

No. 44  
STATE OF MICHIGAN  
**Journal of the Senate**  
102nd Legislature  
REGULAR SESSION OF 2024

---

---

Senate Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, May 9, 2024.

10:00 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President, Lieutenant Governor Garlin D. Gilchrist II.

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

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

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

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

Senator Sue Shink of the 14th District offered the following invocation:

May I be an agent of love in this world. Where there is hatred, let me bring loving-kindness; where there is injury, forgiveness; where there is doubt, insight; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; where there is sadness, joy.

May I console as well as be consoled. May I understand as well as be understood; may I love as well as be loved; for in giving we receive; in forgiving, we are forgiven; and in dying to self-centeredness, we live a more fulfilling life.

The President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist, led the members of the Senate in recital of the *Pledge of Allegiance*.

### **Motions and Communications**

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

Senator Geiss entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Singh moved that Senators Anthony, Brinks, Camilleri, Chang, McMorrow and Santana be temporarily excused from today's session. The motion prevailed.

### **Messages from the House**

#### **Senate Bill No. 817, entitled**

A bill to make, supplement, and adjust appropriations for certain capital outlay projects and the department of natural resources for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024; to provide for expenditure of the appropriations; and to prescribe certain conditions for the appropriations.

The House of Representatives has amended the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 8, line 15, by striking out all of section 103 and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

2. Amend page 11, line 13, by striking out the balance of the bill.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill as amended and ordered that it be given immediate effect. Pursuant to rule 3.202, the bill was laid over one day.

The House of Representatives returned, in accordance with the request of the Senate

#### **House Bill No. 4331, entitled**

A bill to amend 1956 PA 218, entitled "The insurance code of 1956," by amending section 2227 (MCL 500.2227), as amended by 2014 PA 509.

#### **House Bill No. 4332, entitled**

A bill to amend 1909 PA 279, entitled "The home rule city act," by amending section 4q (MCL 117.4q), as amended by 2013 PA 188.

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

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

### **Introduction and Referral of Bills**

Senators Cherry, Damoose, Polehanki and Shink introduced

#### **Senate Bill No. 867, entitled**

A bill to amend 1974 PA 300, entitled "Motor vehicle service and repair act," by amending sections 2, 13b, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 30, 32, 32a, and 33 (MCL 257.1302, 257.1313b, 257.1314, 257.1315, 257.1316, 257.1317, 257.1318, 257.1330, 257.1332, 257.1332a, and 257.1333), section 2 as amended by 2020 PA 227 and sections 13b and 32a as added and sections 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 30, 32, and 33 as amended by 2016 PA 430.

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

Senator Hertel introduced

**Senate Bill No. 868, entitled**

A bill to amend 1998 PA 58, entitled “Michigan liquor control code of 1998,” by amending section 105 (MCL 436.1105), as amended by 2022 PA 226.

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

Senators Chang and Camilleri entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Camilleri introduced

**Senate Bill No. 869, entitled**

A bill to amend 1945 PA 327, entitled “Aeronautics code of the state of Michigan,” by amending section 135 (MCL 259.135), as amended by 1982 PA 466.

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

Senators McCann, Shink, Chang and Polehanki introduced

**Senate Bill No. 870, entitled**

A bill to amend 1976 PA 267, entitled “Open meetings act,” by amending section 3a (MCL 15.263a), as amended by 2023 PA 214.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

Senators Chang, Bayer, Cavanagh, Polehanki, Shink, Wojno, Geiss, Klinefelt, McDonald Rivet, Victory and McMorrow introduced

**Senate Bill No. 871, entitled**

A bill to protect the safety of judges and certain other individuals; to protect certain information of judges and certain other individuals from disclosure; to provide for the powers and duties of certain state and local governmental officers and certain other people and entities; and to provide remedies.

The bill was read a first and second time by title and referred to the Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety.

**House Bill No. 5434, entitled**

A bill to amend 2001 PA 142, entitled “Michigan memorial highway act,” (MCL 250.1001 to 250.2092) by adding section 114.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill and ordered that it be given immediate effect.

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

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

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

**Senate Resolution No. 118**

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

Senators Shink, McBroom, Wojno, Irwin, Cherry, Santana and Chang offered the following resolution:

**Senate Resolution No. 118.**

A resolution to recognize May 5-12, 2024, as Correctional Officers Week.

Whereas, The safety and well-being of every Michigander is of the utmost importance, and the correctional officers who work in our correctional facilities dedicate themselves to this critical task each and every day; and

Whereas, In an environment that may become intimidating, aggressive, or even hostile, correctional officers are skilled professionals that are trained to maintain composure while preserving safety and property, and restraining persons that may be dangerous to themselves or others; and

Whereas, These honorable men and women are hard-working and committed public servants, and without their expertise and service, Michigan's correctional facilities would be unable to operate as successfully and efficiently as they do today; and

Whereas, During this week, we join with the Michigan Department of Corrections and the Michigan Corrections Organization to recognize every correctional officer that serves in Michigan. We thank them for the essential role they play in helping to protect the people of Michigan; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of this legislative body recognize May 5-12, 2024, as Correctional Officers Week.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Senators Lauwers and McMorrow were named co-sponsors of the resolution.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Shink's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I rise today to speak to this bipartisan resolution to recognize May 5-12, 2024, as Correctional Officers Week in Michigan. More than 6,000 corrections officers serve in Michigan's prison and corrections institutions, providing invaluable service to the state of Michigan. These honorable men and women are hardworking and committed public servants, and without their expertise and service Michigan's correctional facilities would not function. Throughout the 31 correctional facilities in the state, including in my own district, corrections officers play a pivotal role in enriching their communities. These men and women help protect our communities, while also maintaining a safe and constructive environment for justice-involved residents.

During this week, we join the Michigan Department of Corrections and the Michigan Corrections Organization to recognize each correctional officer who serves in Michigan. We thank them for the essential role they play in helping to protect the people of Michigan, not just during this week but throughout the year. I hope we continue to extend our support and gratitude for corrections officers by shaping our budget and policy decisions in ways that make their workplaces and job satisfaction better. I appreciate my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, for co-sponsoring this resolution and I hope that all members of this body will join me in supporting this important recognition today.

Senator Santana entered the Senate Chamber.

### **Recess**

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 10:09 a.m.

10:53 a.m.

The Senate was called to order by the President, Lieutenant Governor Gilchrist.

During the recess, Senators Brinks and Anthony entered the Senate Chamber.

By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to the order of

### **Statements**

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator McCann's statement is as follows:

Colleagues, on Tuesday night multiple tornadoes hit communities in my district resulting in heavy damage. Fortunately there were no fatalities. My heart goes out to all those impacted by this devastating natural disaster, including people in the city of Portage, Pavilion Township, Texas Township, and others. I want to thank all the phenomenal first responders throughout Kalamazoo County and southwest Michigan who quickly coordinated an exceptional relief effort to those in need. I also want to thank Governor Whitmer for her swift emergency declaration that will provide southwest Michigan with necessary relief.

Mr. President, Michigan citizens are resilient, kind, sharing, and supportive, especially in the face of disaster. We pull together and help our neighbors in challenging times and I have witnessed this firsthand in the aftermath of these tornadoes. I look forward to working with everyone to rebuild from the damage and helping those impacted in whatever way I can.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to 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 10:55 a.m.

11:58 a.m.

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

During the recess, Senator McMorrow entered the Senate Chamber.

Senator Singh moved that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following bill:  
**Senate Bill No. 762**  
The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 762, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the department of military and veterans affairs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Nesbitt offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 5, after line 11, by inserting:

“National Guard deployment to southern border 8,000,000”.

2. Amend page 5, line 15, by striking out “21,000,000” and inserting “29,000,000.”

3. Amend page 5, line 18, by striking out “21,000,000” and inserting “29,000,000” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 115**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

Johnson Victory

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

**Protests**

Senators Hertel, Moss, McDonald Rivet, Anthony, McMorro, Geiss, Shink, Santana, Cavanagh, Chang, Wojno, Camilleri and Singh, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the adoption of the amendments offered by Senator Nesbitt to Senate Bill No. 762.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Hertel’s statement, in which Senators Moss, McDonald Rivet, Anthony, McMorro, Geiss, Shink, Santana, Cavanagh, Chang, Wojno, Camilleri and Singh, is as follows:

Michiganders and the American people at large deserve a solution to a broken immigration system. What they don’t deserve is to have their elected representatives exploit this issue simply for political gain. This amendment that is proposed by colleagues on the other side of the aisle is just more about political theater than our state or our national security. Here is the truth: Michigan has sent more than 400 National Guard members to the southern border in the past four years, and there is another scheduled deployment for this fall. This decision should be made by our generals and by military experts, not politicians who have an agenda. It is my friends on the other side of the aisle, where if they were truly interested in solving this crisis, which I think we all are, then they would spend less time fear mongering and instead stand up and call on Congress to do their job and fix our immigration system.

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 5, after line 10, by inserting:

“Early cancer screening pilot project 1,000,000”.

2. Amend page 5, line 15, by striking out “21,000,000” and inserting “22,000,000”.

3. Amend page 5, line 18, by striking out “21,000,000” and inserting “22,000,000” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

4. Amend page 38, after line 11, by inserting:

“Sec. 703. (1) From the funds provided in part 1 for early cancer screening pilot project the department shall provide outreach and support services to promote and expand early and regular cancer screenings among veterans. The pilot project should seek demonstratable increases in veteran early cancer screenings that may be achieved through promotion and outreach activities, low or no-cost screening, the facilitation of access to services, or other avenues.

(2) By not later than March 1, 2025, the department shall communicate to the appropriate committees and subcommittees of the Senate and House of Representatives the detailed plan to provide and promote increased early cancer screenings.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 116**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Huizenga offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 4, line 1, by striking out “29,485,100” and inserting “32,511,400”.
2. Amend page 4, line 2, by striking out “25,649,700” and inserting “25,927,700”.
3. Amend page 4, line 3, by striking out “31,961,000” and inserting “38,827,500”.
4. Amend page 4, line 5, by striking out “3,680,700” and inserting “4,622,600”.
5. Amend page 4, line 7, by striking out “92,601,000” and inserting “103,713,700”.
6. Amend page 4, line 15, by striking out “35,931,800” and inserting “47,044,500”.
7. Amend page 5, after line 8, by striking out all of lines 9 through 12.
8. Amend page 5, line 15, by striking out “21,000,000” and inserting “16,500,100”.
9. Amend page 5, line 18, by striking out “21,000,000” and inserting “16,500,100” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 117****Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

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. 118**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protest**

Senator Theis, under her constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 762 and moved that the statement she made during the discussion of the bill be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Theis’ statement is as follows:

While this budget is a good first step to ensuring that every veteran receives resources and care they need and deserve, it falls short of protecting our residents here at home. Too many of our communities have been directly impacted by the ongoing border crisis. If the Biden administration won’t do its job, we must step up to protect our nation’s border and its citizens. It’s unfortunate that my colleagues want to continue to ignore the reality of what’s happening on our southern U.S. border. I recommend a “no” vote at this time.



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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Nesbitt's statement is as follows:

This amendment is very straight forward. It would appropriate \$8 million to deploy Michigan National Guard units to our nation's southern border. The failed enforcement policies of the Biden administration have created a crisis of historic proportions, making every state a border state. Over 7.2 million illegal immigrants have entered the United States through our southern border since Biden has taken his oath of office—those are just the ones we probably know about. The states have a duty to step up where the federal government has failed to protect our residents from the deadly fentanyl and other drugs pouring across our borders and criminals who seek to hide and do harm within our communities. Texas has led the way, spending billions of its own state resources to secure and protect the border with Mexico because the Biden administration has abandoned its duty and failed its citizens. Many other states are now following the example and sending in support to help secure our border and guide those who seek entry into our great nation away from dangerous and nefarious sites and illegal points of entry. My amendment would include Michigan in this important national security effort. I ask for a "yes" vote.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I think that an amendment like this is vitally needed. This issue, from everything I've seen across the nation, is the number one issue in the nation. Yes, the National Guard should be sent to assist this total crisis here in this nation, this crisis that is flooding the nation, including Michigan, with fentanyl. When I was over on the west side of the state and was talking to this sheriffs over there, they said that they no longer have fentanyl labs over on the west side of the state, or pretty much anywhere in Michigan, because you can buy pennies on the dollar as it floods over and murders Michigan's citizens with the poisoning—it's not even an overdose. People will take these little kids who get this fentanyl that looks like its something they're used to, and they die—because of a wide-open border. Eighty-five thousand children coming over unaccompanied—all OKed by the cartels; very often sex trafficked.

This is a horror, and this is why the people in this nation and in the state of Michigan are sick and tired of this wide-open border that the Democrats, every single one, seems to be supporting this. I don't hear a single word from the Democrats attacking this unbelievable flooding-in of people, from cartel-approved people, from people that have been sleeper cells all over the nation coming here to do us harm. This should be dealt with, and not with that ridiculous bill that was in Congress that said 1.5 million people could come over illegally and we'll again approve them—after five years they get amnesty to vote. So yes, this is a disaster and we should be involved, we should be doing this for the state of Michigan, and of course, just like in Congress, nothing gets done on closing that border.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

The men and women of our armed forces courageously serve this nation and its citizens. During that service they take many risks, and often they pay a high price. In the post-9/11 veteran community in particular, increased exposure to toxins during deployments, and the resulting health impacts, have been the subject of increased advocacy in recent years. This is because the risk of being exposed to numerous carcinogens has drastically increased during deployment. Those who take these risks on behalf of our country deserve the care they need when they return home, especially for these health impacts—like cancers—that may be linked to toxic exposure but may not manifest until many years later. The good news is that progress has been made in this area—the recent federal legislation and steps taken by the VA. But more should be done.

This amendment would promote cancer-screening programs offered through the VA to increase screening of Michigan's veterans. This is only a start to how we at the state level can help repay those who served this country, and I hope for more discussion on how else we can be involved. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Senator Huizenga's statement is as follows:

My amendment would simply restore appropriate levels of funding to our state's veterans homes. These selfless men and women who have risked their lives to defend at protect our great nation deserve our full support when they return home. These veterans homes are a vital resource to many of our veterans, and this is not the appropriate area to roll back our support. I encourage you to vote "yes" with me on this amendment, and not shy away from our duty to serve the brave men and women who have served us.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 763, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the department of state police for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Huizenga offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 10, line 28, by striking out “2,000,000” and inserting “10,000,000”.
2. Amend page 11, line 4, by striking out “2,500,000” and inserting “10,500,000”.
3. Amend page 11, line 6, by striking out “2,500,000” and inserting “10,500,000” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 119**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 41, after line 15, by inserting

“(4) The department must require that motor carrier division officers wear a uniform color other than dark blue and that motor officers specifically state that they are not police officers when they begin interactions/enforcement activities.”.

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

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 41, after line 15, by inserting

“(4) The department must require that all new vehicles for use by motor carrier officers not be painted to look similar to those used by Michigan state police officers and that the motor carrier division develop and display a division logo that is significantly dissimilar to that used by Michigan state police.”.

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

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 8, line 12, by striking out “500,000” and inserting “921,600”.
2. Amend page 8, line 13, by striking out “171,861,400” and inserting “172,283,000”.

3. Amend page 9, line 13, by striking out “57,792,500” and inserting “58,214,100” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

4. Amend page 44, line 28, after “implementation costs if” by striking out “the”.

5. Amend page 44, line 29, by striking out all of line 29 and inserting “Senate Bill No. 497 of the 102nd Legislature is enacted into law.”.

6. Amend page 45, by striking out all of lines 1 through 3.

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. 120**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protest**

Senator Theis, under her constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 763 and moved that the statement she made during the discussion of the bill be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Theis’ statement is as follows:

Our focus should be on recruiting, training, and retaining qualified law enforcement officers. Instead, this proposed budget focuses more on keeping lawmakers safe than protecting our local communities. Our resources should be directed toward supporting and strengthening public safety for all of our citizens, not just a select few. We must also acknowledge the unique challenges that police officers encounter in the line of duty. They operate under increased scrutiny and face considerable risks, both in their physical safety and in their mental health. Any new guidelines should be carefully crafted to avoid weakening the effectiveness of law enforcement and exacerbating the concerning trend of experienced officers leaving the profession. This budget includes exacerating language that I fear could threaten public safety and harm officer retention. I recommend a “no” vote.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Huizenga's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, my amendment will increase funding to recruit, train, and retain more local law enforcement officials. With many police officers leaving the field due to the stresses and pressures, it's imperative that we provide local communities with the resources they need to keep our neighborhoods safe. I ask my colleagues for their support on this amendment.

Senator McBroom's first statement is as follows:

Mr. President, many of us in our professional lives encounter various state employees whose job is regulation. Whether that person is coming to check an elevator in a building or coming to check a dairy farm, or whether they're at your grocery store looking at the scales, or even coming to your house as a CPS worker to make sure a report of child care is verified or unverified, these state workers provide a vital function for our state in keeping our citizens safe.

However, not one of them gets to dress up and be a police officer. Not one of them can come in and pretend to be a police officer or look like a police officer, except for one set of inspectors in this state, and that's the Motor Carrier Division. The Motor Carrier Division officers dress up like State Police officers and they come and pull people over, and they inspect vehicles—not just commercial vehicles either, but other vehicles as well. I think that is an egregious abuse of power that they're able to look like police officers and it automatically puts them in an intimidating position with the citizens who are supposed to be being regulated, not being treated as if they're committing crime. I think it would be wise for us, and my amendment proposes that they not dress in the State Police blue uniforms and they not have the insignias of the State Police on those uniforms so they are clearly not police officers when members of the public are forced to deal with them, just like it is when you deal with any other state inspector or regulator who comes to your business or to your home. I recommend a "yes" vote.

Senator McBroom's second statement is as follows:

Mr. President, this amendment, similar to the previous one, but this time in regard to the vehicles that Motor Carrier drives.

Once again, they drive in vehicles that are to any eye identical to the vehicles our state troopers drive around. While there is a slight label on the back side of the vehicle that tells you it's Motor Carrier Division, that's not something you can tell in your rearview mirror when they pull you over. I've seen so many hardworking citizens of Michigan—truck drivers, people with lawn care businesses, farmers—pulled over on the side of the road and dealing with someone who's dressed like a policeman, who's driving a car with red flashing lights like a policeman. If anybody else did these things, they'd be arrested for impersonating an officer. It's not the right thing for our citizens to do, it's not good for morale or for citizen understanding of their rights to be pulled over by somebody who looks like a policeman and put in a situation where they feel like they're being treated by a policeman when it's not a police officer, it's a state inspector checking over a vehicle for deficiencies. We should be painting these cars a different color.

My amendment doesn't propose that we change this all at once, but as we acquire new vehicles in the future that we remove the State Police insignia, badges, and colors from these cars and that they come up with a different appearance that does not make it look like it's State Police. I recommend a "yes" vote.

Senator Runestad's statement is as follows:

I have a tremendous amount of respect for the troopers who are out on the streets protecting us everyday but there are so many issues with the higher-ups at the Michigan State Police. The *Free Press* did a complete exposé on issue after issue, issue of favoritism, there were allegations of people getting special treatment by getting answers to the tests in order to be promoted. People who had very little ability in terms of experience that were jumped over—many, many officers to get higher-level positions. This is something really, I believe, that we should be looking at as a Legislature, investigating the higher-ups in the Michigan State Police. The one who had resigned when the troopers thought they were going to get a much better situation with the individual who replaced them and they said it's as bad or worse. There are so many issues. I'll speak on this when I have my notes in front of me to walk through line by line every one of these issues, but again, I 100 percent support the troopers but there's major, major issues that need to be dealt with at the high end of the Michigan State Police.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 757, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

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. 121**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protest**

Senator Outman, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 757 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 Outman’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, a transparent and open judicial system is key to maintaining public trust. Removing tracking metrics and funding for statewide court transparency undermines the fundamental principles of accountability upon which our legal framework is built. I hope we can reconsider this course of action and instead seek ways to enhance transparency. Doing so will strengthen public confidence in the integrity of our judicial system. I ask for a “no” vote.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 756, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the department of corrections for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Outman offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 2, line 21, after “program” by striking out “14,814,600” and inserting “17,314,600” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

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 serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 122**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 3, line 3, after “costs” by striking out “16,450,000” and inserting “30,321,400”.
2. Amend page 29, line 14, after “costs” by striking out the balance of the line through “bills” on line 15 and inserting “if Senate Bill No. 497”.
3. Amend page 29, line 15, after the first “Legislature” by striking out “are” and inserting “is”.
4. Amend page 29, line 15, after “law” by inserting a period.
5. Amend page 29, line 15, after “law” by striking out the colon through “167.” on line 18.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Singh requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 123**

**Yeas—12**

|          |          |         |          |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert   | Daley    | Lauwers | Outman   |
| Bellino  | Hauck    | Lindsey | Runestad |
| Bumstead | Hoitenga | Nesbitt | Theis    |

**Nays—24**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator McBroom offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 49, following line 19, by inserting:

“Sec. 606a. From the funds appropriated in part 1, the department shall provide a report by April 1 for the preceding 12 month period on the number of prisoners, that have been incarcerated for a minimum of 5 years, who received suboxone upon release from a correctional facility.”.

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. 124**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

### Protest

Senator Outman, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 756 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 Outman’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I had hope that public safety would be one area where we could evade politics, but this proposed budget before us today removes critical funding that would go towards keeping our community’s corrections officers and inmates safe. That includes bonuses for our hard-working corrections officers, body-worn cameras that would improve officer and inmate safety, and funding to provide workforce and educational development to individuals—which would help them reacclimate into society and reduce future crime in our local communities. On top of that, reporting and transparency requirements were stripped that ensure the safety of staff and inmates. Unfortunately, those core priorities have been removed from this budget bill. I recommend a “no” vote.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Outman’s statement is as follows:

Our corrections officers maintain one of the most difficult professions there is. It is mentally and physically exhausting and, like many other fields, is facing significant shortfalls. This amendment would provide more resources for jails that bear the cost of housing felons and help keep both prisoners and corrections officers safe. I ask my colleagues for their support of this amendment.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

Corrections officers are valuable members of our state’s public safety community. Our prison system has faced significant staffing shortages for years, and it has made an already-tough job even tougher for this dedicated men and women. It also puts significant strains on their families. There is no question that we should do more to improve the conditions for staffing shortfalls and for these officers to help with recruitment and retention efforts.

I agree with the Senator from the 27th District that it would be constructive for corrections officers to have improved retirement benefits but the option presented within this budget proposal, while well intentioned, is a solution we have already tried and failed. In 1997, we closed the state employee pension plan, and we still haven’t finished paying off the debt. This is the same pension plan that corrections officers and other state employees used to be part of. Now this bill funds the proposal to have corrections officers and some other state employees moved into an open plan—the state troopers pension. It is foolish to not learn from past mistakes. There is nothing about this open plan that prevents another financial hole from being created. At the end of the day it is higher wages, not a pension, that would make the biggest difference in staffing and restoring a healthy work/life balance. To think employees are going to gut out a job for 20 or 30 years that mandates overtime and does not pay well relative to other jobs with significantly less risk for a pension is an oversimplification. The more we pay our corrections officers in wages, the less turnover we will have.

It is time for the Governor, the office of the State Employer, and the Civil Service Commission to get ahead of this issue. While wages are not something negotiated by the Legislature, I am confident we would find the money in the budget to pay for raises. All that aside, this plan to implement a pension would increase risk over the long run for both the Michigan taxpayer and for the troopers who are already part of the Michigan State Police retirement system. This plan will be allowing current employees to buy their years of service. If the assumptions that go into calculating the years of service are wrong, troopers will be on the hook to pay off the debt too. This is unfair to them.

My amendment presents an alternative that I believe is more financially viable over the long run and will do a much better job at helping plan for retirement. It significantly improves the 401K match for corrections officers and other law-enforcement-related state employees. New employees would start at a six-percent match and would phase up to a ten-percent match over five years. This mirrors one piece of a retention proposal I introduced earlier in this legislative session in Senate Bill No. 497. It’s important we look at the true costs of retirement systems over time. The true cost of pensions are hard to quantify with great accuracy moving forward because of all the variables. Will the actual investment return meet the assumed rate? How long will retirees live? And so on. If you need proof for how far off we can be on these assumptions, just look at the annual debt cost. For example, the Department of Corrections has an estimated \$229 million in legacy pension and retiree health costs for this fiscal year alone. That system was closed 27 years ago. Just imagine if we didn’t have to spend \$229 million on legacy retirement costs this year. It could translate to significant pay raises, potentially many thousands of dollars for each corrections officer each year.



As a starting point, please support my amendment that provides an alternative and sustainable retirement plan. With my alternative, we know when the liability ends and we will provide more generous retirement option. Thank you, and I ask for support of my amendment.

Senator Cherry’s statement is as follows:

I would like to encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment. This bill funds, as the Senator indicated, moving our corrections officers to the State Police retirement system. When you have the conversation with the corrections officers, they will tell you the number one way to address our recruitment and retention problem in the Michigan Department of Corrections is to restore those retirement benefits. When we look at nations across the state, it has been a disaster every time a state has removed retirement benefits from corrections officers. They deal with the same issue, not having people in the jobs anymore, because you can come to the Michigan Department of Corrections, get trained, get experience, and then go move on to a system that will actually provide you benefits, whether that be federal government or local government. What we’ve seen across the country is that this is removing these retirement benefits from corrections officers have been a disaster. I would encourage—this amendment would essentially not fund that move while costing more than the proposal in the budget as it is would not achieve the results that we’re trying to achieve. So I encourage my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

Senator McBroom’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, my amendment seeks to receive from the department a report regarding the use of Suboxone treatments in inmates prior to their release, and also to understand whether or not we are truly helping inmates get off of their drug addictions or whether we’re helping them continue them upon their release time. Some disturbing reports have come to me from a number of my constituents who work at corrections about the department providing Suboxone to those who’ve been incarcerated far long enough to have gotten off of the material and prior to their release, and I think that we ought to know the full extent of this dangerous practice. So I recommend a “yes” vote on my amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 769, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the department of education for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 9, following line 3, by inserting:

---

“Chronic absenteeism task force 250,000”.

---

2. Amend page 37, following line 25, by inserting:

“Sec. 1103. The funds appropriated in part 1 for chronic absenteeism task force shall be appropriated to support the costs of a task force with the goal of identifying policies that could help lower the statewide chronic absenteeism rate for Michigan. Funds shall be expended when the governor has established the taskforce with the following members:

- (a) A member from each party of the house of representatives.
- (b) A member from each party of the senate.
- (c) A representative from the department.
- (d) A representative from an organization that represents school boards.
- (e) A representative from an organization that represents school administrators.
- (f) Two representatives from a union for teachers.”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 125**

**Yeas—15**

|          |          |         |          |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert   | Damoose  | Lindsey | Runestad |
| Bellino  | Hauck    | McBroom | Theis    |
| Bumstead | Hoitenga | Nesbitt | Webber   |
| Daley    | Lauwers  | Outman  |          |

**Nays—21**

|           |          |                |           |
|-----------|----------|----------------|-----------|
| Anthony   | Cherry   | Klinefelt      | Polehanki |
| Bayer     | Geiss    | McCann         | Santana   |
| Brinks    | Hertel   | McDonald Rivet | Shink     |
| Camilleri | Huizenga | McMorrow       | Singh     |
| Cavanagh  | Irwin    | Moss           | Wojno     |
| Chang     |          |                |           |

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

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. 126**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

This amendment would allocate \$250,000 to establish a task force to study and make recommendations to reduce chronic absenteeism among students in Michigan. Just about every school district I talk to mentions what a struggle it has become to get kids to regularly attend class. Before the pandemic, in the 2018-2019 school year, the state reported that 19.7 percent of Michigan’s public school students were considered chronically absent. In the 2022-2023 school year, long after mandated school shutdowns were over, 30.8 percent of students were considered chronically absent. At the individual school district level, these rates vary. For example, both Flint and Lansing school districts saw absenteeism rates just over 80 percent.

The data clearly shows that this is a significant issue. When did it become OK to miss school? Look no further than the state policies enacted during the COVID pandemic. Shutting down schools for so long a few years ago sent a terrible and lasting message, even if it was an unintended one—that the state just didn’t think attending school was all that important. It’s a mistake that we’re still paying for, and some of our kids may never recover from it. We must come up with better strategies to turn this trend around. I’ve thought a lot about what we can do to get ahead of this issue, and I have to admit, I have found this a difficult problem to make better. This is one that could use collaboration with people from different perspectives, and this task force would be a good starting point.

In addition to four legislators, the task force would have representatives from the Michigan Department of Education, school administrators, school boards, and teachers unions. Please join me in supporting this amendment to spark initiatives to get kids back in the classroom.

**Recess**

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 12:51 p.m.

1:22 p.m.

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

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 761, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the state transportation department for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Hauck offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 10, line 26, by striking out all of line 26.
2. Amend page 10, line 28, after “\$” by striking out “195,990,100” and inserting “190,990,100”.
3. Amend page 11, line 4, after “\$” by striking out the balance of the bill and inserting “170,000,100” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.
4. Amend page 38, line 8, by striking out all of section 1006.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 127**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Hauck offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 6, line 19, after “construction” by striking out “411,168,800” and inserting “451,168,800”.
2. Amend page 6, line 25, after “\$” by striking out “4,153,822,600” and inserting “4,193,822,600”.
3. Amend page 7, line 6, after “\$” by striking out “0” and inserting “40,000,000”.
4. Amend page 8, line 13, after “\$” by striking out “261,750,000” and inserting “221,750,000”.
5. Amend page 8, line 15, after “\$” by striking out “302,376,500” and inserting “262,376,500”.
6. Amend page 8, line 20, after “\$” by striking out “40,000,000” and inserting “0” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 128****Yeas—16**

|          |          |         |          |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert   | Damoose  | Lauwers | Outman   |
| Bellino  | Hauck    | Linsey  | Runestad |
| Bumstead | Hoitenga | McBroom | Theis    |
| Daley    | Huizenga | Nesbitt | Webber   |

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

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. 129**

**Yeas—22**

|           |         |                |           |
|-----------|---------|----------------|-----------|
| Anthony   | Chang   | Klinefelt      | Polehanki |
| Bayer     | Cherry  | McCann         | Santana   |
| Brinks    | Damoose | McDonald Rivet | Shink     |
| Bumstead  | Geiss   | McMorrow       | Singh     |
| Camilleri | Hertel  | Moss           | Wojno     |
| Cavanagh  | Irwin   |                |           |

**Nays—14**

|         |          |         |          |
|---------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert  | Hoitenga | McBroom | Runestad |
| Bellino | Huizenga | Nesbitt | Theis    |
| Daley   | Lauwers  | Outman  | Webber   |
| Hauck   | Lindsey  |         |          |

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Hauck’s first statement is as follows:

I think you would be hard-pressed to find many people who want their movement tracked by government and be forced to pay more to do so, yet the funding is a veiled attempt to do just that. The study is just an unclever attempt by my colleagues to try to pull a fast one on the hard-working people of our state. VMT may stand for “vehicle miles traveled” but it is more accurately described as vehicle miles tracked or even worse, taxed. We don’t need another taxpayer-funded study to let my colleagues know that this is an unpopular idea. We should instead scrap this wasteful spending and put it towards fixing our roads. I ask for a “yes” vote on my amendment to eliminate this wasteful spending from the budget.

Senator Hauck’s second statement is as follows:

People have been clear in their calls for fixing the roads and improving our infrastructure; I hear during local meetings, office hours, and here in Lansing. We have a clear need for additional local funding, a need I believe that proceeds above many of things in this budget. Instead, more money is being thrown into government-run transit systems with fewer interested riders. Government-run transit systems experienced a staggering 61 percent decline in ridership, plummeting from 83 million rides in 2019 to just 32 million in 2021. We ought to be spending this time addressing the state’s dire needs like local road repairs and prioritizing things that those who elected us to serve in Lansing are asking for. I ask members for their support on this amendment.

Senator Damoose’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I know that everyone in this chamber agrees that our roads are in desperate need of repair. Last year, I spoke before this body about the need for a comprehensive transportation plan that prioritizes fixing our local roads and bridges in a way that addresses the needs of all of our Michigan families in all of our geographic locations, not just the high population locations, but critically important regions like the Upper Peninsula and the towns and villages that dot the map throughout northern Michigan. It seems we are actually making some progress on some of our MDOT roads, but let’s not forget that most of the real problems can be found in our local roads, which counties and townships simply do not have the resources to address.

We also have desperate needs to keep our critically important industries, not the least of which is our logging and timber industry which is in serious need of additional Category E funding for seasonal roads that has not been increased since the 1980s. So, we still have some more work to do in this budget and I hope some of these ideas and some of the ideas proposed in the amendments today will be considered as the final budget is crafted. That said, I will be supporting this budget today as a solid first step, and appreciate the chair’s commitment to work together on this budget, but hope we can continue to make improvements to help better serve all of the people of this great state.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 768, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the department of environment, Great Lakes, and energy for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendment:

- 1. Amend page 18, line 19, after “\$” by striking out “83,000,000.00” and inserting “3,000,000.00”.

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 serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 130**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

Johnson                      Victory

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Bellino offered the following amendments:

- 1. Amend page 14, line 17, by striking out all of line 17.
- 2. Amend page 14, line 20, after “initiative” by striking out “10,000,000” and inserting “25,000,000”.
- 3. Amend page 37, line 24, by striking out all of section 1003.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 131**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

Johnson                      Victory

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

- 1. Amend page 3, line 3, after “State employees retirement system implementation costs” by striking out “50,000” and inserting “92,200” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.
- 2. Amend page 30, line 2, after “No.” by striking out the balance of the line through “167.” on line 4 and inserting “497”.

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

Senator Hauck offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 14, line 16, by striking out all of line 16.
2. Amend page 14, following line 17, after “infrastructure”, by inserting “\$”.
3. Amend page 14, line 18, after “infrastructure” by striking out “25,000,000” and inserting “35,000,000”.
4. Amend page 38, line 25, by striking out all of section 1004.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 132**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Outman offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 14, following line 19, by inserting:

---

|                                   |             |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| Wastewater infrastructure project | 9,000,000”. |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|

---

2. Amend page 14, line 25, after “funds” by striking “0” and inserting “9,000,000” and adjusting the subtotals, totals, and section 201 accordingly.

3. Amend page 40, following line 6, by inserting:

“Sec. 1006. From the funds appropriated in part 1 for wastewater infrastructure project, \$9,000,000.00 shall be awarded to a wastewater infrastructure project located in a city with a population between 5,900 and 6,000 and in a county with a population of between 66,800 and 67,000 according to the most recent federal decennial census that supports a wastewater infrastructure project but due to cost increases resulting from inflation, supply chain, or other impact have been awarded funding amounts that are insufficient to complete the approved project.”.

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. 133**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protest**

Senator Bumstead, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 768 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 Bumstead’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, I am concerned that this EGLE budget prioritizes electric cars for government officials and EV charging stations at the expense of Michiganders. In fact, this budget wouldn’t even be possible without raising taxes on families across this state. To make matters worse, my colleagues want to try and trick Michiganders into thinking that this proposed budget would not further increase their taxes. Our state’s water infrastructure is a pressing issue for many communities across Michigan. It’s important that funding better reflects our shared priorities. I recommend a “no” vote.

Senators Lindsey, Irwin, Bellino, Hauck and Outman asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Lindsey’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, there’s a lot of hot garbage in the budgets before us, but Governor Whitmer’s 1,200 percent trash tax hike is especially stinky. The Senate recommendation before us may use a contingency fund to set aside \$80 million, but make no mistake, that funding does not exist without the trash tax increase. And to be clear, it is a tax hike. The 1,200 percent increase will simply be passed down to homeowners across our state. Mr. President, when is enough enough? Michiganders are paying higher income taxes this year, thanks to the majority. They’re still struggling with high inflation, they’re pinching pennies to afford groceries and gas, and here comes Governor Whitmer and Democrats, saying, Sorry, we’re going to need you to fork over even more. Enough. I ask for support of my amendment to dump this massive trash tax hike in a landfill where it belongs.

Senator Irwin’s statement is as follows:

I just want to let members know that this budget line item does not actually authorize any new fees. When you vote on this item, you should know that the previous speaker and those comments were not in line with what’s in the bill. This does not authorize any fees; in fact, the Legislature would have to authorize those fees. I hope it’s a discussion we have here because out-of-state trash and the fact Michigan is a huge magnet for out-of-state trash is a problem that this Legislature has been wrestling with for years. This budget does not fix that, this line does not increase any fees, and that discussion will happen elsewhere.

Senator Bellino’s statement is as follows:

Just like millions of families, many local communities across our state continue to struggle with increased costs. We should be helping our locals maintain the level of service their residents need or improve the aging water infrastructure their families rely on. Instead, this budget subsidizes the higher cost of electric vehicles for local fleets. If a community wants to buy EVs, then they should use their own resources to cover the extra cost, not get a bailout by the taxpayers. My amendment would take the \$10 million dedicated in this budget for “clean fleet” grants to government bodies and repurpose it for lead line replacement services. I urge a “yes” vote on my amendment.

Senator Hauck’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, many communities across our state continue to struggle to afford to improve their aging water infrastructure. This is the type of critical priority where we can make long-term investments and improve the lives of millions of Michigan families. My amendment would cut \$15 million in this budget for clean fuel and charging infrastructure, and dedicate it to water infrastructure. Focusing on safe drinking water for all is a more responsible use of public funds, ensuring essential resources that benefits all Michiganders, not just those who can afford an electric vehicle. I urge my members to meet our current needs by voting “yes” on this amendment.

Senator Outman’s statement is as follows:

Mr. President, it’s no secret that inflation has increased the cost of virtually everything in recent years. Just like families have been grappling with these added expenses, local governments find themselves facing similar challenges. This project has already been approved and we should protect the health of these residents and avoid penalizing this community for factors beyond their control. My amendment would fund the shortfall and ensure this critical project can be completed as originally planned. I ask for your support on this amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 748, entitled**

A bill to make appropriations for the department of lifelong education, advancement, and potential for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025; and to provide for the expenditure of the appropriations.

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. 134**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

Johnson

Victory

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protests**

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill Nos. 748 and 769 and moved that the statement he made during the discussion of Senate Bill No. 769 be printed as his reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Albert’s statement is as follows:

I must address the Department of Education and MiLEAP budgets together because, unfortunately, they can’t be separated under the terms of what the Democrats want to do in this budget. The MiLEAP budget proposal contains elements that should be in the Department of Education budget—if they are to be included anywhere at all. Our Constitution says the State Board of Education shall serve as the general planning and coordinating body for all public education, except for certain powers reserved to state universities.

The Governor proposes to fund her new MiLEAP department by shifting funds and employees from other departments, primarily the Department of Education. It’s an attempt to strip away power from the separately-elected State Board of Education—the Superintendent it selects—and instead give the power to the Governor and her own hand-picked bureaucrats. During the committee process, I asked MiLEAP representatives, Where does MiLEAP have the constitutional authority to act as the general planning and coordinating body for public education? I was told MiLEAP has a clear charge from the Governor to continue to support learning before our children enroll in kindergarten and after they graduate from high school. Well, unlike the Governor, I believe we should follow the state Constitution in this matter.

There are some components of MiLEAP that are constitutional, such as child-care components for example. But there are some areas that must be left to the State Board of Education, MDE, and the Superintendent. This includes education planning and coordinating functions that MiLEAP attempts to grab. I get the desire to want to reform the structure of the Department of Education. I’m sure I could get behind some big reforms, but I cannot get behind doing an end-run around our state Constitution.

This isn’t a commentary on the merits of MiLEAP or MDE, it’s a commentary on the attempt to create a parallel entity to the Department of Education and place it under the Governor’s direction. It’s a power grab by the Governor and her allies. MiLEAP would be constitutional if it was housed within the Department of Education, but it’s not, and it’s not what is reflected in this proposal. I urge my colleagues to follow the Constitution and vote “no” on Senate Bill Nos. 748 and 769.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 752, entitled**

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending sections 236, 236b, 236c, 236j, 236m, 241, 241a, 241c, 244, 248, 248a, 250, 251, 252, 253, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 263, 263b, 264, 268, 269, 270c, 275b, 275k, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, and 282 (MCL 388.1836, 388.1836b, 388.1836c, 388.1836j, 388.1836m, 388.1841, 388.1841a, 388.1841c, 388.1844, 388.1848, 388.1848a, 388.1850, 388.1851, 388.1852, 388.1853, 388.1855, 388.1856, 388.1858, 388.1859, 388.1860, 388.1863, 388.1863b, 388.1864, 388.1868, 388.1869, 388.1870c, 388.1875b, 388.1875k, 388.1876, 388.1877, 388.1878, 388.1879, 388.1880, 388.1881, and 388.1882), sections 236, 236m, and 248 as amended by 2023 PA 320, sections 236b, 236c, 236j, 241, 248a, 251, 252, 256, 259, 260, 263, 264, 268, 269, 270c, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, and 282 as amended and sections 241a, 241c, 263b, and 275k as added by 2023 PA 103, section 244 as amended and section 250 as added by 2017 PA 108, sections 253 and 255 as amended by 2012 PA 201, section 258 as amended by 2013 PA 60, and section 275b as amended by 2022 PA 144, and by adding sections 236q, 236r, 241e, 247, 270, 275l, 275m, and 275n; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The question being on the passage of the bill,  
Senator Huizenga offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 7, line 25, after “grants,” by striking out “~~\$34,925,900.00~~” and inserting “\$42,021,500.00”.
2. Amend page 8, line 13, by striking out “~~\$500,656,800.00~~” and inserting “\$507,752,400.00”.
3. Amend page 14, line 29, after “2025,” by striking out “~~\$500,656,800.00~~” and inserting “\$507,752,400.00” and adjusting the subtotals and totals in section 236 and enacting section 1 accordingly.
4. Amend page 45, line 13, after “year.” by striking out the balance of the subsection.
5. Amend page 47, line 14, by striking out all of subsection (9).

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,  
Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 135**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Webber offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 24, line 29, after “than” by striking out “4.5%” and inserting “2.5%”.
2. Amend page 24, line 29, after “or” by striking out “\$703.00” and inserting “\$391.00”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,  
Senator Lauwers requested the yeas and nays.

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

The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 136**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 2, line 7, by striking out “\$2,325,732,700.00.” and inserting “\$2,360,732,600.00.”
2. Amend page 2, line 10, by striking out “\$2,325,732,700.00.” and inserting “\$2,360,732,600.00.”
3. Amend page 2, line 19, by striking out “\$1,870,864,400.00.” and inserting “\$1,905,864,300.00.”
4. Amend page 9, line 18, after “236m,” by striking out “\$100.00” and inserting “\$35,000,000.00”.
5. Amend page 9, line 19, after “for” by inserting “debt.”
6. Amend page 9, line 20, after “maintenance,” by striking out the balance of the sentence and inserting “safety, and capital outlay grants.”
7. Amend page 15, line 14, by striking out all of section 236m and inserting:

“Sec. 236m. (1) Subject to subsection (2), funds appropriated in section 236(10) for debt, infrastructure, technology, equipment, maintenance, safety, and capital outlay grants are intended to be used for necessary improvements and deferred maintenance of public university buildings, facilities, and other physical infrastructure; necessary improvements and deferred maintenance of information technology, other technology infrastructure, and other equipment; and other purposes related to infrastructure, technology, equipment, and maintenance. A public university may also use these funds for debt or to upgrade safety and security infrastructure. These funds are not intended to be used for any other purpose than what is specified in this section.

(2) Each public university must receive grant awards under this section as follows:

(a) A capital outlay grant of \$1,500,000.00 that may be used for any purpose allowed under section 237a of the management and budget act, 1984 PA 431, MCL 18.1237a.

(b) A debt, infrastructure, equipment, maintenance and safety grant equal to \$22,500,000.00 multiplied by each public university’s respective share of total fiscal year equated students as reported to the higher education institutional data inventory for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2023 for all public universities that receive a payment under this section. A grant under this subdivision may be used for any purpose detailed under subsection (1). Not less than 15% of grant funds received under this subdivision must be used to repay debt.

(3) Payments to public universities under this section must be distributed in 1 lump sum to each institution with the October 16, 2024 payment described in section 241.

(4) By September 30, 2025, each public university that receives a grant under this section must submit a report to the house and senate appropriations subcommittees on higher education, the house and senate fiscal agencies, and the state budget director that details the use of funds received under this section. If, at the time the report is submitted, a public university has unspent grant funds received under this section, the university must indicate that in the report, and provide a summary of the purposes for which the university intends to use those funds, if an intended use has been identified.

(5) It is the intent of the legislature that capital outlay grants as described under subsection (2)(a) be included as an ongoing appropriation for future fiscal years, and that those grants be used to replace bonds issued by the state building authority as the financing mechanism for the state’s share of capital outlay project costs.”.

8. Amend page 72, line 2, after “at” by striking out “\$2,322,532,700.00” and inserting “\$2,357,532,600.00”. The amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

- 1. Amend page 2, line 17, by striking out “\$451,668,300.00.” and inserting “\$0.00.”.
- 2. Amend page 2, line 19, by striking out “\$1,870,864,400.00.” and inserting “\$2,322,532,700.00.”.
- 3. Amend page 6, line 29, after “from” by striking out the balance of the page through “State” on line 2 of page 7 and inserting “state”.
- 4. Amend page 7, line 2, after “money” by striking out the balance of the line through “\$1,270,619,000.00,\$1,314,162,400.00.” on line 3 and inserting a period.
- 5. Amend page 8, line 20, after “state” by striking out the balance of the sentence and inserting “general fund/general purpose money.”.

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

Senator Albert offered the following amendment:

- 1. Amend page 66, following line 7, by inserting:

“Sec. 275o. (1) To receive funds under section 236(2), a public university may not spend more than 2.0% of its total general fund operations revenue from all sources on diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives or programs, including staff salaries, benefits, and program operations.

(2) By March 15, 2025 each university with a diversity, equity and inclusion program must report to the house and senate appropriations committees on their total diversity, equity and inclusion initiatives spending. The reporting must include, but is not limited to, a description of program goals, number of employees, and an overview of staff salaries and benefits.”.

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 serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 137**

**Yeas—16**

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

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

**Protests**

Senators Anthony, Moss, Bayer, Geiss, Klinefelt, Shink, Cavanagh, McCann, Santana, McDonald Rivet, Hertel, Brinks, Wojno, Camilleri, Cherry, Polehanki and McMorrow, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the adoption of the amendment offered by Senator Albert to Senate Bill No. 752.

Senator Anthony moved that the statement she made during the discussion of the amendment be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Anthony’s statement, in which Senators Moss, Bayer, Geiss, Klinefelt, Shink, Cavanagh, McCann, Santana, McDonald Rivet, Hertel, Brinks, Wojno, Camilleri, Cherry, Polehanki and McMorrow concurred, is as follows:

I know we’re discussing the higher education budget, and while there’s lots of pontification, and what seems as though we just sat through, a lecture, an uninformed lecture, I believe that the Senator who just spoke has no experience, no formal education in diversity, equity, and inclusion. In fact, none of those remarks were actually germane to the amendment that we were discussing. So if that member, or any member of this chamber, has an honest assessment, an honest heart or an open mind to understanding the value of diversity, equity, and inclusion in our higher education institutions, or how it can manifest in spaces like this, I urge them to pick up a book. Attend a lecture at one of our institutions of higher learning, but at this moment, I ask for a “no” vote on this amendment, and really any amendments that are as ridiculous as what we just heard. Thank you.

Senator Lindsey offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 66, following line 7, by inserting:

**“Sec. 275p. (1) Each university that receives an appropriation in section 236(2) must produce a report containing the following information:**

**(a) An itemized list of funds received by the university from entities located outside the United States, including funds received for research.**

**(b) A description of expenditures made, or expenditures that are planned to be made from funds described in subdivision (a).**

**(c) A description of any research conducted or intended to be conducted using funds described in subdivision (a).**

**(2) By March 15, 2025, each university must submit the report described in subsection (1) to the house and senate appropriations subcommittees on higher education, the house and senate fiscal agencies, and the state budget director.”.**

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 serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 138**

**Yeas—16**

|          |          |         |          |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert   | Damoose  | Lauwers | Outman   |
| Bellini  | Hauck    | Lindsey | Runestad |
| Bumstead | Hoitenga | McBroom | Theis    |
| Daley    | Huizenga | Nesbitt | Webber   |

**Nays—20**

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

**Excused—2**

Johnson

Victory

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

Senator Bellino offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 66, following line 7, by inserting:

**“Sec. 275q. (1) To receive an operations increase payment under section 236, each public university must do the following by October 10, 2024:**

**(a) Submit to the house and senate appropriations subcommittees on higher education, the house and senate fiscal agencies, and the state budget director a report listing all university-sanctioned student organizations.**

**(b) Certify to the state budget director that no organization identified in the report required under subdivision (a) has a demonstrated history of supporting terrorist organizations or threats of physical violence toward others.**

**(2) If a public university does not fulfill the requirements under subsection (1), the state budget director must not provide that university with payment of the operations increase appropriated under section 236, and must notify the house and senate appropriations subcommittees on higher education within 30 days of determining that such payment must be withheld.**

**(3) As used in this section, “terrorist organization” means a foreign organization that is designated by the United States secretary of state in accordance with section 219 of the immigration and nationality act, 8 USC 1189, as amended.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendment,

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

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 serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 139**

**Yeas—16**

Albert

Damoose

Lauwers

Outman

Bellino

Hauck

Lindsey

Runestad

Bumstead

Hoitenga

McBroom

Theis

Daley

Huizenga

Nesbitt

Webber

**Nays—17**

Anthony

Chang

Irwin

McMorrow

Bayer

Cherry

Klinefelt

Polehanki

Brinks

Geiss

McCann

Shink

Camilleri

Hertel

McDonald Rivet

Singh

Cavanagh

**Excused—2**

Johnson

Victory



### Not Voting—3

Moss

Santana

Wojno

In The Chair: Geiss

### Protests

Senators Camilleri, Chang and Shink, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the adoption of the amendment offered by Senator Bellino to Senate Bill No. 752.

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

The motion prevailed.

Senator Camilleri’s statement, in which Senators Chang and Shink concurred, is as follows:

I rise to oppose this amendment on Senate Bill No. 752. Freedom of speech and campus activism are distinctly American. Students have the right to assembly; the First Amendment gives them that protection.

Throughout our country’s history, student protests from the Civil Rights Movement, to the war in Vietnam, to the South Africa Anti-Apartheid Movement, have changed our domestic foreign policy for the better. This moment in time is no different. History repeats itself, and in like every other social movement, attacking and misconstruing the message of student protestors by those in positions of privilege is a sad but time-honored tradition. If you followed the Civil Rights Movement at the time, MLK was seen as a controversial figure, and his tactics were sometimes unpopular. In fact, a 1961 Gallup poll found that 57 percent of Americans thought that sit-ins at the lunch counters hurt the chances of integration in the south. Right here in Michigan, in 1937, the Flint Sit-Down strikers were led by workers who occupied and demanded changes in their workplace. The 1965 march across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, something that is brought to our attention every year, was technically trespassing. There are a lot of people who saw that as an act that was so confrontational at the time, but now those tactics we know forced a conversation that required our country to look itself in the mirror—to make ourselves better by questioning long-held assumptions about our society and our role in the world. And in retrospect, these movements have consistently been on the right side of history.

The students protesting today come from all backgrounds and religions. They see the war in Gaza as a human-rights issue. They’re using their voices to call for a change in the U.S. policy, because over 40,000 innocent Palestinians—largely women and children—have been crushed under the rubble of bombed buildings, or shot in the street as they are seeking refuge. We have seen these images across social media: the starvation, the makeshift camps, the injuries, the destruction, the death, and the mass graves, which has only fueled students’ drive to seek an end to the occupation, war crimes, and genocide—just like they did in the past.

The tactics of student protestors are working now. Just last night we saw an important shift in U.S. policy toward this conflict. I refuse to live in a state where we weaponize our budget to go after students who are peacefully protesting. These demonstrations are overwhelmingly focused on safeguarding human rights and dignity for all, no matter their race, religion, or nationality. Those are American values. I urge my colleagues to focus more of their attention on the tens of thousands of lives that have been lost rather than how students are exercising their First Amendment rights.

Senator Theis offered the following amendment:

1. Amend page 66, following line 7, by inserting:

**“Sec. 275r. (1) A student found to be in violation of the student code of conduct of the postsecondary education institution the student attends may not receive an award under a scholarship program receiving an appropriation under section 236(7), if the violation of the student code of conduct is determined to be a result of the student’s support of a terrorist organization.**

**(2) By September 30, 2025, any postsecondary education institution that suspended or denied a scholarship award under subsection (1) must provide a report disclosing the number of students who had a scholarship suspended or denied under this section to the house and senate appropriations subcommittees on higher education, the house and senate fiscal agencies, and the state budget director.**

**(3) As used in this section, “terrorist organization” means a foreign organization that is designated by the United States secretary of state in accordance with section 219 of the immigration and nationality act, 8 USC 1189, as amended.”.**

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 serving not voting therefor, as follows:

**Roll Call No. 140**

**Yeas—15**

|          |          |         |          |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Albert   | Hauck    | Lindsey | Runestad |
| Bellino  | Hoitenga | McBroom | Theis    |
| Bumstead | Huizenga | Nesbitt | Webber   |
| Daley    | Lauwers  | Outman  |          |

**Nays—17**

|           |        |                |           |
|-----------|--------|----------------|-----------|
| Anthony   | Chang  | Irwin          | McMorrow  |
| Bayer     | Cherry | Klinefelt      | Polehanki |
| Brinks    | Geiss  | McCann         | Shink     |
| Camilleri | Hertel | McDonald Rivet | Singh     |
| Cavanagh  |        |                |           |

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—4**

|         |      |         |       |
|---------|------|---------|-------|
| Damoose | Moss | Santana | Wojno |
|---------|------|---------|-------|

In The Chair: Geiss

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 65, line 27, after “**275n.**” by inserting “**(1)**”.
2. Amend page 65, line 29, by striking out the balance of the line through “**The**” on page 66, line 13 and inserting “**if**”.
3. Amend page 66, line 5, by striking out the balance of the section and inserting “**nondiscrimination.**”

**(2) As used in this section:**

**(a) “Inclusion” means a core belief that each individual person has infinite dignity and must have equal opportunity based on challenges bested, skills built, and lessons learned.**

**(b) “Nondiscrimination” means a principle that ensures each student is protected under the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment of the United States constitution.**

**(3) The legislature finds and declares that in the spirit of inclusivity, no student should have a scholarship award withheld because that student is enrolled in a program of study leading to a degree in theology, divinity, or religious education, and that all religions and creeds are welcome to be studied. It is the intent of the legislature to support and defend the American ideal of religious tolerance which has been a pillar of our democratic republic and an example of true freedom and liberty since the nation was founded. The legislature further intends that each student’s pursuit of truth, beauty, and goodness through their chosen course of study be a benefit to all Michigan residents through the spread of faith, hope, and love.”.**

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Albert withdrew the amendments.

Senator Albert offered the following amendments:

- 1. Amend page 65, line 27, after “275n.” by inserting “(1)”.
- 2. Amend page 65, line 29, by striking out the balance of the line through “The” on page 66, line 3 and inserting “if”.

3. Amend page 66, line 5, by striking out the balance of the section and inserting “nondiscrimination.

(2) As used in this section:

(a) “Inclusion” means a core belief that each individual person has infinite dignity and must have equal opportunity based on challenges bested, skills built, and lessons learned.

(b) “Nondiscrimination” means a principle that ensures each student is protected under the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment of the United States constitution.

(3) The legislature finds and declares that in the spirit of inclusivity, no student should have a scholarship award withheld because that student is enrolled in a program of study leading to a degree in theology, divinity, or religious education, and that all religions and creeds are welcome to be studied. It is the intent of the legislature to support and defend the American ideal of religious tolerance which has been a pillar of our democratic republic and an example of true freedom and liberty since the nation was founded. The legislature further intends that each student’s pursuit of truth, beauty, and goodness through their chosen course of study be a benefit to all Michigan residents through the spread of faith, hope, and love.”

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. 141**

**Yeas—20**

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

**Nays—16**

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

**Excused—2**

|         |         |
|---------|---------|
| Johnson | Victory |
|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Geiss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protest**

Senator Albert, under his constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 752 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 Albert's statement is as follows:

I am opposed to these budgets because they don't do enough to address the main problems facing universities and community colleges today. The issue facing most of our public universities is declining enrollment. For example, the enrollment dropped since the 2011-2012 fiscal year is roughly 30 percent or more for Central Michigan, Eastern Michigan, Ferris State, Lake Superior State, Northern Michigan, Saginaw Valley, and Western Michigan. Lake Superior State and Eastern Michigan were both over a 40 percent drop. Only University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, Michigan State, and Michigan Tech saw enrollment increases. If we don't take action to get ahead of this problem soon, it is possible not all of our universities will survive. The cost of attending universities is a factor for many students obviously, but on the other hand, enrollment has been stable for a few of our universities; including universities at the high end of the cost spectrum. So, accessibility alone is not the issue. Students should be treated fairly when it comes to accessibility. Eliminating the Michigan Tuition Grant program hurts undergraduates with financial need who are attending non-profit, independent colleges.

Fixed costs at universities should, to a large extent, reflect the number of students enrolled. If enrollment is dropping, you have to come up with ways to reduce the fixed costs. So what can the state do to help? The item funding we had last year was a good idea, but we are getting away from that now. This funding will help universities pay for upgrades which they are going to have to pay for one way or the other, and it has the added benefit of reducing fixed costs over time. I also propose that we allow debt payments to be an eligible use of item funding since it will free up cash flow—any way we pay down debt in the university system that will reduce ongoing expenses for the schools themselves and improve their solvency going forward. We must also acknowledge the general perception of the university community that may affect decisions young people make about where they go or where not to go.

Wokeism and antisemitism is not helping the situation. Disturbing protests like at Columbia University are not helping convince kids about the merits of attending college anywhere. My amendments aimed at consequences for promoting violence and terrorism would help send a message that we need to turn the corner and have a stable campus environment for all.

On the community college budget, I do want to acknowledge that this proposal alters the Governor's unworkable and woefully misnamed, "free community college for all plan". Under this Senate bill, tuition aid for community college would differ depending on the residency of the student. If the student lives in a community college district where they live, they could receive complete tuition coverage, but if they don't, they could not. Instead of going down this road of trying to navigate contingency based on where a student resides, it would be more prudent to spend our energies on eliminating community college districts. Large areas of the state are not included in a community college district at all, and the Senate proposal appears to at least recognize that. Last year, I proposed eliminating community college districts entirely, and doing so would at least make a proposal like this more fair.

Dollars and cents aside, getting students into community college is not the greatest problem potential students face. We already have a whole host of programs available to cover the costs. The biggest problem we face is getting students to graduate once they get there. Too many of our students just aren't prepared academically to complete a post-secondary education. We would be better served at focusing on ways in improving academic support. It is worth noting, nothing we offer in this budget is free—not school lunches, not student loan payoffs, not community college tuition—but free actually means it is paid for by the taxpayers.

Thank you and I urge a "no" vote.

Senators Huizenga, Webber, Albert, Runestad, Chang, Singh, Lindsey, Bellino, McBroom, McMorrow, Moss and Theis asked and were granted unanimous consent to make statements and moved that the statements be printed in the Journal.

The motion prevailed.

Senator Huizenga's statement is as follows:

I urge your support for the restoration of the Michigan Tuition Grant. The Michigan Tuition Grant is an important tool in reaching the Governor's 60x30 goal. Currently, over 15,000 students receive the Michigan Tuition Grant with almost half being students color and/or Pell-eligible. Additionally, the tuition grant program is Michigan's only financial aid option for adult learners to go back to school and earn a four-year degree. Over 25 percent of tuition grant recipients are over the age of 25. Phasing out the Michigan Tuition Grant as this budget does will hinder our efforts to encourage adults to go back to school for a four-year degree and reach the Governor's 60x30 goal and will disproportionately impact low-income and minority students.

My amendment is simple. It would simply remove language phasing out the tuition grant and reverse the planned \$7.1 million cut in funding. I urge members to support helping students afford college and education in Michigan, and to vote “yes” on this amendment.

Senator Webber’s statement is as follows:

My amendment would simply reduce the tuition restraint cap proposed in this budget from 4.5 to 2.5 percent—the rate of inflation. This cap is a vital tool to prevent exorbitant tuition hikes and helps to ensure higher education remains an affordable option for Michigan residents. Furthermore, with additional funding sources like the Michigan Achievement Scholarship supporting student enrollment, these institutions should not need to raise tuition at skyrocketing rates. Setting this cap at the rate of inflation is a reasonable and commonsense restraint to keep higher education affordable for Michigan residents. I ask for support on this amendment.

Senator Albert’s first statement is as follows:

This amendment would add \$35 million of funding for two priorities at our universities. The first is \$22.5 million for university capital outlay; the second priority is \$12.5 million of funding divided up by student count from each university that can be used for infrastructure, technology, equipment, maintenance, safety, or items for short.

One of the more perplexing aspects of funding in our state government is our capital outlay process for our universities and community colleges. We have a relatively elaborate scoring process that is used by the State Budget Office which ranks projects and the Legislature funds projects on an unpredictable and irregular schedule, and as we found out last year at the end of the day, the ranking system is really more of a suggestion because projects can be added or dropped based on political connections. On top of that, capital outlay is fully funded using debt which further adds long-term cost both to the state and to the universities. My proposal is to give a fixed amount—here I am offering \$1.5 million—to each university on an annual basis. Schools then can save up cash for projects on a predictable basis and plan further out into the future for capital improvements on their campus.

In regard to items funding, universities have a lot of fixed cost, and this funding helps defray costs of required upgrades and maintenance that may be made over time. Previous language for this funding did allow for debt paydown, and my amendment goes a step further and requires at least 15 percent of the funding to go toward lowering liabilities. We have this funding line item in the current-year budget, and it has been widely accepted as a responsible use of funding amongst the institutions in higher education. Like capital outlay, I am proposing this funding should be ongoing for our schools so they can better plan into the future. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Senator Albert’s second statement is as follows:

For years and years, legislators on both sides of the aisle have complained about using School Aid dollars for higher education. It is allowed under terms of our State Constitution, but it is far from ideal and it was an uncommon practice until a decade or so ago. Last year, we had the money to make this shift with minimal impact on the broader budget and the Senate Democrats rejected the proposal. We may have missed an opportunity last year, but there is no time like the present. This is an issue we should work together on, so I offer my amendment again this year.

This practice is no longer necessary. The Senate budget proposal before us today would use over \$451 million in School Aid money in higher education. My amendment would ensure that the state higher education budget is funded entirely through the state’s General Fund, leaving the School Aid Fund alone.

Senator Albert’s third statement is as follows:

There have been various studies on how much universities are spending on diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives—DEI for short. At the University of Michigan alone, one recent review by the college fix estimated there are more than 240 paid staff members whose main duties are to provide DEI programming and services. The total annual payroll cost of U of M’s full-time DEI staff was estimated at more than \$30 million, including wages and benefits. That money could be used to cover in-state tuition and fees for roughly 1,700 undergraduate students. Any way you slice it, that’s a lot of money.

Based on the reviews I have seen from previous academic years, it appears DEI spending is increasing rapidly. It’s not just the spending that is a concern. I support the goals of diversity and inclusion and I am all for equal opportunity, but we must be careful that these programs do not cross the line into initiative that categorize individuals for preferential treatment based on race, sex, or anything else. We must be careful that these programs do not become a means to advance a particular ideology. Concerns about that is what contributed to the shutdown of DEI programs in Florida and elsewhere. Diversity and inclusion can be improved without creating separate bureaucracies pushing certain agendas.

This amendment would cap DEI spending at 2 percent of the university’s operations funding.

Senator Runestad's first statement is as follows:

This concept has been an ongoing concept for decades. The names change; the concept's still the same. It has to do with discrimination. Nobody has any problem with inclusion. It's a wonderful thing. Nobody has any problem with diversity; that's a wonderful thing. But equity, a lot of the general public is misled about what it means. They think it means equality, equality under the law. That is the last thing it means. Equity means equal outcome. It means that whatever facet of life you're dealing with this equity concept, they don't look at you as an individual. They don't look at the content of your character, they look at your external characteristics—what do you look like—to determine your rights. Whether you're permitted in a university, whether you get a job, whether you get a promotion is dependent upon what you look like. That's how the Democrats define equity.

We thought we had defeated this here in Michigan when almost 60 percent of the voters here in this state in 2006 adopted a ballot proposal. What were the universities like the University of Michigan with woke ideology going to do to continue violating the Constitution, and they bragged about how they do it, as did the Ivy League colleges when they went to the Supreme Court. They have what's called a likability index. It doesn't matter if you have high achievement, that you've worked hard in the community, you've done all these things, they look at what you look like, they bring you in, and they say based on your group, you're not very likable. Do you know who these Ivy League colleges and U of M find the least likable people in the nation? Asian people. You see, Asian people, their community, they see as very unlikable when they score them to allow them to get into the university or reject them. My experience is the Asian community has been one of the most welcoming wonderful communities I've ever seen in my life, yet the universities like the University of Michigan find them very unlikable in order to reduce their numbers in the university.

What do we find with the University of Michigan, like my colleague from the 18th District said? \$30 million a year on DEI, every year, \$30 million. 240 employees. That is an average of \$16,000 in state tuition, 1,700 non-traditional students, every year, could be brought into U of M with that money. But no, we have to have the patronage jobs of 240 well-paid people to take those jobs so the students can't get into the university because of the DEI concept.

You know who never gets discriminated against though? Who never pays a price, who they don't worry about the likability index? They don't care about your external view, what you look like? There's one group exempt from that. You know who that is? The legacy, the legacy admission. Just so the public out there knows what the legacy is, that means if your rich daddy owns a big company and he went to U of M and his granddaddy went to U of M and the year one of those progeny that needs to have that leg up because you're a poor student, you didn't do any community work, you're a terrible student but you want to get into the University of Michigan, daddy's big legacy gets you in. That's what will never be affected by DEI. This is a terrible concept, it should be rejected here in the state of Michigan.

Senator Chang's statement is as follows:

I am an Asian-American, and I am also a University of Michigan graduate. And wouldn't you know it, May is Asian American, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander Heritage Month, so there are large numbers of Asian Americans that are here at the Capitol advocating for things that are all actually related to diversity, equity and inclusion, so I think that it's important to point out that actually, Asian Americans are very supportive of the DEI efforts that are underway at many of our universities, and would in fact like to see more. But I also think that using Asian Americans as a wedge, which has been done time and time again, is honestly just very, very old. It's not effective, and also doesn't accurately reflect the diversity of the Asian American community, the support that the Asian American community has for ensuring that we have equity in all of our educational institutions. Thank you.

Senator Singh's statement is as follows:

As an Asian American in this chamber, I am deeply offended by the Senator from the 23rd District. We, as a community, don't want you speaking on our behalf. We should not be used as a wedge in conversations on our campuses. We are celebrating the rich heritage of Asian American, Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities in this state, and for the minority party to have a representative of that party stand up today and make those comments about Asian Americans and the University of Michigan is despicable.

Senator Lindsey's statement is as follows:

Mr. President, as tensions continue to rise across the globe, we need to do more to shield Michigan and help shield the entire nation from growing threats. My amendment would simply require that any university in this state doing research with or for a foreign adversary of the United States report that information to this Legislature. We obviously don't want our taxpayer-funded higher education institutions working on research that could advance adversarial goals or potentially risk the safety of the United States or the people of Michigan. I ask for support on this amendment.

Senator Bellino's statement is as follows:

Extremists are taking over our colleges and universities nationwide, including some in our very own state. Students are choosing to set their education aside and instead stand in line with extremism, violence, and antisemitism. Worse yet, American students are participating in anti-American chants and support a U.S. government-designated terrorist organization, Hamas. This is both dangerous and concerning. My amendment would prevent any organization supporting this heinous behavior from becoming a registered student organization sanctioned by the college or university. I ask for support of my amendment.

Senator McBroom's statement is as follows:

Madam President, I think the amendment is far more simple than the previous speaker would like to make out in that it simply prescribes that if the protest is in support of an organization that the U.S. government recognizes and notes through its process is a terrorist organization, that those penalties should be ascribed to them because these are our dollars going to support education. Why would we continue to use taxpayer dollars to fund the educational goals of those who are also supporting groups that are recognized terrorist organizations that the federal government has recognized that way? That doesn't make any sense. It's a very narrow and prescriptive amendment when read carefully and I believe it should be supported.

Senator McMorrow's statement is as follows:

We've seen a lot of guest speakers on college campuses who have espoused Nazi ideology. We have seen a lot of protests on college campuses and members on the other side of the aisle stand in defense of them because of the right of free speech. What is true in these protests across the country is that people are angry and they're looking to have difficult conversations. In the midst of some of those difficult conversations, there are completely inexcusable indefensible moments of antisemitism. There are indefensible moments of Islamophobia and hatred, but to leverage and weaponize this moment to say that this exercise of freedom of speech is wrong when there have been plenty of others that have not warranted such an amendment to weaponize in this moment, we must support our college students and their ability to use these spaces to have difficult conversations. This amendment is a violation of free speech and should be rejected.

Senator Albert's fourth statement is as follows:

I don't have prepared remarks on this one. I had a colleague who said earlier this year basically on this topic that it's time to speak up. I'm one who spent time in the Middle East in a war zone. I don't have a combat action ribbon. I'm not going to say I have any big war stories or anything like that, because I don't, but I do know what it's like to have to roll down the streets in a war zone and have the enemy have a tactic where they will slow down your convoy and they'll have kids jump out and throw hand grenades at you. The idea—you want to know what it's like to be terrorized? Think about sitting in that turret and fearing that some kid jumps out. These are not good people. There is a reason why these organizations are listed as terrorist organizations. They use tactics that we in the Western world, the free society, do not live up—we do not respect those, we do not adhere to those, and we will not condone them, and we will not associate with organizations that do those kinds of terrorist horrible acts. I'm old enough to know what it's like to see our country be under attack. I was a junior in high school when 9/11 happened. I tried joining the Marine Corps when I was a senior. It didn't work out, but the Lord had a plan for me to become an officer in the Marine Corps so I did that. I agree with my colleague who said earlier it's time to speak up. I don't like really just speaking about things, that's why I think it's good to put in an amendment—let's actually do something. This amendment, as my colleague said who spoke just previous to me, this is very narrowly-tailored. If there's a student organization at one of our universities that's publicly supporting a United States-designated terrorist organization, then they should not be allowed to be a student organization anymore. They should not be allowed to have state tax dollars—our tax dollars—funding them. Is this the type of environment we want—do you want to know one of the reasons why we're having trouble getting our kids to go to college? Here you go. What parent wants to spend tens of thousands of dollars to send their kid to a school where they're supporting enemies of our country? That's not sending a very good message. We should be sending a message to our parents, You know what, we're going to support our country and we're going to make sure our kids are learning good values.

Senator Runestad's second statement is as follows:

To me this is an amendment that I wanted to make sure was very limited because I certainly support conversations and all of our universities on just about any issue, including comments made on the other side of the aisle, certainly advocating positions that may not be popular with the university I think is something we should be advocating for. In this specific case as my two previous colleagues outlined, the list is extremely limited—what, maybe 12 different organizations, international organizations—that you would not be able

to support publicly at the university. I wouldn't trust anything that the universities would put together, and I'm a little conflicted about how accurate it is with the federal government. I am going to support this, hoping they are accurately reflecting the danger of these organizations. In terms of what we're hearing on the other side of the aisle, that you won't be able to express all the views that we heard today, certainly you would be able to do those. You just can't support that specific list of terrorist organizations.

Senator Moss' statement is as follows:

I've been presiding over this amendment process for the past several hours and intend to pick up and continue this presiding over the next several amendments as we continue through our budget. Some of these amendments are commonsense, some of these are tailored to districts, some of these are benign, and some of these have been nakedly political in order to clip a video, pop it on Twitter, and try to attack each other.

I've made my sentiments known about how aggravating it is to watch the antisemitism play out on our college campuses. I do not believe that the only sole intent of all the protestors is to protest what is going on in the Middle East. Some of them have certainly advocated for their position in peace and I respect that, but a lot of these protests have been coopted and it's been very frustrating to watch this antisemitism play out and have a lack of regard for the Jewish community as it happens.

What is incredibly frustrating on this floor right now are the political attempts to weaponize this moment in the budget process. If you want to speak out against antisemitism, there's an outlet to do that. Very few of us have done that, and there was an outlet for every single one of you to speak out. If you want to talk to our universities about what's going on our campus, you should do so. Some people have; others have remained silent. But to use this budget process to attack this horrific situation that so many communities are trying to grapple with is a total perversion of why we're here as lawmakers. You want to do something in the budget? Let's have a conversation. But you want to plop an amendment where really only the Jewish lawmaker is left grappling on what to do with this amendment, to me, are words I can't print in the Journal. I'm pissed off that this is what we're doing right now. I'm super pissed off that you've put me in this position and that you don't really have a care for the Jewish students on campus by using sound bites and the budget to exploit this. There are avenues to resolve the antisemitic problem on our campus. This is not one of them. To be honest with you, I've not missed a single vote in the Senate over the last six and a half years here—I'm not voting on this amendment and I'm not voting on the next one.

Senator Theis' statement is as follows:

There's certainly been a lot of commentary going back and forth on this particular topic. This absolutely has a public policy purpose and absolutely should be discussed in our budget. What is the purpose of providing funds so that students can go to college? It's so that we can have a well-educated population. This is what our Founding Fathers wanted. Chaos is overtaking our college campuses across the country, where American students are gathering in support of terrorist organizations—not all of them, but some of them. I've heard people claiming they want to have a conversation. Well, I've seen video after video after video of the students who say they want a conversation refusing to have a conversation, covering up their faces, walking away when questioned, not having a conversation. These organizations they're supporting, like Hamas, have very clearly stated their goals. They have a desire to end the American way of life and entirely eliminate our allies. From which river? To what sea? Please define jihad. Please define intifada because I'm hearing them marching in favor of these things.

My amendment would authorize the state to rescind any scholarship funding from students who are found aiding government-designated terrorist organizations. There is a public policy purpose for this. The dangerous threatening rhetoric coming from many of these students is repulsive and it's inciting acts of aggression on campuses and elsewhere and creating a fear-filled environment where our students are concerned for their lives and their wellbeing. I'm having conversations with these students who can't get to their library comfortably, who are genuinely concerned for their safety. While some of these students who are agitators have been given taxpayer-funded scholarships, the intention was to help them receive a good education, not to teach them how to incite violence.

I thank you for your time, and I ask for your support of my amendment.

Senator Albert's fifth statement is as follows:

In the higher education budget, there is new language that deals with being eligible or ineligible to receive scholarship funding. The language says that the college or university must have a board-approved policy of inclusion and non-discrimination. It also says that a student cannot be enrolled in a program working toward a degree in theology, divinity, or religious education. There are two different things going on here, so I'll talk about each part separately.



First, it is ironic that this language uses diversity and inclusion as a way to exclude people. It is not trying to be welcoming and embrace variety; instead, it is limiting and seeks conformity. My amendment does not strike the requirement for schools to have a board policy of inclusion and non-discrimination—far from it. I support the idea. My amendment defines those terms as follows: “‘Inclusion’ means a core belief that each individual person has infinite dignity and must have equal opportunity based on challenges bested, skills built, and lessons learned. ‘Nondiscrimination’ means a principle that ensures each student is protected under the equal protection clause of the fourteenth amendment of the United States constitution.”

It has been a tenet in America since our founding that everyone is inherently endowed with equal justice and opportunity before the law. The language proposed in this bill as written tries to circumvent that idea and seeks to implement a new ideology. This ideology seeks equal outcomes and conformity, not equal opportunity and diversity of thought. Equal opportunity is not the same as equality of outcome.

The second provision in this language prevents equal opportunity for scholarships for students working toward a degree in theology, divinity, or religious education. My amendment proposes language to do the opposite. It ensures Michigan students cannot be denied opportunities open to other students. I specifically point out that the Michigan Legislature fully supports and defends the American ideal of religious toleration which has been a pillar of our democratic republic, and that all creeds are welcome to be studied. I could understand the need to preclude funding if the intent were to establish a state religion—which would be unconstitutional—but that clearly is not the goal. This new language I propose expressly states that all creeds are welcome, echoing a theme of diversity and inclusion upon which our nation was founded. This scholarship has been in place for two years now and there has been no problem of a state religion being established. The language proposed by Democrats is not fixing a problem; it is creating one.

Why are Democrats making these proposals? The intent of this language clearly cannot be a constitutional reasoning. Are we afraid that some students might learn about eternal truths or a higher order? Or maybe even learn to live virtuous lives? Are we afraid studying these things undermines reliance on big government? I can’t imagine a world would be a worse place if more people started living more fully the two greatest commandments explained by Jesus Christ: to love the Lord your God with all your heart and your soul and your mind, and love your neighbor as yourself. To be clear, and inclusive, if a student wanted to study Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, or anything else, I am failing to see the harm in it.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 753, entitled**

A bill to amend 1979 PA 94, entitled “The state school aid act of 1979,” by amending sections 201, 205, 206, 207a, 207b, 207c, 216c, 217, 217b, 222, 223, 229, 229a, and 230 (MCL 388.1801, 388.1805, 388.1806, 388.1807a, 388.1807b, 388.1807c, 388.1816c, 388.1817, 388.1817b, 388.1822, 388.1823, 388.1829, 388.1829a, and 388.1830), section 201 as amended by 2023 PA 320, sections 205 and 217 as amended by 2020 PA 165, sections 206, 207a, 207b, 207c, 223, 229a, and 230 as amended by 2023 PA 103, sections 216c and 217b as added by 2023 PA 103, section 222 as amended by 2021 PA 86, section 229 as amended by 2022 PA 144, and by adding sections 216e, 217c, and 217d; and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Senator Webber offered the following amendments:

1. Amend page 20, line 25, after “than” by striking out “4.5%” and inserting “2.5%”.
2. Amend page 20, line 26, by striking out “\$217.00” and inserting “\$121.00”.

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

**Recess**

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

The motion prevailed, the time being 2:43 p.m.

2:58 p.m.

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

The question being on the adoption of the amendments,

Senator Singh moved that further consideration of the bill be postponed for today.

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 Irwin as Chairperson.

### Recess

Senator Singh moved that the Committee of the Whole recess subject to the call of the Chairperson. The motion prevailed, the time being 3:00 p.m.

3:15 p.m.

The Committee of the Whole was called to order by the Chairperson, Senator Irwin.

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

#### **Senate Bill No. 237, entitled**

A bill to amend 1937 PA 94, entitled "Use tax act," by amending section 4cc (MCL 205.94cc), as added by 2015 PA 252.

Substitute (S-11).

The following is the amendment to the substitute recommended by the Committee of the Whole:

1. Amend page 8, following line 13, by inserting:

**"(9) The Michigan Strategic Fund Board shall not issue any new certificates of exemption under the provisions of this Section after December 31, 2029. This sunset shall not affect any existing certificates of exemption in effect on December 31, 2029."** and renumbering the remaining subsection.

The Senate agreed to the substitute as amended recommended by the Committee of the Whole, and the bill as substituted was placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

By unanimous consent the Senate returned to the order of  
**Motions and Communications**

Senator Singh moved that a respectful message be sent to the House of Representatives requesting the return of the following bill:

#### **House Bill No. 4360**

The motion prevailed.

Senator Singh moved that the rules be suspended and that the following bill, now on Third Reading of Bills, be placed on its immediate passage:

#### **Senate Bill No. 237**

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

Senator Singh moved that Senator Chang be excused from the balance of today's session. The motion prevailed.

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. 237**

The motion prevailed.

The following bill was read a third time:

**Senate Bill No. 237, entitled**

A bill to amend 1937 PA 94, entitled “Use tax act,” by amending section 4cc (MCL 205.94cc), as added by 2015 PA 252.

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. 142**

**Yeas—24**

|           |          |                |           |
|-----------|----------|----------------|-----------|
| Anthony   | Daley    | Klinefelt      | Outman    |
| Bellino   | Damoose  | Lauwers        | Polehanki |
| Brinks    | Hauck    | McCann         | Santana   |
| Camilleri | Hertel   | McDonald Rivet | Singh     |
| Cavanagh  | Huizenga | McMorrow       | Webber    |
| Cherry    | Irwin    | Moss           | Wojno     |

**Nays—11**

|          |          |          |       |
|----------|----------|----------|-------|
| Albert   | Geiss    | McBroom  | Shink |
| Bayer    | Hoitenga | Nesbitt  | Theis |
| Bumstead | Lindsey  | Runestad |       |

**Excused—3**

|       |         |         |
|-------|---------|---------|
| Chang | Johnson | Victory |
|-------|---------|---------|

**Not Voting—0**

In The Chair: Moss

The Senate agreed to the title of the bill.

**Protests**

Senators Bayer and Geiss, under their constitutional right of protest (Art. 4, Sec. 18), protested against the passage of Senate Bill No. 237.

Senator Bayer moved that the statement she made during the discussion of the bill be printed as her reasons for voting “no.”

The motion prevailed.

Senator Bayer’s statement, in which Senator Geiss concurred, is as follows:

The new mega data centers represented in these bills are really important for us as we more and more depend on using technologies like artificial intelligence. Michigan is a good choice for hosting these large enterprises, especially when we get them to use our brownfield sites and have the potential to really make a positive difference in the communities that host them. These data centers are also massive users of electricity and water. Their water and energy use is unlike any other business or corporation we currently see in our state. There are only a few of these large data centers in the United States today, and already—already, with just a few, they are over two percent of the energy use in the country.

As we seek to welcome these enterprises to Michigan, we want to make sure that we protect our most-precious resources: our water, our committed move to green energy for climate change mitigation, and our people. States that are hosting these data centers already are consistently seeing the need for upgrades to their grid and for upgrades to water infrastructure. The cost of these upgrades is often included in the increased residential utility rates; increasing residents' water and electricity bills. Some states are already experiencing depletion of aquifers and loss of water availability to their residents.

We know here in Michigan we are stewards of 97 percent of the country's fresh water. We can put some regulation in place to make sure that these super-large data centers just have some specific regulation to make sure we do not overuse our water, that we do move to the green energy that we've already committed to, and that we continue to protect our residents' ability to pay their utility bills for their use, not for the use of commercial enterprises. My hope is that these issues are addressed as we move forward with the pair of bills as this goes over to the House and we continue to work on the House bill that goes with this to put these kind of protections in place. For this reason, I have to vote "no" on these bills at this time and this bill today, and hope we continue to work on it until we make sure we protect our water and our people.

### Announcements of Printing and Enrollment

The Secretary announced that the following House bills were received in the Senate and filed on Thursday, May 9:

**House Bill Nos. 5499 5500 5501 5502 5503 5504 5505 5506 5507 5508 5509 5510 5511  
5512 5513 5514 5515 5516 5517 5522 5556**

The Secretary announced the enrollment printing and presentation to the Governor on Thursday, May 9, for her approval the following bills:

**Enrolled Senate Bill No. 249 at 09:23 a.m.  
Enrolled Senate Bill No. 27 at 09:25 a.m.**

The Secretary announced that the following bill was printed and filed on Wednesday, May 8, and is available on the Michigan Legislature website:

**House Bill No. 5718**

The Secretary announced that the following bills were printed and filed on Thursday, May 9, and are available on the Michigan Legislature website:

**Senate Bill Nos. 867 868 869 870 871**

### Committee Reports

The Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety reported

**Senate Bill No. 617, entitled**

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled "Michigan vehicle code," by amending sections 303, 320a, and 601c (MCL 257.303, 257.320a, and 257.601c), section 303 as amended by 2020 PA 376, section 320a as amended by 2023 PA 39, and section 601c as added by 2001 PA 103.

With the recommendation that the bill pass.

Stephanie Chang  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Chang, Shink, Wojno, Irwin, Santana and Runestad

Nays: None

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety reported

**Senate Bill No. 618, entitled**

A bill to amend 1949 PA 300, entitled "Michigan vehicle code," (MCL 257.1 to 257.923) by adding section 79g. With the recommendation that the substitute (S-1) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Stephanie Chang  
Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Chang, Shink, Wojno, Irwin, Santana and Runestad

Nays: None

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

The Committee on Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety reported

**Senate Bill No. 688, entitled**

A bill to amend 1988 PA 13, entitled "Juvenile diversion act," by amending section 9 (MCL 722.829), as amended by 2023 PA 287.

With the recommendation that the substitute (S-2) be adopted and that the bill then pass.

Stephanie Chang

Chairperson

To Report Out:

Yeas: Senators Chang, Shink, Wojno, Irwin, Santana and Runestad

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 Civil Rights, Judiciary, and Public Safety submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 12:00 noon, Room 1200, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Chang (C), Shink, Wojno, Irwin, Santana and Runestad

Excused: Senator Johnson

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Elections and Ethics submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 3:00 p.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

Present: Senators Moss (C), Wojno, Santana, McMorrow, Chang and McBroom

Excused: Senator Johnson

COMMITTEE ATTENDANCE REPORT

The Committee on Regulatory Affairs submitted the following:

Meeting held on Wednesday, May 8, 2024, at 11:00 a.m., Room 1100, Binsfeld Office Building

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

Excused: Senators McCann and Webber

Senator Singh moved that the Senate adjourn.

The motion prevailed, the time being 3:25 p.m.

The President pro tempore, Senator Moss, declared the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 14, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.

DANIEL OBERLIN  
Secretary of the Senate

