

No. 59
STATE OF MICHIGAN
Journal of the Senate
103rd Legislature
REGULAR SESSION OF 2025

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Wednesday, June 25, 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—present
Klinefelt—present
Lauwers—present
Lindsey—present
McBroom—present
McCann—present
McMorrow—present

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

Senator Sylvia Santana of the 2nd District offered the following invocation:

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, now and forever. 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 Senator Nesbitt be temporarily excused from today's session.
The motion prevailed.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded 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 Webber 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 without amendment, the following bills:

Senate Bill No. 54, entitled

A bill to amend 2023 PA 10, entitled "An act to require prevailing wages and fringe benefits on state projects; to establish the requirements and responsibilities of contracting agents and bidders; to make appropriations for the implementation of this act; and to prescribe penalties," by amending section 9 (MCL 408.1109).

Senate Bill No. 319, entitled

A bill to amend 1947 PA 336, entitled "An act to prohibit strikes by certain public employees; to provide review from disciplinary action with respect thereto; to provide for the mediation of grievances and the holding of elections; to declare and protect the rights and privileges of public employees; to require certain provisions in collective bargaining agreements; to prescribe means of enforcement and penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act; and to make appropriations," by amending sections 11 and 15 (MCL 423.211 and 423.215), section 15 as amended by 2023 PA 143.

The bills were placed on the order of 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 10:10 a.m.

10:35 a.m.

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

During the recess, Senator Nesbitt entered the Senate Chamber.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of
Third Reading of Bills

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bill:
Senate Bill No. 288
The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:
Senate Bill No. 288, entitled

A bill to amend 1976 PA 267, entitled “Open meetings act,” by amending section 8 (MCL 15.268), as amended by 2021 PA 166.

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. 171

Yeas—22

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

Nays—14

Albert	Damoose	Lauwers	Runestad
Bellino	Hauck	Lindsey	Theis
Bumstead	Hoitenga	Nesbitt	Victory
Daley	Johnson		

Excused—1

Outman

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. 224, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 224 (MCL 750.224), as amended by 2006 PA 401.

The question being on the passage of the bill,
Senator Polehanki 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. 172**Yeas—22**

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

Nays—14

Bellino	Hauck	Lindsey	Runestad
Bumstead	Hoitenga	McBroom	Theis
Daley	Johnson	Nesbitt	Victory
Damoose	Lauwers		

Excused—1

Outman

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. 225, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 372, entitled “An act to regulate and license the selling, purchasing, possessing, and carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices; to prohibit the buying, selling, or carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices without a license or other authorization; to provide for the forfeiture of firearms and electro-muscular disruption devices under certain circumstances; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide immunity from civil liability under certain circumstances; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to prohibit certain conduct against individuals who apply for or receive a license to carry a concealed pistol; to make appropriations; to prescribe certain conditions for the appropriations; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act,” by amending section 5o (MCL 28.425o), as amended by 2017 PA 95.

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. 173**Yeas—19**

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

Nays—17

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

Excused—1

Outman

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. 226, entitled

A bill to amend 1931 PA 328, entitled “The Michigan penal code,” by amending section 234d (MCL 750.234d), as amended by 2024 PA 158.

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. 174

Yeas—19

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

Nays—17

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

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senator Bellino, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 225 and 226 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 225 be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

By now, I shouldn’t be surprised by the constant attack on our Second Amendment rights, and I’m not. What does always surprise me is the Democrats’ repeated attempts to carve out special rules for lawmakers. As the saying goes: Rules for thee, not for me.

While the Governor and lawmakers have the privilege to be protected by armed officers—and even some of us on the floor carrying—here at the Capitol, law-abiding citizens are not granted that same right. Thankfully, there has never been an incident of gun violence in our State Capitol—never in our State Capitol. Sadly, that can’t be said about other so-called gun-free zones. That’s because criminals, intent on doing harm, don’t care about the law. Anyone brandishing a weapon in a threatening manner in our Capitol should be, and is, being held accountable by existing laws.

We should all be focusing our energy and resources on measures that continue making our communities safer. I urge a “no” vote on these bills.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 331, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 372, entitled “An act to regulate and license the selling, purchasing, possessing, and carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices; to prohibit the buying, selling, or carrying of certain firearms, gas ejecting devices, and electro-muscular disruption devices without a license or other authorization; to provide for the forfeiture of firearms and electro-muscular disruption devices under certain circumstances; to provide for penalties and remedies; to provide immunity from civil liability under certain circumstances; to prescribe the powers and duties of certain state and local agencies; to prohibit certain conduct against individuals who apply for or receive a license to carry a concealed pistol; to make appropriations; to prescribe certain conditions for the appropriations; and to repeal all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act,” (MCL 28.421 to 28.435) by adding section 14c.

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. 175

Yeas—19

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

Nays—17

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

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senators Lindsey, Bellino and Theis, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 331.

Senator Lindsey moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the bill be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lindsey’s statement, in which Senators Bellino and Theis concurred, is as follows:

I just want to make an observation about this bill by way of explaining why I’ll be voting against it. A little bit over a week from now, we will all be celebrating the Fourth of July. A lot of people will be out having burgers on the grill, or however they choose to celebrate, maybe watching fireworks. So, we’re very close to that, and most people on both sides of the chamber celebrate, love, and embrace our nation’s founding.

I’d just like to point out that if this bill were the law of the land at the moment of our founding, our nation would mostly likely not exist. The firearms that our founders used to protect their homesteads, to hunt, to go about their daily business, and yes, to fight back the tyranny of the British government, were, under the definition of this law, “ghost guns.” Ooh, scary.

If this law existed at the moment of our founding, America itself would not exist. That’s how anti-American this legislation is. I ask for a “no” vote.

Senator McMorrow asked and was granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator McMorrow’s first statement is as follows:

I would just like to correct a statement that was made from the previous speaker. The United States Supreme Court, even with its conservative majority, just ruled as recently as March of this year that such legislation to regulate so-called “ghost guns”—as you would any other firearm by requiring serial numbers—is in fact constitutional.

Senator McMorrow’s second statement is as follows:

I would also like to make an observation that at the founding of our country, AR-15s also did not exist.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 332, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 11b of chapter XVII (MCL 777.11b), as amended by 2023 PA 22.

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. 176**Yeas—19**

Anthony
Bayer

Chang
Cherry

Klinefelt
McCann

Santana
Shink

Brinks
Camilleri
Cavanagh

Geiss
Hertel
Irwin

McMorrow
Moss
Polehanki

Singh
Wojno

Nays—17

Albert
Bellino
Bumstead
Daley
Damoose

Hauck
Hoitenga
Huizenga
Johnson

Lauwers
Lindsey
McBroom
Nesbitt

Runestad
Theis
Victory
Webber

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senator Runestad, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 331 and 332 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 331 be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

These bills are a misguided attempt to regulate so-called “ghost guns,” but they ultimately punish responsible gun owners rather than address the root causes of gun violence. This legislation does nothing to stop black market firearms sales, reduce crime, or enhance public safety. Instead, it burdens law-abiding citizens with excessive regulation and fuels fear over the erosion of their Second Amendment rights.

Under this legislation, over a million firearms in Michigan would be rendered illegal overnight, forcing their owners into a costly bureaucratic reserialization process. This would not only create confusion and fear among hobbyists and collectors, but would also flood the already-overwhelmed public agencies with new administrative responsibilities. Michigan has millions of legal gun owners, yet this Democratic-led effort would impose firearm restrictions even more so than federal law, disregarding the constitutional rights of citizens. The role of the Legislature is to uphold and to defend these rights, not to undermine them in pursuit of a political agenda.

This legislation sets a dangerous precedent. It discourages lawful self-protection, criminalizes ordinary Michiganders, and overburdens our law enforcement agencies with enforcement duties unrelated to actual public safety. For these reasons, I will be voting “no” on Senate Bill Nos. 331 and 332, and strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

The following bill was read a third time:

House Bill No. 4090, entitled

A bill to authorize the state administrative board to convey state-owned property in Wayne County; to prescribe conditions for the conveyance; to provide for powers and duties of state departments, agencies, and officers regarding the property; and to provide for disposition of revenue derived from the conveyance.

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. 177

Yeas—34

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

Nays—2

Bellino Runestad

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Singh moved that the bill be given immediate effect.
The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.
The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protest

Senator Runestad, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of House Bill No. 4090 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 Runestad’s statement is as follows:

This will serve as my “no” vote explanation, and it would be my “no” vote explanation on just about any transference of property to the city of Detroit. The reason for that is that Detroit has one of the most amazing historical structures in America. They have one of the few remaining five-star forts left in the nation. Underneath the five-star fort is a thousand-plus-year-old Native American community and burial grounds. Without a doubt, the most significant burial grounds and Native American community in the state of Michigan. Also beneath there is Fort Pontchartrain, which was built by the French in 1701. Beneath that, or above that, it would be, is Fort Shelby, built by the British in 1826. All underneath this incredible, unbelievable, historic entity.

Fort Wayne itself was built in 1842, and then in 1948 it was transferred to the city of Detroit. I visited that fort about 35 years ago, and was filming as the whole thing is continuing to collapse. The city refuses to put any roofs on any of the buildings. They got a big allotment by advertising to the people of Wayne County that they were going to restore Fort Wayne with a parks and rec millage. They restored one building, left all the rest of it a crumbling mess. Governor Snyder funded a \$175,000 study on all the things that could be done with Fort Wayne. An incredible vision of what could be done, especially with the Ambassador Bridge right above it, it could be like Mackinac Island. You’ve got the river, you’ve got the history, you’ve got everything.

I have been working since I got elected to this Legislature to try to get the city of Detroit to do one thing: at least put a roof on, do something with that property, or transfer it back to the federal government. Both Senators Levin and Stabenow at the time got the permission to transfer it back. The city says it will not let it go back. They let it crumble, the most historic thing in the state of Michigan, one of the most historic in the nation, and they just let it go to dust. So, as long as they're going to continue with this absolutely irresponsible behavior, I will not agree to transfer one thing to the city of Detroit until they've shown that they have the responsibility to take care of it.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Santana's statement is as follows:

This bill was designed to transfer property to the city of Detroit. Quite frankly, for the member from the 23rd District, your comments are disrespectful to the city of Detroit—a city that has been on the resurgence and up-come for a very long time post-bankruptcy. So, your comments about the city being irresponsible are not merited and this bill should be supported by everyone.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

This is one of the relatively few occasions where I have to depart from my colleague from the 23rd District, who just gave an impassioned and sensible argument against voting for this bill. I will be supporting it. I don't disagree with his remarks that it's a challenge to trust the city of Detroit to take conveyance of this property, but I just have to point out that it also matters from where it is being transferred—and that's the Department of Corrections. You can make as strong an argument as you want about challenges the city might have in overseeing it, and I would just say that I have even less faith that it should stay in the hands of the Michigan Department of Corrections under their current leadership. So, I will be voting "yes."

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 154, entitled

A bill to prohibit certain conduct at or near a health facility and prescribe penalties; to provide remedies; and to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Runestad offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 1, line 1, after "to" by inserting "places of worship and".
 2. Amend page 2, line 10, after "a" by inserting "place of religious worship or a".
 3. Amend page 2, line 11, after "a" by inserting "place of religious worship or a".
 4. Amend page 2, line 23, after the second "or" by inserting "entering, remaining in, or leaving a place of religious worship, or"
 5. Amend page 2, line 24, after "facility" by inserting "or place of religious worship".
 6. Amend page 2, line 26, after "services" by inserting "or because a place of religious worship is a place of religious worship".
 7. Amend page 5, line 1, after "a" by inserting "place of religious worship or a".
- The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator Runestad offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 2, line 6, after "means" by striking out the balance of the subdivision and inserting a colon and:
 - (i) Except as provided in subparagraph (ii) and subject to subparagraph (iii), to knowingly and intentionally engage in conduct that would place a reasonable individual in fear of imminent bodily harm to the individual's self or to another individual, so long as such fear is objectively reasonable under the circumstances.
 - (ii) Mere presence, verbal expression, or conduct protected under section 5 of article I of the state constitution of 1963 and the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not, without more, constitute intimidation.
 - (iii) This subsection must not be construed to prohibit constitutionally protected activity, including peaceful picketing or other expressive conduct, unless such activity is undertaken with the specific intent to place another individual in fear of imminent bodily harm."

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

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 178

Yeas—19

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

Nays—17

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

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Runestad’s first statement is as follows:

I rise in support of my first amendment to Senate Bill No. 154. As currently written, this legislation risks leading to the overprosecution of speech and activities that are clearly protected under the First Amendment. While Senate Bill Nos. 154 and 155 are modeled in part on the federal FACE Act, they intentionally omit one of its most-important provisions: additional protections for religious places of worship. My amendment corrects this serious omission by reinserting that critical language into the bill. Churches, temples, synagogues, mosques, and other religious gathering places are all too often targets of harassment and violence. That’s why they were put in the federal law.

Just this past weekend in Wayne County, parishioners heroically stopped an armed individual who entered a Sunday service with the apparent intent to commit mass murder on the assembled parishioners. Incidents like this underscore the urgent need for stronger legal protections, not less. If we’re going to adopt the so-called Michigan FACE Act, then it should fully reflect the federal model, especially when it comes to safeguarding the houses of worship. These sacred spaces are just as deserving of protection as the facilities and individuals covered under this proposed legislation, such as those working in abortion clinics.

My amendment ensures equal protection under the law, and it reinforces our commitment to religious freedom and safety. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and make Senate Bill No. 154 more balanced, more fair, and consistent with the federal standards.

Senator Runestad’s second statement is as follows:

I rise to offer amendment No. 2, which addresses a serious and glaring issue with Senate Bill No. 154—the current definition of the term “intimidate.” As it stands, the bill defines “intimidate” as causing someone to reasonably have an “apprehension of bodily harm.” This language is very over-broad, vague, and highly

subjective, opening the door to unjust and politically motivated persecutions. Criminal penalties should be based on objective standards, not on how someone feels in a given moment. As written, Senate Bill No. 154 allows prosecution to hinge entirely on the accusers perception rather than the actual conduct or the intent of the accused. That is a dangerous precedent. It risks allowing prosecutors to target law-abiding demonstrators, simply by stretching ambiguous language to fit a particular narrative.

To address this, my amendment offers a clear, more constitutionally sound definition of “intimidate.” It ensures that only those who knowingly and intentionally engage in threatening or assaultive conduct are subject to prosecutions—not citizens peacefully exercising their First Amendment rights. My amendment defines “intimidate” as follows: Intimidate means “to knowingly and intentionally engage in conduct that would place a reasonable individual in fear of imminent bodily harm to the individual’s self or to another individual, so long as such fear is objectively reasonable under the circumstances.”

This revised definition strikes the proper balance. It ensures that genuine bad actors can still be prosecuted, while protecting the constitutional rights of peaceful protestors and demonstrators. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to remove the dangerous subjectivity from this bill, to protect both the public’s safety and civil liberties.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 155, entitled

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 13n of chapter XVII (MCL 777.13n), as amended by 2023 PA 63.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Runestad offered the following amendments:

- 1. Amend page 6, line 2, after “to” by inserting “**place of religious worship or**”.
- 2. Amend page 6, line 6, after “to” by inserting “**place of religious worship or**”.
- 3. Amend page 6, line 12, after “to” by inserting “**place of religious worship or**”.
- 4. Amend page 6, line 16, after “to” by inserting “**place of religious worship or**”.

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

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

Roll Call No. 179

Yeas—19

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

Nays—17

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

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

Protests

Senator Bellino, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 154 and 155 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 154 be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

Senate Bill Nos. 154 and 155 are solutions in search of a problem. These bills are the kind of laws that are designed to limit the ability of sidewalk counselors to reach women who are facing untimely pregnancies and contemplating abortion. These counselors provide peaceful, loving, and compassionate outreach to women, presenting them with options they might not be aware of, such as that there are nearly 100 pregnancy centers in our state. These bills rightly make harassment, assault, vandalism, and intimidation criminal offenses. But as I looked yesterday, Madam President, these are already criminal offenses in Michigan.

These bills are unnecessary. These bills are nothing more than a platform designed for abortion supporters to support the false narrative that claims pro-life sidewalk counselors are dangerous, and Madam President, that is hilarious after five years of watching peaceful protests. I urge a “no” vote on Senate Bill Nos. 154 and 155.

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

Senate Bill No. 235

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

Senate Bill No. 235, entitled

A bill to amend 1967 PA 281, entitled “Income tax act of 1967,” (MCL 206.1 to 206.847) by adding section 678.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Singh offered the following substitute:

Substitute (S-2).

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. 180

Yeas—28

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

Nays—8

Albert	Johnson	Lindsey	Runestad
Huizenga	Klinefelt	McBroom	Theis

Excused—1

Outman

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. 236, entitled

A bill to create a sustainable aviation fuel incentive program; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state governmental officers and entities; to provide for the certification of certain tax credits and incentives; and to prescribe penalties.

The question being on the passage of the bill,
Senator Bellino offered the following substitute:
Substitute (S-2).

The question being on the adoption of the substitute,
Senator Lindsey offered the following amendment to the substitute:

1. Amend page 2, line 27, after “biomass” by inserting “and that is not derived from a source facility that also sells to manufacturers of high fructose corn syrup”.

The amendment to the substitute was not adopted.
The question being on the adoption of the substitute,
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. 181

Yeas—28

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

Nays—8

Albert	Johnson	Lindsey	Runestad
Huizenga	Klinefelt	McBroom	Theis

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—0

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

This amendment I affectionately call the "high-fructose corn syrup amendment." Some of you may remember I offered it last year when a similar bill came through. The premise is this: the underlying bill is designed to create a tax advantage for certain economic activity—specifically, let's put it in clear terms—this is to help corn growers get an incentive to be able to sell corn to turn it into ethanol for airplanes.

Now, I personally don't think it's generally wise for the government to step in and create these sort of economic incentive structures to manipulate the market, but the reason I wrote this amendment is to say that, if we are going to provide this sort of advantage to people—if we say we're going to alter Michigan's laws to give a special advantage to some people to incentivize the use of corn for certain products—could we also take the same opportunity to make the minor ask of those industrial players to say, Would you join us in helping to reduce the amount of high-fructose corn syrup out there in the world? That's what this amendment does. It says that if you're going to qualify, you're going to have to go back through the supply chain and make sure that you're also benefiting from distribution channels that are producing high-fructose corn syrup.

Of course, I believe this matters because high-fructose corn syrup is one of the contributing factors that has led to so many negative health outcomes. I won't bore the chamber, but I encourage anybody to pull up Google and ask how we're doing as a state and as a nation. Ask how our children are doing. Ask what the obesity rates are. Ask what the other chronic illnesses are. I think that you'll find that it's a pretty fair measure to make a minor ask of these big industrial players: that if you're going to get an advantage on the backs of Michiganders in terms of the tax code, could you join us in trying to help our state be a little bit healthier?

In fact, I had this conversation with some of the advocates of the legislation, and even told them that I would step out of my comfort zone and work with them on trying to help advocate for some of the policies they want if they would proactively work on a solution on this topic. The answer was crystal clear. The answer was that we're standing here today with no meaningful negotiation having happened on that because Big Ag and some of their partners in aviation believe they have enough control over this chamber that, when they're asked to even put a fraction of effort into stepping forward and trying to join on solutions to help tackle the health crisis across America, they say: We don't need you. We have enough power in the Legislature. We will get our way.

So, I ask my colleagues—I encourage you to think of it this way: We are the only ones who can push back effectively on them and say "no," you don't hold the power, you don't serve the people, we do. It's our job to say that this sort of trade-off is exactly what we should be doing if we're going to give you a big incentive, we're going to ask a little bit in return, that you join us and help make our state healthier. I ask for a "yes" vote on this amendment.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

Resolutions

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

Senate Resolution No. 62**Senate Resolution No. 64**

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

Senators McCann, Wojno, Klinefelt, Chang, Cavanagh and McMorrow offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 62.

A resolution to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Whereas, On July 26, 1990, President George H.W. Bush signed into law the Americans with Disabilities Act, a civil rights law which prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities; and

Whereas, This year marks the 35th anniversary of the ADA, a landmark federal law that protects the rights of people with disabilities by eliminating barriers to their participation in many aspects of living and working in our country and our state; and

Whereas, It is estimated by the United States Census Bureau that nearly one in four, or 70 million, adults live with a disability in America; and

Whereas, The ADA helped to break down barriers that prevented opportunities for people with disabilities to live and work in their communities and participate fully in our economy and democracy; and

Whereas, The ADA ensures fairness for all in many areas of public life including jobs, schools, and transportation; and

Whereas, Every individual deserves respect, access, and equal opportunity; and

Whereas, America and the state of Michigan are strong because of the contributions of all of our citizens; and

Whereas, We recognize that our work to uphold the spirit and the letter of the ADA is not yet finished; and

Whereas, We must continue to work together to build a society in which differences are embraced, opportunities are made equally available, and one that will leave no person behind; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body commemorate the 35th anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA); and be it further

Resolved, That we hold the highest regard for everyone who contributed to the enactment of the ADA and those who continue to uphold its principles. We urge all Michigan residents to acknowledge and celebrate this occasion.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Bayer, Moss, Polehanki, Santana and Webber were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

Senator Webber offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 63.

A resolution to urge the Michigan congressional delegation, the United States government, and the governments of India and Pakistan to condemn all terrorism and acts of violence against civilians and to continue working toward a peaceful resolution of this conflict.

Whereas, The former princely state of Jammu and Kashmir is located in South Asia, at the intersection of Pakistan, India, and China. Both Pakistan and India claim ownership of the whole of Jammu and Kashmir, but in reality each nation only controls a portion of the region, separated by a “Line of Control” that runs through the Kashmir Valley. The dispute over the ownership of Jammu and Kashmir has been the cause of repeated conflicts between India and Pakistan since 1947; and

Whereas, On April 22, 2025, a group of militants attacked civilians near Pahalgam, a tourist destination in the Indian-administered portion of Jammu and Kashmir, killing 26 people. Witnesses have reported that the terrorists specifically targeted Hindu tourists. While most of the victims were Hindu, one Catholic was also reportedly killed, along with one local Kashmiri Muslim tour guide who intervened to protect the tourists being targeted; and

Whereas, This attack has increased tensions between India and Pakistan. The two nations have expelled each other’s diplomats and canceled the visas of each other’s nationals, and India announced that it is holding the bilateral Indus Waters Treaty of 1960 in abeyance. In early May 2025, the conflict escalated to include the use of military force by both sides, resulting in dozens of additional civilian deaths. India and Pakistan agreed to a ceasefire on May 10, but there are lingering concerns about whether the peace will hold, and tensions remain high; and

Whereas, The attack in Pahalgam has been condemned by the government of India, the United Nations Security Council, and the international community at large as an act of terror against a civilian population, and the government of Pakistan has stated that it condemns terrorism in all forms. Targeting civilians based on their religion violates international tenets of religious tolerance and freedom. It is vital that we condemn acts of violence against civilians; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the Michigan congressional delegation, the United States government, and the governments of India and Pakistan to condemn all terrorism and acts of violence against civilians and to continue working toward a peaceful resolution of this conflict; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, the United States Secretary of State, the United States Ambassador to India, the United States Ambassador to Pakistan, the Ambassador of India to the United States, and the Ambassador of Pakistan to the United States.

Pursuant to rule 3.204, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Senator Cherry offered the following resolution:

Senate Resolution No. 64.

A resolution to condemn the Trump Administration and congressional Republican's support of the divisive "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" that raises costs for Michiganders, slashes Medicaid, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and the Women, Infants and Children program (WIC), adds burdensome hurdles to important tax relief measures for low-income households, drives more families into poverty by giving tax cuts to the most wealthy households, and sets back progress on a clean energy future while increasing energy costs on Americans.

Whereas, The Trump Administration's budget reconciliation bill, House Resolution 1, named the "One Big Beautiful Bill Act," is a raw deal for the citizens of the United States (U.S.) and Michigan by cutting programs that millions of citizens rely on and gives tax breaks to multi-millionaires and billionaires; and

Whereas, President Trump and congressional Republicans have campaigned for the past 10 years on concerns regarding the national debt but are preparing to add \$2.8 trillion additional debt to the U.S. over the next 10 years, which represents an economic and national security threat to our citizens and will burden our children and grandchildren with this debt; and

Whereas, President Trump's "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" will significantly increase the financial burden on working- and middle-class Americans by eliminating or reducing basic needs programs; and

Whereas, The bill proposes deep systematic cuts to Medicaid, jeopardizing healthcare access for millions of low-income families, seniors, children, and individuals with disabilities; and

Whereas, Medicaid covers one in four Michiganders, with 2.6 million Michiganders receiving access to healthcare each month through Medicaid, including one million children (Medicaid covers 45 percent of all Michigan births), 300,000 people living with disabilities, 168,000 seniors, and 750,000 adults in the Healthy Michigan Plan; and

Whereas, Medicaid is the largest health insurance program in the U.S. and restricting access to this vital lifeline will negatively impact the access of millions of citizens to healthcare as hospitals will be forced to reduce staffing, eliminate services, and close their doors, with rural hospitals, often the largest employers, taking the hardest hit; and

Whereas, President Trump's legislation slashes funding for SNAP, taking away food from over 1.4 million Michiganders (15 percent of our state's population), and forcing food insecurity on vulnerable households, including children, veterans, and the elderly; and

Whereas, Cuts to Medicaid, SNAP, and WIC, as proposed by the Trump Administration and congressional Republicans, will create an estimated \$2 billion hole in Michigan's budget; and

Whereas, This bill takes the money cut from Medicaid, SNAP, and WIC and gives it to wealthy individuals and large corporations through tax cuts, by extending the 2017 tax cuts that resulted in benefits to the wealthiest 10 percent and rising costs for the bottom 90 percent from President Trump's tariffs and slashing of basic needs programs; and

Whereas, The bill increases the Child Tax Credit only for the wealthiest of families and leaves 20 million children in working families with no additional benefit and receiving less (or no) health care or food support, pushing more families (especially those with children) into poverty; and

Whereas, Millions of families that rely on the Earned Income Tax Credit will now have additional burdensome hurdles to receiving their benefits, hindering and stifling families from rising out of poverty; and

Whereas, The legislation seeks to eliminate or scale back resources for clean energy projects, undermining climate goals, exacerbating the effects of climate change, stifling innovation, and threatening progress toward a sustainable and environmentally secure future; and

Whereas, An independent analysis estimates that the congressional Republicans' bill will raise the cost of energy prices for households and businesses by nearly seven percent by 2026, equating to approximately \$110 for the average American household, nearly canceling out any benefit for working class families; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body condemn the Trump Administration and congressional Republican's support of the divisive "One Big Beautiful Bill Act" that raises costs for Michiganders, slashes Medicaid, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), and the Women, Infants and Children program (WIC), adds burdensome hurdles to important tax relief measures for low-income households, drives more families into poverty by giving tax cuts to the most wealthy households, and sets back progress on a clean energy future while increasing energy costs on Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge members of Congress to reject this legislation in its entirety, and to instead pursue policies that fully fund Medicaid, SNAP, and WIC, protect vulnerable communities, expand access to healthcare, promote clean energy, and ensure a fair and equitable tax system for all Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President 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,

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, assumed the Chair.

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

Senator Singh requested the yeas and nays.

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

The resolution was adopted, a majority of the members voting therefor, as follows:

Roll Call No. 182

Yeas—19

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

Nays—15

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

Excused—1

Outman

Not Voting—2

Daley Lauwers

In The Chair: Geiss

Senators McMorrow, Moss, Polehanki and Santana were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

Protest

Senator Bellino, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the adoption of Senate Resolution No. 64 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of the resolution be printed as his reasons for voting “no”.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

President Trump has done it again. With the “One Big Beautiful Bill Act,” he’s cutting through the mess in Washington and putting Americans first. I read a report this morning that the average family of four in

America could save up to \$11,700 per family. Not billionaires, not millionaires, hard-working families. This bill is bold, simple, and exactly what we need. It secures our borders, protects American jobs, slashes red tape, and puts our economy back on the path to greatness, all in one clear no-nonsense package. No more bloated bills full of pork. Remember the \$9 billion? This is about getting results, restoring order, and putting America first again. I proudly support this bill, and I proudly stand with President Trump as he fights for working Americans and delivers the leadership this country deserves. Let's get this done. Let's make this a big, beautiful day. God bless President Trump, and God bless Michigan.

Senators Cherry, McCann, Shink, Moss, Bayer, Runestad, Santana, Hauck, Irwin and McMorrogh 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 statement is as follows:

I rise today in strong support of my resolution urging Congress to abandon the Trump administration's so-called "One Big Beautiful Bill Act," a bill whose title is about as misleading as its content is harmful. This federal legislation raises everyday costs for Michiganders; slashes basic needs programs like Medicaid, SNAP, and WIC; makes it harder for low income families to access essential tax relief, like the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit; deepens inequality with tax breaks for the ultra-wealthy and large corporations; and derails progress on clean energy while raising energy costs on working families. What do we get for all of this? Trillions in additional debt for our kids. This bill is a raw deal for our neighbors, our working families, and our most vulnerable citizens. It's a handout to the wealthy, funded by taking from those who already have the least.

We have heard in committee the impacts of this, firsthand from mothers of disabled children, food banks, rural hospitals, and many more. If you're a Michigander who relies on Medicaid to stay healthy, this bill is cutting your care. If you're a Michigander who doesn't rely on Medicaid, the bill will increase your costs and decrease your services. If you're a Michigander using SNAP or WIC to keep food on the table, this bill makes it harder to feed your loved ones. If you're a Michigan farmer, you lose money on already narrow margins. If you're a Michigan senior hoping the big, beautiful bill will protect your Social Security, this bill keeps your essential safety net on the pathway to insolvency.

We're told this is a path toward fiscal responsibility, but the numbers say otherwise. This legislation will add \$2.8 trillion in additional debt. Let me repeat that: \$2.8 trillion dollars in additional debt. I think we can all agree that asking our children and their children and the generations that will come after to foot the bill for these 2025 tax cuts, tax cuts that only benefit a select few, is illogical at best. Let's be clear. Calling this a beautiful bill is just another in a long line of dishonest sales pitches. The reality is that it trades away the health and dignity of working people to offer yet another giveaway to the ultra-rich, all at the expense of everyday Americans and everyday Michiganders.

Michigan deserves better. This resolution tells our elected officials in Washington exactly where we stand. It says we stand with the Michiganders who work hard and only ask for a fair shot. We stand with families, seniors, and children who need care and support, not cruel cuts. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in rejecting this flawed and harmful legislation. Let's put our people before politics. Please join me in adopting this resolution.

Senator McCann's statement is as follows:

As we know, the U.S. House of Representatives recently passed a spending bill that slashes \$535 billion from Medicaid over the next decade, threatening to kick hundreds of thousands of Michigan citizens off their health insurance, all to help pay for \$4 trillion tax break for billionaires and corporations. As the largest health insurance program in the United States, this threat to Medicaid is a threat to our people here in Michigan, our medical facilities, and healthcare as a whole.

Since 1965, Medicaid has given states the ability to provide much needed healthcare coverage. In 2014, Michigan expanded Medicaid coverage by creating the Healthy Michigan Plan. I was here for it—in the Michigan House in 2013—and I proudly voted for the legislation to expand Medicaid in Michigan. I remind you it had strong bipartisan support, and was signed into law by then-Governor Rick Snyder. It was one of the best things Michigan ever did. Today, Medicaid and the Healthy Michigan Plan provide vital coverage to 2.6 million Michigan citizens, including two out of five children, three in five nursing home residents, and 45 percent of all births. The fact is, Medicaid is a money-saver in healthcare. It is an economy booster with strong ripple effects. It promotes good health, it prevents more expensive healthcare outcomes, and it keeps rural hospitals open.

Without the influx of federal Medicaid funding, hospitals and care providers would be forced to downsize or close entirely, laying off workers and forcing all patients—all patients, including those with private insurance—to travel farther and wait longer to receive care. In rural areas, Medicaid patients are essential to keeping hospital doors open as they make up nearly 40 percent of patient volume. Hospital administrators in Michigan are warning us that cuts to Medicaid threaten the entire rural healthcare system. This is not just theoretical or ambiguous. Recent data from the University of North Carolina shows that healthcare cuts under consideration in this legislation could place over 300 rural hospitals across the U.S. at risk of closure, conversion, or service reductions. This includes 20 hospitals, 20 rural hospitals here in Michigan that will potentially close if this legislation passed. Here's a few Ascension Borgess - Lee Hospital in Dowagiac, Ascension Standish Hospital in Standish, Bronson South Haven Hospital in South Haven.

Madam President, less people with healthcare harms us all. We need to remember that there is a personal story for every person who relies on Medicaid, but there are faces behind the numbers that a broad brush approach sacrifices nuance for harmful simplicity, and reduces personal stories to numbers and statistics. We know this approach almost always results in greater suffering of people and communities.

Colleagues, the resolution before you gives you a chance to make your voice heard. By supporting it, you stand for your constituents, your districts, and the hospitals that support thousands of patients and employ hundreds of workers. It's the right thing to do, and I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution.

Senator Shink's statement is as follows:

This so-called big, beautiful bill working its way through the U.S. Senate at the behest of Donald Trump is better described as a big blight booster, because that's exactly what it will do. Boost hardship for our local farmers who are working hard to provide for their families while delivering fresh food to Michiganders across the state. More specifically, this legislation would slash SNAP benefits, a vital program that helps Michiganders, real people, put food on the table. Cuts like these mean more families will go hungry, more children without proper nutrition, and our local farmers will face significant hardships. In addition to the federally funded programs that buy directly from Michigan farms to stock homes, schools, and childcare centers, a vital source of income for growers that this bill would cut, an increasing number of farmers markets accept SNAP dollars, giving the 1.5 million Michiganders who rely on them easy access to healthy, locally-grown produce.

These dollars directly benefit our economy and support our farmers and rural communities. These dollars are very important. For every dollar spent in SNAP benefits, about \$1.50 stays at the local economy. Farmers depend on this income, and over 1.3 Michiganders depend on these programs. By cutting these resources, Donald Trump and D.C. Republicans aren't just starving families, they are also putting the livelihoods of our small farmers and rural communities at risk, and for what? To serve billionaires a tax break on a silver platter? It's ridiculous. It's not for the people. We must continue to stand up and do what we can as state lawmakers to protect hard working Michiganders from these drastic, irresponsible, and harmful cuts.

Senator Moss' statement is as follows:

I rise in support of this resolution because this congressional bill is anything but beautiful, although it will have big negative consequences on Michigan's economy. It is the latest in a series of unstable and confusing Trump economic policies that have not lowered costs but have increased economic anxieties. This isn't just political rhetoric; this is from research and data that it will impact our state's economy, small businesses, and working families in our state.

Last week, the Michigan Senate Oversight Committee held a hearing on consumer confidence, taking in the last 80 years of public attitudes toward our economy as surveyed by the Institute for Social Research at U of M. How people felt about their financial situation was on a general upward trend from June 2022 to December 2024, and then plunged over the first four months of 2025—declining to the second-lowest level since the 1950s. Nearly two-thirds of consumers expect unemployment to worsen. When consumer confidence is this low, it slows spending, it slows growth, and it can lead to a recession. There's not a partisan divide here either. Even Republicans who broadly support Trump's agenda agree that the economic outlook has deteriorated over the course of this year. This is a sentiment across all economic classes, even among higher income groups who generate the majority of consumer spending. This is not the economic climate Donald Trump promised.

What's big about this bill is the increase to our country's debt, the increase to household costs, and the increase in taxes to most people. And it's certainly not beautiful to cut vital support and lifelines for Michiganders struggling to get by. Add this to the chaotic tariff policy that threatens tens of thousands of jobs in Michigan's manufacturing plants. U of M's research also forecasts that the combined impact of tariffs on steel, aluminum, and the auto sector will result in 13,000 fewer jobs than otherwise expected by 2027. Additionally, they project the state's unemployment rate will rise to 6 percent by the first quarter of 2026, which would be the first time it reached that height since the pandemic in 2021.

This is a lot of figures, this is a lot of data, a lot of numbers, but it all points in the same direction. Our economy is not a political game. It is real life and impacts real people here in the state of Michigan. It only stands to get worse with the passage of this bill. We must speak with one voice in Michigan to oppose it.

Senator Bayer's statement is as follows:

I rise to speak in support of this resolution and in strong opposition to what I call the "bad billionaires budget bill." The proposed federal budget legislation cuts trillions of dollars over the next 10 years, and why? The primary purpose of this legislation is a sweeping tax overhaul intended to make the 2017 tax cuts passed during Trump's first term permanent. The beneficiaries? The rich and the powerful. Fifty percent of the bill's total tax cut benefits go to the wealthiest Americans: the top 10 percent. While the bottom 30 percent—a third of our people in this country—will lose money due to the spending cut offsets. In order to pay for this horrendous tax shift, Trump and the Republicans are planning to slash important services that people in Michigan and around the state depend on.

One of the many issues that are on the chopping block is housing and homeless assistance. Federal Republicans have proposed cutting housing and urban development—HUD—programs by 44 percent and rental assistance reduced by 57-1/2 percent, affecting over 4.4 million very low income residents. HUD is dedicated to creating strong, sustainable, inclusive communities and quality, affordable homes for everyone. That role is more important now than ever. A Zillow analysis a couple of years ago estimated that America was short 4.5 million homes—four and a half million homes, not enough for our people, and the shortage is actually continuing to increase and that's making costs go up. Nearly half of our households spend more than 30 percent of their income on rent or mortgage payments falling under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development definition of cost-burdened. The programs we have now that incentivize development of lower income or working families housing, specifically the community development block grants, CDBG grants, and the home investment partnerships program, the homes grants will be slashed. These programs are crucial for community and affordable housing development. The direct cuts are just one of the ways that the bad billionaires budget bill is going to cause housing costs to rise.

If this bill is passed, economists are warning that the rising deficit will push mortgage rates even higher. At a time when average mortgage rates are already near 7 percent, another rise in borrowing costs will make homeownership even more difficult for most Americans. Right now, 42 percent of families in Michigan are living at the ALICE level—that's asset limited income constrained—struggling to pay their bills every month. Even one of the cuts in this disastrous budget proposal, whether it's support for food or health care or housing, just one of these things can very quickly take a family into crisis. This is what Trump and the Washington Republicans are looking to cut to pay for one of the biggest tax shifts and wealth transfers ever. Cut support to keep people in a home, not in a car or parking structure. Cut the ability to put food on their table. Cut the healthcare to keep their families healthy.

Just over a week ago, millions of people across this country, in communities of all sizes, hundreds of thousands of Michiganders, people in Bad Axe, Owosso, Ironwood, Detroit, Farmington Hills, endless cities and villages around our state, all over the state protested proposed cuts to basic needs for their families, food, healthcare, and housing. That proposal should die. This is what you'll be supporting if you oppose this resolution, I urge you all to join me in voting "yes."

Senator Runestad's first statement is as follows:

The good Senator from the 7th District said that this is not a political game. I could tell you this resolution is nothing but a political game. It's just a bunch of hot air from the other side of the aisle. So much of that is absolutely inaccurate. The Senator from the 7th District said it will increase taxes. This is polling that the tax portion of this by 80 percent of the American people. Why? Because if this does not pass, it will be the largest tax increase on the middle class and working class in the nation's history. If this does not pass and we do not get these tax cuts in place. Also there's huge money for border security. The Biden administration threw open the border. I keep hearing 10 million, but when I was at the border, talked to the state, local, and national law enforcement down there, they said it was more along the lines of 40 million people, who all need housing, by the way, taken from the middle class primarily. It's going to have border enforcement dollars. No tax on tips, no tax on overtime. I think that that's actually not for billionaires. I don't know how many billionaires are getting tips and working overtime. That's for the working and the middle class.

In terms of Medicaid, that's probably the biggest pile of misinformation of all. We need to protect Medicaid for the truly needy. What the Michigan Auditor General found out is, in 2022 data, the state is alleged to pay out \$1.5 billion in 2022, improper payments to beneficiaries who were not eligible, another \$800 million to recipients whose case files were missing documentation eligibility. Eleven percent of Medicaid payments were made to individuals not eligible for this type of assistance, 33 percent of CHIP recipients are not eligible for this type of assistance they were registered under. The improper payments were, according to arcmi.org,

is 6.1 percent. The national average is 5.9 percent. We are one of the top states for pouring money into improper payments nationally. We should be one of the leaders because we have real needs here. The people who are on Medicaid need more, not less. We need to be giving it to the people who deserve it, not to people who don't deserve it. And I can't get the other side of the aisle to address this issue. It's a huge issue that the people on Medicaid need more. The work requirements say that you can do almost all kinds of things. You can get a GED, you can go to drug rehab, you can do community service, you can go to school, you can work part time, you can even work minimum wage as a self-employed person, and on and on and on for 20 hours a week. The vast majority of people in the United States say for a benefit like that when you're able-bodied and you do not have dependents, the vast majority of the people support that. The Democrats just want all of this waste, fraud, and abuse to continue, and it's harming those who are on Medicaid, those who need these services.

The administration costs—I also hear all this smoke over on the other side about how much the administration costs are—to implement the work requirements would be between \$17.5 million and \$70 million, but there's a tremendous amount of savings when you have those work requirements. The other side is saying, Well, if you have work requirements, you have community service or go to school. No one's going to do it. They'll all refuse, even though they're able-bodied without kids. No, a lot of them are going to do it. The vast majority of people would do it. It would save money for the Medicaid system, and I think improve their lives as well and create more money for the people on Medicaid who are not getting enough on Medicaid. We need to pass this bill to protect Medicaid and those who are truly needy on that program.

Senator Santana's statement is as follows:

Madam President, to the Senator from the 23rd District, this is not a political game. This is about the health and the lives of Michiganders across this state who rely on Medicaid as a lifeline. And to the Senator from the 16th District what I heard you say was that, Oh, we want to make a great tax break for a lot of Americans can become billionaires based off the backs of the people who need health care.

But, Madam President, more importantly, I rise to support the people of my district and across Michigan for this resolution, because the one big, beautiful bill and its attacks on the healthcare our people depend on is devastating. This legislation proposes deep, systematic cuts to Medicaid, risking healthcare access for millions of low income families, seniors, children, and individuals with disabilities. Medicaid covers over one in four Michiganders. Additionally, 45 percent of births in Michigan are covered by Medicaid. The 2.6 million Michiganders who receive access to health care each month through Medicaid include one million children, 300,000 people with disabilities, 168,000 seniors, and 750,000 adults in the Healthy Michigan Plan.

The Medicaid cuts that Washington Republicans are proposing would have a devastating impact on people's health, with the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services estimating more than 500,000 Michiganders will lose their coverage mainly due to the burdensome administrative hurdles and bureaucratic red tape that is proposed to seek to enact. As both the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Health and Human Services and the majority vice chair of the Health Policy Committee, I definitely understand thoroughly the importance of Medicaid to our state, our budgets, and our state residents.

I am also only painfully aware of the human costs of slashing Medicaid. Early this year, we had medical and healthcare officials testify before our subcommittee on the fiscal and systematic impacts to those cuts. And in a recent Senate Health Policy Committee hearing, we heard directly from worried patients, scared parents, and others directly impacted by these issues.

I'd like to leave you with a couple of their words, not mine. I quote, I never thought I would hear, but would that be here? But without Medicaid, I don't know how my children and I would survive. It only takes one moment for everything to change and everything in mission and family deserves to know that if the worst happens, there is a safety net that that's there to catch them. Rose from Grosse Pointe. Losing Medicaid wouldn't just have a policy change. It would be catastrophic for my family and so many others. We can't afford to let this happen. Katie from Ypsilanti. As you prepare to take this vote, I'd like you to think of those stories and those 500,000 other Michiganders, like the people you heard from here, and everybody in each corner of this state who is impacted by Medicaid. That's who we're really talking about here when you vote for or against this bill.

Senator Hauck's statement is as follows:

You know, I like how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so concerned about the people they represent and what's going to happen to them if everything they say comes true, but what concerns me the most is the district that I butt up against, who I have neighbors that live in that district, have no representation to come in front of their Representative or Senator and ask them what really is going to happen, and that's the 35th District. They have no representation. We're so concerned—you're so concerned about everybody else, but you will not demand to the Governor that they have a special election for the 35th District. This is the longest that's ever been, where they have not called the special election, especially a Governor who won two elections with a special election. Thank you for your leeway.

Senator Irwin's first statement is as follows:

Hearing this debate makes me wonder, what do Republicans think happens to low income people when they're cut off Medicaid? What do you think happens to them? Do you think they just disappear? Do you think they're vaporized? What do you think happens when they get sick? Why is it that you seem to think denying preventative care from people in our state is going to somehow save money? Think about it. This is a ridiculous piece of logic. Denying preventative care to people is only going to increase the cost of our healthcare system, increase premiums for people who are buying insurance on the private market or on the exchange, and it's cruel and inhumane. Let's not forget about that.

When you deny these people preventative care, they aren't able to go to the doctor, they get sicker and they get sicker, and then they end up in the emergency department. And then we all pay more for a worse outcome. That's what Republicans in Congress are debating. That's the idea. That's the wool they're trying to pull over on the American people. I think my Republican colleagues are actually too smart to believe this.

You know how insurance works. When people go to the doctor, when people get sick, when people go to the hospital, those costs are all real costs. They don't disappear when you cut people off Medicaid. They get bigger and they get pushed to everyone else. Don't pretend that this is going to save money. We know it won't. We know in the federal budget this is being used to produce black ink that they're using to shift off to their buddies, their wealthy buddies who are getting a huge tax cut as a result of this, but it doesn't actually reduce costs for the American people. It just pushes these costs onto our hospitals, onto our health insurance companies, and onto us who ultimately have to pay the final bill. It would be smarter for us to have an economy where people got paid a living wage where they could pay for their own healthcare, but unfortunately we have an economy in these United States where corporate interests have gotten over on the public interest so much that we are subsidizing companies to the tune of billions of dollars a year by letting them pay people so little they can't afford basic healthcare, can't afford basic housing, can't afford food on their table. And now the Republicans in Congress once again to make room for their fat cat, rich buddies put more money in their pockets, they're talking about cutting all these people off of healthcare and pretending that it saves money. Cutting people off Medicaid does not save people money. It pushes those costs on to us. You'll notice it also push costs onto our state budget. I've heard a lot of big talk in here about how we ought to fund schools, we want to fund roads. How are we going to do that when our hospitals are closing? How are we going to do that when all that federal money that was coming in to support our health care system is no longer coming in to support our healthcare system and those costs have to be picked up by our residents or the state of Michigan?

What Congress is debating right now is a massive wealth redistribution scheme, taking wealth away from the poor and giving it to the rich, just like we know Republicans are always about doing. What's even worse about it this time is that they're doing it while smiling and telling us that they're doing it to save costs, to tighten the belt, to reduce the deficit and the debt, to reduce the debt that we're leaving to future generations, but that's not true either. We're cutting off people's food assistance, we're cutting off their healthcare, we're cutting off supports that could grow our economy and bring good jobs, all to increase the deficit, to increase the debt, to add trillions of dollars to the credit card that some people pretend to care about around here.

I'm here to say all of us should be supporting this. What Congress is doing is bad for Michigan, it's bad for our people, it's bad for our state budget, it's bad for the pocketbooks of our residents. Let me just close by saying not only does it cost our people more money, not only does this blow a huge hole in our budget, not only does this leave a problem for future generations, but it's also increasing costs, driving people into emergency rooms, and denying people care that could make them happier and healthier and more successful. These are our people we're supposed to be looking out for and we're cutting them off, making their lives worse, costing us more money in the process, all to deliver a big paycheck to wealthy donors.

Senator Runestad's second statement is as follows:

Speaking of smiling while making a point that we heard from the Senator from the 15th District, that's the vision I have of the other side of the aisle when they're going out in communities and misinforming the community, just like I heard from also from the Senator from the 2nd District saying the same thing, that people going to be cut off Medicaid. They're just willy-nilly, and she even referenced the comments of a person who has dependents. There is no part of this bill that says anyone with dependents is going to be cut off and they know that. They know if you're not able-bodied and you have health conditions or mental issues that preclude you from doing all of those things, you can do, there will not be a change. They know that, the other side of the aisle, and yet they'll go with a smile and misinform the people out there. They could just say the same thing, Do you know the Republicans are going to shoot a missile at the moon and blow it up? Why would they do such a thing? Of course, there is no proposal to blow up the moon, as there is no proposal to do anything different for those who are on Medicaid, who are with dependents or have other issues that preclude them from doing the requirements. They know that, and yet they say that.

What they will not say, what they will not smile about or even address, is the points that I made before that the government accounting office for the state of Michigan, the Michigan Auditor General, said that \$1.5 billion with a B is being paid improperly to beneficiaries. That's called waste, fraud, and abuse that came out, a big chunk of it, out of our budget, \$800 million to recipients whose case files are missing documentation of the eligibility. You make sure someone's eligible before you pay them. No business could survive if they don't have these basic cost structures in place to make sure the person you're paying is the proper person. That 33 percent of CHIP payments were not eligible for the type of assistance they were getting in Michigan, 11 percent of Medicaid payments were made to individuals ineligible in Michigan. This is all Michigan taxpayer dollars. Nationally, it was estimated a little over \$1 trillion in the last 10 years paid improperly out of Medicaid. Waste, fraud, and abuse. The Democrats will never talk about waste, fraud, and abuse. They will lie and say that we, that the Republicans, want to cut the average person off Medicaid. No, we want to increase the average person's Medicaid payments, not decrease it. We just don't want the waste, fraud, and abuse that you'll never see the Democrats smile about or address about because they hide and run away from the waste, fraud, and abuse.

Senator Irwin's second statement is as follows:

I would hope that members could read the bill, or they could look at some nonpartisan analysis. Maybe they would understand where some of these concerns are coming from. The previous member was talking about waste, fraud, and abuse, talking about how there's money wasted in the system. I think everybody wants to go after, sort of, fraud and waste and abuse. That means more ability to serve more people; that's what I'm all about. But one of the things I want to highlight is that in the bill that Congress is proposing is a massive increase in waste here in the state government. Just yesterday, during a committee meeting that I and the previous speaker were both attending, I believe, we heard that the bill that Congress is debating now will increase bureaucratic costs in the state of Michigan for state government by tens of millions of dollars. Because what's going to happen is, as we add new bureaucratic requirements, people are going to struggle to check the right boxes on the right day, there's going to be chaos, and there's going to be a whole lot of extra bureaucratic work that has to get done to try to accomplish what Congress is trying to accomplish, which is to cut some of these folks off of Medicaid.

I don't know if any of you remember the unwinding we had a couple of years ago after COVID-19. I don't know if any of you are very involved in the constituent service aspect of your office, but I am and I know that what happened with that Medicaid unwinding was that loads of eligible people got kicked off. That's what happens when you get these big federal programs that affect millions of people. Somebody has to actually go out and sort out the wheat from the chaff, so to speak. What happens with situations like this is a whole lot of eligible people get thrown off of Medicaid. That's what happened with the unwinding; that's what's going to happen with this. So in addition to the people who are losing food assistance because they're 8 to 18 years old or they're losing food assistance because they're 54 to 64, you know, in addition to those people, in addition to the folks who are going to get cut off of Medicaid because they're not eligible, I think we also have to recognize the massive bureaucratic expense that we're going to incur as a result of all the people going to get kicked off who are eligible. Because if your office hasn't been dealing with those problems in the last several years you've been here, I know I have. There's a lot of sorting out of that kind of spaghetti that we do, and what Congress is doing is only making that messier and more expensive for our state government, which once again takes money from our schools, takes money from our roads, takes money from all the things the state needs to do to serve our people.

This bill is a disaster, and the idea is that it's going to be administered with surgical precision and only the people you don't like are going to get cut off but all the people you do like are going to be saved, that's the kind of infantile messaging that I've come to expect from our President and it's not surprising that we're seeing it here in Michigan.

Senator McMorrow's statement is as follows:

Today, we are on the verge of the single largest redistribution of wealth from poor and working-class Michiganders to the rich in our nation's history. That's what we're staring down in this so-called big beautiful bill. And sure if you're already wealthy, this bill is going to be great for you. If you earn more than \$715,800, congratulations, you will get a tax cut of over \$50,000. That tax cut alone is significantly higher than the \$39,500 the average Michigander earns in an entire year. Are you a foreign investor? Congratulations, collectively, you will all get \$23 billion in tax cuts next year alone. Are you in a position to leave more than \$7,000,000 to your heirs? Congratulations, you will get a cut to the estate tax.

How does this bill pay for all of this? By cutting the services you rely on. This big, bad bill cuts more than \$200 billion from food assistance, potentially affecting 4 million children and 7 million adults nationwide. In Michigan, SNAP provides vital food assistance to over 1.4 million Michiganders. That's approximately 15 percent of our state's population. SNAP dollars fuel \$2 billion in economic activity, supporting farms and grocery stores, especially in our rural communities.

Proponents of this bill, and I have heard it here today, will argue that it's just about cutting so-called waste, fraud, and abuse, and that these cuts are necessary and that enacting these cuts will benefit everybody. That argument is a flat out lie. The University of Michigan economist Justin Wolfers analyzed the impact of all of the Trump policies combined. The cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and SNAP found in this big bad bill, the tax cuts here that overwhelmingly benefit the rich, and Trump's reckless tariff policy that adds cost to the food and the goods that so many of us rely on in our daily lives, with that additional cost not borne by the country of origin, not borne by the importer, not borne by the retailer, but passed on to you. Combined over the next ten years, here's how those policies will impact you.

If you are in the lowest 10 percent of earners, making just under \$19,000 a year, you will lose \$2,600. If you're in the lowest 25 percent of earners, making \$40,000 a year, you will lose \$1,600 dollars. If you're the median income earner, if you make \$80,000 a year, you will lose \$1,200. If you're in the top 75 percent of earners, making \$1,400,770, you will lose \$600. If you're in the top 80 percent of earners, you will lose \$500. Are you picking up on a trend here?

But if you happen to be in the top 10 percent of earners earning over \$250,000 a year? Congratulations, you will gain an average of \$7,200. Ninety percent of Americans will lose money over the next 10 years to give the wealthiest 10 percent of Americans more money. That's insane. Fifty years of trickledown economics has shown us clearly that it simply does not work. The wealthiest Americans are wealthier than they ever have been before, while just about everyone else from low income to middle class is struggling to make ends meet.

But do not fret, because today we have an opportunity to stop this big, bad disaster before it starts. I ask for your vote on this resolution today to send a message to our counterparts in Washington that we in the Michigan State Senate, those of us closer to the people on the ground, that we speak for Michiganders, Let's fight for all of our residents. Let's safeguard Medicaid. Let's safeguard Medicare. Let's safeguard funding for the Affordable Care Act. Let's safeguard cost savings for Michigan families on their energy costs. Support this resolution to say, from an independent state like Michigan, that Michigan legislators speak for Michiganders, not for the wealthiest 10 percent of us.

Senator Theis moved that Senators Lauwers and Daley be excused from the balance of today's session.
The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of
Introduction and Referral of Bills

Senators Bayer, Klinefelt and Chang introduced

Senate Bill No. 441, entitled

A bill to regulate the creation of stormwater management utilities by local units of government; to provide for the creation of stormwater management plans; to provide for the adoption of stormwater management utility fee ordinances; to provide for the establishment and collection of stormwater management utility fees; to provide for the reduction or elimination of stormwater management utility fees; to provide for appeals; and to prescribe the powers and duties of certain local governmental officers and entities.

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

Senators Victory, Santana, Chang, Damoose and Bellino introduced

Senate Bill No. 442, entitled

A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled "The general property tax act," by amending section 7kk (MCL 211.7kk), as amended by 2014 PA 456.

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

Senator McCann introduced

Senate Bill No. 443, entitled

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled "Public health code," (MCL 333.1101 to 333.25211) by adding section 20187.

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

Senators Runestad, Bellino, Johnson, Outman, Daley and Theis introduced

Senate Bill No. 444, entitled

A bill to require verification that public contracts are performed by employees who are entitled to work in the United States; to prescribe acceptable methods for verifying legal presence in the United States; to condition the eligibility of employers to perform certain public contracts on participation in the federal immigrant verification system; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and entities; to provide for the promulgation of rules; and to provide sanctions and penalties.

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

Senators Runestad, Bellino, Victory, Johnson, Outman, Daley, Theis and McBroom introduced

Senate Bill No. 445, entitled

A bill to amend 1953 PA 232, entitled “Corrections code of 1953,” (MCL 791.201 to 791.285) by adding section 7b.

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

Statements

Senators Webber, Bellino and Polehanki 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:

Madam President, the majority in this chamber has spent countless committee and now session hours on things that may or may not happen. Things we as state legislators have no control over. Meanwhile, a very real ongoing crisis that we do have control over goes on. Patients, many of them children, in Michigan psychiatric facilities continue to be mistreated, and their families say their concerns aren’t being heard. Patient escapes. Traumatizing emergency simulations. Violent attacks. Multi-million dollar lawsuits. Recipient rights complaints going unanswered, or the complaint is answered and verified, yet no disciplinary actions against the state employee occurs.

I’ve been stonewalled when seeking answers from the department in charge of our facilities. This majority would rather protect the department than protect patients’ rights in our own facilities. I’ve asked for the independent audit of the Office of Recipient Rights that is ongoing as we speak. I’ve introduced legislation to provide greater oversight, transparency, and accountability for patients seeking mental health care.

Earlier this month, the House version of the same legislation was approved unanimously in committee. Protecting Michigan’s young and vulnerable mental health patients is not, and should not be, a partisan issue. This is why I again call on the Housing and Human Services Committee to take up Senate Bill Nos. 142 and 143.

We share a duty to protect Michigan’s most vulnerable residents by providing leadership and proper oversight where it is lacking. I urge the majority to stop using committee time on issues that may or may not happen, and instead focus on fixing real problems right here at home.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

Madam President, we come together in a moment of reflection now—yes, somber for what could have happened, but filled with gratitude and pride for what didn’t happen because of the bravery of one man and one person driving a car. Just days ago, at a Wayne County church—on what was meant to be a peaceful Sunday morning—chaos nearly shattered the lives of dozens of innocent worshippers, but thanks to the quick action and courageous heart of one security guard, a mass shooting was stopped before it ever began. This man—armed, trained, and ready—did what so many hope they could do in the face of evil: he stood up, stepped forward, and protected fellow citizens. He didn’t wait for backup. He didn’t have the luxury of time. He acted decisively and lawfully, and because of him, mothers went home to see their children. Grandparents would home to see their families. And church folk went home, grateful they lost no members.

This isn’t the story of one hero. It’s a reminder of a larger truth. The Second Amendment is not just a line in the Constitution. It’s a guarantee of the right to defend ourselves, our families, and our communities. Even today, as Senate Democrats passed legislation to further restrict law-abiding citizens from carrying—all while criminals, by definition, they don’t follow these laws. In those moments, when seconds count, we cannot afford to rely solely on the government to respond, even if they’re just minutes away.

What happened in that church is not just an act of heroism—it's proof. Proof that when danger comes to the door, it's often the good guy with a gun that stands between life and death. We must stop vilifying responsible gun owners. We must stop passing laws that disarm the very people we depend on when evil threatens our schools, our churches, our neighborhoods, and, God forbid, our Capitol Building. I will continue to stand strong against any legislation that strips Michiganders of their God-given constitutionally protected right. I will defend the Second Amendment because I believe every law-abiding citizen has the right and responsibility to defend what matters most.

To the hero in Wayne County—we thank you. You remind us of what courage looks like, and why our rights must never be surrendered to fear or political pressure. God bless Michigan. God bless this man in Wayne County. And God bless our great nation.

Senator Polehanki's statement is as follows:

I have close family members who do not wish to be identified, who were inside CrossPointe Community Church in Wayne during the attempted massacre of its parishioners Sunday morning. My family is forever grateful to the vigilant parishioner who subdued the shooter with his truck, as well as the member of the church's parishioner-led security team that took out the shooter, ending the threat. My family lives because of your actions—you are heroes.

While I have sympathy for anyone in the midst of a mental health crisis, according to reports, this troubled young shooter, who believed he heard from God and was a prophet, was able to accumulate an arsenal of guns and ammunition in the home he lived in with his mother. I wish that more people knew about Michigan's red flag law of 2024, which temporarily restricts access to firearms for individuals like the CrossPointe shooter who are deemed to be a danger to themselves or others. If you'd like to learn more about Michigan's red flag law, visit [Michigan.gov](https://www.michigan.gov), and search "extreme risk protection order."

Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Tuesday, June 24:

House Bill Nos. 4262 4263 4493

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Wednesday, June 25, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

Senate Bill Nos. 433 434 435 436 437 438 439 440

Committee Reports

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Housing and Human Services submitted the following:

Meeting held on Tuesday, June 24, 2025, at 12:00 noon, Harry T. Gast Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Irwin (C), Santana, Bayer, Shink, Chang, Cherry, Lindsey, Hoitenga and Damoose

Excused: Senators Cavanagh and Geiss

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Legislative Council submitted the following:

Meeting held on Tuesday, June 24, 2025, at 12:45 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Brinks (C), McCann, Moss, Singh, McBroom and Victory

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Appropriations Subcommittee on DHHS submitted the following:

Joint meeting held on Tuesday, June 24, 2025, at 1:30 p.m., Harry T. Gast Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor, Capitol Building

Present: Senators Santana (C), Cherry, Irwin, Cavanagh, Bayer, Klinefelt, Outman, Huizenga, Hauck and Theis

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Health Policy submitted the following:

Joint meeting held on Tuesday, June 24, 2025, at 1:30 p.m., Harry T. Gast Appropriations Room, 3rd Floor, Capitol Building

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

Excused: Senator Geiss

Scheduled Meetings

Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety – Thursday, June 26, 12:00 noon, Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5312

Regulatory Affairs – Thursday, June 26, 9:30 a.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building (517) 373-1721

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 12:35 p.m.

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 26, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN
Secretary of the Senate