

No. 99  
STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**Journal of the Senate**  
103rd Legislature  
**REGULAR SESSION OF 2025**

---

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Wednesday, October 29, 2025.

10:00 a.m.

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

The roll was called by the Secretary of the Senate, who announced that a quorum was present.

Albert—present  
Anthony—present  
Bayer—present  
Bellino—present  
Brinks—present  
Bumstead—present  
Camilleri—present  
Cavanagh—present  
Chang—present  
Cherry—present  
Daley—present  
Damoose—present  
Geiss—present

Hauck—present  
Hertel—present  
Hoitenga—present  
Huizenga—present  
Irwin—present  
Johnson—excused  
Klinefelt—present  
Lauwers—present  
Lindsey—present  
McBroom—excused  
McCann—present  
McMorrow—present

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

Senator Roger Victory of the 31st District offered the following invocation:

Thank You, Lord, for this beautiful fall day of Your creation. We ask for Your blessing on this chamber as we do the work on behalf of the people of this great state. Also, Lord, may Your hand of guidance be with those who are working and harvesting the fields. You have given us a bountiful crop; may You grant us a safe and blessed fall harvest. This we ask in Your name. Amen.

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

Senator Polehanki entered the Senate Chamber.

### **Motions and Communications**

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

Senator Lauwers moved that Senators McBroom and Johnson be excused from today's session.  
The motion prevailed.

Senator Nesbitt entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Singh moved that Senators Anthony, Cavanagh, Cherry, Irwin and Santana be temporarily excused from today's session.  
The motion prevailed.

Senator Singh moved that rule 3.902 be suspended to allow the guest of Senator Moss admittance to the Senate floor.

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

### **Recess**

Senator Singh moved that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 10:03 a.m.

10:18 a.m.

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

During the recess, Senators Anthony, Cherry, Irwin, Cavanagh and Santana entered the Senate Chamber.

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 Shink 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. 430, entitled**

A bill to amend 1978 PA 368, entitled "Public health code," by amending section 7401 (MCL 333.7401), as amended by 2016 PA 548.

**Senate Bill No. 431, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 13m of chapter XVII (MCL 777.13m), as amended by 2016 PA 549.

**Senate Bill No. 432, entitled**

A bill to amend 1927 PA 175, entitled “The code of criminal procedure,” by amending section 1 of chapter XI (MCL 771.1), as amended by 2019 PA 165.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of

**Third Reading of Bills**

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

**Senate Bill No. 133**

**Senate Bill No. 423**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 133, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled “The insurance code of 1956,” by amending section 1204c (MCL 500.1204c), as amended by 2017 PA 67.

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. 286**

**Yeas—34**

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

**Nays—1**

Runestad

**Excused—2**

Johnson

McBroom

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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 Senate Bill No. 133.

Senator Runestad’s statement is as follows:

I used to do financial services and insurance training for continuing education. I think the hours are important, and what this bill says is that four hours of active participation in an association counts toward the required 24 hours of continuing education, and that any activity undertaken by an insurance agent can count as one hour of continuing education—any activity. I wonder how many—like in the medical profession—they can join an association and work your way around your required courses with any activity.

To me, it seems preposterous. We’re saying that joining an association—and now you run around your required education, continuing education you’re required to take. What you need to be is a dues-paying member in good standing with the organization. The agent actively participates in the function. I mean, this is basically just saying, Join an association and then you don’t have to do at least four hours of your continuing education. The director of DIFS can just unilaterally determine that anything counts. Why have it at all? Why don’t we make all 24 hours—just join an association and pay the dues. I’m sure there’s somebody wanting to pay the dues for this, and I think that’s what’s behind this because all of the required courses are there for a reason. What this says is we’re—I believe a slippery slope—pay the dues, join an association—you don’t really have to do anything else—and you get the credit. I oppose this bill.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 423, entitled**

A bill to amend 1893 PA 206, entitled “The general property tax act,” by amending sections 78g and 78q (MCL 211.78g and 211.78q), section 78g as amended by 2020 PA 256 and section 78q as amended by 2020 PA 33.

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. 287**

**Yeas—34**

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

**Nays—1**

Runestad

**Excused—2**

Johnson

McBroom

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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. 84**

**Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7**

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

Senator Damoose offered the following resolution:

**Senate Resolution No. 84.**

A resolution to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the sinking of the S.S. *Edmund Fitzgerald*.

Whereas, On November 10, 1975, the Great Lakes freighter S.S. *Edmund Fitzgerald*, one of the largest and most storied vessels ever to sail the inland seas, sank during a fierce storm on Lake Superior, taking with it all 29 brave souls aboard; and

Whereas, The loss of the *Edmund Fitzgerald* remains the deadliest tragedy in Great Lakes shipping history, a solemn reminder of both the power of nature and the courage of those who dedicate their lives to maritime commerce; and

Whereas, The men who perished that night were fathers, sons, brothers, and friends — hardworking crewmen who embodied the grit, perseverance, and devotion that define Michigan’s maritime heritage; and

Whereas, The 29 men lost on the *Edmund Fitzgerald* join more than 30,000 mariners who are estimated to have perished throughout history on the Great Lakes; and

Whereas, The sinking of the *Edmund Fitzgerald* spurred improvements in maritime safety, leading to stronger regulations, enhanced ship design, and advanced weather monitoring, ensuring that the sacrifice of her crew contributed to greater protections for future generations; and

Whereas, For five decades, the memory of the *Edmund Fitzgerald* has been honored in Michigan and across the Great Lakes through solemn ceremonies, tolling church bells, and story telling that keeps a living legacy of those lost; and

Whereas, The people of Michigan remain forever bound to the waters of the Great Lakes, which have shaped our history, culture, and economy, and on this solemn anniversary we reaffirm our enduring respect for those who work and sacrifice upon them; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body commemorate the 50th anniversary of the sinking of the S.S. *Edmund Fitzgerald* and pay tribute to the memory of her 29 crew members, whose lives were tragically lost on November 10, 1975; and be it further

Resolved, That November 10, 2025 will be recognized as “Edmund Fitzgerald Day” in honor of the mariners lost in that tragic event; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the families of the crew, maritime organizations, and museums dedicated to preserving the history of the Great Lakes as a lasting testament to Michigan’s reverence for the *Edmund Fitzgerald* and her crew.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

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

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Damoose’s statement is as follows:

“Does anyone know where the love of God goes / When the waves turn the minutes to hours?” These haunting lyrics from the Wreck of the Edmund Fitzgerald by singer-songwriter Gordon Lightfoot bring into focus the peril of more than 30,000 mariners lost throughout history on the Great Lakes—at once some of the most beautiful waters in the world, and at the same time some of the most powerful natural forces on Earth.

The stories of those lost on our inland seas have become the stuff of legend. No disaster at sea has captivated the imagination of millions of people more than the loss of the *Edmund Fitzgerald* off Whitefish Point on Lake Superior on November 10, 1975. The tragedy brought to life in the words and music of Gordon Lightfoot, and especially the memory of the 29 seafarers lost on that day, have highlighted for so many around the world the perilous lives our mariners have faced throughout history in the pursuit of trade, defense, and exploration.

Anyone who has, like me, sat on the shores and watched these magnificent Great Lakes freighters roll by, understands the power of what they're seeing. Great vessels, some 1,000 feet in length, crafted by human hands, massive vehicles of steel that bear the marks of life on the dangerous seas, is awe-inspiring. Anyone who has sat at the Soo Locks in Sault Ste. Marie and pondered the history of the ships that have traversed them knows the materials transported by these vessels built the greatest industries this world has ever seen and accomplished incredible things in history, not the least of which was hauling the iron ore that became the airplanes, tanks, and jeeps that literally defeated Adolf Hitler and won World War II by turning Michigan into the Arsenal of Democracy.

November 10 of this year will mark the 50th anniversary of the *Edmund Fitzgerald* foundering amidst the brutal gales of November. I cannot imagine the power of Lake Superior or the horror of a scene that must have brought down such an enormous vessel on that day, and it draws to mind not just those 29 sailors lost but all of the men, women, and children lost throughout the centuries on these majestic waters in pursuit of commerce, exploration, charity, and so much more. As such, it is altogether fitting that through this resolution, our state solemnly declares November 10, 2025, Edmund Fitzgerald Day in honor of the sailors lost and the families who remain.

Senator Brinks offered the following concurrent resolution:

**Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7.**

A concurrent resolution to urge the Trump Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to immediately release Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program funding.

Whereas, The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is one of the most effective anti-hunger and anti-poverty initiatives in the nation. SNAP provides critical food assistance to more than 42 million individuals, including working families, children, seniors, and veterans, who rely on this support to put food on the table; and

Whereas, In 2024, approximately 1.4 million Michigan residents relied on SNAP, which is one in seven Michiganders, including 492,225 children and 38,513 veterans; and

Whereas, In Senate Districts 9, 20, and 30 alone, over 29,000 households rely on SNAP benefits; and

Whereas, The USDA under the Trump Administration advised the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services that there may not be enough funds to pay November SNAP benefits in full and directed the department to pause and withhold November SNAP benefits until further notice; and

Whereas, The withholding, delay, or obstruction of SNAP benefit disbursement needlessly and directly threatens the stability and health of working individuals and their families who are already struggling under rising inflation from national policies initiated by the Trump Administration and the Republican Congress; and

Whereas, The White House and Republican Congressional majorities have repeatedly used hunger and hardship as political weapons, leveraging the suffering of fellow Americans to advance radical and draconian budget cuts, dismantle social safety nets, and score partisan political points at the expense of working families and human dignity; and

Whereas, The legislative actions and inactions of President Trump and Republicans in Congress have generated the political climate that has resulted in the shutdown of the federal government that threatens SNAP benefits and will also lead to dramatic increases in healthcare costs due to extreme cuts to Medicaid, Medicare, and Affordable Care Act Enhanced Premium Tax Credits for working families; and

Whereas, The USDA has the option to use the billions of dollars available in contingency reserves, already authorized by Congress, to fund SNAP benefits, and any failure to act by President Trump and Secretary Rollins is a callous disregard of working individuals and families and a conscious choice to hurt fellow Americans; and

Whereas, Failure to release SNAP benefits will likely cause immediate and lasting harm: seniors will skip meals, children will go hungry, individuals with disabilities will have to pick between medication and eating, families will be forced to choose between putting food on the table and paying rent, and resource-strained communities will struggle with increased demand on food banks and emergency services; and

Whereas, The Trump Administration's actions this year have already strained food banks by cutting 500 million dollars in deliveries for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, which provides locally produced meat, dairy, and eggs to food banks and other organizations across the country; and

Whereas, Michiganders in rural counties will be hardest hit. Of the 30 counties with the highest SNAP participation rates, 26 are rural. The economic impact of withholding SNAP benefits extends beyond individual households, as farmers, local grocery stores, and vendors will struggle with reduced demand for their goods; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That we urge the United States Department of Agriculture under the Trump Administration to release Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program funding without political interference, delay, or manipulation; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the Republican majorities in Congress and President Trump to reopen the government, uphold health care access, and restore food access to people as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That we call for an end to the deliberate obstruction of nutritional aid by the White House and Congressional Republicans, whose actions threaten the health, stability, and moral conscience of the nation; and be it further

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

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,

Senator Singh moved that Senator Klinefelt be excused from the balance of today’s session.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 3, line 26 after “urge” by striking out “the Republican majorities in Congress and President Trump” and inserting “Michigan Senators Gary Peters and Elissa Slotkin and Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer”

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 288**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—18**

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

**Excused—3**

Johnson	Klinefelt	McBroom
---------	-----------	---------

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The question being on the adoption of the concurrent resolution,

Senator Singh requested the yeas and nays.

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

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

**Roll Call No. 289**

**Yeas—18**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—3**

Johnson	Klinefelt	McBroom
---------	-----------	---------

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

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

**Point of Order**

Senator Lauwers raised the Point of Order that the concurrent resolution was not adopted because a majority of the members elected and serving did not vote “yea.”

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, ruled that pursuant to *Mason* 's, § 42-8, where there is no additional provision in the Constitution, statute, or rule, parliamentary law requires only a simple majority vote.

Senator Lauwers appealed the decision of the Chair.

The question being shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the Senate, a majority of the members voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 290**

**Yeas—18**

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



**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—3**

Johnson	Klinefelt	McBroom
---------	-----------	---------

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

**Point of Order**

Senator Lauwers raised the Point of Order that the decision of the Chair was not sustained because a majority of the members elected and serving did not vote “yea.”

The question being on a ruling from the Chair,

Senator Singh moved that the Point of Order be postponed for today.

The motion prevailed.

**Protests**

Senators Albert, Runestad, Theis, Lindsey, Bellino and Nesbitt, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the adoption of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7.

Senators Albert, Runestad, Theis, Lindsey and Nesbitt moved that the statements they made during the discussion of the resolution be printed as their reasons for voting “no”.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

I guess I’ll start with—I definitely could have been supportive of a resolution in regard to this topic. I definitely would be supportive of us calling on the federal government to get their act together, especially when we have SNAP benefits—for food assistance for needy families—that’s on the line. I’m a full believer that we need to have a safety net to help those who are in need.

That doesn’t change the fact that there definitely needs to be some changes to SNAP benefits. If you look at one of the biggest problems we have in our country is obesity. We have people that are eating unhealthy food in large quantities, and these SNAP benefits are probably the biggest driver of that problem. So I do think that there are changes that need to be looked at the federal level, and even at the state level where we can, but that’s not really the conversation for today. The conversation for today is that we need to make sure those who are in need have the benefits that are out there, that are available to make sure they don’t go hungry. That being said, this resolution does not do that. This resolution is—it’s really sad.

I’m going to read three parts of it. Here’s the first part—it says “there are families who are already struggling under rising inflation.” OK, I can agree with that. But let’s continue: “from national policies initiated by the Trump administration and the Republican Congress.” OK, well, this is just factually incorrect. You want to go back to where inflation really was generated from, let’s go back to the aptly named Inflation Reduction Act which just injected massive amounts of government spending into our country, which raised inflation to levels we had not seen since the 1970s. If we also want to look within this chamber, we spent \$9 billion in one budget cycle. All of that money was, boom, injected into our economy and increased prices.

It's just completely incorrect to have this language in there, and it's also not helpful. What's the next piece of language we should look at? "The White House and the Republican congressional majorities have repeatedly used hunger and hardship as political weapons, leveraging the suffering of fellow Americans to advance radical and draconian budget cuts, dismantle social safety nets, and score partisan political points at the expense of working families and human dignity." What an evil image that puts forward. Does anybody actually believe that? How helpful is it to try and heal some of the divisions in our country to put language out like this, that cast Republicans as simply evil?

This is a shame. I've never put anything out like this against Democrats. I've spoken the truth, like I'm trying to speak now, to the best of my ability. This is ridiculous. Do we need to look at the numbers for the national debt that we have, for what our federal deficit is? Should we just ignore that? Should we just continue to spend money and let inflation continue to rise, rob people of the value of their money in their homes? This is ridiculous. How is this language going to help bring the federal government to finding a solution and getting these SNAP benefits out there? It's not helpful. And then the last one I'll bring up: "Republicans in Congress have generated the political climate that has resulted in the shutdown." Ridiculous. Look at what you made me do. Typical language of people shirking personal responsibility. Look at what you made me do. Ridiculous. This is a joke. This isn't about trying to find healing and bringing some of our divide together and finding solutions. This is about keeping us separate. Talk about trying to score political points—this is trying to say, Republicans bad, Democrats good, vote for me.

No. This is ridiculous. This is a shame. I'll be voting "no" on this, and I encourage my colleagues to too. And if you come up with something that we can both get behind, if you want to work together on something, I'd be happy to, because we do need to make sure these benefits get done.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

Spare us all the fake outrage contained in this ridiculous, blatant political-pandering document. Let me correct some of the narrative spinning that's occurring in this chamber. This resolution ought to read, "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, concurring to urge the Democrats in Congress to reopen the government, stop the Schumer shutdown, uphold healthcare access, restore food access to the people as soon as possible, and further stop benefits to illegal immigrants." Like the Senate Democrats here—with our shutdown—that was their responsibility. They can pretend they didn't cause that, just like the Democrats are trying to message in Washington, D.C., but they had an opportunity, and 13 times the Democrats have voted to keep it closed.

This after flooding our nation with not 10 million—because I was down at the border two times, and I talked to local, state and federal law enforcement. They said, "Senator, it is not 10 million, it is 40 million illegal immigrants flooded the nation." They're going to need some kind of housing. What's that going to do to housing costs? Explode it. They're going to need all kinds of other things that we're unprepared for. What's that going to do? Drive up inflation? And the Democrats are all for it, but now they're just desperate to hand out this \$200 billion in health care benefits to illegal immigrants. Is this what the people want? Do they want to pay for that? No, they don't want to pay for that. They want these benefits to go to American citizens.

So, the Democrats in D.C., they think that this is a leverage point that they're going to work to persuade people that it's the Republicans, so they're going to continue this shutdown as long as they feel they can drag this out, and that it will help them politically. But the people are not leverage points, the families struggling to put food on their table are not leverage points, just like the Democrats here are trying to use this as leverage points, there is a clear decision to be made. The Democrats' position is we need benefits for illegal immigrants, and we say that we need to pass a budget to get on with doing the business of the American people. We need the Democrats to come to the table, we need to get Senators Peters and Slotkin to stand with the families and end the Schumer shutdown now. I will be voting "no" on this preposterous resolution.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

This is not a serious resolution that calls for actual solutions. How do we know this? A few weekends ago we saw people all over the place protesting, claiming that our President Trump had way too much power, that he was overreaching his authority. Now this resolution calls for him to ignore the more than 12 votes that our federal Congressional Democrats have made, refusing a continuing resolution that would allow for these benefits. If this was a serious resolution, if they actually wanted a solution, they'd be calling on their members of Congress who are voting against these benefits. It is obvious that the language in here is intentionally political. It's obvious that our federal Democratic friends are concerned because people are recognizing where this is coming from.

I've been poverty-stricken. There was a time when in my refrigerator was butter, in my cupboard was bread, my dog had dog food, and that was the entirety of the food in my house. I know what it feels like to be hungry. I know what those families are going through. We need to come up with actual solutions, not political talking points for a CYA for our federal colleagues. Thanks. I ask my colleagues to vote "no."

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

I wish I could be surprised to see another resolution on the floor put forward by the Democrats that's full of lies, but unfortunately, that's a common occurrence in this chamber. This resolution about SNAP benefits is political theater, it's disingenuous, and as I said, it's full of lies. I could go through a lot of them, but I'm just going to focus on one area. The resolution says "the White House and Republican congressional majorities have repeatedly used hunger and hardship as political weapons, leveraging the suffering of fellow Americans to advance," blah, blah, blah. Here's the truth: the Republicans have voted repeatedly, over and over, to fund the federal government, including the SNAP program, and Democrats have continuously blocked it. And who is actually leveraging this as a political weapon? Who is using hunger against the people they serve? But let me read a quote to you from Katherine Clark, the Democratic whip of the House, the second highest ranking member in the United States House of Representatives on the Democratic side: "You know, there are families that are going to suffer, but it is one of the few leverage times we have." That's what Democrats believe. Families are going to suffer, but it's one of the few leverage points we have. Don't get up here and preach to Republicans that we're the ones using this tool.

Here's another fact that people should be aware of: September 30—the Senate Republicans voted to fund the government. This would include SNAP benefits. Democrats in the Senate blocked that vote. They voted again on October 1—Democrats blocked it again. They voted again, October 3—Democrats blocked it. They voted October 6—Democrats blocked it. They voted October 9—Democrats blocked it. They voted October 14, October 15, October 20, October 22, October 23 and October 28—every single time, the consistent pattern was that Democrats in the U.S. Senate blocked the vote, preventing SNAP money from going to those in need. Now we have a member of this chamber, Senator Mallory McMorrow, who just spoke about the seriousness of this issue, who wants to serve in that body. And she said a lot of things about how the federal government should be helping out—

Apologies, Madam President, apologies to the member. We have a member in this chamber who is seeking to serve in the United States Senate, and that member gave some passionate remarks about the need for food assistance for families, and I appreciate that. But what I didn't hear was a commitment that that person would take a different course than the current sitting Democratic Senators from the state. Those two members, Senator Peters and Senator Slotkin, have repeatedly voted to keep the federal government shut down, including keeping SNAP benefits from the residents of, people of, Michigan. I would like to hear the member that we have the honor of serving with here, who wants to go and serve in that role, stand up and tell the people of Michigan that she would be committed to reopening the government and making sure those programs are funded, but we didn't hear that.

I'll be voting "no" on this resolution. I hope everyone else will as well.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

Let me start off with just a few quotes: "It's an easy, easy choice to pick my country over the party, especially in circumstances like this. I'm not afraid to tell my truth, and if I'm going to pay a penalty, I'm not afraid of that. It's wrong to shut our government down." "I refuse to vote to suspend SNAP for millions of Pennsylvanians in my state and across the entire nation." That's U.S. Senator John Fetterman, Democrat from Pennsylvania. One of only three brave Democrats in Washington, D.C., that have continuously voted to keep the government open. Every last one of the rest of the Democrats, led by Chuck Schumer, continuously have voted, 13 times, to keep the government shuttered. And this is what we were at this week. And they're trying to move the blame, from where it should be on Chuck Schumer, Senator Peters, Senator Slotkin, who continue to vote to keep the government shut down and to make sure that these SNAP benefits aren't actually going out. It's on them. And then we get this political resolution just minutes before we go into session, full of inaccuracies that isn't right for the paper it's written on for this body.

This resolution before us would be laughable if it wasn't so ridiculous. Democrats demanding to fix a problem that Democrats created in Washington, D.C., while hard working families line up at food banks, federal workers stare at empty paychecks, and our veterans wait for the care that they so deeply deserve. Our Democrats and Chuck Schumer, Senators Peters and Slotkin have blocked a clean budget bill. Not once, not twice, not three times, but 13 times. They had another opportunity yesterday. And now the majority of the Democrats here in the Senate bring about this political resolution. To send it where? To the Trump administration, who's ready to sign a clean budget to keep the government open? Ridiculous. And all in the name, to shield health care for illegal immigrants over American citizens, shame.

Our congressional Republican members, on the other hand, have voted to keep the government open, continue SNAP benefits, and continue benefits for our veterans. Seems to me that this performative non-binding resolution should really be directed to the Senate Minority Leader in Washington, D.C.—Chuck Schumer—and our U.S. Senators Slotkin and Peters. Heck, I'm sure many of you have their phone numbers. Give them a call. Why not just give them a ring? Tell them to reopen government. It could be done

by Saturday. Describe to them the chaos that their far-left obstructionism is causing to the American people, and maybe, just maybe, you could convince them to get over their Trump derangement syndrome, put America first in this farce today, demand they vote “yes” on a clean budget resolution. Michigan deserves better than these Democratic theatrics.

Senators Camilleri, Shink, Damoose, McMorrow, Bayer, McCann, Irwin, Brinks, Nesbitt and Albert asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal. The motion prevailed.

Senator Camilleri’s first statement is as follows:

I’m asking for a show of hands: How many of us know someone personally who has a Bridge Card? Or know someone in the past who did? I do, and I know many of us here do as well. I’ve got extended family members who have had or currently used those Bridge Cards. The food assistance program has been a lifeline for them to be able to afford groceries. And they’re not alone. You see, it’s actually pretty common in our state. One-point-four million Michigan residents rely on food assistance to feed themselves and their families. But what’s not so common is that people like us in the halls of power know the direct impact of these programs outside of the emails and calls that come to our office. And those stories, to be clear, are flooding in right now. People who need food assistance don’t know what they’re going to do if they get cut off on November 1. Food banks and their volunteers are overwhelmed with the burden of having to serve more people.

Just like when we stood firm this year and refused to back down when Republicans in the House tried to eliminate the free breakfast and lunch program in our schools, we need to stand up and do what we can to help, right now. We find ourselves here again with a similar issue, nearly a month into the Republican federal shutdown and three days away from SNAP funding getting cut. My question to the Republican majority in Washington, D.C., is really simple: How can you go back to your communities, particularly to those who are vulnerable residents of your districts, and say to them that they don’t deserve to eat? How can you tell children that because of partisan politics, they will go hungry at home? Inequality has never been more stark in our world, in our country, and in our state. It is in moments like this when we show ourselves who we truly are.

Billionaires of this nation continue to rake it in. Companies are cutting jobs due to AI and other things. Inflation is still growing, and the prices are still way too damn high. Meanwhile, healthcare costs are going up. Medicaid is getting slashed across the nation, and ACA premiums are set to skyrocket if action is not taken, and now they’re also trying to take away food from the kids. Do we have leaders who will step up and help those who are struggling, or do we have leaders who will let them go hungry? Starting Saturday, these questions will become a reality for so many across Michigan and in this country. Food banks nationwide will need more resources in order to meet the surge of families who will be in need of food. I know that Senate Democrats here in Michigan will be doing all that we can to help, but we deserve more from Republican leaders in Washington, D.C. We’re demanding that Donald Trump and Republicans in Congress take action today to keep SNAP funded and ensure that the 13 percent of Michigan households that rely on food assistance don’t go hungry, especially as we enter the holiday season. This is their shut down. It is their problem that they created, and Republicans in D.C. are the ones who can solve it.

This resolution is not the solution, but it adds our voice to the many who are demanding change in D.C. End the shutdown. Feed the kids. Let’s get something done.

Senator Shink’s statement is as follows:

Federal Republicans turn a blind eye to our farmers and rural citizens. Cutting SNAP, amongst current cuts to USDA programming, such as the Local Food Purchasing Agreement 25 and Local Foods for Schools and childcare further diminishes the opportunity for local farmers to provide fresh and healthy food to people in need and simultaneously feed our economy. Removing SNAP from the hands of Michiganders exacerbates food insecurity initiated by the actions of the federal government, especially as grocery prices remain increased. Food banks alleviate the gap for residents facing hunger, but they cannot sustain the coming influx of 1.5 million Michiganders who are currently enrolled with SNAP benefits.

My colleagues and I will continue to fight for the food security of Michiganders left vulnerable by federal Republicans’ gross negligence. I affirm my support for Michigan’s farmers, and for the rural, urban, and suburban communities projected to face the most disparity. Refusal of solutions in Washington should not determine the ability for our families to put food on their tables. I am sickened by the federal government’s actions, continuing the government shutdown, and attacking our nation’s infrastructure while tax breaks continue for the wealthiest of Americans.

The November closure of SNAP funding predates the current shutdown, as federal cuts from earlier this year surpassed \$300 billion in reductions to the United States Department of Agriculture and other programming that millions of Americans rely on to sustain themselves and their families. I will remind all of us that these are our tax dollars. SNAP dollars generate \$2 billion in economic activity and ensure that farms and grocery stores alike stay afloat. This is critical in rural communities as well as in others, like those in my district and everybody in these in these areas disproportionately facing food deserts and poverty.

Again, federal Republicans: please get your act together and get those dollars flowing. Our communities need them.

Senator Damoose's statement is as follows:

This is the type of thing that people back home just hate. They hate when our side does it, and when your side does it—it's just not good. I heard a rumor this morning that there was some resolution going to be coming up on SNAP benefits and I thought, Wow that sounds great. I mean, I'm getting call after call after call talking to a lot of people. This is really an important—a critical program, and we're trying to resolve this. We need to do something so that these benefits don't run out or aren't paid. But then we just get handed this literally minutes ago, and you're looking at it, and you wonder why somebody had to go and ruin it. This could have been something you got 100 percent support on just by playing it straight.

There's a lot of truth in this resolution. You look through: "SNAP is one of the most effective anti-hunger and anti-poverty initiatives in the nation." It absolutely is. You won't find a person here who disagrees with that, that it's important to working families—42 million individuals—children, seniors, and veterans. You're exactly right. It goes on to something good: "The withholding, delay, or obstruction of SNAP benefit disbursement needlessly and directly threatens the stability and health of working individuals and their families." Who disagrees with that? I see this all the time. It's a big deal right now, and you can point out here, "Michiganders and rural counties will be hardest hit." That's my area. I'm worried about it. I was all excited to support this, but who came up with having to put this in?

This is what people are tired of. This is what people need to understand. The devil is in the details: "Whereas, The White House and the Republican congressional majorities have repeatedly used hunger and hardship as political weapons." I'm sorry, I've never met a single person who wants to use hunger as a political weapon. I mean, that is the height of evil in this world. As one of my colleagues just said. Do you really honestly believe that there are people sitting back wanting to use this as a weapon? "Radical and draconian budget cuts," this is the type of thing that has pitted our society against one another, and it's the type of thing we need to stop doing.

I'm going to be voting "no" on this, and it's because of these lines in here. It didn't need to be there. And, what a shame, because I actually agree with you that this is a real problem that we're about to lose these benefits. It's a crying shame, but it's too bad somebody had to make this so political.

Senator McMorrow's statement is as follows:

I rise to encourage a "yes" vote on this resolution because this is a serious resolution. And I want to read some language from the federal government website: Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP):

OMB's General Counsel provided a letter to USDA on May 23, 2025 stating that there is a bona fide need to obligate benefits for October—the first month of the fiscal year—during or prior to the month of September, thereby guaranteeing that benefit funds are available for program operations even in the event of a government shutdown at the beginning of a fiscal year.

This language goes on to say, "To fulfill this Congressional intent...it is a necessary implication that a limited number of FNS employees be excepted from furlough to support program operations. These activities include, but are not limited to program policy and operations, financial management, and stakeholder communications." It also says, "These multi-year contingency funds are also available to fund participant benefits in the event that the lapse occurs in the middle of the fiscal year."

Make no mistake, there are years worth of funding available for the SNAP program—our tax dollars that we have already paid to the federal government to facilitate this program—and the Trump administration deleted this language from the website this morning. They are hiding the fact that not only is there more than enough funding to pay these benefits that we have already paid our tax dollars into, but that there was contingency language to ensure that even in the event of a government shutdown, that SNAP would go uninterrupted. The Trump administration and the Republicans supporting him are using food as a political weapon. This is a choice. They chose to delete this language. They are choosing to force children to go hungry. We will not stand for that choice, and I encourage a "yes" vote.

Senator Bayer's statement is as follows:

I would like you to imagine—try to remember being a kid. Try to imagine you're the kid who woke up to a growling stomach, not thinking about math or even recess, but how hungry you are. There are nearly 500,000 Michigan children who get food via the SNAP program. Half a million of our kids will have their food support cut off. Parents and grandparents will skip meals so the kids can eat, and too many of our people have no home at all and walk miles just to find something to eat—and it's cold.

SNAP is the difference between a meal and an empty stomach. It is literally a lifeline for our most vulnerable—our kids, elderly, disabled, and homeless. People will suffer. Vulnerable people don't have spare resources. They can't go to their pantry or to their freezer and survive just fine for a week or a month. They don't have that kind of buffer. People will die. Being hungry robs kids of their health, their energy, and their chance to think and to dream. It eliminates possibilities. And for those who have no home—hunger is more than discomfort, it is survival. People will die.

Cutting SNAP funding is not about the budget. As we just heard, there is plenty of money in the SNAP program for situations like this. It is playing nasty politics with people's lives and putting people in dire straits. In the richest country of the world, no child should cry from hunger and no parent should ever have to choose between rent, heat, and food. No person should have to rummage through the garbage for food. Cutting off food makes hunger an acceptable thing—that some deserve to eat and others don't. This is not who we should ever be. To do this for political reasons is worse than disgusting—it's horrific.

We're nearly a month into this shutdown, and families are already feeling the pain as they lose access to health care. Every day that Washington stays closed, more Americans suffer, and the worst is soon to come. In a couple of days, Michiganders around the state will find a \$0 balance on their SNAP cards. No money for food, all due to the USDA's instruction to pause this benefit and take away families' access to food.

Over 1.4 million families in Michigan receive food supports. Our food banks and our shelters are stretched thin. They will do everything they can. They're serving even more people who're facing challenges with housing, and low and unstable incomes—people who depend on those meals to survive, especially now as everyday costs are skyrocketing—mostly due to tariffs. Individuals and organizations who can spare some will help, but it's not sustainable. It does not replace the resources needed that we lose in this major system. If the shelves of our food pantries run dry, which they will if SNAP benefits are withheld, very quickly, people will suffer, our children will go hungry, and people will die.

We have to stop playing politics with people's lives. This isn't about partisanship—it is about survival. It's about doing right by the families we serve. It's time for Congress to end the shutdown, to deliver on the promise of food and health care to all our people, and to make sure every Michigander—every child—has food on the table.

Senator McCann's statement is as follows:

I, too, am disturbed by the USDA's alarming announcement to halt SNAP benefits starting in November—just days away—and the burden it'll place on children, families, and communities across our state and nation. Already we've seen it on the news and in our communities, parents figuring out how they're going to make ends meet—like Bill and Mary contemplating which bills they'll have to leave unpaid in order to put food on the table. We see food banks and community resources now scrambling to figure out how they're going to help provide for their neighbors to make up for the massive hole being blown in this critical safety net, but we must actually ask why. It's not just that it's immoral to deny food from the mouths of hungry children, adults, and communities in need. And it's not just an outright terrible political decision to play games with people's livelihoods while disrupting critical supports, along with the economics of grocers, farmers, and small business owners. And it's not just that it doesn't make sense to hold people's food benefits captive in an attempt to undermine their access to healthcare, all while claiming to serve and support the very people whose lives you're wreaking havoc on. It's that this whole thing is completely and utterly avoidable.

Congress created and invested in the SNAP contingency fund to prepare for this exact scenario. With millions of dollars in it and full legal authority by the administration to use it, these funds can and should be tapped to continue the flow of benefits during this shutdown. The Trump administration knew this to be true, and the current administration does, as indicated by the USDA's recently posted lapse in funding plan, which has since been deleted from the USDA's website. Even in prior temporary federal shutdowns under both Democratic and Republican administrations, SNAP benefits have always continued to be distributed using available funding sources to prevent a disruption for families who depend on them.

So, to recap, the Trump administration's refusal to act and ensure the continuation of this critical lifeline runs contrary to the plain language of the law, deviates from the precedent that prior administrations have set, continues their own previously stated guidance, and flies in the face of the very mission we hold as elected officials: People who are entrusted to serve with care and compassion; people who were elected by the people, for the people, to make their lives easier and better. Tell me how denying food from the plates

and pantries of kids and seniors makes lives easier. Tell me how undermining people's ability to see the doctor makes lives better. Tell me how skewing our tax code to favor the top one percent and removing a critical food security program from those with the least accomplishes these goals.

Madam President, it's my understanding that a state is only as strong and healthy as its people are. People who have access to nutritious food to nurse their bodies and healthcare systems that care for them when they are sick, and despite what Republicans in Washington would have us believe, we can and must help to provide both. I'm asking all of my colleagues here to join me in calling on the Trump administration and the United States Department of Agriculture to immediately release SNAP contingency funding so that our vulnerable families across the state and country keep food on their table in the weeks ahead. It's the right thing to do, and I urge a "yes" vote on this resolution.

Senator Irwin's first statement is as follows:

Our people here in Michigan—1.4 million people who depend on SNAP benefits and millions more around them—are all heading for this cliff. And what do we hear today on the floor of the Michigan Senate, while we're proposing a resolution to call upon Congress to get to work and make sure that these SNAP benefits are released? We're hearing from our Republican colleagues that SNAP benefits are the leading cause of obesity. I find that offensive. I don't know if any of you have been shopping anytime recently, but \$180 a month doesn't go very far in this economy—\$180 a month doesn't go very far in these grocery stores when people are being hit with inflation and food prices are going up and up and up. Did you know that 42 percent of Michigan kids depend on SNAP benefits? They depend on SNAP benefits to eat, and the suggestion that continuing SNAP benefits is somehow overfilling the bellies of our hungry kids in Michigan is offensive.

What else do we hear from Michigan Republicans? We hear about debt and deficit. Why is it that we only hear about debt and deficit from Republicans when we're trying to feed hungry kids? Where was that energy when Congress just added trillions of dollars to our national debt to give fat tax breaks to billionaires? Where was that energy when the President found \$40 billion to send to bail out his right-wing friend in Argentina—to give money to Argentine farmers who are competing with our own farmers who are struggling under the chaotic, illegal, and foolhardy trade policies of this President? I wish we could see some of that Republican energy for austerity when it comes to corporate welfare and handouts to fossil fuel companies. But no, the Republicans, well it's get tight when it comes to feeding hungry kids. And it frustrates me, because this is one of the most important things that we should be coming together on today. Maybe the language could be a little more pleasing to my Republican colleagues, I'll accept that, but what you ought to accept is that Trump has the money. He had the money for Argentina. Why doesn't he have the money for Michigan's hungry kids?

The other thing you need to accept is that Republicans control the Congress and the presidency. They control every branch. They could do this tomorrow with 50 votes. They could do this tomorrow by working with the Democrats to keep health insurance rates down. There are multiple paths to do this. The Republicans hold all the cards in Washington, D.C., but what are they doing instead of acting to make sure that our hungry people get fed? They're making excuses. They're pointing fingers. They're making up lies about how this is about undocumented people—those are lies. This is not about undocumented people. Democrats in D.C. are trying to stand up to keep health insurance costs low, and Republicans are using this leverage. They're using hungry kids, and they're ignoring the needs of hungry people in our state while they fill the pockets of foreign leaders and billionaires.

Senator Brinks' statement is as follows:

I rise to offer this resolution today. It is of most urgent consequence. I rise to plea with our federal leaders to fund SNAP in full. There's no positive spin that you can put on this because of an absolute failure of leadership by the President of the United States, the Speaker of the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate Majority Leader. Thousands of kids and their families will not be able to afford food when SNAP funding runs out in just a few days. Last week, the USDA communicated with Michigan's health department that SNAP benefits will see an interruption due to the ongoing federal government shutdown. Here's what that means by the numbers: 1.4 million Michiganders rely on SNAP benefits to afford groceries and to feed their families; nearly 500,000 of those Michiganders are children; nearly 40,000 of those Michiganders are veterans; and more than 50 percent of SNAP households include a family member with a disability. Federal Republicans have decided that it's OK for those kids, veterans, and people with disabilities to go without, not to mention the economic toll that this will take on our grocers and farmers. It goes against our values.

I am so proud that our state has so many charitable organizations that have stepped up, and they've stepped forward to say, How can I help? But the reality is that the federal government is outsourcing its core responsibilities and abusing the big heartedness of our communities while Republicans turn their backs on us.

All of us here know first-hand how programs like SNAP, ACA credits, and more help keep people afloat. We get calls about these kinds of programs from our constituents every single day. During my time as a caseworker prior to coming to the Legislature, I met so many people who suffered in silence and who were just trying to make ends meet for their kids, for their elderly parents, or for themselves. They're people who you interact with every day, who you might not realize need a little support. And if you think you don't know anyone who has needed a hand from public services, you know at least one. When I was six years old, my father died suddenly of a heart attack at the age of 40, leaving my mother with five small children to raise—one of whom was profoundly disabled—and a dairy farm to run.

In most countries, we would have been destined for poverty, but with the help of Social Security and disability benefits, and Medicaid and Medicare for my brother, my mom was able to make ends meet. She ran the business while raising all of us on her own, ultimately sending four of us to college—something she's incredibly proud of. And throughout his life, my brother's needs were met without the crippling costs of round-the-clock medical care that he needed. And while the challenges vary, my story is not all that different from millions of other Americans.

So while we're here today specifically talking about SNAP, we're also talking about the changing narrative in this country that these sorts of programs are optional, or worse: waste, fraud, or abuse. The most basic simple safety net provided by government programs made it possible for my family not just to survive, but to thrive. Without these supports, I'm not sure that I would have had the opportunity to go to college or that I'd be standing in front of you today holding this position. I'm here because I believe that government, when done right with justice and compassion, can change lives for the better. I know it can, because it changed mine. So colleagues, I urge you to join me in reminding Congress of the responsibilities they have to their constituents by supporting this resolution to fund SNAP.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

Well, the majority Democrats didn't give us time to rewrite this whole resolution that was full of inaccuracies, but at least I'll rise here in support of my amendment. There are many things wrong with this resolution. And frankly, it's embarrassing the way the factual inaccuracies are in this resolution. Perhaps the most glaring though is the fact that this resolution isn't going to be sent to the right people—Chuck Schumer and Michigan's two U.S. Senators, Elissa Slotkin and Gary Peters. And when given the opportunity to reopen the government, they kept voting "no." My amendment calls on Chuck Schumer and our two Senators to reopen the government and restore these benefits.

Senator Irwin's second statement is as follows:

I'm not going to have the time to be able to correct all of the inaccuracies in the Senate Minority Leader's earlier speech about this resolution, but with respect to this specific amendment, I can say that the U.S. Senators from Michigan have made it very, very clear under what circumstances they'd be happy to vote for this resolution that keeps being brought up, this clean CR. But I just want to stress again, because it seems like there are some people who are, perhaps, constitutionally challenged, that the Republicans have a majority in the House, they have majority in the Senate, and they have the control of the White House. They have all the tools they need to pass that CR without any Democratic votes.

Senator Albert's statement is as follows:

I want to make clear how this amendment is illustrative at the legislative level here at the state as well. So, when we pass a budget here at the state, we have to have majorities in both chambers. However, in the Senate, you have to have more votes. You have to get votes from the other side of the aisle in order to have immediate effect. It's effectively the same type of problem or issue that they need to work through at the federal level. The Democrats aren't giving them the requisite number of votes in order to get the budget done. Neither party here at the state level that I'm aware of has ever withheld the budget votes for immediate effect, to withhold SNAP benefits, the school budget, or any other type of budgetary issue. They don't have majorities. The Democrats don't have majorities at the federal level. But in the same way, they're withholding the requisite number of votes in order to get it through. We don't do it here. Why are we defending—why are you guys defending it at the federal level? It's the same issue. We don't do it—because it hurts people. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Senator Camilleri's second statement is as follows:

You know, it's just very clear here that we have, I think, a difference of opinion on the ways in which our federal leaders can handle this problem. But to the Senator's point who just spoke, the thing that the Democrats are asking for is to lower people's health care costs. They're asking to lower health care costs, and the Republicans in Congress are saying "no." Republicans in Congress want to skyrocket people's



premiums through the ACA. So, the simple ask that Democrats in Congress are bringing to the table for their negotiation—it's not a pet project, like we see in this chamber from you to effect votes. It's a simple ask: lower people's healthcare costs, extend the ACA premiums, done deal. Congress would get it together and the federal government would reopen. You can't get something—you can't ask for something more simple than that. Here in this chamber, people ask for pet projects, they ask for district priorities, that's fine—

The point here though is, for this amendment, in order for—if you were to bring this up—the Minority Leader of the U.S. Congress is not in charge, much like the Minority Leader in this Legislature is not in charge. There are opportunities here to ask for things. Well, in Congress, Democrats are asking to lower health care premiums. I think they should do it. I ask you to vote “no” on this amendment.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of  
**Statements**

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Moss' statement is as follows:

I actually wanted to acknowledge and introduce somebody in the Gallery, a very close person to me. Many of you know, I was 25 when I was elected to the Southfield City Council—and for the Senator from the 8th District, this is another story from the Southfield City Council—when I was elected, one of my future colleagues said, Congratulations, welcome to the council, but it's like being on a deserted island with six other people and everybody hates everybody else. So it took me a little bit to find my people, and my caucus per se on the council, and there was a tight band of three of us throughout that period—myself; Ken Siver, who is now the mayor of Southfield; and my dear friend Myron Frasier, who is in the Gallery visiting with us today.

Myron was the voice of reason on our Southfield City Council—measured, thoughtful, looking for problems to solve, and figuring out the path to get there. I will also note that many of our council meetings went until 1 o'clock in the morning, so he sat up there for the last two hours—this is nothing compared to those late nights on the Southfield City Council. There were a lot of Myron-isms, too, that I've picked up over the years, including “Never argue with a fool, because someone is going to look at both of you and wonder which one's the fool”, or “Don't strain too hard to find logic where there is none”, so I keep those and carry those with me. So, Myron, who is since retired from the City Council, is in the Gallery with his daughters Michelle and Marie, and his joining me up here is very meaningful for me to have such a good friend be with me here today to watch our work here at the Capitol. Myron has devoted his life to public service. We thank him for all that he has done for Southfield, and I just wanted to recognize him as he's watched session with us here today.

### **Announcements of Printing and Enrollment**

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Tuesday, October 28:

**House Bill Nos. 4124 4125 4126 4127 4128 4129 4509**

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

**House Bill Nos. 5102 5103 5104 5105 5106 5107 5108 5109 5110 5111 5112 5113 5114**

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

**House Bill Nos. 5115 5116 5117 5118 5119 5120 5121 5122 5123 5124 5125 5126 5127  
 5128 5129 5130 5131 5132 5133 5134 5135 5136**

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Tuesday, October 28, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

**House Bill Nos. 5137 5138 5139 5140 5141 5142 5143 5144 5145 5146 5147 5148 5149  
 5150 5151 5152 5153 5154**

### Committee Reports

The Committee on Regulatory Affairs reported

**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.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Jeremy Moss

Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Moss, Polehanki, McCann, Wojno, Santana, Hertel, Singh, Hauck, Webber, Lauwers and Bellino

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

### COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Regulatory Affairs submitted the following:

Meeting held on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, at 1:30 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

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

The Committee on Education reported

**Senate Bill No. 492, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 451, entitled “The revised school code,” by amending section 1135 (MCL 380.1135), as amended by 2018 PA 619.

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

Dayna Polehanki

Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Polehanki, Geiss, Chang, Camilleri, Irwin, Damoose and Johnson

Nays: None

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

### COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Education submitted the following:

Meeting held on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, at 1:45 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Polehanki (C), Geiss, Chang, Camilleri, Irwin, Damoose and Johnson

### COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Housing and Human Services submitted the following:

Meeting held on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, at 12:00 noon, Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building

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

### COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Natural Resources and Agriculture submitted the following:

Meeting held on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, at 3:00 p.m., Room 1300, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Shink (C), Cherry, Singh, Polehanki, Daley, Victory and Hoitenga

## COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure submitted the following:

Meeting held on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, at 3:30 p.m., Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Geiss (C), Klinefelt, Hertel, Chang, McCann, Bellino and Victory

Excused: Senators Wojno, McBroom and Bumstead

**Scheduled Meetings**

**Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety** – Thursday, October 30, 12:00 noon, Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5312

**Economic and Community Development** – Thursday, October 30, 12:00 noon, Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-1721

**Energy and Environment** – Thursday, October 30, 1:30 p.m., Room 403, 4th Floor, Capitol Building (517) 373-5323

**Labor** – Thursday, October 30, 2:00 p.m., Room 1300, Binsfeld Office Building (517) 373-5314

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

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

The Assistant President pro tempore, Senator Geiss, declared the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 30, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN  
Secretary of the Senate

