

**ANIMAL LAW SECTION  
Public Policy Position  
SB 660**

The Animal Law Section is a voluntary membership section of the State Bar of Michigan, comprised of 262 members. The Animal Law Section is not the State Bar of Michigan and the position expressed herein is that of the Animal Law Section only and not the State Bar of Michigan. To date, the State Bar does not have a position on this item.

The Animal Law Section has a public policy decision-making body with 15 members. On November 30, 2017, the Section adopted its position after discussion an electronic discussion and vote. 12 members voted in favor of the Section's position on SB 660, 0 members voted against this position, 0 members abstained, 3 members did not vote.

**The Animal Law Section Supports SB 660 with Recommended Amendments.**

**Explanation:**

Compared to a bill that was introduced last session that included a number of onerous provisions, this bill, while still extending time for compliance with the new law providing improved animal care standards for egg-laying hens by 5 years (with the stated reason that many large food corporations are requiring their suppliers to abide by standards similar to the ones required by existing Michigan law, but that these corporate requirements will not go into effect until 2025), reflects significant compromise. The bill adds a new provision, Section 47, which makes legislative findings about the effects of current practices on the hens, and, ultimately, consumers of eggs; and, importantly, does not allow the sale of eggs in this state produced in another state "IF THE BUSINESS OWNER OR OPERATOR KNOWS OR SHOULD HAVE KNOWN THAT THE EGG WAS PRODUCED BY AN EGG-LAYING HEN THAT WAS CONFINED ON A FARM THAT IS NOT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE ANIMAL CARE STANDARDS FOR EGG-LAYING HENS SET FORTH IN SECTION 46." The provision applying standards to all eggs sold in Michigan regardless of where the egg was laid is particularly significant. Massachusetts passed a similar provision by ballot measure in 2016, and it was considered a major victory.

The Section recommends that the bill drafter check on the district court's jurisdiction noted on page 5, lines 22-27 through page 6, line 1, as this does not appear to fall within the district court's statutory grant of jurisdiction.

**Contact Person:** Ann M. Griffin

**Email:** [annmgriffin@hotmail.com](mailto:annmgriffin@hotmail.com)