No. 95
STATE OF MICHIGAN

Journal of the Senate

103rd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2025

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Tuesday, October 21, 2025.

10:00 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Erika Geiss.

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—excused
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—present
Victory—present
Webber—present
Wojno—present

Senator Jim Runestad of the 23rd District offered the following invocation:

O God, ruler of heaven and earth, we implore Thy wisdom for this council. Direct our minds to enact just laws, strengthen our resolve for liberty, and unite us in Thy service. Bless this assembly and our people in Thy peace and favor, now and forevermore. Amen.

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

Motions and Communications

Senator Lauwers moved that Senators Lindsey, Nesbitt and McBroom be temporarily excused from today's session.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lauwers moved that Senator Johnson be excused from today's session.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Irwin moved that Senators Anthony, Brinks, Chang, McMorrow, Polehanki and Singh be temporarily excused from today's session.

The motion prevailed.

Recess

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:03 a.m.

10:26 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss.

During the recess, Senators Lindsey, McBroom, Polehanki, Anthony, McMorrow, Chang, Brinks, Nesbitt, Santana and Singh entered the Senate Chamber.

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 resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 80

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

Senators Webber, Polehanki, Runestad, Shink, Bellino, Bayer, Chang, McMorrow, Huizenga and Wojno offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 80.

A resolution to recognize the historic, cultural, and religious significance of the festival of Diwali.

Whereas, Diwali is celebrated annually every autumn by Hindus, Sikhs, and Jains in Michigan, the United States, and throughout the world, with over one billion celebrants marking the holiday; and

Whereas, Diwali is a holy day, during which celebrants light small oil lamps and place them around the home. The lighting of the lamps is followed by prayers for attainment of health, wealth, knowledge, peace, and valor, and is recognized as the beginning of a new year for some Hindus; and

Whereas, "Diwali" is a shortened version of the Sanskrit word "Deepavali," which means a row of lamps, and in English is referred to as the "festival of lights;" and

Whereas, Celebrants of Diwali believe that the rows of lamps symbolize the light within the individual that rids the soul of the darkness of ignorance; and

Whereas, For Hindus, Diwali is a celebration of the belief that light triumphs over darkness and good triumphs over evil; and

Whereas, For Sikhs, Diwali is feted as the day that the sixth founding Sikh Guru, or revered teacher, Guru Hargobind, was released from captivity by the Mughal Emperor Jehangir; and

Whereas, For Jains, Diwali marks the anniversary of the attainment of moksha or liberation by Lord Mahavira, the last of the Tirthankaras, who was the great teacher of Jain Dharma at the end of his life in 527 B.C.; and

Whereas, Michigan remains resolute in its commitment to fostering diversity of experience and religious acceptance; and

Whereas, Diwali is a time marked by qualities of togetherness, family, and community; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize the historic, cultural, and religious significance of the festival of Diwali. We recognize the Diwali message of tolerance, compassion, and acceptance of others which resonates with the ideals of the American spirit; and be it further

Resolved, That we express respect and admiration to all those who celebrate Diwali throughout the world and in our own communities.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Moss and Theis were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

Senators Webber and Singh asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Webber's statement is as follows:

I invite you to join me today in recognition of Diwali and ask for your support of Senate Resolution No. 80 to acknowledge the historic, cultural, and religious significance of this wonderful festival. Diwali is celebrated by more than 1 billion Hindus, Sikhs, and Jains around the world each year, including our Michigan neighbors who identify with these traditions.

Diwali, a shortened version of the Sanskrit word meaning "row of lamps" is often translated into English as the "festival of lights." Diwali is a time marked by qualities of togetherness, family, and community. It is a special time for charitable giving and selfless service. Diwali celebrants will light small oil lamps and place them around their homes with prayers for health, wealth, knowledge, peace, and valor. The rows of lamps are said to symbolize the light within the individual that rids the soul of the darkness of ignorance. This wonderful reminder that light triumphs over darkness, that good triumphs over evil, is a theme celebrated within many of our individual faith traditions.

Hope is something we all share. Hope is a force of universal good. That is why I ask for your support of this resolution and our shared commitment to celebrate diversity of experiences and religious acceptance. I ask you to join me in recognition that Diwali's message of tolerance, compassion, and acceptance resonates with the ideals of the American spirit. Let us express together our respect and admiration for all those who celebrate Diwali throughout the world and in our own communities.

Senator Singh's statement is as follows:

Madam President, I want to also rise today and speak on this resolution and thank the good Senator from Oakland County for bringing it forward during another year. Diwali, as he mentioned, is a great celebration amongst the Hindu, Jain, and Sikh populations. I know as my family celebrates Diwali, we want to just wish our guests who are here as well as members in the chamber a happy Diwali, an opportunity for us to celebrate the victory of good over evil, inner light over spiritual darkness, and knowledge over ignorance. Happy Diwali, and I support this resolution.

Recess

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:32 a.m.

11:12 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss.

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 Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, designated Senator McCann as Chairperson.

After some time spent therein, the Committee arose; and the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, having resumed the Chair, the Committee reported back to the Senate, favorably and with a substitute therefor, the following bill:

Senate Bill No. 596, entitled

A bill to amend 1984 PA 431, entitled "The management and budget act," (MCL 18.1101 to 18.1594) by adding section 364.

Substitute (S-2).

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.

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

House Bill No. 4420, entitled

A bill to amend 1984 PA 431, entitled "The management and budget act," (MCL 18.1101 to 18.1594) by adding section 1365a.

Substitute (S-3).

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

The following communication was received and read:

Office of the Auditor General

October 16, 2025

Enclosed is a copy of the following report:

- Performance audit on the Michigan Sex Offender Registries, Michigan Department of State Police (551-0595-24).

Sincerely,
Doug Ringler
Auditor General

The audit report was referred to the Committee on Oversight.

The following communications were received:

Department of State

Administrative Rules
Notices of Filing

September 19, 2025

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 #2024-060-LR (Secretary of State Filing #25-09-04) on this date at 10:08 a.m. for the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs entitled, "Sanitarians Registration – General Rules."

These rules become effective immediately after 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.

September 29, 2025

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 #2024-054-LR (Secretary of State Filing #25-09-05) on this date at 11:11 a.m. for the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs entitled, "Accountancy – General Rules."

These rules become effective immediately after 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.

October 2, 2025

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 #2023-031-LR (Secretary of State Filing #25-10-01) on this date at 10:07 a.m. for the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs entitled, "Board of Midwifery."

These rules become effective immediately after 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 communications were referred to the Secretary for record.

The following communication was received:

Office of Senator Stephanie Chang

October 16, 2025

Per Senate Rule 1.110(c) I am requesting that my name be added as a co-sponsor to Senate Bill 537 which was introduced on September 11, 2025 and was referred to the Senate Committee on Elections and Ethics.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Chang
State Senator, District 3
Senate Democratic Policy & Steering Chair

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

The following communication was received:

Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy

October 16, 2025

In accordance with Sections 17303(9) and 17317(9) of Part 173, Electronics, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, 1994 PA 451, as amended, attached is the Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy's (EGLE) Biennial Report on the Electronic Waste Recycling Fund Revenue and Expenses for fiscal years 2024 and 2025.

If you need further information, please contact Tracy Kecskemeti, Acting Division Director, Materials Management Division, at 248-200-6469 or KecskemetiT@Michigan.gov; or you may contact me at 517-243-6195.

Phillip D. Roos
Director

The communication was referred to the Secretary for record.

The Secretary announced that pursuant to rule 1.117(e) of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Senate Majority Leader has allocated $0 to the standing committee operations accounts for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026. Accordingly, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2026, there are no committee expenses to be reported and no committee expense reports to be filed with the Senate Business Office pursuant to rule 2.109 of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The Senate Business Office submits, pursuant to rule 1.208, the following report on out-of-state travel by members on legislative business for the quarter ended March 31, 2025.

Senator	Travel Dates/Conference/Location	Amount
Senator Sylvia Santana	January 31-February 2, 2025 NOBEL Representative Lois DeBerry Leadership Institute New Brunswick, N.J.	$ 4,185.98

The Senate Business Office submits, pursuant to rule 1.208, the following reports on out-of-state travel by members on legislative business for the quarter ended June 30, 2025.

Senator	Travel Dates/Conference/Location	Amount
Senator Sylvia Santana	April 5-7, 2025 Black Legislative Leaders Network Summit New Orleans, La.	$ 1,432.07
	May 16-18, 2025 BILLD Steering Committee Spring Meeting Madison, Wis.	$ 967.07

The Senate Business Office submits, pursuant to rule 1.208, the following reports on out-of-state travel by members on legislative business for the quarter ended September 30, 2025.

Senator	Travel Dates/Conference/Location	Amount
Senator Sean McCann	August 18-25, 2025 American Irish State Legislators Conference Dublin, Ireland	$ 3,245.39
Senator Sylvia Santana	August 4-6, 2025 2025 NCSL Legislative Summit Boston, Mass.	$ 4,107.23

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bill, now on the order of Third Reading of Bills, be placed on its immediate passage:
Senate Bill No. 596
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Third Reading of Bills

Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.
The motion prevailed, the time being 11:20 a.m.

11:26 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bills:
Senate Bill No. 596
Senate Bill No. 330
Senate Bill No. 456
Senate Bill No. 276
Senate Bill No. 277
The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 596, entitled

A bill to amend 1984 PA 431, entitled "The management and budget act," (MCL 18.1101 to 18.1594) by adding section 364.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 1, line 3, after "**item.**" by striking out the balance of the line through "**representatives**" on line 6 and inserting "**A legislator must submit a request for a legislatively directed spending item at least 60 days before the date that the appropriations bill containing the legislatively directed spending item is passed by that legislator's chamber the first time**".

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Runestad withdrew the amendment.

Senator Runestad offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 1, line 5, after "**least**" by striking out "**10**" and inserting "**60**".

2. Amend page 1, line 7, by striking out "**both chambers of the legislature**" and inserting "**that legislator's chamber the first time**".

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. 275 **Yeas—18**

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

Nays—18

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

Excused—1

Johnson

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. 276 **Yeas—31**

Albert	Chang	Klinefelt	Runestad
Anthony	Cherry	McBroom	Santana

Bayer	Damoose	McCann	Shink
Bellino	Geiss	McMorrow	Singh
Brinks	Hauck	Moss	Victory
Bumstead	Hertel	Nesbitt	Webber
Camilleri	Hoitenga	Outman	Wojno
Cavanagh	Huizenga	Polehanki	

Nays—5

Daley	Lauwers	Lindsey	Theis
Irwin			

Excused—1

Johnson

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Senators Runestad, Lindsey and Theis 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:

Madam President, the Legislature has a duty to the people of the state of Michigan to be good stewards of their hard-earned money. That means we have to put every expenditure under the microscope—not after the fact, not three months after we vote on it or after the Governor signs it, but before we vote on it—so that the public and the media know what kinds of projects—pork-barrel projects often—are being requested so that the legislators making those requests have to account with a decent amount of time to be able to say, This is my project, this is the good it will do, and I have been demanding that kind of transparency for so long and I'm glad the House Republicans pushed it in this last budget.

A report by the *Detroit News* this very morning said that there's a nonprofit that received $2.8 million in earmarks from the Legislature over the past five years even though this nonprofit failed to file required federal tax returns. Those filings, those tax returns, are the basic form of accountability to ensure our taxpayer dollars aren't wasted. For five years, we've been giving this nonprofit millions of dollars and they don't even file their federal tax returns. Those returns are an organization's income, expenses, salaries, the board members are on that so we can see, the taxpayers can see, where all their money is going. The state requires these same board members' information to verify that the nonprofit is legally registered and that it is filing the necessary financial disclosures. If we don't have enough time, the people aren't going to know, the media is not going to have enough time to dig into this and find out what's happening.

That's why my amendment requires 60 days from the time the legislators put their requests in to give everyone time to look at this, to do the due diligence that obviously just was not done. It makes all the sense in the world. When I go out into the public and talk to people about this, they are outraged that billions in pork-barrel projects get put by legislators names in and gets passed in the dead of night and it takes months or years if ever to find out who actually made those requests.

If we are serious about protecting taxpayer dollars, we should have a shining light put on these pork-barrel projects. With that, we need the transparency that this 60 days before the vote will require. I ask that my colleagues all join me in supporting this very worthy transparency amendment for the public that would prove we take oversight seriously and that we're not just paying it lip service. I ask for your "yes" vote on my amendment.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

This is another one of those moments in the Legislature that is bittersweet because we see progress being made, but we also see huge missed opportunities. I just want to start by saying I think if the people of Michigan broadly understood with great detail the way the budgets in the state of Michigan are passed, I believe the moment they fully understood that, that they understood the nuance of it, the vast majority of the people serving in the Legislature would immediately lose their next re-election campaign. There would be a wholesale rejection of the politics of Lansing, and that's for a lot of reasons. There's a lot of cloak-and-dagger things that happen during the budget, but certainly one of the top ones is the member-directed spending items where people will go out and look for opportunities to control millions and millions of dollars of taxpayer money and they'll do that in order to secure votes in the budget.

I think it's great that we have a bill now and we see a process developing to add more transparency to that. When I was elected in 2022, before I was sworn in, the first thing I started working on with Senator Runestad who had worked on it for many years was asking that we amend the rules of the Senate to require transparency in the budget process. That request fell on deaf ears. The newly-elected Democratic majority was not interested in changing those rules. Fast forward a few years, I remember being engaged with a lot of people who were interested in serving in the House in the next cycle, there was sort of a groundswell movement around this topic, and sure enough when Republicans won the majority in the House, Speaker Matt Hall, under his leadership, adopted a new rule in the House requiring budget transparency on these legislative spending items. The Senate resisted though. The body that's putting this bill forward right now, that's doing this, I believe, there's a level of performative legislation going on here, resisted for the entirety of this year, coming to a resolution about a set of rules that we could all follow to have transparency in the budget. Now we're going to vote on this.

What bill do we have in front of us? We're going to now create a law that creates a framework around budget transparency on legislative-directed spending. Sounds great, until you read it, dig into the details, and consider some of the implications. I'll just say two broad reasons I'm going to oppose this legislation. One, on a technical level when you go through it, there are just too many gaps, too many problems. We just saw an amendment attempted to make sure there's a sufficient amount of time to review these and that was rejected. We just saw a largely party-line vote rejecting the idea that we have enough opportunity for people to review these items and actually see what they are before voting on it. There are also carveouts in there. There are spaces where people can still take advantage of the process.

The bigger problem I have with this is that I don't think we should be doing this by amending a law in the first place. This body—the Senate of Michigan—and the House, we are governed by our own rules. The Senate is governed by a set of rules, the House is governed by a set of rules, and jointly we're governed by a set of joint rules. Those rules are powerful, especially the joint rules. If we were to use the joint rules to create a process for budget transparency, that would be a very effective tool. It would be difficult to suspend those rules because it would take both chambers, and importantly, when we're actually doing budget negotiations and passing those bills, it would provide an actual mechanism of recourse where we can object to the process. We could highlight if the rules are not being followed. If we do this legislatively instead, we're going to end up with a law that tells the Legislature how we have to do budget transparency and I predict that if we pass this law this way, the Legislatures of the future will promptly ignore it, find ways around it, of simply challenge it by saying, We're going to spend money the way we want to. It may be cloak-and-dagger, it may involve legislative-directed spending that doesn't comply with this process, and if somebody doesn't like it, they can take us to court. The history of litigation around this tells us that the courts are very cautious in getting involved in telling another branch of government—the Legislature—how they operate.

Just to summarize, I don't believe this law is actually tight enough to accomplish what it says it's going to but more importantly, on a structural level, I think it's going to fail down the road. We need more transparency but this isn't the way to do it. Let's give the people what they actually want. Let's go back to the drawing board and work on a real measure, ideally a set of joint rules.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

I would like to reiterate some of the cautions I described in committee when this was being presented there. I have major concerns with prohibiting for-profit organizations. I'd like to see not-for-profit and for-profit be held to the same high standards for both. Historically the state has partnered with for-profit to much more success in certain areas than they have not-for-profit. This bill exempts the for-profit and I have major concerns with that. Another concern is the timeframe. It seems to me that there is a definitive desire not to be fully transparent if 60 days are not allowed. I don't understand why we're going to limit it to a timeframe when the public would then be unable to understand fully where the government money is going in advance of it being ordered.

I would like to ask we put this back to the drawing board. I reiterate my colleague's comments. This is a fantastic idea. We absolutely should have more transparency, but to the extent that we're limiting it in such a way, I have major concerns, and that would be the reason I'm going to be voting "no."

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 330, entitled

A bill to amend 1961 PA 236, entitled "Revised judicature act of 1961," by amending section 1307a (MCL 600.1307a), as amended by 2023 PA 308.

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. 277 **Yeas—34**

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

Nays—2

McBroom Runestad

Excused—1

Johnson

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protest

Senator McBroom, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 330 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting "no."

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

I've served in the Legislature now for—almost finished 13 years, right? I keep telling people I have 14 months and, I think, 13 days left. This is not the first time that we have voted on exceptions to jury duty. The frustrating part to me on all of those votes continues to be that it ignores the provisions that are in the law that already allow for dismissal if the life of another person or the health of another person depends on you. You already have the ability to tell a judge that somebody else is dependent on your being there for them and to get an exemption from serving.

We keep on doing additional exemptions—on top of that, we're just making it more illegal than it already is for the judge to force you to do jury duty. That's why I have voted "no" on all these bills over the years—sponsored by Democrats of Republicans—and will continue to do so today.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 456, entitled

A bill to amend 2012 PA 176, entitled "Mozelle senior or vulnerable adult medical alert act," by amending the title and section 5 (MCL 28.715).

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. 278 **Yeas—36**

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

Nays—0

Excused—1

Johnson

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. 276, entitled

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled "Natural resources and environmental protection act," by amending sections 43520, 43521, 43522, 43523a, 43523b, 43524, 43525b, 43525c, 43527a, 43527b, 43528, 43528a, 43528b, 43529, 43531, 43532, 43532a, 43533, 43535, 43540a, 43540c, 43546, and 43553 (MCL 324.43520, 324.43521, 324.43522, 324.43523a, 324.43523b, 324.43524, 324.43525b, 324.43525c, 324.43527a, 324.43527b, 324.43528, 324.43528a, 324.43528b, 324.43529, 324.43531, 324.43532, 324.43532a, 324.43533, 324.43535, 324.43540a, 324.43540c, 324.43546, and 324.43553), section 43520 as amended by 2024 PA 96, section 43521 as amended by 2009 PA 69, section 43522 as amended by 1996 PA 585, section 43523a as amended by 2018 PA 3, sections 43523b, 43527a, and 43527b as added and sections 43524, 43528, 43528a, 43528b, 43529, 43531, 43535, and 43553 as amended by 2013 PA 108, section 43525b as amended by 2016 PA 462, section 43525c as amended by 2021 PA 6, section 43532 as amended by 2020 PA 271, section 43532a as amended by 2020 PA 270, section 43533 as amended by 2016 PA 463, section 43540a as amended by 2018 PA 237, section 43540c as added by 2005 PA 117, and section 43546 as amended by 2004 PA 587, and by adding section 503d.

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. 279 **Yeas—23**

Anthony	Chang	Irwin	Santana
Bayer	Cherry	Klinefelt	Shink
Brinks	Daley	McCann	Singh
Bumstead	Geiss	McMorrow	Webber
Camilleri	Hertel	Moss	Wojno
Cavanagh	Hoitenga	Polehanki	

Nays—13

Albert	Huizenga	McBroom	Runestad
Bellino	Lauwers	Nesbitt	Theis
Damoose	Lindsey	Outman	Victory
Hauck			

Excused—1

Johnson

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Hoitenga offered to amend the title to read as follows:

A bill to amend 1994 PA 451, entitled "Natural resources and environmental protection act," by amending sections 40111a, 43520, 43521, 43522, 43523a, 43523b, 43524, 43525b, 43525c, 43527a, 43527b, 43528, 43528a, 43528b, 43529, 43531, 43532, 43532a, 43533, 43535, 43540a, 43540c, 43546, and 43553 (MCL 324.40111a, 324.43520, 324.43521, 324.43522, 324.43523a, 324.43523b, 324.43524, 324.43525b, 324.43525c, 324.43527a, 324.43527b, 324.43528, 324.43528a, 324.43528b, 324.43529, 324.43531, 324.43532, 324.43532a, 324.43533, 324.43535, 324.43540a, 324.43540c, 324.43546, and 324.43553), section 40111a as amended by 2015 PA 265, section 43520 as amended by 2024 PA 96, section 43521 as amended by 2009 PA 69, section 43522 as amended by 1996 PA 585, section 43523a as amended by 2018 PA 3, sections 43523b, 43527a, and 43527b as added and sections 43524, 43528, 43528a, 43528b, 43529, 43531, 43535, and 43553 as amended by 2013 PA 108, section 43525b as amended by 2016 PA 462, section 43525c as amended by 2021 PA 6, section 43532 as amended by 2020 PA 271, section 43532a as amended by 2020 PA 270, section 43533 as amended by 2016 PA 463, section 43540a as amended by 2018 PA 237, section 43540c as added by 2005 PA 117, and section 43546 as amended by 2004 PA 587, and by adding section 503d.

The amendment to the title was adopted.

The Senate agreed to the title as amended.

Protests

Senators Albert, Bellino, Damoose, McBroom and Lindsey, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 276.

Senators Albert and McBroom moved that the statements they made be printed as their reasons for voting "no."

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert's statement, in which Senators Bellino and Damoose concurred, is as follows:

While there are some carveouts here that benefit antlerless deer hunters, make no mistake, overall this is not a savings for sportsmen in Michigan. Overall, this is a $29.4 million fee increase. This is not an economic windfall. It's actually taking money out of the pockets of Michigan residents, which is a drag on household

budgets already reeling from years of increased prices. This is simply another way to take money out of the Michigan economy.

The real winner here is a government agency. Advocates of this bill say it's needed for government revenues to keep up with inflation. This is a faulty argument. Inflation is a gauge to measure the cost of goods and services to individual citizens and businesses. It's not supposed to be a measure to gauge how much we should increase government spending. Governments must operate at a level people can afford—not at the level needed to satisfy their never-ending desire to spend. The DNR budget has risen by 19 percent over the last 5 years, and 36 percent over the last ten years. If we give the DNR or any government agency more money now, they aren't going to be content. They never will be. Next year, they will ask for more, and they will do so again, and again, and again. Eventually, you have to say enough.

I know where my district stands on this issue. I sent a survey out on hunting and fishing this summer, and 66 percent of the respondents opposed hunting and fishing license fee increases. This opposition exceeded a 2-to-1 margin. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out why—they have been crushed by inflation over the last several years, and let's not add fuel to the fire. Thank you, and I urge a "no" vote on this.

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

I guess I wish I was feeling a little bit more prepared to speak on this today, I didn't realize that it was going to come up. But I find the idea that we would give the DNR what it is asking for so incredibly repugnant, so incredibly offensive, in the midst of a department plagued with mismanagement and scandal after scandal, to the point right now that you see them in the news because they're going to kill somebody's pet coyote or pet fawn because somebody missed some deadline for application, and the fact that they're going after this coyote year after year and spending taxpayer dollars to go after stopping someone from killing a tame coyote that they have a USDA license to hold and yet the DNR sues them, loses, sues again, loses, and is now suing another time. It's the same drama with the pigs. Again, with the pigs. After 15 years of being here and seeing this department out of control under Republicans, out of control under Democrats, persecuting some farmers out there who raised some pigs that happen to be uglier than somebody else's pigs, we're going to give them exactly what they want: more money. A department that has a history of hiding money, of coming to us for a fee increase, and then suddenly the Legislature gets off its butt, discovers that they're sitting on a pile of money. That's the history of this department. And yet here they are, Give us more money. We need more money so we can send more people out to the woods to persecute some guy who finally got a day off work, sets himself up in a blind, and the DNR shows up, blasts at him with a megaphone, Come out here. We have to check your license, and ruins his whole day of hunting. That's the department we're supporting. We're supporting a department that right now is going after a guy in my area who has been sneaking onto his property, riding bicycles out of uniform, and putting trail cams out there, looking to see what kind of trouble he might be making. You know why? Because he ran some radio ads for his business where he mocks the DNR and they've got to put a stop to it because they're all butthurt that he was out there doing his thing. Private property rights be darned with this DNR. We're going to stomp around out in the woods, looking everywhere to see what's going on out in the woods. We wouldn't let the police do that, but sure, we'll let the DNR do it. And here they are, Give us some more money so we can pay more people to trespass on your private property just in case you might be committing a crime.

This is a department out of control, and fortunately we've got one chamber that has been spending some time digging into this, but here we are doing exactly what they want: Give them more money. They have to be held accountable. We've got to do something about the open fields doctrine that they are abusing. We've got to do something about these lawsuits that don't cost them any money; doesn't cost the DNR anything personally, to go after some farmer because of pigs or some guy who's got a pet coyote or somebody who's got a pet baby fawn. They just put it on the taxpayer dime. Go to the Attorney General, Hey, defend us because our guy made this really stupid decision and decided to write a ticket for somebody who carried some gasoline out to his lost boat on the shoreline of the Keweenaw. That's happened, and what did I get from the department when I talked to them? A whole bunch of, Well, we have to back up our guy. We couldn't possibly tell him he was wrong.

This is a department completely out of control. Writing tickets for people for nothing, writing tickets to somebody because they found a bait pile when they were trespassing on his land, Well, that must belong to you. It's on your land. We wouldn't trust the police to do that and yet we let the Department of Natural Resources do it. It is out of control. Do you know that they're writing tickets for people who have bird feeders? We tried to pass a law to protect bird feeding, but, Oh no, they said to us in committee, You have to make sure the bird feeder is at least 9 feet high. Yeah, so my 80-year-old grandmother has to get a ladder to climb up to put bird seed in her bird feeder in the 4-feet-deep of snow? This is a department out of control, and here we are giving them more money. Let's have a fee increase without doing any accountability for them. Do you understand what they've done to the pigs? Do you understand how long this has gone on?

You've heard me talk about it. Apparently nobody else seems to care that somebody with a legal piece of property can suddenly be told by the DNR, You can't have that anymore. Too bad for you. We're taking it. No money for you, no recompense. And they've lost in court again and again, and yet they keep coming back. Most recently they spent taxpayer dollars to take their guys, put them undercover to sneak onto the game ranches under false pretenses, do a hunt so they could take the pigs and then get them tested to see whether or not they were really legit pigs or not. That's what we're paying for. We're going to get more officers to do more of that really super-duper important work, apparently. And you know, the study they're using for the genomic test? You probably don't but we've looked at it. They've got some guy who sampled a couple hundred pigs, and supposedly now they have a genetic base to determine what's a legal pig and what's not. It's complete bullocks, complete, unscientific drivel.

This is what this department is hanging its hat on to persecute people and steal their private property. When they finally get their butt handed to them for the last time in court, who's going to have to pay for all of those damage lawsuits? We are. And yet we're going to, right now, foist a huge fee or tax increase on sportsmen and women in this state to fund a department that won't then use the dollars to do the thing they said they're going to do, which is to enhance hunting opportunities, enhance fishing opportunities. Instead, they're going to be running off chasing some coyote or fawn or farmer with some pigs. I can't believe we're doing this today. Giving money to this department that's out there doing such a terrible job in this state, they have no faith, no confidence from sportsmen and women around this state. People are up to their ears in frustration with this department. They're shouting about it, and we're not listening. Instead, we're going to give them more money? It's unbelievable. It's shameful.

That's my "no" vote explanation, and I want it printed in the Journal with all the anger I have too.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 277, entitled

A bill to amend 1933 PA 167, entitled "General sales tax act," by amending section 25 (MCL 205.75), as amended by 2023 PA 20.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Bumstead offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-1).

The substitute 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. 280

Yeas—22

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

Nays—14

Albert	Hoitenga	McBroom	Runestad
Bellino	Huizenga	Nesbitt	Theis
Damoose	Lauwers	Outman	Victory
Hauck	Lindsey		

Excused—1

Johnson

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protest

Senator McBroom, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 277 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting "no."

The motion prevailed.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

As I mentioned before, I wasn't expecting these bills to come up today so I apologize for being perhaps too angry in my last speech, but it is, in my opinion, not unjustified after a great chain of injustices that are coming forth to the people and per capita, I have no doubt, impact my district more than any other on a per capita basis. I completely do appreciate my colleague who just spoke from the 32nd District and the chairman from the 27th District who care a lot about natural resources and about good experiences for sportsmen. They care and I appreciate the work I've had and the open door I've had with the Senator from the 27th District.

I do believe using a fee-based system is appropriate for conservation, and I do believe there are times when an increase is appropriate. I have voted for that in the past when we made this change while I was in the House. But now is not the time, now is not the right time because the list of breakdowns within this department is too long and too serious and too severe to simply move forward with this without doing our due diligence to correct the problems that are happening. I listed some of those for you. There are so many more. While there are good people in the department, people I have appreciated and have a good working relationship with, the current head of wildlife and even Director Bowen who I like very much and believe is very sincere, these issues within the department cannot remain unaddressed. They cannot continue to ignore the rogue officers. They cannot continue to ignore the biologists who give recommendations that are contrary to science. We cannot continue to support the department ignoring the Natural Resources Commission's recommendation on bears just because at one point over two decades ago, the commission asked the department to step in. Now the department won't give that authority back.

We cannot continue to simply ignore these problems and just give them more money. They must fix these problems. They must stop trespassing on private property, they must stop choosing citizens to persecute, they must stop picking certain wildlife issues to just persecute. We can't stand idly by and allow the people to be trampled on the way this department is doing, and what we're hearing from the citizens themselves. The groups that support this is anemic compared to what we had back in 2014 or 2015 when we did it before, when every organized sporting group was saying, Yes, do this. We need this, we need what we're going to get from this. They're not here this time. Where are they? Instead they're showing up to the hearings that are pointing out the problems. Again and again, they come to us and say, Please, get this department to toe the line again, to recognize the rights of the people, to stand against this waywardness we're seeing within the law enforcement division and within the biology department.

We've got to stand strong for what the citizens are telling us is happening with this department. Let this serve as a wakeup call to us, that we don't just give money to departments because they ask for it and because they can show legitimate need when they are doing the wrong thing with the dollars they get.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Cherry's first statement is as follows:

I just wanted to get up and address a couple items, you know, in terms of what the funding challenge is and why we need to make some changes to license fees. First, you know, the situation nationally that occurs—that is occurring—is there's a decrease in the number of hunters and anglers across the nation at the same time that costs are increasing. So, nationally, that creates a funding challenge for conservation, which is user funded, receives very little general tax dollars. This package of bills attempts to address that in the least burdensome way possible.

What does that challenge mean for the state of Michigan? Well, in the recent budget we passed, we had to include $2.8 million of one-time funding for our hatchery system because if we hadn't have done that in January, fish would have had to be moved from the hatchery to the landfill because the department couldn't afford the cost of feed for the hatcheries. This helps solve that problem, amongst others. The bills also help solve issues surrounding deer management by providing a variety of tools to increase antlerless harvest, particularly in southern Michigan, reducing the cost for farmers who are facing damage to their crops.

At the same time, it also maintains some of the lowest fees in our region. Even with this package, we would have the lowest base license in the region, lowest cost base license, lowest cost turkey license, the second lowest cost deer license, the second lowest cost fishing license, and it actually significantly reduces by 80 percent the cost of an antlerless deer license. If this were to become law, then someone could hunt deer for less than it costs them to hunt deer today, so it does address the challenges of funding conservation in our state. But it also does it in a way that reduces the burden on folks. It also puts dollars aside specifically for hunters' education and recruitment, because we don't want to have to constantly increase prices, but if we start recruiting hunters and there's more people participating, that spreads the burden across a greater number of people.

Madam President, I think this does address challenges that we're facing, and does so in a way that minimizes the burden on our hunters and anglers.

Senator Bumstead's statement is as follows:

I would like to thank the chairman of the committee, Senator Cherry. He reached out to us from day one on these packages—not just to our office, but to every sportsman's group in the state of Michigan. So this is a really well thought out package. I really want to thank him for the reach out that he did. It's not just this rooms package, it's the package of all the sportsmen's, fishermen groups throughout the state. We took a lot of—had a lot of meetings with all these groups, got all their opinions and everybody had their 2 cents' worth. That usually doesn't happen these days in politics, where one side is reaching across the other side, and mainly it's just a big thank you to Senator Cherry for doing that. He didn't have to do that, but I really appreciate that and I really appreciate him and his hard work. It's a really good package and a lot of good ideas here, and it's going to make our natural resources better and stronger in the state of Michigan.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

We're here taking up a bill that, along with the package, is, the heart of it is, to raise the fees on hunting and fishing in Michigan. I wasn't going to speak, but one of the people who spoke in support of it made an argument that I just think needs to be responded to. So, generally speaking, the number of hunters and fishers is going down and that's part of what's creating a problem for the funding mechanism. There are fewer and fewer people who are engaging in these activities. I think only in government can somebody come to the conclusion that if we go ahead and tax that activity more, somehow that's going to help solve the problem. It was even said in the argument, so this is the structure, we're going to raise the cost of hunting and fishing and then we're going to take some of the money we get from that to go and encourage people—that's what was said, we're going to have a new program to help fund encouraging people to hunt and fish.

One more time: the government is going to raise the cost of hunting and fishing so that we can take the money to go convince people to hunt and fish. Maybe the answer is, if we made it less of a barrier for people to hunt and fish, we might get what the department and what all the stakeholders actually want is that people might get back to hunting and fishing. We could see a healthy flow of revenue in this stream. I'm voting "no," and I hope everyone else does as well.

Senator Cherry's second statement is as follows:

I appreciate the Senator's remarks, but I just want to maybe offer a thought that can kind of break down the argument. The biggest barrier to hunting is folks understanding how to safely use a firearm. That's been shown time and again; that's the biggest barrier. So, having a package that actually dedicates resources to helping people go through that process is how it helps recruitment. I just want to, I appreciate that—I feel that the Senator is making a genuine argument, but I want to understand why my argument here that this helps is genuine as well.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

With all respect to the previous speaker, and certainly there is a barrier there with training and the requirements, but they're requirements that the department and we have put on people. You have to take these classes now in order to be a hunter, so now we're going to advertise the classes so that they can get the training that we now require everybody to have before they can go in the woods to be a hunter.

But, more than that, what is the genuine barrier right now to people hunting? It's success; it's success. People who go into the woods a few times as a kid and don't get success, don't come back. Success is the prime driver for returning to the fields and to the woods and to the streams. Because you had success, you enjoyed it, and if we don't manage for the success, we're going to continue to see decreasing numbers. If we keep on hassling people and persecuting them, they're going to be driven away from going out in the first place.

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. 81
Senate Resolution No. 82
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Senator Hertel offered the following resolution:
Senate Resolution No. 81.

A resolution urging the Congress and the President of the United States to permanently extend the Affordable Care Act Enhanced Premium Tax Credit to help ensure that all individuals and families have equitable access to healthcare.

Whereas, The Affordable Care Act (ACA), commonly known as Obamacare due to its champion, former President Barack Obama, established the Premium Tax Credit to make health insurance coverage more affordable for individuals and families purchasing insurance through the federal Health Insurance Marketplace; and

Whereas, The tax credit is based on income and household size, ensuring that low- and middle-income Americans can access quality healthcare coverage while capping the amount they must pay for premiums as a percentage of their income. Approximately 21.8 million Americans benefit from the tax credit, including roughly 484,000 Michigan residents; and

Whereas, In 2021, Congress passed the American Rescue Plan Act, which expanded eligibility for the Premium Tax Credit and enhanced credit amounts for tax years 2021 and 2022. These changes were extended for three additional years, 2023 through 2025, under the Inflation Reduction Act. The expansion of the Premium Tax Credit under these acts significantly reduced health insurance costs for millions of Americans, leading to record enrollment and historic lows in the number of uninsured Americans; and

Whereas, Without the continuation of the Enhanced Premium Tax Credit, millions of Americans could face steep cost increases, risking a reversal of coverage gains and forcing many families to forgo necessary healthcare due to unaffordability. A loss or reduction of the credit would disproportionately harm working families, seniors not yet eligible for Medicare, and vulnerable individuals with chronic health conditions who depend on consistent, affordable coverage at a time when Michigan families are already struggling with paying for the increased cost of essential goods and services; and

Whereas, Federal law prohibits the use of the Enhanced Premium Tax Credit by non-citizens who are not lawfully present in the United States; and

Whereas, Sustaining the Enhanced Premium Tax Credit is essential to stabilizing the health insurance marketplace, preventing sharp increases in uncompensated care costs, and ensuring access to affordable healthcare for all Americans; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the Congress and President of the United States to permanently extend the ACA Premium Tax Credit; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

Senator Singh moved that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Health Policy.

The motion prevailed.

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

Senator Brinks offered the following resolution:
Senate Resolution No. 82.

A resolution to condemn political violence in all forms, regardless of political party or ideology, and affirm the commitment of the Michigan Senate to peaceful dispute resolution through lawful, democratic means.

Whereas, Robust debate, freedom of expression, civic participation, fair elections, and the peaceful exchange of ideas are the basis for democracy, all of which become endangered when violence is used as a political weapon; and

Whereas, Political violence includes a wide range of actions, from symbolic intimidation to lethal attacks, and seeks to undermine public institutions, reduce trust, and suppress political participation; and

Whereas, According to research from the University of Maryland, there were approximately 150 politically motivated attacks in the United States during the first six months of 2025, nearly doubling the number of attacks seen over the same period in 2024; and

Whereas, Political violence impacts individuals across the political spectrum at the federal, state, and local level, as well as journalists, activists, and public figures; and

Whereas, Proponents of political violence seek to suppress free speech and debate by creating a climate of fear and intimidation in hopes of stifling civic participation from constituents, public figures, and activists; and

Whereas, The Michigan Senate values the right of Michiganders to freely express themselves and feel safe when doing so, as civic engagement is crucial for a successful democracy; and

Whereas, We urge law enforcement authorities at all levels to thoroughly investigate, prosecute, and hold accountable those who commit to incite political violence; and

Whereas, The Michigan Senate commends law enforcement and all public officials who work to respond to such violence; and

Whereas, We condemn actions and rhetoric that is intended to harass, intimidate, silence, and dehumanize public officials, political candidates, public figures, and their respective family members and staff; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body condemn political violence in all forms, regardless of political party or ideology, and affirm the commitment of the Michigan Senate to peaceful dispute resolution through lawful, democratic means.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

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

Senators Nesbitt, Brinks and Runestad asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

I appreciate this resolution, not just because I introduced a similar resolution last week that the Democratic majority refused to take up, but that it's very timely that this chamber takes this up. Especially considering the abhorrent rhetoric and calls for violence we saw over the weekend. We saw folks this weekend blinded by their hatred of President Trump at our own Capitol building with signs calling for more assassinations and more violence—while waving flags for the domestic terrorist organization, Antifa—all while we saw some elected Democrats out there with them.

And what happens the very next day? The Secret Service down in Florida finds a snipers nest aimed right where President boards Air Force One. By the grace of God, President Trump avoided being assassinated for a third time. Charlie Kirk was murdered in front of the world. They're still gunning for President Trump, and ICE agents are being threatened and attacked daily across this country for upholding the rule of law. Yet, some on the left continue to turn a blind eye. Why?

We swore an oath to protect this country from all enemies, foreign and domestic, and that's exactly what we're going to do. We'll secure our boarders, defend our heroes in uniform, and protect the rule of law. We will never surrender to those who think they can silence us through violence and fear. We will never surrender to people who celebrate murder. We will never surrender to the terrorists who attack our law enforcement heroes. We will now cower, we will not be intimidated, and we sure as hell aren't going to stop. We're going to make America—and Michigan—great again; stronger, safer, and freer than ever before.

To my Democratic colleagues, this resolution today is better than nothing. But what we saw this past week—the calls for violence and extremist rhetoric from left-wing groups—it must be condemned. Specifically, Americans don't believe the lies anymore. They can see through the gaslighting and cringy performances. It's time to step up, call out the violent rhetoric from these groups, and put America and the people of this state first.

Senator Brinks' statement is as follows:

To the Minority Leader, I will again offer my condolences for your loss. As a devout Christian, I'm sure that Charlie Kirk would have been honored by the words from the Senator from the 18th District who paid tribute to him during the invocation the day following his death.

Colleagues, it's not my standard practice to share internal communications in a form like this. I wasn't going to, but because you insist on using Charlie Kirk's death for personal political gain, I feel the need to share this with the members of this chamber: The week of Charlie Kirk's murder, I reached out to the Speaker, to the House Minority Leader, and the Senate Minority Leader to author a joint press statement condemning political violence and urging Americans to unite in this moment. The House Minority Leader signed on. The Speaker of the House said he would sign on—if the Senate Republican Leader signed on. But the Senate Republican Leader refused.

In the spirit of transparency, I want to share the statement that I invited the other three caucus leaders to share. It is as follows:

> We resoundingly reject political violence in any form. It is unacceptable and unamerican. We represent unique legislative priorities, leadership styles, and political philosophies. We cherish our nation's longstanding tradition of fierce debate. It is something we engage in daily, because we believe it makes us stronger. We know that the people of our country cannot fully exercise that freedom to disagree if there is fear of physical harm. If Michiganders can be united in one thing at this moment, let it be the shared desire to maintain the freedom to speak our minds openly, without worry for violence or retribution.

Pretty simple. That was the statement that the Republican Leader couldn't bring himself to join. While I acknowledge his desire to pay respect to someone who fell victim to this tragic assassination, we can't allow that to be done in such a way that creates further political division when what we desperately need is our leaders working together to promote peaceful debate and shared understanding.

Therefore, colleagues, I rise to offer all of us in this chamber the opportunity to say with one voice that we, in the strongest terms possible, condemn all forms of political violence. One of our nation's longest and best traditions is our tradition of debate—fierce, robust, and at times, deeply challenging debate. We can only enjoy that freedom of debate if we are physically safe to engage in it. But we are seeing more and more of these deeply disturbing actions and threats, and it can't stand. We must condemn political violence, not just when people we agree with are killed, hurt, or threatened, but when anyone is killed, hurt, or threatened for their political views.

Colleagues, our job is debating, and I think we're pretty good at that. I think you saw an example of that today. Our job is also listening. Let's continue to set an example for the young people of our state, for the disenfranchised people of our state, and for the people who feel left behind or overlooked. Let's show them that you can be seen and heard without resorting to violence or threats.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I think everyone in this chamber can agree that political violence is unacceptable; it's horrific; it stymies dissent; it stymies discussion, free speech—all the things that this country has been based upon. Every one of us here, I think, feel that way. Yet, we have seen a plethora of political violence across the landscape of the United States like I have never seen in my lifetime.

In my view, there has to be a concern about the language used when you're talking about your opponents in a democratic system. What I have been called here—all of us, on this side at least, on video after video—a fascist, a Nazi, a racist, insurrectionist, Klansman. Now are any of the people over here—does that really identify anyone or anyone's philosophy over here? It absolutely does not.

The purpose of that language is to dehumanize a person, to take their humanity away, turn them into a cockroach or a wolf or something—a predator. That kind of language, I think, is taking disordered individuals who think, Well my goodness, I'm going to be thrown in a gulag by this fascist, I must kill this person. That is what I see driving so much of these disordered people into violence. Instead of saying, We disagree, they're good people. We disagree on the other side of the aisle—we may come to a different conclusion. Maybe we want the end game, but getting there is different.

That's what I was trained to do by my dad. His best friend was a liberal Democrat and they'd argue all day long, then when one would get upset, they'd say, Well let's go grab something to eat. That's the way I was trained. You could look at somebody you disagree with and not start calling them Nazis, fascists, all of this stuff that's so dangerous, that I and all of us have been called on this side of the aisle over and over again.

I hope with this resolution that there's some thought going into the kind of language we use when we disagree with somebody to say, I disagree with this person but I respect their position, they're not a bad person but we just disagree. I hope with this resolution, that is the end goal of it.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Statements

Senators Moss and Bellino asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Moss' statement is as follows:

It seems a while ago now, but earlier in session we did pass legislation to add much-needed transparency in our budget process, which is a significant step forward, something that many of us generally have been advocating for here in this institution for a very long time. In the passage of that legislation, I listened to rhetoric from the other side of the aisle, and I had to be compelled to make sure there was some fact here, not to make sure it was twisted in any which way: that Senate Democrats have led the way. When we took over the majority here, we instituted the first-ever requirements to disclose grant sponsors in the budget process. Don't you forget that the infamized coffeemaker was part of a Republican-controlled Legislature's budget, sponsored by House Republican leadership. Instead, we took a different course. We added transparency marks. Today, we are codifying it into law and expanding upon it.

Before any of the members of the media go to Speaker Hall's victory lap on this—I'm sure he'll hold a press conference—everyone here knows that the real transparency that this institution needs is expanding the Freedom of Information Act to the Legislature and the Governor's office. We are one of two states that do not allow our residents here to request access to inside documents here. This budget transparency is incredibly important. We should expand further into the entire institution, into the entire Governor's office and executive branch. We are not only out of the mainstream compared to what residents of other states can do, achieve, understand, and disclose, we are out of the universe by being one of two states that do not allow our residents to have that same access to the innerworkings of government.

This should not be a controversial move to pass this into law. We've passed it here in this chamber, and it's passed every single session in at least one of the legislative chambers since the Senator from the Upper Peninsula and I drafted these bills. In fact, the current Speaker of the House has voted for these bills. He has advocated for these bills when he served in the minority. He said,

> The Freedom of Information Act is supposed to ensure public access to government records, and it's worrisome that there are gaps in how information is shared and communicated with the public. … It's crucial to support proposals that enhance transparency in our government, including stricter requirements for the governor and state departments to disclose documents and communications.

I agree with that. Now where is he? We introduced these bills as Senate Bill Nos. 1 and 2 in this chamber. You can't elevate it to a bigger priority for our majority here. We passed these here the very first day of voting in this chamber, and there they have sat in the House ever since. And of course, because it wasn't his bills, he's pooh-poohed the bills all together. It's absolutely ridiculous.

So for those who are going to talk to the Speaker later today: we're trying to give you in the media tools to expose more about government decisions. It's high time that the media ask him about the decision of the House Republican majority to not move these bills.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

I really can't make this stuff up. Eleven months after the Democratic chair of Lenawee County—a man elected by Democrats and the executive board of Lenawee County—called for my death, we have a resolution. Thank you, but I'm not going to stop my speech here.

For years, I've watched Democrats and their allies in the media—yes, media, you are complicit—they spent years painting Republicans as a party of political violence. They've told America that we're dangerous, that I'm an extremist, that I somehow threaten democracy itself. They've said it over, and over, and over—hoping if they repeat the lie enough, people will start to believe it.

And then these same Democrats turn around and hold a rally called "No Kings." What did I see in Monroe? Shirts, worn by nuns, that said 8647—a thinly veiled, disgusting call for violence against the sitting President of the United States. Let's be clear, I don't care what an obese ex-Rep in Monroe County says about what 8647 means because he had a job in a restaurant. James Comey told us last year what 8647 means. He ran the FBI, and the FBI said 8647 means to kill and get rid of. And now it's happening in my own backyard.

Just recently, the same man, the head of the Lenawee Democratic Party, Bill Swift, who also called for anyone that supported Donald Trump to be hung—like I said, 11 months ago—attended the Dingell Unity

Dinner—what an apropos name, unity dinner—in Monroe County, in my backyard, at the Plumbers and Pipefitters hall, posing with an 8647 sign, and also a MAGA=Nazis sign. Now some on the other side of the chamber were at this event. They were headliners. The Secretary of State, your state party chair—he headlined the event. These are the same people who claim to be the champions of civility? These are the same people who tell me that words matter? That rhetoric can incite violence? And then when it's your side, when it's hate directed at the Republican President, you laugh and suddenly say, Well it's speech, it's resistance, it's a restaurant industry term, it's art—it's not resistance, it's true hypocrisy.

Imagine for one second if we held a rally out on the lawn and we all had shirts that said "Death to Governor Whitmer." Imagine what would happen. Imagine the field day the press would have on that for weeks. It would be wall-to-wall coverage. But what happened 11 months ago when they called for me to die? Crickets. Until 11 months later—crickets. The journalists didn't write a thing about it. They knew about it. Journalists lose their minds over mean tweets, but they don't want to respond when a Democrat called for the death of Joe Bellino—that's what I think about your damn journalist.

This isn't about hypocrisy—it's about the moral rot that's got ahold of American politics, where the hatred for one man—Donald J. Trump—has clouded basic decency. Where disagreement has turned into dehumanization. Where political opponents aren't wrong anymore, they're enemies that must be destroyed. And let's not forget, for years Democrats were yelling, No one's above the law. Well, Madam AG in New York, no one's above the law. You say there's "no kings," but you like to decide who gets to live and die.

On a personal note, one of my last campaigns, the Carpenter's Union put a freaking noose in my front yard with my picture on it. My wife discovered it. And now you want to talk about civility and no violence? It's complete bullshit. The Carpenter's Union who give almost all their money to Democrats—they did that to me. They violated—

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Thursday, October 16, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

Senate Bill Nos. 606 607 608 609 610 611 612 613 614 615

Scheduled Meetings

Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety — Thursday, October 23, 12:00 noon, Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5312

Finance, Insurance, and Consumer Protection — Wednesday, October 22, 12:30 p.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5314

Health Policy — Wednesday, October 22, 12:30 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5323

Regulatory Affairs — Wednesday, October 22, 2:00 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building (517) 373-1721

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 12:38 p.m.

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, October 22, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN
Secretary of the Senate