

# Journal of the Senate

FIRST REGULAR SESSION

---

**SEVENTY-SECOND DAY - FRIDAY, MAY 30, 2025**

---

The Senate met pursuant to adjournment.

Senator O’Laughlin in the Chair.

The following Senators were present during the day’s proceedings:

Present—Senators

Bean	Bernskoetter	Black	Brattin	Brown (16)	Brown (26)	Burger
Carter	Cierpiot	Coleman	Crawford	Fitzwater	Gregory (15)	Gregory (21)
Hudson	Luetkemeyer	Moon	Nicola	O’Laughlin	Schnelting	Trent—21

Absent—Senators

Beck	Henderson	Hough	Lewis	May	McCreery	Mosley
Nurrenbern	Roberts	Schroer	Washington	Webber	Williams—13	

Absent with leave—Senators—None

Vacancies—None

A quorum being established, the Senate proceeded with its business.

## REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Senator Luetkemeyer, Chair of the Committee on Rules, Joint Rules, Resolutions and Ethics, submitted the following reports:

Mr. President: Your Committee on Rules, Joint Rules, Resolutions and Ethics, to which were referred **SB 2, SCS for SB 3, CCS for SS for SB 28, HCS for SS for SB 43, SS for SCS for SBs 49 and 118, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 63, CCS for HCS for SS for SCS for SB 68, HCS for SS for SCS for SB 71, SS No. 2 for SB 79, CCS for HCS for SS for SCS for SBs 81 and 174, SS for SCS for SB 82, SS for SCS for SB 98, SS for SCS for SB 105, SS for SCS for SB 133, SS No. 2 for SB 145, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 150, SS for SB 152, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 160, HCS for SS for SB 218, SS for SB 221, SS for SCS for SB 271, HCS No. 2 for SCS for SB 348, SB 396, and SS for SCR 3**, begs leave to report that it has examined the same and finds that the bills and concurrent resolution have been duly enrolled and that the printed copies furnished the Senators are correct.

## SIGNING OF BILLS

The President Pro Tem announced that all other business would be suspended and **SB 2, SCS for SB 3, CCS for SS for SB 28, HCS for SS for SB 43, SS for SCS for SBs 49 and 118, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 63, SS for SCS for SB 82, SS for SCS for SB 98, SS for SCS for SB 105, SS for SCS for SB 133, SS No. 2 for SB 145, SS for SB 152, HCS for SS for SB 218, SS for SB 221, SS for SCS for SB 271, HCS No. 2 for SCS for SB 348, and SB 396**, having passed both branches of the General Assembly, would be read at length by the Secretary, and if no objections be made, the bills would be signed by the President

Pro Tem to the end that they may become law. The bills were so read by the Secretary and signed by the President Pro Tem.

Also,

The President Pro Tem announced that all other business would be suspended and **CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 2, CCS for SCS for HCS for HB 3, CCS for SCS for HCS for HB 4, CCS for SCS for HCS for HB 5, CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 6, CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 7, CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 8, CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 9, CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 10, CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 11, CCS for SS for SCS for HCS for HB 12, CCS for SCS for HCS for HB 13, CCS for SCS for HCS for HB 17, SCS for HCS for HB 18, SCS for HCS for HB 20, HCS for HB 105, SS for SCS for HB 121, SS for SCS for HCS for HBs 145 and 59, SS No. 2 for SCS for HB 147, HCS for HB 169, SS No. 2 for SCS for HB 199, HB 262, HCS for HBs 296 and 438, SS No. 2 for HB 419, SS for SCS for HCS for HBs 516, 290, and 778, HCS No. 2 for HBs 567, 546, 758, and 958, SS No. 2 for HCS for HBs 594 and 508, CCS for SS for HCS for HBs 595 and 343, SS No. 2 for HB 596, CCS for SS for HCS for HBs 737 and 486, SS for SCS for HB 754, SS for HCS for HBs 974, 57, 1032, and 1141, and SS for HB 1041, HCS for HJR 23 and 3, and HCS for HJR 73, having passed both branches of the General Assembly, would be read at length by the Secretary, and if no objections be made, the bills would be signed by the President Pro Tem to the end that they may become law. No objections being made, the bills and joint resolutions were so read by the Secretary and signed by the President Pro Tem.**

### **SIGNING OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS**

The President Pro Tem announced that all other business would be suspended **SS for SCR 3**, having passed both branches of the General Assembly, would be read at length by the Secretary, and if no objections be made, the concurrent resolution would be signed by the President Pro Tem to the end that it may become law. No objections being made, the concurrent resolution was so read by the Secretary and signed by the President Pro Tem.

### **OBJECTIONS**

Senator Moon submitted the following:

May 22, 2025

Kristina Martin  
Secretary of the Senate  
201 W. Capitol Avenue  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### **OBJECTION TO SS SCS HB 225**

Senate Substitute for Senate Committee Substitute for House Bill 225 allows the chief law enforcement executive for any law enforcement agency to request assistance from a law enforcement agency in another jurisdiction, including from outside the State but within the United States.

It is important to note that not all states operate the same as do Missouri law enforcement officials. For example, unlike Missouri, some states allow non-United States citizens to work in law enforcement. This is unacceptable!

An undocumented immigrant is a foreign national who has entered the United States without government permission or has stayed beyond the authorized period of their visa. In other words, they are in the country without the legal right to be here. Three states, California, Colorado, and Illinois have passed laws permitting illegal aliens to become law enforcement officers. Louisiana and Maine allow any person with a work permit to become a police officer. North Dakota and Washington allow legal permanent residents to work in law enforcement. Other

states, such as, Vermont and West Virginia, do not require United States citizenship to become law enforcement officers. Nothing in SS SCS HB 225 prohibits individuals who are not U.S. citizens from acting as law enforcement officers (and, perhaps, aiding Missouri law enforcement, if summoned).

I don't know about you, but I doubt anyone in Missouri would be agreeable to having an undocumented immigrant, illegal alien, or a non-United States citizen having police-authority over us. While this legislation might be well-intended, however, for the safety, health, and welfare of all Missourians, and since no protections against the employ of persons who may not have the best interests of our residents at heart are contained in the bill, I encourage Governor Kehoe to veto SS SCS HB 225.



Mike Moon  
District 29

Also,

May 22, 2025

Kristina Martin  
Secretary of the Senate  
201 W. Capitol Avenue  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### **CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – HCS SS SCS SB 68**

The original purpose of SB 68 was relating to school safety (RsMO 160). As has become commonplace in the legislative process, especially during the last few weeks of the session, legislators have been convinced that in order for their bills to reach the Governor's desk, bills must be joined together, often with unrelated topics, in order to get as many bills as possible passed.

Missouri's Constitution states, in Article III, section 21, "... no bill shall be so amended through its passage through either house as to change its original purpose. A quick review of the changes made to SB 68 clearly show that an expanded purpose was required in order to add the majority of amendments.

Prior to being Truly Agreed and Finally Passed, the purpose of SB 68 was changed to relating to elementary and secondary education. This change made it possible for the following additions: Calculation of student attendance (RsMO 160.265), Grade-level equivalence (RsMO 160.518 and 160.522), Active military members (RsMO 160.701), Adult high schools (RsMO 160.2700, 160.2705, and 160.2710), Teacher representatives on the state board of education (RsMO 161.026), STEM career awareness (RsMO 161.264), Virtual assessments (RsMO 161.670), Electronic personal communications devices (RsMO 162.207), Kindergarten eligibility for children with a developmental delay (RsMO 162.700), Contracts for special educational services (RsMO 162.705), Small school grants (RsMO 163.044), State aid for school (RsMO 163.045), Minimum teacher's salary (RsMO 163.172), Juvenile court (RsMO 167.115), Children of school contractors (RsMO 167.117), Cardiopulmonary resuscitation (RsMO 167.624), Recovery high schools (RsMO 167.850), Teacher certification (RsMO 168.850), Teacher externships (RsMO 168.025), Substitute teaching in retirement (RsMO 168.036), Principal-administrator academy (RsMO 168.407, 168.409, and 168.500), Models of reading instruction (RsMO 170.014), Teacher recruitment and retention scholarships (RsMO 173.232), International Baccalaureate examinations (RsMO 173.1352), and School bus endorsements (302.177, 302.272, and 302.735).

These changes, expanding the scope of the original bill, directly contradict the aforementioned Article III, section 21. Perhaps, a pertinent question would be, "If the purpose of the bill had not been changed, would the calculation of student attendance be germane to the original purpose of school safety?"

In addition, our state's constitution states, in Article III, section 23: "No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title,..." The subject of SB 68, in the original bill, was school safety. While some amendments added were germane to the original purpose, the majority were not. For example, it would be a stretch to find a relationship between teachers' salary, school bus endorsements, International Baccalaureate examinations, and school safety.

As shown in the list of amendments above, the additions clearly render the bill in violation of our state constitution's single subject requirement. Following the logic of the court's December 19, 2023, decision regarding HB 1606 (2022) and the January 30, 2024, decision on SB 26 (2021), I encourage Governor Kehoe to veto HCS SS SCS SB 68.



Mike Moon  
District 29

Also,

May 22, 2025

Kristina Martin  
Secretary of the Senate  
201 W. Capitol Avenue  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### **CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – HCS SS SCS SB 71**

The original purpose of SB 71 was relating to college tuition for first responders (RsMO 173). As the bill advanced through the legislative process, the purpose was changed to public safety. This change was necessary for the additions of several unrelated-to-the-original-purpose amendments.

Missouri's Constitution states, in Article III, section 21, "... no bill shall be so amended through its passage through either house as to change its original purpose." A quick review of the changes made to SB 71 reveal that an expanded purpose was required in order to add the majority of amendments.

Prior to being Truly Agreed and Finally Passed, the purpose of SB 71 was changed to relating to public safety. This change made it possible for the following additions: Criminal background checks (RsMO 43.546, 168.014, 190.106, 208.222, 209.324, 210.482, 210.487, 304.551, 324.055, 324.129, 324.488, 324.1105, 326.257, 330.025, 331.025, 332.015, 334.015, 334.403, 334.501, 334.701, 334.739, 334.805, 334.022, 334.042, 336.025, 337.018, 337.308, 337.501, 337.605, 337.702, 338.502, 339.015, 339.510, 345.016, 374.711, 436.225, 443.702, 476.802, 484.125, 590.060, and 640.011) (I must say, this change alone is a far cry from the bill's original purpose relating to tuition for first responders); Missouri local government employees' retirement system (RsMO 70.630); LAGERS: cost of living CPI (RsMO 70.655); LAGERS: Repeal of obsolete statutory provision (RsMO 70.680); LAGERS: Membership (RsMO 70.690); LAGERS: Investment decisions (RsMO 70.745-70.747); LAGERS: Investment funds (RsMO 70.748); Police retirement system of St. Louis City (RsMO 86.200); Fireman's retirement system of St. Louis (RsMO 87.140, 87.145, and 87.260); All public pension plans: Investment Fiduciary (RsMO 105.688); Public safety recruitment and retention (RsMO 173.2655 and 173.2660); Patient medical records (RsMO 191.227); Line of duty compensation act (RsMO 287.243); Missouri emergency response commission (RsMO 292.606); Offense of burglary in the second degree (RsMO 569.170 and 569.175); and the Missouri task force on non-profit safety and security (RsMO 650.900 and 650.910).

These changes, expanding the scope of the original bill, directly contradict the MO Constitution, Article III, section 21. Perhaps, a pertinent question would be, "If the purpose of the bill had not been changed, would any of the LAGERS provisions be germane to the original purpose?"

In addition, our state's constitution states, in Article III, section 23: "No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title,..." The subject of SB 71, in the original bill, was college tuition for first responders. Without the change in purpose, it would difficult to claim criminal background checks, LAGERS: cost of living CPI, and Police retirement system of St. Louis be considered under the same subject heading.

As shown in the list of amendments above, the additions clearly render the bill in violation of our state constitution's single subject requirement. Following the logic of the court's December 19, 2023, decision regarding HB 1606 (2022) and the January 30, 2024, decision on SB 26 (2021), I encourage Governor Kehoe to veto HCS SS SCS SB 71.



Mike Moon  
District 29

Also,

May 22, 2025

Kristina Martin  
Secretary of the Senate  
201 W. Capitol Avenue  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### **CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – SS#2 SB 79**

The original purpose of SB 79 was relating to health care benefits provided by certain organizations (RsMO 376). Specifically, the introduced bill allows contracts for health care benefits, provided by a qualified membership organization, as such terms are defined in the act, to its member shall not be considered insurance under the laws of this state.

Due to misunderstandings about the coverage provided, additional 'covered' procedures were added to the bill. As such, these additions were beyond the scope of the bill's original intent.

Missouri's Constitution states, in Article III, section 21, "... no bill shall be so amended through its passage through either house as to change its original purpose. A quick review of the changes made to SB 79 clearly show that an expanded purpose was required in order to add the majority of amendments.

Prior to being Truly Agreed and Finally Passed, the purpose of SB 79 was changed to relating to health care. This change was required for the following additions: sexually transmitted infections (RsMO 191.648); Telehealth services (RsMO 191.1145); Forensic examinations of victims of sexual offenses (RsMO 192.2521); MO Healthnet coverage of hearing-related devices (RsMO 208.152); Prenatal test for certain diseases (RsMO 210.030); Examination of health maintenance organizations (RsMO 354.465); and, Insurance coverage for self-administered hormonal contraceptives (RsMO 376.1240).

These changes, expanding the scope of the original bill, directly contradict the MO Constitution, Article III, section 21 ("no bill shall be so amended ... to change its original purpose"). Perhaps, a pertinent question would be, "If the purpose of the bill had not been changed, would any of the insurance-related provisions be germane to the original purpose?"

In addition, our state's constitution states, in Article III, section 23: "No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title,..." The subject of SB 79, in the original bill, was health care benefits provided by certain. Without the change in purpose, it would difficult to claim that forensic examinations of victims of sexual offenses, MO Healthnet coverage of hearing-related devices, or insurance coverage for self-administered hormonal contraceptives be considered under the same subject heading.

As shown in the list of amendments above, the additions clearly render the bill in violation of our state constitution's single subject requirement. Following the logic of the court's December 19, 2023, decision regarding HB 1606 (2022) and the January 30, 2024, decision on SB 26 (2021), I encourage Governor Kehoe to veto SS#2 SB 79.



Mike Moon  
District 29

Also,

May 22, 2025

Kristina Martin  
Secretary of the Senate  
201 W. Capitol Avenue  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### **CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – CCS HCS SS SCS SBs 81 and 174**

The original purpose of SB 81 was relating to fireworks protections (RsMO 49.266, 5 253.195, 320.106, 320.111, 320.116, 320.121, 320.126, 320.127, 6 320.131, 320.141, 320.147, 320.151, 320.371, and 568.070). Prior to its passage, the bill's purpose was changed to public safety. Perhaps, it's reasonable to conclude that fireworks protections could (and, conceivably should) be a public safety concern.

The change in purpose (to public safety) made it possible to amend SB 81 with the following: criminal background checks (RsMO 43.546, 168.014, 190.106, 208.222, 209.324, 210.482, 210.487, 301.551, 324.055, 324.129, 324.246, 324.488, 324.1105, 326.257, 330.025, 331.025, 332.015, 334.015, 334.403, 334.501, 337.701, 334.739, 334.805, 334.022, 335.042, 336.025, 337.018, 337.308, 337.501, 337.605, 337.702, 337.052, 339.015, 339.510, 345.016, 374.711, 436.225, 443.702, 476.802, 484.125, 590.060, 640.011). Perhaps, criminal background checks may be prudent for individuals who desire to be a fireworks distributor. However, where is the logic in adding line of duty compensation act (RsMO 287.243) or Missouri emergency response commission (RsMO 292.606) unless each of these sections are related to fireworks? The reality is, they are not!

Also, the addition of license waiver for spouses of Missouri law enforcement officers (RsMO 324.009) is unrelated, as well, unless the spouses intend to work in the fireworks industry (this is clearly not the intent of the amendment). Also, civil actions for childhood sexual abuse (RsMO 537.046) is not germane to the original purpose of SB 81.

These changes, expanding the scope of the original bill, directly contradict the MO Constitution, Article III, section 21 ("no bill shall be so amended ... to change its original purpose"). If the purpose of SB 81 had not been changed, would each of the amendments be germane to the original purpose?

In addition, our state's constitution states, in Article III, section 23: "No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title,..." The subject of SB 81, as introduced, was fireworks protections. Unless the purpose was changed, civil actions for childhood sexual abuse, the Missouri emergency response commission, or the license waiver for spouses of Missouri law enforcement officers would not fit with the bill's original purpose.

As shown in the list of amendments above, the additions clearly render the bill in violation of our state constitution's single subject requirement. Following the logic of the court's December 19, 2023, decision regarding HB 1606 (2022) and the January 30, 2024, decision on SB 26 (2021), I encourage Governor Kehoe to veto CCS HCS SS SCS SBs 81 and 174.



Mike Moon  
District 29

Also,

May 22, 2025

Kristina Martin  
Secretary of the Senate  
201 W. Capitol Avenue  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### **CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – CCS HCS SS SB 150**

The original purpose of SB 150 was relating to the career-tech certificate program (RsMO 173). Prior to its passage, the bill's purpose was changed to workforce development initiatives. This change was required for the following additions: adult high schools (RsMO 160.2700, 160.2705, and 160.2710); STEM career awareness (RsMO 161.264); STEM grant (RsMO 173.685); Authority to confer degrees (RsMO 172.280 and 174.160); Proprietary schools (RsMO 173.612 and 173.616); Access Missouri financial assistance (RsMO 173.1102, 173.1103, and 173.1105); the mission of Missouri Southern State University (RsMO 174.231); Higher education core curricula (RsMO 174.231); the Missouri state loan repayment program (RsMO 190.600-191.615); Child care facility licensure (RsMO 210.221); License waivers for spouses of Missouri law enforcement officers (RsMO 324.009); Licensing of funeral directors and embalmers (RsMO 333.041 and 333.042); and, Educational requirements for social workers (RsMO 337.600, 337.604, 337.615, 337.627, 337.628, 337.664, and 337.645).

It seems obvious that the change in purpose was necessary to include the licensing of funeral directors and embalmers, license waivers for spouses of Missouri law enforcement officers, child care facility licensure, educational requirements for social workers, et cetera. The changes made to SB 150 appear to be a clear violation of MO Constitution, Article III, section 21 ("no bill shall be so amended ... to change its original purpose"). Without a change in purpose of SB 150 the additions to the bill would not be germane to the original (introduced) version.

In addition, our state's constitution states, in Article III, section 23: "No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title,..." The subject of SB 150, the original bill, was the career-tech certificate program. The amendments aforementioned would not have been germane to the bill without a change in purpose.

As shown in the list of amendments above, the additions clearly render the bill in violation of our state constitution's single subject requirement. Following the logic of the court's December 19, 2023, decision regarding HB 1606 (2022) and the January 30, 2024, decision on SB 26 (2021), I encourage Governor Kehoe to veto CCS HCS SS SB 150.



Mike Moon  
District 29

Also,

May 22, 2025

Kristina Martin  
Secretary of the Senate  
201 W. Capitol Avenue  
Jefferson City, MO 65101

#### **CONSTITUTIONAL OBJECTION – CCS HCS SS SB 160**

The original purpose of SB 160 was relating to student associations at public institutions of higher learning (RsMO 173). Prior to its passage, the bill's purpose was changed to educational institutions. This change made possible the following additions: Protective hairstyles in educational institutions (RsMO 160.082). More often than not, the courts may not know the legislative intent of a bill. In order to inform the court, here's a brief summary of the intent of the original bill, SB 38 (Protective hairstyles, et cetera): "An educational institution is

defined as including any public or private pre-kindergarten program, public or private elementary or secondary school, charter school, or public or private school board, charter school governing board, or other school administrative body.”

It appears to be clear that SB 38 was not intended to include institutions of higher learning. Nonetheless, as the bill ‘morphed,’ it was hitched to SB 160, which was aimed solely at public institutions of higher learning.

In addition, the Authority to confer degrees (RsMO 172.280 and 174.160) was added to SB 160 – even though, it would be a stretch to make the case that this authority is related to student associations.

This change in purpose to SB 160, made to include the CROWN Act and the authority to confer degrees, appears to be a clear violation of MO Constitution, Article III, section 21 (“no bill shall be so amended ... to change its original purpose”). Without a change in purpose of SB 150, the additions to the bill would not be germane to the original (introduced) version.

In addition, our state’s constitution states, in Article III, section 23: “No bill shall contain more than one subject which shall be clearly expressed in its title,...” The subject of SB 160, the original bill, was student associations at public institutions of higher learning. The aforementioned amendments would not have been germane to the bill without the change in purpose.

As shown in the list of amendments above, the additions clearly render the bill in violation of our state constitution’s single subject requirement. Following the logic of the court’s December 19, 2023, decision regarding HB 1606 (2022) and the January 30, 2024, decision on SB 26 (2021), I encourage Governor Kehoe to veto CCS HCS SS SB 160.



Mike Moon  
District 29

### **SIGNING OF BILLS**

The President Pro Tem announced that all other business would be suspended and **CCS for HCS for SS for SCS for SB 68, HCS for SS for SCS for SB 71, SS No. 2 for SB 79, CCS for HCS for SS for SCS for SBs 81 and 174, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 150, and CCS for HCS for SS for SB 160**, having passed both branches of the General Assembly, would be read at length by the Secretary, and, the objections notwithstanding, the bills would be signed by the President Pro Tem to the end that they may become law. The bills were so read by the Secretary and signed by the President Pro Tem.

Also,

The President Pro Tem announced that all other business would be suspended and **SS for SCS for HB 225**, having passed both branches of the General Assembly, would be read at length by the Secretary, and, the objection notwithstanding, the bill would be signed by the President Pro Tem to the end that it may become law. The bill was so read by the Secretary and signed by the President Pro Tem.

### **BILLS DELIVERED TO THE GOVERNOR**

**SB 2, SCS for SB 3, CCS for SS for SB 28, HCS for SS for SB 43, SS for SCS for SBs 49 and 118, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 63, CCS for HCS for SS for SCS for SB 68, HCS for SS for SCS for SB 71, SS No. 2 for SB 79, CCS for HCS for SS for SCS for SBs 81 and 174, SS for SCS for SB 82, SS for SCS for SB 98, SS for SCS for SB 105, SS for SCS for SB 133, SS No. 2 for SB 145, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 150, SS for SB 152, CCS for HCS for SS for SB 160, HCS for SS for SB 218, SS for SB 221, SS for SCS for SB 271, HCS No. 2 for SCS for SB 348, and SB 396**, after having been duly signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in open session, were delivered to the Governor by the Secretary of the Senate.

**CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS  
DELIVERED TO THE GOVERNOR**

**SS** for **SCR 3**, after having been duly signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives in open session, was delivered to the Governor by the Secretary of the Senate.

On motion of Senator Luetkemeyer, the Senate adjourned pursuant to the Constitution.

DAVID WASINGER

Lieutenant Governor

KRISTINA MARTIN

Secretary of the Senate

✓