



NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, MICHIGAN

Michigan Questionnaire for Michigan House and Senate Candidates 2026

Name: Natalie Price

District: State Senate, District 10

1. Briefly provide biographical information, and relevant experiences, qualifications, and skills you bring to the position.

I was raised in a family of strong women who taught me to speak up for fairness, lean on community, and help others succeed. Those lessons have guided me throughout my life—as a teacher, a city councilmember, and now as a state representative in my second term.

Before serving in Lansing, I was a high school teacher who saw firsthand how inequities in education, healthcare, and opportunity affect families. That experience inspired me to fight for equitable school funding, reproductive justice, gun safety, and meaningful climate action.

Now representing Michigan's 6th District, I've championed policies that protect both people and the planet. I've co-sponsored bills to repeal Michigan's preemption law on single-use plastics, hold corporate polluters accountable, and proudly voted for the Michigan Clean Energy and Jobs Act.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on EGLE, I've worked to secure funding for Renewable Ready Communities and to defend clean water initiatives from cuts. I'm also a signer of the Taking Back Our Power pledge, refusing contributions from DTE and other regulated monopolies while advocating to remove their financial influence from elections.

In this legislature, much of my work centers on protecting recent progress while preparing to advance a bold agenda when we regain control of the House. My belief that good government begins with listening to constituents led me to launch the Michigan Vision Project—an effort to engage voters and shape our Democratic priorities for the years ahead.

2. What are the top three priority issues that the legislature should address?

1. **Expanding access to affordable healthcare.** Michigan families deserve a healthcare system that works for them, not one designed around the interests of insurance companies and corporate hospital networks. I'm proud to be a co-sponsor of MICare, a plan for single-payer healthcare here in Michigan, and I'm committed to doing the work necessary to pass it. In the meantime, I'm fighting to protect our healthcare system from collapse, and I'll continue that work in the Senate. That means protecting the provider-patient relationship from political interference, combating the use of AI to wrongfully deny claims, incentivizing more Michiganders to enter the healthcare workforce, and preventing the mergers and acquisitions that have already stripped rural and urban communities of the care they need close to home.

2. Fully funding public education. Every child in Michigan deserves a school that is safe, well-resourced, and staffed by educators who are supported and fairly compensated. That means not just reaching the constitutional funding floor, but repairing crumbling school facilities and investing in the full continuum of education, from early childhood through trade schools, community colleges, and universities, so Michigan can grow and sustain a workforce that keeps our economy competitive. Our public schools are among our greatest community assets, and I will oppose any attempt to weaken them through vouchers and privatization schemes.

3. Equitable taxation and a strong economy for working families. For too long, tax policy in Michigan has asked the most of those who have the least. And as our state budget becomes increasingly strained by federal mismanagement and corruption, Lansing faces real pressure to fill gaps in ways that shift the burden onto underrepresented communities or cut the essential services Michiganders rely on. I'll continue pushing for a fairer tax structure that relieves working families, closes corporate loopholes, and invests in what actually grows the middle class, including driving down utility costs through clean energy investment so that Michigan can honor its clean energy commitments and workers can keep more of what they earn.

3. Please answer the following questions on specific areas of concern to our members and supporters:

EDUCATION

Background: *Michigan lawmakers periodically consider proposals that would allow public funds to be used to support students attending private or religious schools.*

Question: What types of legislative proposals would you be most likely to support or oppose, and why?

I would oppose any proposal that routes public money to private or religious schools, whatever it gets called. Vouchers, education savings accounts, and scholarship tax credits all do the same thing, and Michigan voters barred it in our constitution. They were asked again in 2000 and said no by a wide margin. A tax credit that reimburses a donation dollar for dollar is still an appropriation with extra paperwork. A private school taking public dollars is still free to turn a student away and still not required to open its books to the people paying the bill.

Money leaves our schools in quieter ways too. It happens in the budget when School Aid dollars get shifted to cover a hole in the general fund, and it happens on the tax side every time a corporate carve-out shrinks the revenue flowing into School Aid. That is a cut to our classrooms, and it almost never gets described that way when it comes up for a vote.

I would support funding that is built on what it actually costs to educate a child. A flat per-pupil allowance treats districts as though their students arrive with identical needs. I want weighted funding for students with disabilities, English learners, and kids living in poverty, with special education reimbursed near its real cost.

I would also support keeping politicians out of decisions that belong to educators. I taught high school. Teachers should be able to make curricular judgments and raise concerns without fear of retaliation or a banned book list written in Lansing.

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

Background: *In 2022, Michigan voters approved Reproductive Freedom For All (Proposal 3), which amended the Michigan Constitution to establish a constitutional right to reproductive freedom, including a right to choose abortion.*

Questions:

1. How should Michigan legislators approach future legislation that would affect reproductive healthcare in light of Proposal 3?

Proposal 3 passed with 57 percent of the vote and it settled the question of whether Michiganders have a right to reproductive freedom. It did not repeal the statutes already on the books that conflict with it. Legislators should treat that cleanup as ongoing work rather than finished work. The Reproductive Health Act got part of it done, and the parts that got traded away in negotiation are still sitting there, including the Medicaid coverage ban that keeps the constitutional right out of reach for people on public insurance. We also need to address the critical gaps in accessibility in rural and remote areas of our state where people have to drive hours to reach an OB/GYN. A right that a person cannot afford to exercise is not fully secured. I would also apply a plain test to any new proposal that touches this area: if a restriction would not be imposed on any comparable medical procedure, it is not about safety, and it does not survive Proposal 3.

2. Should access to mifepristone (medication abortion, which is available through telemedicine and mail) be protected? If so, how can it be protected within Michigan's existing legal and regulatory framework? If not, please explain.

Yes. Medication abortion is the majority of abortion care in this country and it is safe by every measure we have. Telehealth is what makes it reachable for someone in a rural county or someone who cannot take two days off work. I'm proud to have spoken on the house floor against federal interference in this care back in 2023, and I will continue to defend access to mifepristone and misoprostol throughout my service.

The threat to this care is federal, not state, which limits what Michigan can do but does not leave us with nothing. Repealing the remaining telemedicine and in-person dispensing restrictions in our own statutes matters. So does a shield law strong enough to protect Michigan clinicians and pharmacists from out-of-state subpoenas and license actions. And the state can act on supply, either through stockpiling authority or by making sure our public health infrastructure is not dependent on a single federal decision.

HATE CRIME PREVENTION

Background: *In 2025, Michigan enacted the Michigan Hate Crimes Act, which expanded the state's hate crime law and established criminal penalties for offenses motivated by bias against protected characteristics. According to FBI data released in 2025, reported anti-Jewish hate crime incidents increased by 5.8% from 2023. In March 2026, Temple Israel in West Bloomfield was the target of an attack that authorities investigated as a hate crime.*

Questions:

1. What role should the Michigan Legislature play in implementing, evaluating, and, if necessary, modifying Michigan's hate crime laws to protect the safety of all communities from bias-motivated violence?

The Legislature's job did not end with the passage of the Michigan Hate Crimes Act. We need to ensure that the people who enforce it know how to use it, and right now Michigan does not have good visibility into whether that is happening. I would support requiring uniform reporting from every law enforcement agency in the state, and I would want the Legislature to hold hearings on the first years of charging data. If prosecutors are not bringing these charges, we need to know whether the problem is the statute, the training, or the evidentiary threshold, and each of those has a different fix.

2. Are there additional legislative or budget actions you would support or oppose to prevent hate crimes, improve law enforcement training and response, assist victims, or enhance security for communities that are at increased risk of bias-motivated violence?

Yes. The most direct thing the state can do is fund physical security for the institutions that are being targeted. Synagogues, mosques, Black churches, and LGBTQ community centers are all spending congregational money on cameras, door hardening, and guards, and that is money not spent on the work those institutions exist to do. I support sustained appropriations for nonprofit security grants at a level that actually meets demand rather than a one-time line item that runs out.

I would also fund victim services seriously. Federal VOCA dollars have fallen off a cliff and the state has been backfilling unevenly, which leaves the organizations that walk people through the aftermath of an attack operating on year-to-year uncertainty. Beyond that, MCOLES training on bias-motivated crime should be recurring instead of a one-time academy module, since the officer who takes the initial report determines whether a case ever gets classified correctly.

VOTING RIGHTS

Background: *In 2022, Michigan voters approved Promote The Vote 2022 (Proposal 2), which amended the Michigan Constitution to expand several voting policies, including early in-person voting, a permanent absentee voter list, and prepaid postage for absentee ballot applications and ballots. In Congress, proposals such as the federal SAVE Act have sought to establish additional federal requirements for voter registration and election administration, including documentary proof of U.S. citizenship to register to vote in federal elections. In Michigan, the Americans for Citizen Voting ballot proposal (which echoes the federal SAVE Act on a state level) seeks to place a constitutional amendment on Michigan's November 2026 ballot.*

Question: What policies do you support or oppose regarding elections, access to the ballot and voting rights?

Proposal 2 passed with 60% of the vote and the Legislature's job is to fund it and defend it. Early voting and the permanent absentee list only work if clerks have the money and staff to run them, and we have underfunded that obligation since the day it took effect. I would also protect election workers, who have spent four years absorbing threats for doing clerical work correctly and face increasing interference by the federal government.

I strongly oppose the SAVE Act and I opposed the Americans for Citizen Voting ballot initiative. Documentary proof of citizenship does not stop a problem that barely exists, and it does reliably

stop married women whose names changed, older voters born at home, and anyone whose birth certificate is in a box somewhere in their basement. That proposal fell short of the ballot this year on signature validity rather than on the merits, and I expect it to be back in 2028. My position will be the same.

Polling places should be added to the list of locations where federal immigration enforcement may not operate. I have supported legislation drawing that line at schools, hospitals, and courthouses, and a precinct on Election Day belongs in the same category. A single ICE vehicle parked outside a polling place suppresses turnout across an entire neighborhood, including citizens, and that is exactly the point of parking it there.

I also strongly support the Michigan Voting Rights Act. The federal Voting Rights Act has been narrowed to the point where it cannot be relied on, most recently in *Callais*, and states now have to build the protections themselves. We need state-level review of local election changes that dilute minority voting strength, a private right of action so voters are not waiting on a federal agency that will not act, and real language access requirements.

GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

Background: *Some lawmakers have proposed prohibiting the sale and manufacture of assault-style firearms for civilian use, while others believe such restrictions violate constitutional rights and would have little impact on violent crime.*

Question: Do you support or oppose restricting civilian access to assault-style firearms? Please explain your position and the factors that would guide your vote.

I support it, not only as a member of the Firearm Safety and Gun Violence Prevention Caucus but as a mom and a former teacher.

I live in and represent Oakland County. Oxford is our county. The families who buried children in 2021 did not get an abstract debate about definitions, and neither did the Michigan State community just 15 months later. These semi-automatic weapons are designed to kill quickly at scale, and they do exactly what they were built to do every time one is used this way.

We passed universal background checks, safe storage, and extreme risk protection orders in 2023, and those laws are already saving lives. But they do not address the specific problem of a weapon that lets one person shoot dozens of people in a few minutes.

I support bills that define the class of weapon by function rather than by cosmetic features. Often, the definition is where these laws have historically gotten into trouble. We need to be addressing large-capacity magazines, since capacity is what drives the casualty count. And enforcement should be designed so that the burden does not land disproportionately on Black and brown Michiganders, which has been a real failure of gun enforcement in this country and is a legitimate concern I take seriously.

We should also be honest about what these policies don't address. Most gun deaths in Michigan are suicides, and the strongest thing we can do there is storage and access, which is why the 2023 package matters and why I want it funded and enforced. This session, the first bill I passed out of the House removed the sunset on the tax credit for safe storage devices which experts believe will help increase adoption of more effective safety devices.