Rep. Bradstreet offered the following concurrent resolution:

House Concurrent Resolution No. 71.

A concurrent resolution to urge the Civil Service Commission to reject any and all provisions of state labor contracts that offer same-sex domestic partner benefits to state employees.

Whereas, The Governor, through the Office of the State Employer, is currently negotiating five different state contracts with various labor unions representing state employees. These contracts are to set labor compensation and benefits, beginning October 1, 2005; and

Whereas, According to the Office of the State Employer, under these contracts, the state is to provide for same-sex domestic partner health care benefits for state employees. Same-sex benefits for domestic partners have never before been provided to state employees; and

Whereas, On November 2, 2004, the people of Michigan spoke clearly on the issue of same-sex relationships. By a large margin, the people voted to amend our state constitution by adding language that provides that "the union of one man and one woman in marriage shall be the only agreement recognized as a marriage or similar union for any purpose"; and

Whereas, The Civil Service Commission is empowered by the *Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963*, under Article XI, Section 5, to fix rates of compensation for all classes of positions, approve or disapprove disbursements for all personal services, make rules and regulations covering all personnel transactions, and regulate all conditions of employment in the classified service. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the Civil Service Commission to approve, reject, or modify the contracts; and

Whereas, The Director of the Office of the State Employer has publicly stated his concern that the same-sex domestic partner benefits negotiated in response to union demands could violate the new constitutional amendment. In addition, the director has stated that he expects the courts to determine how this matter may be resolved; and

Whereas, In addition to its questionable constitutionality, extending same-sex domestic partner benefits to state employee is clearly contrary to the will of the people of the state of Michigan as recently expressed at the polls. Moreover, the financial cost to the state to provide this labor benefit, not to mention the legal cost to defend constitutional challenges, will impose a great burden on the citizens of Michigan; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That we urge the Civil Service Commission to reject any and all provisions of labor contracts that grant state employees same-sex domestic partner benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge Governor Jennifer M. Granholm and the Office of the State Employer to refrain from negotiating or approving any state contract that gives state employees same-sex domestic partner benefits; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Governor, the Civil Service Commission, and the Office of the State Employer.