

No. 36
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
103rd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2025

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, April 24, 2025.

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
McMorrow—present

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

Senator Rick Outman of the 33rd District offered the following invocation:

Dear Father, thank You for this day and for another opportunity to serve You. Your servant Moses commanded us to, “love your neighbor as yourself,” but Your Son Jesus gave us a new command, a new standard, an even higher standard. Jesus said, “Love one another as I have loved you.” But how do we model that love? A love so perfect that He was willing to leave an indescribable and perfect paradise to come down and enter into a sinful and depraved humanity, living a life of complete servitude, knowing all the while that it would end both abruptly and violently. Suffering the shame, humiliation, pain, and death on the cross, not because of any wrong He committed but because of His love for us. How can we possibly model that level of love in our community? The truth is we can’t, but with God, all things are possible. As we go through our deliberations today, please, Father, give us that spirit of love. In Your Son’s name I pray. 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 Theis be excused from today’s session.
The motion prevailed.

Senator Singh moved that Senators Brinks and Geiss be temporarily excused from today’s session.
The motion prevailed.

Senator Brinks entered the Senate Chamber.

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

Senate Bill No. 3

Senate Bill No. 4

Senate Bill No. 5

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

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

Senator Geiss entered the Senate Chamber.

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 pro tempore, Senator Moss, designated Senator Cherry as Chairperson.

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

Senate Bill No. 99, entitled

A bill to amend 2023 PA 281, entitled “Public officers financial disclosure act,” by amending sections 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, and 15 (MCL 15.703, 15.705, 15.707, 15.711, 15.713, and 15.715).

Senate Bill No. 100, entitled

A bill to amend 2023 PA 282, entitled “Candidate for office financial disclosure act,” by amending sections 3, 5, 7, 11, and 13 (MCL 169.303, 169.305, 169.307, 169.311, and 169.313).

Senate Bill No. 4, entitled

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

Senate Bill No. 5, entitled

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

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

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

Senate Bill No. 3, entitled

A bill to provide for a cost and affordability review of certain prescription drug products; to create the prescription drug pricing board and prescription drug affordability stakeholder council and to prescribe their powers and duties; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to establish upper payment limits for certain prescription drug products and provide remedies; and to provide for the promulgation of rules.

Substitute (S-1).

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

Motions and Communications

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

Senate Bill No. 3

Senate Bill No. 4

Senate Bill No. 5

Senate Bill No. 99

Senate Bill No. 100

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 Webber introduced

Senate Joint Resolution B, entitled

A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the state constitution of 1963, by amending section 37 of article IV, to provide for approval by the legislature of any rule or regulation promulgated by an administrative agency with a compliance cost of \$1,000,000.00 or more within five years after implementation of the rule or regulation.

The joint resolution was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senator Albert introduced

Senate Bill No. 262, entitled

A bill to amend 1943 PA 240, entitled “State employees’ retirement act,” by amending sections 55, 58, 63, 63a, and 69 (MCL 38.55, 38.58, 38.63, 38.63a, and 38.69), section 55 as amended and section 63a as added by 2011 PA 264, sections 58 and 63 as added by 1996 PA 487, and section 69 as amended by 2002 PA 99.

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

Senator Albert introduced

Senate Bill No. 263, entitled

A bill to require certain bonus payments to certain qualified employees; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

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

Senator Bellino introduced

Senate Bill No. 264, entitled

A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” by amending section 1113 (MCL 436.2113), as amended by 2011 PA 27.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned 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. 34

Senate Resolution No. 35

Senate Resolution No. 36

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

Senators Theis, Moss, Polehanki, Damoose, Victory, Bellino, Hoitenga, Huizenga and Lauwers offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 34.

A resolution to recognize April 29, 2025, as End Jew-Hatred Day.

Whereas, For millennia, the Jewish people have sustained their shared religious, cultural, and ethnic identity and traditions in the face of enslavement, persecution, genocide, segregation and discrimination; and

Whereas, The Jewish community has continued to be subjected to antisemitism and Jew-hatred, including discrimination in the workplace, on school campuses, and in public spaces; and

Whereas, Hate crimes directed against the Jewish community have skyrocketed in recent years, inspiring and empowering Jewish people to discover and embrace their heritage, without fear of attack or persecution; and

Whereas, We all share an obligation to condemn and combat Jew-hatred in all of its forms; and

Whereas, We recognize the urgent need to stand against Jew-hatred so that the intergenerational trauma of the past shall never be repeated; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize April 29, 2025, as End Jew-Hatred Day; and be it further

Resolved, That we set aside political differences, unite with singular purpose to condemn Jew-hatred in all of its forms, and stand resolute to end the discrimination and persecution of the Jewish people.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

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

The motion prevailed.

Senators Chang and Wojno were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

Senator Moss offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 35.

A resolution to recognize April 23-24, 2025, as Holocaust Remembrance Day.

Whereas, The horrors of the Holocaust should never be forgotten. The Holocaust was the state-sponsored systematic persecution and annihilation of European Jewry by Nazi Germany and its collaborators from 1933-1945; and

Whereas, The Holocaust resulted in the extermination of six million Jews and their potential decedents. The world’s Jewish population was reduced by one-third; and

Whereas, Poland, home to the largest Jewish community before World War II, lost 90 percent of its Jewish population. Greece, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Lithuania, Bohemia, the Netherlands, Slovakia, and Latvia each lost more than 70 percent of their Jewish population; and

Whereas, Millions more suffered grievous oppression and death under Nazi tyranny based on their religion, including Catholic priests, Christian pastors, and Jehovah’s Witnesses; their national origin, including Poles, Soviets, Ukrainians and Sorbs; their ethnicity and culture, including the Romani people; their political beliefs, including courageous resisters and government dissidents; their physical appearance, including those with disabilities; and their sexual orientation and gender identity; and

Whereas, The same conspiracies, hatred, and acts of cruelty against Jews still persist today. The Anti-Defamation League’s most recent report tracked that antisemitic incidents increased 140 percent, including an increase in assaults by 45 percent, harassment by 184 percent, and acts of vandalism by 69 percent. This data amounts to the highest level of antisemitism in the 45 years these incidents have been tracked, as well as a significant increase over 2022 which set the previous record for antisemitic incidents; and

Whereas, The history of the Holocaust must instruct the moral and ethical responsibilities of individuals, societies, and government when confronting antisemitism. It serves as an important reminder of what can

happen when we allow bigotry, hatred, and indifference to enter and conquer our societies in moments of peril for Jewish populations. These lessons must not expire; and

Whereas, The state of Michigan, through PA 170 of 2016, requires that the social studies curriculum for grades 8 to 12 includes age- and grade-appropriate instruction about genocide so students learn about past atrocities, factually and comprehensively. This education provides future generations the tools to ensure the evils in history are not repeated; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize April 23-24, 2025, as Holocaust Remembrance Day; and be it further

Resolved, That in honor of the victims of the Holocaust, the survivors, and their liberators, the citizens of Michigan should reflect upon this terrible event and strive to overcome hatred and intolerance through both learning and remembrance.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Chang, McMorrow, Polehanki and Wojno 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:

On this Yom HaShoah, as we continue to see a rise in antisemitism in its various forms, I want to share one of the more harrowing episodes from the very tragic history of the Holocaust. We often think about that history as happening over there, but as our country is clearly going through a moment of tension on many fronts, there is an American piece of this history to recall and learn from.

In late 1938, Kristallnacht, a violent pogrom, broke out in Germany and Austria, during which the glass windows of Jewish-owned businesses were shattered, Jewish livelihoods were looted, Jewish synagogues were set ablaze while firefighters watched and did nothing, and even Jewish cemeteries were desecrated. This proved to be a literal do-or-die moment for German Jews. Tens of thousands fled.

Months later, in the spring of 1939, the MS *St. Louis* was one of the last passenger ships to leave Germany before the outbreak of World War II, carrying more than 900 Jews seeking refuge out of the emerging Holocaust. The ship was destined for Cuba, where the passengers had transit visas and where most of the passengers would await the processing of their visa applications into the United States, but 40,000 Cubans demonstrated in the streets in what would be the largest antisemitic rally in Cuban history to oppose the ship's arrival. Indeed, by the time it arrived weeks later, the Cuban government refused entry to the Jewish passengers. A days-long standoff ensued with Jewish organizations leading advocacy and negotiations, calling on the U.S. government to intervene, drawing tremendous newspaper attention, and eliciting support here in the United States. A ship with nowhere to go, carrying passengers with nowhere to live, moved toward the United States coast and made a desperate appeal to the State Department. The passengers literally could see the lights and palm trees in Miami as our government turned them away.

Several European countries did answer the call of these Jewish organizations desperately trying to save these people, taking in roughly equal shares of the passengers. About 280 Jews who were brought into Great Britain survived the war. But of the remaining passengers, who by happenstance were admitted into mainland European countries, 254 were killed in the Holocaust, including in Auschwitz.

As a Jew, I reflect a lot on the Holocaust—on Yom HaShoah, on instances of antisemitism when they arise, and sometimes just randomly. I often conjure up this image of the plight of the Jewish man, the Jewish woman, the Jewish child, dying in Auschwitz who had just years before been so close to the United States, could be so close to Miami and thinking in their dying moments, I was almost there. I saw the palm trees.

We can learn this history and still not let it diminish that the United States defeated Hitler and Nazism. Today, the United States today is the safest country in the world to be Jewish, but with hate crimes rising we still have to listen to Jewish voices in peril. The United States is the best country in the world to be a religious minority, but we cannot ignore bigotry, intolerance, and discrimination. The United States is a lifeline to immigrants from every nation, but we still have to welcome them here.

People all over the world seek refuge in the United States because we value freedom and liberty more than any other country on Earth. That's why when we slip, when we fail to live up to those ideals, it harms those even more who seek opportunity, a better life, and survival. These are the lessons from the *St. Louis*. They were true then, and they are true today.

Senator Anthony offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 36.

A resolution to recognize April 28, 2025, as Workers' Memorial Day.

Whereas, Every year on April 28, communities and worksites around the world honor friends, family members, and colleagues who have been killed or injured on the job; and

Whereas, In 2023, The Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that 5,283 workers were killed by traumatic injuries on the job. On average, a worker died every 99 minutes from a work-related injury; and

Whereas, In Michigan, 166 workers were lost through fatal workplace accidents in 2023; and

Whereas, It is appropriate to honor the memory of the courageous and dedicated members of Michigan's labor force who have been injured or disabled or have died as a result of workplace accidents; and

Whereas, It is necessary to recognize the integrity of Michigan's workforce and its achievements on behalf of the economic growth of our state; and

Whereas, We remember those who have died in workplace catastrophes, suffered occupation-related diseases, or have been injured due to dangerous conditions; and

Whereas, We renew our effort to seek stronger workplace safety and health protections, better standards, enforcement, and fair and just compensation. We rededicate ourselves to improving both safety and health in every workplace; now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize April 28, 2025, as Workers' Memorial Day. We pay tribute to the workers who have died or been injured or disabled in workplace accidents; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all citizens to recognize and honor the contributions of Michigan's workforce and call for increased workplace safety standards.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Chang, McMorrogh and Polehanki were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Anthony's statement is as follows:

April 28 is Workers' Memorial Day, a day to remember the sacrifices made by countless hardworking individuals while on the job. This day serves as a solemn reminder that behind every statistic is a name, a story, and a family left forever changed.

In 2023, workplace hazards killed approximately 140,000 workers, over 5,000 of whom lost their lives to traumatic workplace injuries. One hundred sixty-six of those were right here in the state of Michigan. What's more, an estimated 135,000 additional people died from occupational diseases. These are individuals who left their homes expecting to come back in time for dinner, who worked hard to build up their communities, and to keep our economy moving, and they deserved better. Workers' Memorial Day is not just about remembering their lives, but also about uplifting our responsibilities to protect workers. We have a duty to protect those who labor in our factories, on our roads, and in our hospitals, schools, and farms. Safe working conditions are not a privilege; they are a right, a right that everyone deserves.

Today, by recognizing Workers' Memorial Day, we honor the memory of those we've lost and recommit ourselves to ensuring no more lives are needlessly lost. We call for stronger protections, greater accountability, and a renewed focus on workplace safety so that every worker in Michigan and across this nation can return home safely at the end of the day. I urge you to support this resolution so we can honor their memory through our actions, not just our words.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Klinefelt's statement is as follows:

Truman Langlois is a senior at MSU and he's about to graduate with a bachelor's degree in political theory and constitutional democracy. What can I tell you about Truman? He came to intern in our office in January and we pretty much just locked him in a room and made him work the whole time. We'd be sitting around at our conference table, eating lunch—has anybody seen Truman? Is Truman here? He's very quiet. You'd hear in our office often, Is Truman here today? Did Truman go somewhere? The poor guy has had—

I have a terrible sense of humor and the poor guy has had to deal with me and deal with my sense of humor and the rest of the office, but he's done real quality work for us. He's done a lot of policy research on mileage-based user fees, he's been looking into ranked choice voting—we have to have a meeting to discuss that—he's worked on earned sick time and tip credit legislation. He's written tributes, letters, done a lot of constituent work; you know how hard constituent work can be. We've also had to double and triple book meetings, and had Truman in meeting with a lot of stakeholders on a lot of issues.

He’s going to take all of those experiences with him. He used them to write a research project that had to do with Senate voting history based on party alignment. We’ve absolutely enjoyed having him and we’re going to miss him tremendously.

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 bills:

Senate Bill No. 99

Senate Bill No. 100

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 99, entitled

A bill to amend 2023 PA 281, entitled “Public officers financial disclosure act,” by amending sections 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, and 15 (MCL 15.703, 15.705, 15.707, 15.711, 15.713, and 15.715).

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. 66

Yeas—35

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

Nays—1

Bellino

Excused—1

Theis

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. 100, entitled

A bill to amend 2023 PA 282, entitled “Candidate for office financial disclosure act,” by amending sections 3, 5, 7, 11, and 13 (MCL 169.303, 169.305, 169.307, 169.311, and 169.313).

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. 67

Yeas—33

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

Nays—3

Bellino	Lindsey	Runestad
---------	---------	----------

Excused—1

Theis

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

Senate Bill No. 3

Senate Bill No. 4

Senate Bill No. 5

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 3, entitled

A bill to provide for a cost and affordability review of certain prescription drug products; to create the prescription drug pricing board and prescription drug affordability stakeholder council and to prescribe their powers and duties; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to establish upper payment limits for certain prescription drug products and provide remedies; and to provide for the promulgation of rules.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 4, line 23, after “state” by inserting “or if the individual has made a personal political contribution to the governor”.

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

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 12, following line 17, by inserting:

“(k) The average monetary price concession, discount, or rebate that is retained by pharmacy benefit managers in this state compared to the average monetary price concession, discount, or rebate that is passed on to prescription drug product purchasers.

(l) The average monetary concession, discount, or rebate that prescription drug product purchasers retain compared to the average monetary concession, discount, or rebate that is passed on to patients.” and relettering the remaining subdivision.

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

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 16, following line 7, by inserting:

“Sec. 27. This act does not apply beginning 3 years after the effective date of this act.”.

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

Senator Webber offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 4, line 15, after “administration.” by inserting “At least 1 member of the board must be an individual who advocates for patients.”.

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 68

Yeas—20

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

Nays—15

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

Excused—1

Theis

Not Voting—1

Huizenga

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Albert, McBroom and Bellino, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 3.

Senators Albert and McBroom 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 bill before us today really is about, How do we want our system to work? Do we want a free market system or do we want a government-controlled collectivist system? That's the question, and that's the question because if you look at what this bill does, it implements a board that controls prices. If I'm wrong about that, I hope somebody will correct me because the way I read it, this board can put caps on prices.

What's the big significance of that? We all want cheaper prescription drugs. We all want that. I commend that for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But what's going to happen? What always happens when the government gets involved in controlling prices? This isn't rocket science. This is something that we've seen over and over and over again, and it's very tiring to see how all the data can be ignored. I wish I could come up with some great, impassioned, emotional speech that would draw people to this. All I can do though is rely on the data and the facts, and I guess it's not very exciting.

When you ignore that, what you're left with, you're left with people that are not as well off. They have less. This bill is not going to help people. This bill is not going to lower prices. Why? What are the tenets of a free market? First off, No. 1 is private property. OK, so we've crossed the hurdle on this one. This bill does not violate private property rights directly. What's the second part of a free market, the second tenet? Competition. Competition spurs innovation and entrepreneurship, and competition regulates the economy. When people decide they want a certain product, they go and they buy it, and it's kind of like they're casting their vote on where they want production. It's very decentralized. It regulates through supply and demand in an efficient manner. When that gets substituted by a board of people—a centralized board of several people, a handful of people who are going to be making the decisions on behalf of millions of people—it creates a massive opportunity for inefficiencies. What if they make a mistake? What if they become corrupt and somebody gets to them? That happens so often. The risks of this bill are so glaringly obvious. I cannot believe it's even up here for a vote.

Well, what's going to happen? Why do we have such a disproportionate amount of innovation in pharmaceuticals in the United States of America as opposed to the rest of the globe? Why do we have so much of the innovation? It's because the producers are free to innovate and they are free to have the market regulate the supply and the demand of the product. If you eliminate that, there's no incentive for innovation or entrepreneurship. It goes away. The competition is destroyed. This does not benefit people. This hurts people. Illnesses that we want to see healed are not going to be healed. This is a bad idea. It's anti-competitive. It's anti-free market. What ends up happening is when you take away basic free market principles, it ends up hurting society as a whole. As Friedrich Hayek said in his book *The Road to Serfdom* and I'm paraphrasing, I don't know the direct quote but, the march to serfdom doesn't just happen in one step, it's a slow walk. This is a step down that road toward a society that's not free. Freedom is indivisible. If you try to divide it apart and like, well, We'll have freedom here but not here, it doesn't work that way. I'm sorry, if you take away freedom in the economy, you take away freedom in the society is the whole.

Senator McBroom's statement, in which Senator Bellino concurred, is as follows:

I don't have, you know, a sophisticated argument as some of my other colleagues do on this issue, but I do appreciate the previous speaker giving us a little bit of a lesson on how broken the system is. I'm a little bit, you know, shocked to even reference the insurance companies as a source of information on this because I don't feel like they're a good actor or a good relayer of information of honesty and truth when it comes to health care costs either, but let's emphasize in particular the point that was made, that our medical care system right now in America is not primarily a free market system. I would agree with that analysis, and look at what a disaster it is. I mean, it's an unmitigated disaster.

None of the main players at the table, whether it's the pharmaceutical companies, the insurance companies, or the providers, have a monopoly on integrity in this. They're all scoundrels, all scamming the system, all jilting the payers of this country into paying exorbitant costs that are out of control, that are bankrupting people, putting our businesses at risk, putting our families at risk, and putting our governments at risk with unmitigated debt. It is a disastrous system that's going on, and then to pretend that we can somehow fix the disaster we've made by doubling down on it just seems to me to be the height of lack of understanding of what history tells us about what we've done, about what happens when we have price controls.

So we're going to put a ceiling in. Sounds great. That's going to be the price. I mean, right now the U.S. government fiddles with the dairy markets all the time and they tell the cheese makers, Here's the maximum amount you can make per pound of cheese. Well, guess what, that's how much they charge. And then they come along every few years, Oh, we don't make enough money anymore. You got to raise our price up. Well, that's what happens. Lack of free market is killing other industries too. The more—and what do we do? What do farmers do? What do sick people do? They run back to the government. They're like, Hey, do some more government for us and fix our problems. And then the problems get worse. This is a solution that would be akin to taking my broken car and saying, Let's cut a hole in the floor and use our feet. Maybe we'll install a horse in the car. That'll work great. And that's the functional equivalence of this plan. What, to really think that we're going to drive down prices? It's not going to work.

History shows us it doesn't work. Our current experience shows us it's not working. I would, I mean, let's do something dramatic here that would actually make a difference. Let's eliminate some of these insurance mandates that we force on people that are clearly not free market and haven't saved us. Obamacare hasn't made health care cheaper. Well, shocker. I didn't see that coming. Medicaid expansion hasn't made health care cheaper, hasn't stopped people from being bankrupted. Shocker. I so appreciate what we're trying to do for people, but we're failing to actually consider the history and the facts, and what will happen is it's not going to do what we think it will do. It's not going to help. Other states have already tried these control boards and they're not helping there either. I encourage a "no" vote.

Senators Runestad, Lindsey, Nesbitt, Webber, Camilleri, Damoose and Irwin asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I first want to thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for their recent all-night vigil and prayers and supplications to the heavens that my voice be restored. I'm very, very appreciative.

This amendment is about one thing: transparency. We need to put an end to the pay-to-play politics. We need take a stand against potential political corruption. My amendment would simply ban any appointments if the potential appointee has made political contributions to the Governor making the appointment. We shouldn't be allowing powerful positions, such as those overseeing prescription drugs which affect health and pocketbooks of Michigan families, to be handed out as political kickbacks. That is not right. Corruption shouldn't be allowed to fester because of the work done in this chamber. In fact, we have a responsibility to make sure it doesn't happen. I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment to protect the integrity of this board and to prevent cronyism and political kickbacks.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

We're here once again discussing prescription drug affordability. The solution presented to us by the Democrats is again a government price-setting scheme through a bureaucratic board, which I will continue to oppose. But the conversation is important and so, going through the legislation, I noticed a couple of things that I thought were noteworthy, and one major oversight.

The oversight is that this legislation doesn't address what happens in the drug supply chain with pharmacy benefit managers. The problem from a consumer/patient standpoint is that they know very little about what happens upstream before they purchase a prescription drug. The manufacturers may enter into a rebate scheme with the PBMs, and that part is addressed in the legislation, so I thought there also was an opportunity to provide information to the board about the PBMs and what happens to that rebate afterwards. The average consumer would probably think that that rebate is there in order to defray costs and reduce costs so that their drugs would be more affordable, but this board would not really have an ability, as written right now, to even access that information. I think it's important for us to know if those PBMs which, once upon a time could have served potentially as a check to the insurance companies and other players in this space, they've now been purchased by the insurance companies, so the same people who set the formularies and determine access to drugs are pocketing huge amounts of these rebates. It's a black box right now where we don't know. We don't have any transparency on this.

I have advocated for transparency in healthcare pricing from hospitals to all sorts of other areas. This amendment is another attempt to require we have more transparency in this system. It would require information about rebates being kept by the PBMs and by payers to be reported to the board, which could have a massive impact on whatever viability this board has in being able to address drug pricing. I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

I rise to support my amendment and ask other members to support my amendment. The results from this government price-fixing scheme across the country are not delivering the promise that supporters said they would deliver. While some are surprised that a Soviet-style price-fixing scheme doesn't actually work, perhaps we could all agree that review will be needed before continuing this inevitable bureaucratic boondoggle. My amendment would simply put a three-year sunset on this package that will require an active review from the Legislature after three years before permanently embedding this costly statist scheme into our government that has shown it doesn't work in other states. I ask for a "yes" vote.

Senator Webber's statement is as follows:

Now more than ever, we need to make sure that patients are protected and that their voices are being heard. My amendment would require that at least one of the Governor's appointees be from a patient advocacy organization. Having a patient advocate on this board would help to ensure that patients are not only represented but that they can continue to receive proper care and access to lifesaving medications they desperately need. I ask for a "yes" vote in order to protect patients and put their needs first.

Senator Camilleri's statement is as follows:

I urge you to support again our effort to lower the cost of prescription drugs for our residents here in Michigan. There is no one-size-fits-all solution. We have attempted multiple angles at the market, whether it was PBM reform and here today with our attempt to hold Big Pharma accountable for their gigantic increases in prescription drugs that we continue to see year after year. This board is a simple concept and a great idea. It allows for a public body of officials appointed by the Governor, including folks who have no connection to the pharmaceutical industry whatsoever, who would then review some of these exorbitant price increases that we see from some companies as they're attempting to gouge the American consumer. They will hold them accountable. It will be a public and transparent process, and they will find ways to lower those costs for our residents.

Just like last term, we accepted an amendment today from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. It's a good idea. We're going to add a patient advocate to the board. Thank you so much to the Senator from Oakland County for adding that to this conversation. My hope then would be that Republicans join us in this effort to support this legislation to lower the cost of that medicine. Last term, we exempted lobbyists from being part of the board, another great idea from our Republican colleagues. Unfortunately, most Republicans voted "no" on that bill last term. I hope that they join us today in supporting this legislation.

It is common sense. It is common sense that we are working to advocate and lower the cost of medicine for our residents. It's a bipartisan issue. It's something we all talk about. I'm urging you to do something. Join us. Do something. Don't say "no." This may not be the only option to lower prescription drug costs. I'm fine with that, but it's doing something as opposed to doing nothing. Join us, offer other solutions, I'm happy to have that debate and that conversation as well, but this is one opportunity that some states have been adopting that allows us at the state level to do something on the cost of prescription drugs. I urge you to vote "yes."

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

I rise today, this time in support of this package, and I'm thankful for having a second chance to vote again on the Prescription Drug Affordability Board. I voted "no" last term and I always sort of regretted it. We all have those votes occasionally that we wish we could take back. This is one of those for me, and here's why: We all know the devastatingly high cost of prescription drugs that our residents face throughout Michigan and across the entire nation. Nearly every political candidate, whoever runs for office, from state representative to president of the United States, promises to lower prescription drug costs. It's the ultimate safe issue, because we've all seen the problem in our own hometowns, even in our own families.

I remember years ago hearing about a drug that cost an average patient in the United States about \$3,000 per month, but the same drug was available in Great Britain for about \$80 a month. Not knowing this industry, I asked, How does that happen? The answer was, The British government won't allow it. My response was obviously, Well, why do we? My district is on the Canadian border and I see it all the time, where people go across the river because they can get the same prescription for half the price in Canada that they can get in Michigan. This is absolutely crazy. Half of these drugs are invented here in the United States; many in our publicly-funded universities or developed with significant federal research funding. Is there no upside for the American consumer for all of this investment that they are making? Why are we subsidizing the cost of drugs in other countries by allowing the highest prices in the world to be charged here to offset those lower prices in other nations?

Last term, I was persuaded by the idea that the market should determine the cost of drugs. I was moved by somebody who called this a price-fixing board, which elicited images of the old Soviet regime, and those arguments did appeal to me and my underlying belief in free-market economics. They're not wrong when it comes to free-market economics, but the more I learned, the more apparent it became that calling the prescription drug market a free market is a total farce. We are so far from being a free market when it comes to pharmaceuticals, it's unbelievable.

The federal government has invested billions, hundreds of billions of dollars in the research that led directly and indirectly to the development and production of so many of these drugs. I think that's a wise investment since the public health has always been a national priority, but the minute that capital was invested into the process, the idea of the free market disappeared entirely from the discussion. The minute regulations, patent

protections, government grants, congressional-directed spending, and so much more government influence entered the equation, rightly or wrongly. The idea of the free market no longer applied. Since the American taxpayers are the ones who made that investment, there should be a dividend in terms of more affordable access to those drugs. It's unconscionable in my mind that those within the nation who supported the development and production of the most incredible body of medical advancement the world has ever seen would pay more than anyone else to access the benefits of those very prescription drugs.

This board isn't about setting prices, it's about reviewing specific drugs under specific circumstances—where our citizens, frankly, aren't getting as good a deal as everyone else. I think, as we look to level the playing field across the world, this is just one program we seem to need in order to stand up for our own residents.

Senator Irwin's statement is as follows:

What we have before us today is legislation that seeks to address one of the most important problems facing our residents here in Michigan, and that is the epidemic of high prescription drug prices. This is a huge problem in my district. I don't want to presume anything about your districts, but if your district is like mine, you've been hearing regularly from residents who are frustrated with the high cost of drug prices and the associated high cost of insurance premiums. We have people who are unable to afford their insurance. We have people who are unable to afford their co-pays.

We heard yesterday testimony from doctors who are saying that they would prescribe a course of treatment; they would prescribe medicine for individuals who were simply unable to fill those prescriptions, and, as a result, would not take those prescriptions and would end up later in greater misery, incurring greater cost to the system, showing up in our emergency departments. We heard yesterday from insurers who said that runaway drug prices are the largest driver of increases in our health insurance premiums. Out of control drug prices are driving up healthcare costs—they're causing people to split pills in half or not take medicine, causing conditions of our residents to get worse, driving up costs in our ER, and it's a disaster. It's a disaster that I want to thank and send appreciation to my colleagues who sponsored this legislation, because they're trying to do something about a problem that is central to the needs of our residents.

One of the things we know about the healthcare system here in America is that it's not a free market. Our healthcare system is a rigged market. It's a system whereby the public invests, and private interests profit. In a system like that, it's essential that we create a board, like this prescription drug advisory board, that has as its mission to identify those outlier cases, those drugs that are driving costs, those drugs that are the ones where our customers and our residents are getting gouged when they seek to fill their prescriptions. I think it's an obligation of this Legislature to form a board like this, to go out there and look for the worst abuses in the prescription drug industry, and to make sure that those worst abuses are reigned in. Putting an upper limit on the cost of drugs when those drug prices are rising unreasonably, when the prices are being rigged to increase the profits of drug manufacturers at the expense of our residents—those are exactly the cases where we should make sure that those abuses are identified, that the public is made aware of those price gougings, and that we set an upper limit to make sure that our residents are not continually abused by this industry that charges lower prices all around the world but drives their profit up here in states like Michigan.

So once again, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation. High prescription drug prices are hurting my residents, they're hurting your residents, and it's time we do something about it.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 4, entitled

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

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. 69

Yeas—20

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

Nays—15

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

Excused—1

Theis

Not Voting—1

Huizenga

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 5, entitled

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

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. 70

Yeas—20

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

Nays—15

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

Excused—1

Theis

Not Voting—1

Huizenga

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Pursuant to rule 1.306, Senator Huizenga made the following statement:

I will be abstaining from the vote on Senate Bill Nos. 3, 4, and 5. I am disclosing a potential conflict of interest in Senate Bill Nos. 3-5 as I have extensive experience in the health care consulting space. Out of an abundance of caution, I will be abstaining from the vote on Senate Bill Nos. 3, 4, and 5.

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Wednesday, April 23:

House Bill Nos. 4033 4034 4207 4208 4255 4256

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Tuesday, April 22, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

**House Bill Nos. 4349 4350 4351 4352 4353 4354 4355 4356 4357 4358 4359 4360 4361
 4362 4363 4364 4365 4366 4367 4368 4369 4370 4371 4372 4373 4374
 4375 4376 4377 4378 4379**

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Wednesday, April 23, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

House Bill Nos. 4380 4381 4382 4383 4384 4385

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Thursday, April 24, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

**Senate Bill Nos. 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256
 257 258 259 260 261**

Committee Reports

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

Senate Bill No. 3, entitled

A bill to provide for a cost and affordability review of certain prescription drug products; to create the prescription drug pricing board and prescription drug affordability stakeholder council and to prescribe their powers and duties; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to establish upper payment limits for certain prescription drug products and provide remedies; and to provide for the promulgation of rules.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Mary Cavanagh
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Irwin, McCann, Bayer and Camilleri

Nays: Senators Theis and Daley

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

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

Senate Bill No. 4, entitled

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

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mary Cavanagh
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Irwin, McCann, Bayer and Camilleri

Nays: Senators Theis and Daley

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection reported

Senate Bill No. 5, entitled

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

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Mary Cavanagh
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Cavanagh, Irwin, McCann, Bayer and Camilleri

Nays: Senators Theis and Daley

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, April 23, 2025, at 12:00 noon, Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

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

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Universities and Community Colleges submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, April 23, 2025, at 9:00 a.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators McCann (C), Irwin, Singh and Albert

Excused: Senator Damoose

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Regulatory Affairs submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, April 23, 2025, at 3:30 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Moss (C), Polehanki, McCann, Santana, Hertel, Singh, Hauck, Webber and Bellino

Excused: Senators Wojno and Lauwers

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 11:14 a.m.

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 29, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN
Secretary of the Senate