Resolution No. 59****Senate Resolution No. 60**

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

Senator Bellino offered the following resolution:

**Senate Resolution No. 58.**

A resolution to recognize June 10, 2023, as Alcoholics Anonymous Day.

Whereas, On June 10, 1935, Bill Wilson and Dr. Bob Smith first met, and what grew out of that meeting was Alcoholics Anonymous; and

Whereas, Out of Alcoholics Anonymous, the 12-step program, a set of spiritual guiding principles to assist in recovery from alcoholism, was developed; and

Whereas, Alcoholics Anonymous has been a positive guide for countless people over the world as they have battled the disease of alcoholism; and

Whereas, Numerous people, both in America and worldwide, are sober because of their experiences in Alcoholics Anonymous; and

Whereas, The 12-step program has been adopted by numerous groups around the world to assist people struggling with other addictions, such as narcotics, gambling, and overeating; and

Whereas, We stand in solidarity with our families, friends, and neighbors struggling with alcoholism; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize June 10, 2023, as Alcoholics Anonymous Day.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Brinks, Chang, Cherry, Lauwers and Shink were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

June 10 is a big day in the history of the world, and you may ask why. Well it's not because I was born that day; it was a day attributed to Alcoholics Anonymous' founding. You see, in the spring of 1935, a young man named Bill W. was struggling at getting sober, but he worked with a doctor at Towns Hospital and he found out that working with others that had the same malady he had—because at that time, Mr. President, there was no cure for alcoholism or drug addiction; you either died, you got locked up, or you put the jug down—he didn't know how to put the jug down and quit drinking. But he found out working with others helped him a lot, so he started working with others. It wasn't going very well but he kept doing it—kept doing it. He wasn't drinking, but others weren't getting the message yet.

He was on a business trip in Akron, Ohio; it was May 13. His business trip went south, he didn't sell what he was trying to sell, and he went to the bar at the hotel where he was staying. He thought, You know, I have one dime left, I'm making a phone call. So he called a church; the church had a pastor there. The pastor hooked him up with a lady named Henrietta Seiberling, and she knew a doctor who drank too much and wasn't a very good surgeon when he was drinking. So she called the doctor and the doctor said, Yeah, I will meet with this gentleman, I'll give him ten minutes. Six hours later, Bill W. left. That day was the start of a fantastic friendship. This doctor, Dr. Bob, did drink one more time but on June 10 they met again and Dr. Bob took his last drink. They started talking about how do we help others, how do we keep ourselves sober—

Henrietta Seiberling knew a pastor that had a doctor friend who was a drunk and he couldn't get sober, and his name was Dr. Bob. Bill W. met with Dr. Bob that night. Doctor Bob said, Look, I'll give the guy ten minutes, he's out of my house. They stayed six hours and became lifelong friends. Through the next five years they formulated the 12 Steps of Alcoholics Anonymous, wrote *The Big Book*, and put millions of people on the road to recovery.

It is important to note, Mr. President, that before this time, all the great psychiatrists in the world said that there's no hope for desperate alcoholics or drug addicts. No hope at all, either you got institutionalized or you died. Dr. Carl Jung worked with Dr. Bob for a while and said, I can't help you, you're on your own. It is important to realize that when these guys met for five years, that they formulated these 12 Steps and the word "higher power" came into presence. There was a lot of discussion about this, sir. Do they use the word "Jesus Christ" or "higher power"? The people in Akron wanted to use the word "Jesus Christ" but the AA people in New York wanted to use the word "higher power" and they prevailed. That was a great thing for the 12 Step growth because anybody from all over the world—from any spirituality—could get sober using these 12 Steps.

Senators Geiss, Cherry, Shink, Klinefelt, Chang, Brinks, Bayer, McMorrow, McCann, Irwin and Wojno offered the following resolution:

**Senate Resolution No. 59.**

A resolution to commemorate June 12, 2023, as Loving Day.

Whereas, Mildred and Richard Loving were an interracial couple who were married in Washington D.C., in 1958, but were banned from marrying in their home state of Virginia, where interracial marriage was illegal at the time; and

Whereas, The Lovings were arrested five weeks after their marriage, found guilty of violating the Act to Preserve Racial Integrity, and banned from the state of Virginia for 25 years; and

Whereas, The Lovings challenged this ruling five years into their 25 year sentence and their case was taken up by the American Civil Liberties Union; and

Whereas, *Loving v. Virginia* worked its way through the judicial system until the United States Supreme Court unanimously decided in 1967 that the Lovings' marriage should be upheld; and

Whereas, The Virginia statute was found unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution which forbids states from restricting basic rights of citizens or other persons; and

Whereas, Laws banning interracial marriages were found similarly unconstitutional and struck down in 16 remaining states that observed them; and

Whereas, Loving Day was founded in 2004, and has garnered support from thousands of people domestically and internationally, and from organizations and publications; and

Whereas, Loving Day celebrations aim to create a common connection between multiracial communities, groups, and individuals; and

Whereas, Loving Day's mission is to fight racial prejudice, promote tolerance, awareness, and understanding through education, and foster supportive multicultural communities; and

Whereas, Loving Day seeks to commemorate and celebrate the United States Supreme Court's 1967 ruling, keeping its importance fresh in the minds of a generation that has grown up with interracial relationships being legal, as well as to explore issues facing couples currently in interracial relationships; and

Whereas, Michigan has long celebrated and enjoyed this freedom since it became state law in 1883 by repeal of the 1838 Miscegenation Act; and

Whereas, We now advance through the 21st century as a multiracial and multicultural society and realize that we must find a common vision from our interwoven past to build a society free of racism for the benefit of our collective future; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body commemorate June 12, 2023, as Loving Day.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Polehanki and Cavanagh were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Geiss' statement is as follows:

I rise to offer Senate Resolution No. 59 to recognize June 12 as Loving Day in the state of Michigan. It's only been 56 years that interracial marriage has been legal in the entire country. While interracial coupling isn't new, historically here in the country, until 1967, it existed by force, or under threat of a range of penalties, or in secret, if recognized at all. And where it was legal—in inconsistent patches—interracial couples were only often safe in the areas where it was legal. Its illegality threatened freedom of domicile and travel at best, life itself at worst, and denied interracial couples life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It's thanks to the fight of Mildred and Richard Loving—yes, their real surname—an interracial couple who in 1958 were married in Washington, D.C. Despite being legally wed, their marriage was not recognized in their home state of Virginia and they received harsh treatment from the state.

Now to us today, this is unconscionable since states uphold the marriage licenses of people married elsewhere. Not in 1958 though when in Virginia and many other states interracial marriage was illegal. But the Lovings recognized that this prohibition of their union was fundamentally unconstitutional and fought the Jim Crow-era law.

Five years into their 25-year sentence in 1963 for violating Virginia's 1924 act to preserve racial integrity and being banned from the state for 25 years, their case was taken up by the American Civil Liberties Union in 1963 and *Loving v. Virginia* worked its way through the judicial system until the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously decided in 1967 that the Lovings' marriage should be upheld because the Virginia statute that arrested and banished them was found unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which forbids states from restricting basic rights of citizens or other persons.

This ruling was not just a victory for the Lovings or for Virginians alone, it was a victory for the country as laws banning interracial marriages, called anti-miscegenation laws, were found similarly unconstitutional and struck down in 16 remaining states that still observed them in 1967.

It took until 2004—37 years after *Loving v. Virginia* was decided—for Loving Day to be founded. In the last nearly 20 years, it has garnered support from thousands of people, organizations, and publications worldwide. Loving Day celebrations aim to create a common connection between multiracial communities, groups, and individuals; and its mission to fight racial prejudice, promote tolerance, awareness, and understanding through education, and foster supportive multicultural communities, while commemorating and celebrating the U.S. Supreme Court’s 1967 ruling. It’s necessary to keep its importance fresh in the minds of a generation—almost two now—that has grown up with interracial relationships being legal. We’ve seen what happens when we fall asleep on rulings that we’ve taken for granted as being protected, secure, and permanent. And today, with ever-increasing threats to multiculturalism and a robust multi-racial community and society, it’s important to also explore issues facing couples in interracial relationships, and we must be intersectional about this.

The state of Michigan has long celebrated and enjoyed this freedom since it became state law in 1883 by repeal of the 1838 Miscegenation Act, but it’s imperative to redouble and recommit our efforts to foster a welcoming state with great intentionality today now as we advance through the 21st century as a multiracial and multicultural society, and realize that we must find a common vision from our interwoven past to build a society free of racism for the benefit of our collective future.

Last century, *Loving v. Virginia* was pivotal in terms of respecting the freedom to love who you love and ushering a first wave of marriage equality and civil rights in this country, and thus paving the way for other civil rights decisions in this century affirming that love is love. Let this body resolve that June 12, 2023 is Loving Day in the state of Michigan.

Senator Moss offered the following resolution:

**Senate Resolution No. 60.**

A resolution to recognize June 2023 as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer+ (LGBTQ+) Pride Month.

Whereas, Pride began in 1970 with the one year anniversary of the Stonewall Riots, a multi-day protest that is credited by many for starting the modern-day LGBTQ+ movement. In 1969, LGBTQ+ individuals, led by the efforts of Black and Brown trans women such as activists Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera, risked their lives to protest the over-policing and injustice that threatened their existence on a daily basis, and elevated the visibility of the movement to a national scale; and

Whereas, The LGBTQ+ community has persevered through tragedies and struggles, such as the government’s insufficient and delayed response to assisting those with HIV/AIDS and the ongoing effort to protect the rights and ensure the safety of the LGBTQ+ community; and

Whereas, The movement has also celebrated victories of recognition, especially the historic *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision in 2015 which recognized marriage equality nationwide, the *Bostock v. Clayton County* decision in 2020 that upheld federal employment protections for the LGBTQ+ community, and *Rouch World v. Department of Civil Rights* in 2022 that affirmed LGBTQ+ protections are included in Michigan’s Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act; and

Whereas, After a fifty year legislative effort, the Michigan House and Senate in its 102nd Legislature, at long last, added sexual orientation and gender identity or expression as protected classes in the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act, which was signed into law as Public Act 6 of 2023; and

Whereas, Still today, LGBTQ+ individuals, especially a disproportionate number of trans women of color, continue to be a target of harassment, violence, and discrimination, yet through community support and solidarity continue to celebrate love, authentic living, and self-acceptance; and

Whereas, Michigan stands out in this watershed moment as a state that embraces equality because our communities benefit from diversity and variety in viewpoints, talents, and cultural perspectives of its residents and from preserving the freedom, worth, and dignity of those in the LGBTQ+ community; and

Whereas, Michigan should expend all efforts to attract and retain talent and signal to the nation we are welcoming to all those who wish to contribute to the economic vitality of our state; and

Whereas, The people of Michigan understand, appreciate, and value the cultural, civic, and economic contributions of the LGBTQ+ community to the larger success of the state, and commit to the learning, humility, and work necessary to make the state fair, safe, equitable, and a refuge of stability regardless of sexual orientation, gender identity, or expression; and

Whereas, June is recognized and celebrated as LGBTQ+ Pride Month throughout the country and worldwide; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize June 2023 as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer+ (LGBTQ+) Pride Month.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Brinks, Chang, Cherry, Hertel, McMorrow, Polehanki and Shink were named co-sponsors of the resolution.



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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Moss' statement is as follows:

The first Pride celebration in Michigan was called Christopher Street Detroit in 1972, named after the street where the Stonewall Inn was located and the riots occurred in New York that spurred a national movement three years prior. It included a march in downtown Detroit that was restricted to a single lane of Woodward Avenue with roughly 200 to 400 participants led by a drag queen named Aretha who rode on the front hood of a brown 1964 Ford Galaxie. The event had two stated goals: repeal anti-queer laws and protect queer rights.

This is all too familiar. Fifty-one years later in so many parts of our country, that fight remains the exact same, maybe even worse. Many states are rolling back LGBTQ protections and instituting harsh restrictions on our freedoms that threaten our safety and welfare. They're even outlawing drag queens. A year ago, when the Republican majority wouldn't even let me adopt this resolution, this could have been Michigan's future too as our state was embarking on a campaign cycle that yet again placed the LGBTQ community in the crosshairs. But Michiganders would not let hate win. We will not go backwards; we are only progressing forward.

This weekend in Detroit, roughly 55,000 people will attend the Motor City Pride Festival and countless other events that will be held this month all throughout our state. And we will be celebrating our newly-gained protections in the Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act and the work ahead here to ban conversion therapy, expand our hate crimes law and much, much more. As Texas, Florida, Tennessee and elsewhere have taken up a lot of volume and space as they spew their hatred, we in Michigan have a unique responsibility to be just as loud and demonstrate how a state can thrive by valuing diversity and protecting all communities in the law.

To marginalized members of our community across the country: just look where Michigan has been and where we are going; you have a future too. To those who still face discrimination here in our state: the law is finally on your side and you have a path to seek justice.

Today I have before this body Senate Resolution No. 60, to commemorate June 2023 as LGBTQ+ Pride Month in the state of Michigan. In the past nine years, I have seen this resolution get ridiculed, dismissed, compromised, and rejected again; but those days are over. I don't have to negotiate the terms to live my true and authentic self in this chamber, and neither should any Michigander in this state. We aren't going anywhere; we are here to stay, and so is this resolution. I ask for its adoption. Happy Pride Month.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Shink's statement is as follows:

Today is one of those days when we say goodbye to one of our friends as their career takes them in a new direction. Brenda Pilgrim started in my office in January as legislative director. From the very beginning, Brenda has been an important part of our team as we have navigated the busy first days of the 102nd Legislature. The pace during the first few weeks and months in a brand-new office was relentless, and Brenda had never ever worked in the Legislature before joining our team. She learned quickly and has done important work while here.

Brenda has become more than a legislative director to our team. To my staff, she's been their counselor, advisor, mentor, therapist, and everything in between. She's provided the office with a calming atmosphere with the morning chimes of her Tibetan singing bowl and her afternoon impromptu opera serenade—which I have to admit I miss and I'm sorry that I did. Her door is always open to anyone who has needed a friend. She's been a force for good since long before her work in my office in the Jackson community. From Meals on Wheels and Community Action Agency to the Salvation Army and the American Cancer Society, as well as Legacy Land Conservancy, Brenda is very active in the community. She has brought years of hands-on experience in Jackson to the Legislature and we are very grateful for that.

She's a tremendous asset to the state of Michigan and the people of District No. 14 and we are going to miss Brenda, although she is not going far. We thank her for all the work she has done and all the good she brings to the world each and every day.

### Recess

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:30 a.m.

10:55 a.m.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Third Reading of Bills**

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

**House Bill No. 4555**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**House Bill No. 4555, entitled**

A bill to designate June 12 of each year as Women Veterans Recognition Day.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 328**

**Yeas—38**

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

**Nays—0**

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

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

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

I rise to support this bill as it is worthy, but just as important—but maybe even more important—it is not paid for by the taxpayers. It is not giving a big paid holiday to unions and to other entities that the vast majority of the citizens of Michigan do not get. So many of these holidays that we do—paid holidays—are so wonderful for big corporate Americans that they don’t care. They are wonderful for the government

because it’s taxpayer dollars, who cares. The way things are going it seems like we might have another one, two, five more paid holidays presented while I’m here. I will not support any more paid holidays, but I do support this since it is an unpaid holiday.

Furthermore, for those intent on utilizing their argument through intimidation and their ad hominem attacks when the next series of paid holidays are presented that you want the taxpayers to fund—your B.S. accusations to intimidate me will not work with me. I will not pay for another paid holiday on the back of the taxpayers.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 134, entitled**

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled “Revised judicature act of 1961,” by amending sections 1084 and 1091 (MCL 600.1084 and 600.1091), section 1084 as amended by 2017 PA 161 and section 1091 as amended by 2018 PA 591.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 329**

**Yeas—38**

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

**Nays—0**

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 135, entitled**

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled “Michigan vehicle code,” by amending sections 83 and 304 (MCL 257.83 and 257.304), section 83 as added by 2020 PA 383 and section 304 as amended by 2020 PA 376.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 330**

**Yeas—38**

Albert	Daley	Lauwers	Polehanki
Anthony	Damoose	Lindsey	Runestad

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

Nays—0

Excused—0

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: President

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

### Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 11:02 a.m.

11:21 a.m.

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

The following bill was read a third time:

#### **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 question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Albert offered the following amendment:

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 question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 331**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

Senator Theis offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 2, line 11, by striking out the balance of the subsection.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 332**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: President

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

Senator Hauck offered the following amendments:

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) A public employee may, by submitting a written request to the public employee’s public employer, elect to not provide the public employee’s employment and contact information to a representative as provided for under subsection (1). A public employer that receives a written request from a public employee under this subsection shall not provide the public employee’s employment and contact information to a representative.”**

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

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

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

**Roll Call No. 333****Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Damoose offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

**“(4) 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 question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 334**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 2, line 14, after “**address.**” by striking out the balance of the subdivision.
2. Amend page 3, following line 9, by inserting:

**“(4) Not later than 30 days after a public employer hires a public employee, the public employer shall provide to the public employee the employment and contact information of the individual in the public employee’s bargaining unit who is the contact person for the representative of the public employee described in section 11. Every 90 days, a public employer shall provide to each of its public employees the employment and contact information of the contact person.**

**(5) The employment and contact information provided under subsection (4) must include all of the following for the contact person:**

- (a) **First, middle, and last name.**
- (b) **Home address. However, if the contact person’s home address is a confidential address, the public employer shall not provide the home address of the contact person and shall instead provide the contact person’s designated address.**
- (c) **Personal telephone number.**
- (d) **Personal email address.**
- (e) **Work email address.**
- (f) **Wage.**
- (6) **As used in this section:**

**(a) “Confidential address” means that term as defined in section 3 of the address confidentiality program act, 2020 PA 301, MCL 780.853.**

**(b) “Designated address” means that term as defined in section 3 of the address confidentiality program act, 2020 PA 301, MCL 780.853.”**

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 335****Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Theis offered the following amendments:

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 question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 336****Yeas—18**

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



**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 337****Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protests**

Senators Albert, McBroom and Nesbitt, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 169 and moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the bill be printed as their reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

This legislation goes much too far. It moves beyond reasonably assisting legitimate communication between a union and the employees it represents into an unwarranted invasion of privacy and potential misuse of personal information. We cannot forget that in the public sector, because of the United States Supreme Court's decision, a worker has the ability to decide for themselves whether or not they want to belong to a union. That right must be respected. Personal information like this should not be released without the worker's consent, particularly if that worker has already decided to not join a union.

Beyond that, this legislation has implications for all public employees and those who wish to become public employees in the future. It is one thing for a union to request reasonable work-focused contact information for the employees it represents and then receive it from the employer. This already happens. But it is another thing entirely for state government to mandate that all public sector employees regularly gather and update this overly broad sort of personal information and give it to a union automatically. It adds a lot of work for school administrators, local government officials, and other tasks from this mandate from the state government. It discloses certain information that does not have to be and should not be disclosed.

It also raises questions about how this contact information would be used. Would home addresses and personal phone numbers be utilized only in legitimate workplace matters, or would they be used to recruit new union members or even harass non-members? There are no safeguards in this bill to distinguish. Like the right-to-work repeal measures that came before it, I worry this legislation is driven more by politics than policy. There are processes that allow unions to gather certain contact information right now. Why mandate these additional and overly-broad steps?

This is another attempt to boost union membership and drive political donations to Democratic causes and candidates which unions overwhelmingly support. State government should not be assisting this kind of effort, and I will be voting "no."

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Do-not-call lists, opt-outs, these are all options we provide people that we expect for ourselves. We demand for ourselves. We pass laws about these things. Repeatedly, because "no" means "no," and once I say "no," I shouldn't have to be harassed every 90 days to say "no" again. It's a simple consumer protectionism. It's a simple service that we expect for each of us as having our own personal rights and now we're literally proposing that the employees of this state shouldn't have that ability? We're not going to give them the same opportunity to avoid harassing phone calls, to avoid harassing e-mails, to even potentially avoid harassing door knocking? I'm just absolutely shocked at the lack of consideration we're affording to our state employees today. And for what? Who needs this? Who's asking for this? Are the state employees asking for this? Have they come into someone's office and said, You know, I really would have decided to join if somebody had just come and asked me every day, every 90 days. If that's the case, let's do it every day. Let's update the list every day. Give them the opportunity every day to come back and do this. No, it's not the employees asking for this.

Folks around here know that I've been very supportive and sympathetic to organized labor and believe we need organized labor. I think they play a vital role in the balance of power and the balance of worker protection and proper wages and many other reasons, but why are we doing this? The reason we need unions and the reason they have to exist is because management, no matter how many good laws and labor protections we put in place, will always find a new way to abuse labor. It's going to happen. But we can't sit here and also then ignore the fact that organized labor will also exert those same influences and that there are members within it, especially in its leadership, who will do unethical and harassing treatment of employees. And now we're just going to provide them no protection, not even their home address and private phone numbers? Who's asking for this? Who are we here to serve? We should be serving the people, and as the employers of thousands of people in this state we should certainly be considerate of them and their needs. We allow them to be unionized. We give the unions a lot of opportunity to argue their case. Their signs are mandated by law to be presented on the walls and in the break rooms, but now we're going to also allow them to be harassed at their homes?

The bill is just absolutely a baffling journey into absolute lack of need, inconsistency, and inconsiderateness for the thousands of people who work for us every day. I ask for a "no" vote.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

United States of America public employees have a constitutional right to work—free of being forced to join a union—and while some in the chamber wish they could ignore the Constitution and the United States Supreme Court's interpretation of it, that still doesn't change the fact that public employees have that fundamental freedom protected. But of course some here just don't let people who choose not to join a union

like free of coercion and intimidation. It's almost like you all eliminated the provisions from the law on purpose. No, under this bill someone who wishes to live free of becoming entangled in the constrictive tentacles of a public sector union is not allowed such a privilege and now must turn over their updated personal contact information, not just once in their career, not once every five years, not once every ten years, but once every three months—four times per year—to a union boss. Why?

Why? So unions can communicate opportunities to those not in the union should they wish to join it. Kind of like being made an offer you just can't refuse. Strongarming and intimidation aside, what if there are other reasons that a public employee wouldn't want to turn over this information to a particular union or to a particular union boss or someone in their leadership? Perhaps it could be because of well-documented cases of corruption or embezzlement like in 2018 when a local AFSCME union boss was charged with stealing \$600,000 from the union. Or perhaps it could be because a person disagrees with the known funding of politicians and causes that just don't align with their fundamental beliefs. Or perhaps it could even be because of well-known and documented rumors of harassment and sexual assault by powerful, well-connected, and protected union bosses. I can see how giving your personal information to such a person would make an individual feel uncomfortable. Forasmuch as labor talks about workplace safety, this seems like it has the potential to create unsafe situations. And these are just some of the many reasons why taxpayer dollars and resources should not be used for union recruitment and promotion.

You want to recruit? Make your pitch for a potential new member. I say it, with your own money and on your own time, but no, once again, here we are, Democrats to the rescue with another special handout to their big union labor backers. Forced unionization, inflated wages for public construction, and now mandatory turning-over of private information of people who likely already refused to join the union. I wish I could say I was surprised, but this is par for the course so far this year under this new majority.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert's first statement is as follows:

This bill would mandate automatic disclosure of public employees' personal contact information to labor unions. That includes workers' home address, personal telephone numbers, and private e-mail addresses. If Democrats are going to continue down this misguided path, the Legislature should at least ensure these same public employees are aware of their rights under the terms of the United States Supreme Court decision from 2018. In the *Janus* decision, the Supreme Court determined public employees cannot be forced to join a union or pay union dues. Public employees deserve to know these rights, especially if their personal phone numbers and other sensitive information is going to be given to a labor union they don't belong to or don't want to belong to.

This amendment would ensure that public employees are regularly notified about their rights under this Supreme Court decision. Thank you, and I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

Senator Theis' first statement is as follows:

This amendment seeks to protect workers' privacy rights by shielding their personal contact information from being shared with union officials. My amendment would simply restrict the sharing of an employee's personal information so that it only includes—that we're providing to the union officials—so that it would only include employee name, department or agency, classification, and address of work.

Protecting workers' privacy rights is essential for upholding individual dignity, fostering trust and morale, ensuring personal safety, preventing discrimination, promoting work-life balance, supporting psychological well-being, and meeting legal and ethical obligations. Respecting workers' privacy rights creates a positive and inclusive work environment where all employees can thrive and contribute effectively. I ask for your support.

Senator Hauck's statement is as follows:

Madam President, during our debate about the right-to-work law I stood at this podium and shared my experience carrying a union card for three decades. I shared how passionately I felt about workers having a choice as to whether they join a union or not and how seriously I took my obligation as a steward to make the case that the union was worth the hard-earned money. I don't believe anyone should be forced to join a union, and I don't believe anyone should be forced to hand their personal information over to unions either.

My amendment will give workers the option to opt out of sharing information like their cell phone number or their home address with union officials. As a former union member and steward, I assure you very few workers will utilize this opt-out if the union does the workers necessary to provide their worth. I ask for support for my amendment.

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

Madam President, I find the notion of state law mandating the sharing of workers' personal contact information with political organizations very concerning. We should at least consider what happens if—or when—this personal information is compromised. Just last month, millions of UAW retirees learned that their personal information—including their Social Security numbers, home addresses, and health plan ID numbers—had been leaked in a data breach. They didn't find out until months after the breach occurred, and just this week the SEIU agreed to pay a \$550,000 settlement in a class-action lawsuit alleging they failed to properly protect sensitive member data including names, addresses, Social Security numbers, and, again, health plan information in a 2021 data breach. Madam President, these kinds of breaches are unfortunate and they're a constant risk in our digital world. This bill does nothing but increase the odds of such incidents occurring by unnecessarily sharing the personal information of Michigan workers with third parties.

My amendment will simply require that the unions being given access to this sensitive personal information also provide workers with ID theft protection measures, and I ask for your support.

Senator Albert's second statement is as follows:

Supporters of this legislation have said it is needed so union officials can better communicate with the workers they represent. If that is truly the motivation, then there is a significant improvement that can be made. This should be a two-way communication. This amendment would make sure public employees know how to quickly find out their union representatives if the need arises. This amendment would require that public employees are regularly given the following information about their local union representatives: the local union contact's home address, the local union representative's personal non-work telephone number, their local union representative's personal e-mail address, in addition to their work e-mail address and the local union representative's salary. If it's OK for a union to be given a worker's home address and personal non-work phone numbers, it should be OK for workers to be given their union rep's home address and personal non-work phone numbers. After all, the need for communication might work both ways.

On top of all that, if it's really OK for union reps to be told how much each individual worker is paid, it should be OK for the workers to be informed on how much their union officials are paid as well. Thank you, and I urge a "yes" vote for this amendment.

Senator Theis' second statement is as follows:

I find it unconscionable that this body would approve a bill like the one before us at a time when the headlines about union bosses abusing their positions have become commonplace. The headlines speak of fraud, bribery, embezzlement, sexual assault, and the list goes on and on. It's important to recognize that the rank-and-file union members are just innocent bystanders and many have spoken to me of their frustration with the actions of the few that reflect poorly on the whole.

Yet this bill would require that union bosses be given access to the personal contact information of workers regardless of their criminal history. And we're not just talking about their work e-mail addresses or office phone number here. We're talking about home addresses, their personal cell phone numbers, and their personal e-mail addresses. Historically this body has worked hard to protect that personal information. Working to ensure the safety—and, necessarily, the privacy—of our citizens is one of the fundamental roles of state government. This isn't just an invasive, government-mandated breach of personal data. It's outright dangerous.

My amendment would remove from this bill the requirement to share personal contact information with union officials who have been convicted of fraud or sexual assault. We as lawmakers should not make it easier for criminals or abusers to access personal information of our citizens. I ask for support of my amendment.

Senator Cherry's statement is as follows:

I just wanted to speak about really the issues that have fostered the bill. We've heard a lot about how horrible unions are and how we don't want them talking to anybody, but ultimately it is the role of a union to represent employees and when there's an issue between a represented employee and their employer, to defend that employee and to help them. It had been in previous administrations the practice of the state to not inform unions when there are people they are supposed to be representing. Fortunately that changed with the change of administration. But ultimately, when a union does not know about and cannot contact an employee they are supposed to represent, it's the employee that is harmed. Denying access hurts the worker. Now, why is it necessary for a union to have the home contact information for an employee? It actually turns out employees are not supposed to actually be talking to their union representatives while they're on the clock. If they can't use their work e-mail or their work phone to talk to their union representative, then that does have to be done outside of work hours which typically means it's at home.

There were a lot of what I might consider inflammatory amendments put forward earlier, and I'd just like to posit that in fact there are protections for leaks which, there was a lawsuit referenced by one of the previous

speakers, and the fact that there is a lawsuit shows that there were protections in place for workers to make sure their identities are not stolen. I would just add the fact that if you do have union representatives convicted of sexual assault, they shouldn't be working there in the first place; I would expect for them to be fired so I don't see that as—well, quite frankly, they'd be in jail, so I don't think we're going to have an issue there.

This bill is really about making sure public employees have the ability to be represented by their unions and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 103, entitled**

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled "Natural resources and environmental protection act," (MCL 324.101 to 324.90106) by adding sections 48714a and 48714b.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 338**

**Yeas—25**

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

**Nays—13**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 104, entitled**

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled "Natural resources and environmental protection act," (MCL 324.101 to 324.90106) by adding sections 43528c and 43528d.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 7, following line 4, by inserting:

**“(ix) An individual who is compensated for providing assistance to another individual in pursuing, capturing, catching, killing, taking, or attempting to take deer.”.**

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 339****Yeas—25**

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

**Nays—13**

Albert	Hoitenga	Lindsey	Outman
Bumstead	Johnson	McBroom	Runestad
Damoose	Lauwers	Nesbitt	This
Hauck			

**Excused—0****Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Madam President, one of the chief reasons why this package of bills is being pushed is the necessity of the department to have a handle on specific numbers of animals that are harvested and they need that to make proper wildlife decisions and advise the Natural Resources Commission. That is ostensibly the reasoning that goes behind much of this, and it is part of why in my remarks yesterday on this bill I mentioned for quota animals one could reach some potential justification.

However, once again when it comes to deer we are already mandating reporting. In fact, we are working very hard right now to eliminate the criminal penalties for failing to report, but yet we have now mandated that the deer harvest be reported. Those of us who participate in the crop damage programs of various sorts, those who have the disease management programs, all of those are reported. There is no information that is needed that a guide would provide to the department except that the person shot the deer with a guide.

Therefore, I offer this amendment to remove the guiding requirement for those who are hunting deer. I ask for members to vote "yes."

Senator Cherry's statement is as follows:

It was mentioned that data collection is one of the reasons behind the package of bills, and that is accurate. Data collection and the value of it is one of the reasons behind the bill, and not just this bill but the previous bill we just voted on. But there is more than that particular reason why these bills are beneficial.

One is—and I will say, Michigan has been working on trying to provide a very basic level of regulation within this activity for a number of different years. Many states are far beyond where Michigan will be if these become law, but the bills do provide consumer protection in the form of making sure that guides have basic training, first aid and CPR; make sure that if you are in the water that you have a pilot's license.

Fundamentally, also what we have when we talk about wildlife and fisheries are a public resource. This is a publicly-owned resource; everybody in the state uses it. When folks are guiding, they are using that public resource for private profit, and so part of the requirements of this bill ensures that those who are profiting off of those public resources are lawful actors—that they aren’t violating our fish and wildlife laws and our laws that protect our public resources.

So why might you want to make sure that people are engaging in this activity are lawful actors? Well oftentimes as somebody guides, you are introducing people to this activity or this recreational pursuit for the first time. Do we want the introduction to these sports—which are part of our cultural heritage—to be with folks who are pursuing it lawfully and can convey that ethic to those wishing to join? I think most people say, Yes, we want that introduction to be happening on the part of those who are behaving properly.

While data collection is one piece of it, it is not the only piece of it. There are many reasons behind these bills.

Senator Daley’s statement is as follows:

I rise to speak in favor of Senate Bill No. 104. First I want to thank my good friend, Senator Cherry from the 27th District, for working with me on this package. I also want to thank the Senator from the 14th District, Senator Shink, for reporting this bill out of committee. And just in response to the good Senator from the 38th District, in committee we had twelve organizations—and I am going to list them—that supported this legislation. Twelve hunting organizations. We had one in opposition that was not even a hunting organization—the Mackinac Center was in opposition. We had the MUCC; we had the Michigan Hunting Dog Federation; we had the Michigan Trout Unlimited; we had U.P. Sportsmen’s Alliance—U.P. Sportsmen’s Alliance—I will repeat; Michigan Charter Boat Association; Ducks Unlimited; Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation; Michigan State Fox Hunters; National Deer Association; Michigan United Coon Hunters Association; U.P. Bear Houndsmen; and various local conservation clubs. So to say for a couple of organizations—and not a single hunting organization opposed this legislation in committee.

With that, I will move on to my prepared remarks. Senate Bill No. 104 would regulate and create licensing requirements for commercial hunting guides in the state of Michigan. Hunting is a vital part of life in this state and can be a great source of food and fun. As a farmer, I understand firsthand the benefits of managing animal populations via hunting so that our crops can thrive. I hope that this legislation will help everyone to feel comfortable retaining the services of a commercial hunting guide in our state. I agree with a wide range of stakeholders who have worked diligently on these bills over the last several years. I believe that this package provides a low threshold for entry and a basic framework for guides while protecting our hunters and anglers and ensuring increased data is available for wildlife management decisions.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of Senate Bill No. 104.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 105, entitled**

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled “Natural resources and environmental protection act,” by amending section 40113a (MCL 324.40113a), as amended by 2016 PA 382.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

**Roll Call No. 340**

**Yeas—26**

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

**Nays—12**

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

**Excused—0**

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

### **Announcements of Printing and Enrollment**

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Thursday, June 8:

**House Bill Nos. 4420 4421 4422 4423 4516**

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Wednesday, June 7, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

**Senate Bill Nos. 375 376 377 378 379**

**House Bill Nos. 4703 4704 4705 4706 4707**

### **Committee Reports**

The Committee on Veterans and Emergency Services reported

**House Bill No. 4555, entitled**

A bill to designate June 12 of each year as Women Veterans Recognition Day.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Veronica Klinefelt  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Klinefelt, Hertel, Santana and Outman

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

### **COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The Committee on Veterans and Emergency Services submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, at 9:00 a.m., Room 1300, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Klinefelt (C), Hertel, Santana and Outman

The Committee on Health Policy reported

**Senate Bill No. 31, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled "Public health code," by amending section 9206 (MCL 333.9206), as amended by 1996 PA 540, and by adding section 5474d.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Kevin Hertel  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Hertel, Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck and Huizenga

Nays: None

The bill and the substitute recommended by the committee were referred to the Committee of the Whole.



## COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Health Policy submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, at 12:30 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Hertel (C), Santana, Wojno, Cherry, Klinefelt, Geiss, Webber, Hauck, Huizenga and Runestad

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

**House Bill No. 4084, entitled**

A bill to amend 2014 PA 92, entitled "State essential services assessment act," (MCL 211.1051 to 211.1061) by adding section 7a.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mary Cavanagh  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Moss, McCann, Bayer, Irwin, Huizenga, Theis and Daley

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

## COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, at 1:00 p.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Cavanagh (C), Moss, McCann, Bayer, Irwin, Huizenga, Theis and Daley

## COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Joint Capital Outlay submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, at 9:00 a.m., Room 352, 3rd Floor, House Appropriations Room, Capitol Building

Present: Senators McDonald Rivet (C), Irwin, McCann, McMorrow, Camilleri, Damoose, Bumstead and Huizenga

Excused: Senator Santana

## COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Elections and Ethics submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, June 7, 2023, at 2:00 p.m., Room 1300, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Moss (C), Wojno, Santana, McMorrow, Chang, Camilleri, Johnson and McBroom

**Scheduled Meetings**

**Local Government** – Tuesday, June 13, 1:30 p.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5312

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

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

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, June 13, 2023, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN  
Secretary of the Senate

