

**No. 7**  
**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**JOURNAL**  
**OF THE**  
**House of Representatives**  
**103rd Legislature**  
**REGULAR SESSION OF 2025**

---

House Chamber, Lansing, Thursday, January 23, 2025.

12:00 Noon.

The House was called to order by the Speaker Pro Tempore.

The roll was called by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, who announced that a quorum was present.

Alexander—present	Foreman—present	McFall—present	Schuette—present
Andrews—present	Fox—present	McKinney—present	Scott—present
Aragona—present	Frisbie—present	Meerman—present	Skaggs—present
Arbit—present	Glanville—present	Mentzer—present	Slagh—present
BeGole—present	Grant—present	Miller—present	Smit—present
Beson—present	Green, P.—present	Morgan—present	Snyder—present
Bierlein—present	Greene, J.—present	Mueller—present	St. Germaine—present
Bohnak—present	Hall—present	Myers-Phillips—present	Steckloff—excused
Bollin—present	Harris—present	Neeley—present	Steele—present
Borton—present	Herzberg—present	Neyer—present	Tate—present
Breen—present	Hoadley—present	O’Neal—present	Thompson—present
Brixie—present	Hope—present	Outman—present	Tisdell—present
Bruck—present	Hoskins—present	Paiz—excused	Ternoglou—present
Byrnes—present	Jenkins-Arno—present	Paquette—present	VanderWall—present
Carra—present	Johnsen—present	Pavlov—present	VanWoerkom—present
Carter, B.—present	Kelly—present	Pohutsky—excused	Wegela—present
Carter, T.—present	Koleszar—present	Posthumus—present	Weiss—present
Cavitt—present	Kuhn—present	Prestin—present	Wendzel—present
Coffia—excused	Kunse—present	Price—present	Whitsett—present
Conlin—present	Liberati—present	Puri—present	Wilson—present
DeBoer—present	Lightner—present	Rheingans—present	Witwer—present
DeBoyer—present	Linting—present	Rigas—present	Wooden—present
DeSana—present	Longjohn—present	Robinson—present	Woolford—present
Dievendorf—present	MacDonell—present	Rogers—present	Wortz—present
Edwards—excused	Maddock—present	Roth—present	Wozniak—present
Fairbairn—present	Markkanen—present	Schmaltz—present	Xiong—present
Farhat—present	Martin—present	Schrivver—present	Young—present
Fitzgerald—present	Martus—present		

e/d/s = entered during session

Pastor Derek Hagland, Lead Pastor of Grace Baptist Church in Gaylord, offered the following invocation:

“Father in Heaven, I humbly approach Your throne and beseech You on behalf of the men and women who diligently labor, day after day, to represent the good people of the state of Michigan.

I come to You believing the words of Jeremiah the prophet who said, ‘Call unto me and I will answer thee and show thee great and mighty things.’

The task before these representatives is far greater than their abilities and talents, so I ask that You bless them with wisdom from above, patience for their fellow colleagues, and a passion that seeks not only to represent their constituents, but does so as not to violate the teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

Please give our representatives clear minds, understanding hearts, skills to be productive; free from distractions, frustrations, and things that may keep them from doing the job they have been commissioned to do.

Please watch over the families of our representatives. Bless their marriages, their children, and loved ones. Keep them safe from harm, in good health, and focused on the things that matter most.

As these men and women work tirelessly to be the best representatives they can be, may You help them live to a higher calling of principle, integrity, and godliness.

I ask that all that is worked on and discussed today will accomplish much and that the way business is conducted will be pleasing to You O God.

I humbly ask this petition in the name of Jesus Christ, my Savior, the One Who died, was buried, and rose again giving hope to the entire human race.

God bless the state of Michigan House of Representatives and God bless the United States of America.”

---

Rep. Fitzgerald moved that Reps. Pohutsky, Steckloff, Paiz, Edwards and Coffia be excused from today’s session.

The motion prevailed.

### **Motions and Resolutions**

Reps. Kelly, Alexander, Beson, Bollin, Fox, Jaime Greene, Johnsen, Rigas, Schuette and Steele offered the following resolution:

#### **House Resolution No. 9.**

A resolution to declare January 26-February 1, 2025, as School Choice Week in the state of Michigan.

Whereas, All children in Michigan should have the right to the highest quality schools possible; and

Whereas, Citizens across Michigan agree that improving the quality of education and expanding access to highly effective schools should be issues of importance to our state’s leaders; and

Whereas, Michigan recognizes the critical role that an effective and accountable system of education plays in preparing all children to be successful in a global economy; and

Whereas, There are a multitude of high-quality public schools, public charter schools, home schools, and nonpublic schools in the state of Michigan; and

Whereas, Approximately ten percent of all K-12 students in Michigan attend a public charter school; and

Whereas, Approximately another ten percent of all K-12 students in Michigan attend a private school; and

Whereas, Tens of thousands of students are homeschooled in Michigan; and

Whereas, Overall in Michigan, one in four K-12 students participates in school of choice by attending schools in neighboring districts; and

Whereas, Michigan has many outstanding teaching professionals across the state who are committed to educating children; and

Whereas, The vital cause of education reform is one that transcends ideology and political party affiliation; and

Whereas, Research in Michigan and across the nation demonstrates conclusively that providing parents with multiple schooling options improves academic performance; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the members of this legislative body declare January 26-February 1, 2025, as School Choice Week in the state of Michigan. We call this observance to the attention of all our citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the National School Choice Week organization with our highest esteem.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Reps. Johnsen, Alexander, Arbit, Beson, Bollin, Breen, Dievendorf, Fox, Glanville, Jaime Greene, Koleszar, Lightner, MacDonell, McFall, Morgan, Rheingans, Rigas, Schuette and Steele offered the following resolution:

**House Resolution No. 10.**

A resolution to declare January 27, 2025, as Holocaust Remembrance Day in the state of Michigan.

Whereas, The Holocaust and all its victims will never be forgotten. The Holocaust was the state-sponsored systematic persecution, execution, and annihilation of European Jews by the Nazi regime and its allies between 1933 and 1945. This atrocity, which took the lives of more than six million Jews, reduced the world's Jewish population by one-third; and

Whereas, It is a constant reminder of the dangers of tyranny and authoritarianism in a free society; and

Whereas, Cruel atrocities such as forced sterilization, isolation, torture, ostracization, murder, and unspeakable brutality were carried out by a culture against their fellow human beings; and

Whereas, Millions more suffered grievous oppression and death under Nazi despotism based on their religious beliefs, their national origin, their ethnicity and culture, their political beliefs, including courageous resisters and government dissidents, their physical appearance, and many more; and

Whereas, The history of the Holocaust allows us to remind ourselves of the responsibilities we have as individuals, societies, parents, and governments to remember the atrocities committed in hatred and under the guise of bettering society. It also serves as an important reminder of what can happen when we allow bigotry and hatred to enter and dominate our societies and our public discourse; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the members of this legislative body declare January 27, 2025, as Holocaust Remembrance Day in the state of Michigan; and be it further

Resolved, That in honor of the victims of the Holocaust, the survivors, and their liberators, the people of Michigan should reflect upon and never forget this terrible event and strive to overcome hatred through education and remembrance.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

Reps. Schmaltz, Alexander, Beson, Bollin, Breen, Fox, Jaime Greene, Johnsen, Rigas, Schuette and Steele offered the following resolution:

**House Resolution No. 11.**

A resolution to declare January 26-February 1, 2025, as Catholic Schools Week in the state of Michigan.

Whereas, There are 51,497 students attending 214 Catholic elementary and high schools throughout our great state; and

Whereas, The Constitution of Michigan states that "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged"; and

Whereas, Catholic school parents pay tuition in addition to supporting their local public schools through their taxes; and

Whereas, Catholic schools comply with the same health, safety, and general welfare regulations required of public schools; and

Whereas, Taking into account Michigan's minimum public school foundation allowance of \$9,608 per pupil, Catholic schools save taxpayers more than \$494 million in state spending during the current school year; and

Whereas, Catholic schools instill a broad, values-based education, emphasizing the lifelong development of moral, intellectual, and social values in young people, making them responsible citizens of our state and nation; and

Whereas, Catholic schools educate many students who are non-Catholic, many students who are economically disadvantaged as a good education remains the single best way out of poverty; and

Whereas, With their traditionally high academic standards, high graduation rates, and commitment to community service, Catholic schools and their graduates make a positive contribution to society; and

Whereas, January 26-February 1, 2025, has been designated as Catholic Schools Week, with the theme “Catholic Schools: United in Faith and Community” as denoted by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops; and

Whereas, The common good of the state of Michigan is strengthened through the continued existence of Catholic schools; and

Whereas, Catholic schools are committed to community service, producing graduates who hold “helping others” among their core values; and

Whereas, Catholic schools create a supporting partnership with each student’s family, encouraging the involvement of parents in the education of their children, so that Catholic schools form productive lives which benefit future generations; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the members of this legislative body declare January 26-February 1, 2025, as Catholic Schools Week in the state of Michigan. We support the continued dedication of Catholic schools across Michigan toward academic excellence and the key role Catholic schools play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for students; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Michigan Catholic Conference with our highest esteem.

The question being on the adoption of the resolution,

The resolution was adopted.

## Second Reading of Bills

### House Bill No. 4001, entitled

A bill to amend 2014 PA 138, entitled “Workforce opportunity wage act” by amending sections 4 and 4b (MCL 408.414 and 408.414b); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-2) previously recommended by the Select Committee on Protecting Michigan Employees and Small Businesses,

The substitute (H-2) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Xiong moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 14, by inserting:

“Sec. 4d. (1) ~~Before September 1, 2014, the minimum hourly wage rate is \$2.65 per hour and, beginning September 1, 2014,~~ **Subject to subsection (2),** the minimum hourly wage rate is ~~38%~~ **48%** of the minimum hourly wage rate established in section 4 if all of the following occur:

(a) The employee receives gratuities in the course of ~~his or her~~ **the employee’s** employment.

(b) If the gratuities described in subdivision (a) plus the minimum hourly wage rate under this subsection do not equal or exceed the minimum hourly wage otherwise established under section 4, the employer pays any shortfall to the employee.

(c) The gratuities are proven gratuities as indicated by the employee’s declaration for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.

(d) The employee was informed by the employer of the provisions of this section.

**(2) Beginning February 21, 2026, the minimum hourly wage rate for an employee described in subsection (1) is as follows:**

**(a) 60% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(b) Beginning February 21, 2027, 70% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(c) Beginning February 21, 2028, 80% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(d) Beginning February 21, 2029, 90% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(e) Beginning February 21, 2030, the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(3) (2) As used in this section, “gratuities” means tips or voluntary monetary contributions received by an employee from a guest, patron, or customer for services rendered to that guest, patron, or customer and that the employee reports to the employer for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.”**

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Scott moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 1, line 8, by striking out the balance of the subsection and inserting:

**“(a) Beginning February 21, 2025, \$12.48.**

**(b) Beginning February 21, 2026, \$13.29.**

**(c) Beginning February 21, 2027, \$14.16.**

**(d) Beginning February 21, 2028, \$14.97.”.**

2. Amend page 2, line 5, after the second “January” by striking out “2030” and inserting “2029”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Miller moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 14, by inserting:

“Sec. 4d. (1) ~~Before September 1, 2014, the minimum hourly wage rate is \$2.65 per hour and, beginning September 1, 2014,~~ **Subject to subsection (2),** the minimum hourly wage rate is 38% of the minimum hourly wage rate established in section 4 if all of the following occur:

(a) The employee receives gratuities in the course of ~~his or her~~ **the employee’s** employment.

(b) If the gratuities described in subdivision (a) plus the minimum hourly wage rate under this subsection do not equal or exceed the minimum hourly wage otherwise established under section 4, the employer pays any shortfall to the employee.

(c) The gratuities are proven gratuities as indicated by the employee’s declaration for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.

(d) The employee was informed by the employer of the provisions of this section.

**(2) Beginning January 1, 2026, the minimum hourly wage rate for an employee described in subsection (1) is as follows:**

**(a) 40% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(b) Beginning January 1, 2027, 42% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(c) Beginning January 1, 2028, 44% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(d) Beginning January 1, 2029, 46% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(e) Beginning January 1, 2030, 49% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(f) Beginning January 1, 2031, 51% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(g) Beginning January 1, 2032, 53% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(h) Beginning January 1, 2033, 55% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(i) Beginning January 1, 2034, 57% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(j) Beginning January 1, 2035, 60% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(k) Beginning January 1, 2036, the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.**

**(3) (2)-**As used in this section, “gratuities” means tips or voluntary monetary contributions received by an employee from a guest, patron, or customer for services rendered to that guest, patron, or customer and that the employee reports to the employer for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Koleszar moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 14, by inserting:

“Sec. 4d. (1) ~~Before September 1, 2014, the minimum hourly wage rate is \$2.65 per hour and, beginning September 1, 2014,~~ ~~the~~ **The** minimum hourly wage rate is 38% of the minimum hourly wage rate established in section 4 if all of the following occur:

(a) The employee receives gratuities in the course of ~~his or her~~ **the employee’s** employment.

**(b) Every day the employee works, the employer calculates the employee’s gratuities described in subdivision (a) plus the minimum hourly wage rate described in this subsection.** If the gratuities ~~described in subdivision (a)~~ **described in subdivision (a)** plus the minimum hourly wage rate ~~under described in~~ **described in** this subsection do not equal or exceed the minimum hourly wage otherwise established under section 4, the employer pays any shortfall to the employee.

(c) The gratuities are proven gratuities as indicated by the employee’s declaration for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.

(d) The employee was informed by the employer of the provisions of this section.

**(2)** As used in this section, “gratuities” means tips or voluntary monetary contributions received by an employee from a guest, patron, or customer for services rendered to that guest, patron, or customer and that the employee reports to the employer for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Grant moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, following line 14, by inserting:

~~“Sec. 4d. (1) Before September 1, 2014, the minimum hourly wage rate is \$2.65 per hour and, beginning September 1, 2014, Subject to subsections (2) and (3), the minimum hourly wage rate is 38% of the minimum hourly wage rate established in section 4 if all of the following occur:~~

~~(a) The employee receives gratuities in the course of his or her the employee’s employment.~~

~~(b) If the gratuities described in subdivision (a) plus the minimum hourly wage rate under this subsection do not equal or exceed the minimum hourly wage otherwise established under section 4, the employer pays any shortfall to the employee.~~

~~(c) The gratuities are proven gratuities as indicated by the employee’s declaration for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.~~

~~(d) The employee was informed by the employer of the provisions of this section.~~

~~(2) For an employee described in subsection (1) who works for an employer that employs fewer than 25 employees, the minimum hourly wage rate is as follows:~~

~~(a) Beginning February 21, 2026, 40% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(b) Beginning February 21, 2027, 42% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(c) Beginning February 21, 2028, 44% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(d) Beginning February 21, 2029, 46% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(e) Beginning February 21, 2030, 49% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(f) Beginning February 21, 2031, 51% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(g) Beginning February 21, 2032, 53% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(h) Beginning February 21, 2033, 55% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(i) Beginning February 21, 2034, 57% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(j) Beginning February 21, 2035, 60% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(k) Beginning February 21, 2036, the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(3) For an employee described in subsection (1) who works for an employer that employs 25 or more employees, the minimum hourly wage rate is as follows:~~

~~(a) Beginning February 21, 2025, 48% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(b) Beginning February 21, 2026, 60% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(c) Beginning February 21, 2027, 70% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(d) Beginning February 21, 2028, 80% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(e) Beginning February 21, 2029, 90% of the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(f) Beginning February 21, 2030, the minimum hourly wage rate established under section 4.~~

~~(4) (2) As used in this section, “gratuities” means tips or voluntary monetary contributions received by an employee from a guest, patron, or customer for services rendered to that guest, patron, or customer and that the employee reports to the employer for purposes of the federal insurance contributions act, 26 USC 3101 to 3128.”.~~

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Roth moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

### **House Bill No. 4002, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 338, entitled “Paid medical leave act” by amending sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12 (MCL 408.962, 408.963, 408.964, 408.965, 408.966, 408.967, 408.968, 408.970, 408.971, and 408.972).

Was read a second time, and the question being on the adoption of the proposed substitute (H-1) previously recommended by the Select Committee on Protecting Michigan Employees and Small Businesses,

The substitute (H-1) was adopted, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

Rep. Foreman moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 3, line 18, by striking out “**50**” and inserting “1”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Mentzer moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 2, line 20, after “employer” by striking out the balance of the subdivision and inserting “in the business of the employer, except that employee does not include an individual employed by the United States government.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Skaggs moved to amend the bill as follows:

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

“(n) ~~(4)~~—“Small business” means an employer for which fewer than 10 individuals work for compensation during a given week. In determining the number of individuals performing work for compensation during a given week, all individuals performing work for compensation on a full-time, part-time, or temporary basis shall be counted, including individuals made available to work through the services of a temporary services or staffing agency or similar entity. An employer is not a small business if it maintained 10 or more employees on its payroll during any 20 or more calendar workweeks in either the current or the preceding calendar year.”.

2. Amend page 5, following line 23, by inserting:

“(2) ~~(a)~~—Employees of a small business shall accrue a minimum of ~~one~~ **1** hour of earned sick time for every 30 hours worked but shall not be entitled to use more than 40 hours of paid earned sick time in a year unless the employer selects a higher limit. If an employee of a small business accrues more than 40 hours of earned sick time in a calendar year, the employee shall be entitled to use an additional 32 hours of unpaid earned sick time in that year, unless the employer selects a higher limit. Employees of a small business must be entitled to use paid earned sick time before using unpaid earned sick time.” and renumbering the remaining subsections.

3. Amend page 6, following line 22, by inserting:

“(3) ~~(e)~~—Earned sick time shall carry over from year to year, but a small business is not required to permit an employee to use more than 40 hours of paid earned sick time and 32 hours of unpaid earned sick time in a single year, and other employers are not required to permit an employee to use more than 72 hours of paid earned sick time in a single year.” and renumbering the remaining subsections.

4. Amend page 8, line 10, after “employer” by inserting “other than a small business”.

5. Amend page 8, line 16, after “(2).” by inserting “An employer that is a small business is in compliance with this section if the employer provides paid leave in at least the same amounts as that provided under this act that may be used for the same purposes and under the same conditions provided in this act and that is accrued at a rate equal to or greater than the rate described in subsections (1) and (2) provided further that that employees of the small business are entitled to use paid earned sick time before using unpaid earned sick time. For purposes of this subsection, “paid leave” includes but is not limited to paid vacation days, personal days, and paid time off.”.

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Longjohn moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 7, following line 12, by inserting:

“(4) **Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, an employer that employs fewer than 50 individuals shall provide an employee who worked not less than 1,000 hours in the immediately preceding year for that employer to take paid time off from work to do all of the following:**

(a) **Attend an annual wellness examination for the employee and, if applicable, each dependent of the employee.**

(b) **Attend all subsequent recommended and documented follow-up appointments related to a wellness examination described in subdivision (a).**” and renumbering the remaining subsections.

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Myers-Phillips moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 11, line 2, by striking out the balance of the subsection and inserting “If the **eligible** employee’s need to use earned sick time is foreseeable, an employer may require advance notice, not to exceed 7 days ~~prior to~~ **before** the date the earned sick time is to begin, of the intention to use the earned sick time. If the **eligible** employee’s need for the earned sick time is not foreseeable, an employer may require the **eligible** employee to give notice of the intention as soon as practicable. **As used in this subsection, “not foreseeable” means any of the following:**

(a) **An unanticipated physical or mental injury, illness, or condition of an employee or a family member of the employee.**

(b) Unanticipated and immediately necessary medical care, treatment, or diagnosis of the employee or a family member of the employee.

(c) The employee or a family member of the employee is a victim of sexual assault or domestic violence.

(d) An unanticipated meeting with the employee's child's school or place of care that is related to the child's health or effects of sexual assault or domestic violence on the child.

(e) The employee or family member of the employee poses a threat to others because the employee or family member was exposed to a communicable disease.

(f) The employee's work or employee's child's school is closed because of a public health emergency."

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Breen moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 16, line 2, after "may" by striking out the balance of the subsection and inserting "do any of the following:

(a) Bring a civil action for appropriate relief, including, but not limited to, payment for used earned sick time; rehiring or reinstatement to the **eligible** employee's previous job; payment of back wages; reestablishment of employee benefits to which the **eligible** employee otherwise would have been eligible if the **eligible** employee had not been subjected to ~~retaliatory personnel action or discrimination; the violation;~~ and an equal additional amount as liquidated damages together with costs and reasonable attorney fees as the court allows.

(b) File a claim with the department, which shall investigate the claim. Filing a claim with the department is neither a prerequisite nor a bar to bringing a civil action."

2. Amend page 17, line 28, after "action" by inserting "as provided in subsection (1)(a)".

3. Amend page 18, line 1, after "action" by inserting "under subsection (1)(a)".

4. Amend page 18, line 3, after "site" by striking out the period and inserting "and who have not brought a civil action under subsection (1)(a)".

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Andrews moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 8, line 28, after "employee" by inserting a comma and "**including tips and gratuities**".

2. Amend page 9, line 9, after the first "**pay**," by inserting "**or**".

3. Amend page 9, line 9, after the second "**pay**" by striking out the comma and "**tips, or gratuities**".

The motion did not prevail and the amendments were not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. Rogers moved to amend the bill as follows:

1. Amend page 14, line 26, after "(2)" by inserting "An employer shall not take retaliatory personnel action or discriminate against an **eligible** employee because the **eligible** employee has exercised a right protected under this act."

The motion did not prevail and the amendment was not adopted, a majority of the members serving not voting therefor.

Rep. DeBoyer moved that the bill be placed on the order of Third Reading of Bills.

The motion prevailed.

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

### Third Reading of Bills

Rep. Posthumus moved that **House Bill No. 4001** be placed on its immediate passage.

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

### House Bill No. 4001, entitled

A bill to amend 2014 PA 138, entitled "Workforce opportunity wage act," by amending sections 4 and 4b (MCL 408.414 and 408.414b); and to repeal acts and parts of acts.

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays as follows:



Roll Call No. 4

Yeas—63

Alexander	Frisbie	Maddock	Slagh
Aragona	Glanville	Markkanen	Smit
BeGole	Green, P.	Martin	Snyder
Beson	Greene, J.	Meerman	St. Germaine
Bierlein	Hall	Mueller	Steele
Bohnak	Harris	Neyer	Thompson
Bollin	Herzberg	Outman	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Pavlov	VanderWall
Bruck	Jenkins-Arno	Posthumus	VanWoerkom
Carra	Johnsen	Prestin	Wendzel
Cavitt	Kelly	Rigas	Whitsett
DeBoer	Kuhn	Robinson	Witwer
DeBoyer	Kunse	Roth	Woolford
DeSana	Liberati	Schmaltz	Wortz
Fairbairn	Lightner	Schrivver	Wozniak
Fox	Linting	Schuette	

Nays—41

Andrews	Foreman	Mentzer	Scott
Arbit	Grant	Miller	Skaggs
Breen	Hope	Morgan	Tate
Brixie	Hoskins	Myers-Phillips	Tsernoglou
Byrnes	Koleszar	Neeley	Wegela
Carter, B.	Longjohn	Paquette	Weiss
Carter, T.	MacDonell	Price	Wilson
Conlin	Martus	Puri	Wooden
Dievendorf	McFall	Rheingans	Xiong
Farhat	McKinney	Rogers	Young
Fitzgerald			

In The Chair: Smit

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

Rep. Myers-Phillips, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:  
“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:  
I am voting no on HB 4001 because of my steadfast commitment to putting more money in the pockets of Michigan’s workers and families. I will not vote for legislation that literally takes money out of workers’ pockets. I choose to honor the choice and act of self-determination of over 300,000 Michiganders who signed petitions to enact the Workforce Opportunity Wage Act as the law the Michigan Supreme Court has upheld as the law of our State. For the past seven years, politicians have denied hard-working Michiganders extra income and benefits they were entitled to receive. The 103rd legislature should do the right thing. Abiding by the law is the right thing to do for Michigan workers, Michigan voters, and taxpayers. It will contribute to growth in our economy.

HB 4001 will not put more money in the pockets of Michigan workers. Supporters of this bill disingenuously use the gradual phasing out of the tip credit for restaurant industry servers to do away with a long overdue shift in how tipped workers are treated and whose responsibility it is to pay for their wages. They argue that paying workers a minimum wage, like all other workers in Michigan, and allowing workers to retain their tips would result in the public tipping less. They also argue that the additional costs would force catastrophic levels of restaurant closures and unemployment.

However, the evidence and the facts show the exact opposite.

- Tipped workers in all seven states (California, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Minnesota, Montana, and Alaska) that require a full minimum wage plus tips earn the same or higher tipping averages as tipped workers in the other 43 states with a subminimum wage. The Economic Policy Institute reports that total earnings, including both tips and wages, for tipped workers in One Fair Wage states are 15 percent higher than they are in states with a subminimum wage.
- Full-service restaurant employment in the One Fair Wage states above increased by 6.71% percent between 2016-19, compared to 4.9% in states with a subminimum wage.
- Small business employment in One Fair Wage states grew by 8.37%. In contrast, jobs in small businesses in states with a subminimum wage grew by only 5.95% between 2016 and 2019.
- From 2016 to 2019, the number of full-service restaurants in One Fair Wage states grew by 10 percent, compared to only a 5.97% increase in the subminimum wage states.

While recent testimony orchestrated by special interest groups would have us believe that Michigan's restaurant industry is full of happy endings, the National Restaurant Association reports that the average turnover rate in the restaurant industry is around 75%. In fact, the Michigan Restaurant and Lodging Association published a recent survey that reflects that 80.5 percent of their members were operating with inadequate labor supply to meet demand, and 99 percent have increased wages over the last 12 months, with 40 percent of operators increasing wages by more than 15 percent in that time. The Michigan restaurant industry knows what it needs to do to improve employee retention. They know they need to raise wages to be successful. The problem is that they don't want to pay for it. They want to shift the burden of paying their employees to the taxpayers through tips and government aid. Nearly 40% of restaurant workers live nearly 2 times below the federal poverty line and thus are eligible for public benefits.

Most Michigan residents I know will not stop tipping. We will continue tipping our servers just as we tip our fellow Michiganders who work in the other areas of the service industry, such as valets, baristas, hotel hospitality staff, curbside airport workers, delivery workers, and spa workers- all of whom earn a minimum wage plus tips. Michiganders want to get ahead and want their children and grandchildren to get ahead. Michiganders know that a rising tide floats all boats."

Rep. Xiong, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I believe in honoring the will of over 300,000 Michiganders who signed petitions to enact the Workforce Opportunity Wage Act, supporting the Michigan Supreme Court's decision to uphold this law and ensuring every minimum wage worker earns a livable income. Increasing the minimum wage for all workers and eliminating the tipped and subminimum wage is crucial to lifting Michigan families out of poverty and achieving economic justice for all. Service sector workers, especially, need fairer compensation. HB 4001 will strip away wage increases for Michigan workers and continue the harmful tip credit system. This legislation is built on disinformation surrounding the impact of eliminating the tipped wage on workers and the business community. To be clear, increasing tipped wages has not stopped tipping or harmed tipped workers' salaries in the seven other states that have eliminated the subminimum tipped wage. Evidence shows that earnings are 21% higher on average for servers and bartenders in states with no subminimum tipped wage, as opposed to states that follow the federal tipped wage. Restaurant and small business employment also saw greater increases in those states. I vote for policies that prioritize working families. This bill takes away benefits and promises of economic prosperity for hardworking Michiganders. Therefore, I must vote no on HB 4001."

Rep. Grant, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I voted no on HB 4001 because it fails to strike a balance between ensuring fair wages for Michiganders and taking seriously the concerns of small businesses in Michigan."

Rep. Foreman, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I believe that the working class is the backbone of our economy. Therefore, I support paying them a liveable wage that not only helps them keep food on their families’ tables, but also keeps businesses’ doors open.

Studies have shown that raising the wage will increase worker productivity and morale, which is a benefit to the business that hires them. And they have shown that a higher minimum wage does not have negative effects on employment. Also, eliminating the ‘tipped wage’ has not been seen as having any major effects on employment or businesses. In fact, several states have adopted One Fair Wage and their restaurant and service industries are thriving and workers did not see a decrease in income nor in customer tips.”

Rep. Rogers, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

*I voted no on House Bill 4001 because not only does it delay critical minimum wage increases, but it also removes a large swathe of employee protections, including protections from both hiring and wage discrimination, retaliatory actions against employees, and workplace harassment. Livable wages benefit local economies and businesses too. People with more money in their pockets are more likely to spend their earnings at businesses in their local communities. And employee turnover, morale and productivity are vastly improved when workers aren’t faced with significant financial stress and the need to juggle multiple jobs. I believe there is a way forward that benefits both businesses and workers, but this is not it.”*

Rep. Longjohn, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I choose to vote ‘no’ on HB 4001, and I would like to share why. As it stands now, minimum wage workers are expecting their wages to increase from \$10.56 an hour to \$12.48 an hour in just a few weeks. This is an increase that has been necessary for years now just to keep up with inflation and the cost of living. HB 4001 decreases that raise by \$0.48. Working people and their families are already struggling to make ends meet. I cannot in good conscience vote for a reduction in pay for our lowest-paid workers. Further, there were several amendments offered which would have provided a more balanced solution to the complex issues related to this Bill, and I cannot support HB4001 without at least some of those Amendments.”

Rep. Wooden, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Like many, I have heard from businesses and workers concerned by the full implementation of the upcoming minimum wage & tipped credit increase. While I am open to changes in how the new minimum wage increase and tipped credit phase-out are implemented, HB 4001 crosses a line I cannot support.

Were this bill enacted, delaying a \$15 per hour minimum wage increase to 2029 will effectively lower Michigan’s minimum wage. To my knowledge, not a single state has lowered their minimum wage in modern history. I cannot support legislation that would do this.

This bill also fully repeals the increase to the tipped credit. Tipped workers are often the most vulnerable to workplace harassment and wage theft, often due to the tipped wage system. Tipped-workers instates with higher tipped-credits earn upwards of 20% more in the workplace. While I fully understand and open to changes to the timeline for how the tipped-wage increases, especially for those businesses with fewer than 25 employees, I cannot support legislation that fully eliminates the scheduled increase for tipped workers.

I supported common-sense amendments that were offered to reach an appropriate balance between businesses and workers. Amendments like those offered by Reps. Scott, Miller, Koleszar and Grant. None of these amendments were adopted. While I voted against the legislation, I am ready to find a meaningful compromise that supports both workers and businesses.”

Rep. Byrnes, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on House Bill 4001 because this bill would result in a minimum wage for workers that is lower than what the many organizers across our state advocated for.”

Rep. Rheingans, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Michigan has established minimum wages and their increases through previous laws, and this bill takes away planned increases in wages and perpetuates the allowance of a sub-minimum wage. I voted against this bill because we should not be taking away planned minimum wage increases.”

Rep. Mentzer, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on House Bill 4001 and House Bill 4002, which proposes changes to Michigan’s minimum wage and earned sick time laws. While I’ve heard from countless constituents on both sides of this issue, I believe these bills lack the thorough consideration necessary to effectively address such an important matter. I remain hopeful for the opportunity to consider a more comprehensive and well-crafted version of this legislation in the future.”

Rep. MacDonell, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Title: We Can Do Better for Michigan Workers – HB 4001

I’m voting no on HB 4001 to allow a continuation of the process to create a just compromise to the Michigan Supreme Court’s decision in Mothering Justice vs. Attorney General. 4001 goes too far, taking wages from restaurant servers promised by the Supreme Court. Michigan’s restaurant workers deserve a raise from the \$4 they will earn this year. And in states that have abolished the tipped minimum wage, average servers saw their take-home pay increase. Additionally, HB 4001 delays Michigan’s climb to a \$15-per-hour minimum wage. I will consider a compromise, but not this ripping away long-awaited justice for Michigan’s workers.”

Rep. McFall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no because the commonsense amendments to protect workers and our small businesses were not adopted.”

Rep. Young, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

There is legislation coming from the Senate also. Both bill packages provide an opportunity to keep working on this issue, so workers and employers are supported.”

Rep. Posthumus moved that **House Bill No. 4002** be placed on its immediate passage.  
The motion prevailed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor.

**House Bill No. 4002, entitled**

A bill to amend 2018 PA 338, entitled “Earned sick time act,” by amending sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12 (MCL 408.962, 408.963, 408.964, 408.965, 408.966, 408.967, 408.968, 408.970, 408.971, and 408.972).

Was read a third time and passed, a majority of the members serving voting therefor, by yeas and nays as follows:

**Roll Call No. 5**

**Yeas—67**

Alexander	Fox	Maddock	Schuette
Aragona	Frisbie	Markkanen	Slagh
Arbit	Glanville	Martin	Smit
BeGole	Green, P.	Meerman	Snyder

Beson	Greene, J.	Mueller	St. Germaine
Bierlein	Hall	Neyer	Steele
Bohnak	Harris	O'Neal	Thompson
Bollin	Herzberg	Outman	Tisdell
Borton	Hoadley	Paquette	VanderWall
Bruck	Jenkins-Arno	Pavlov	VanWoerkom
Carra	Johnsen	Posthumus	Wendzel
Carter, T.	Kelly	Prestin	Whitsett
Cavitt	Kuhn	Rigas	Witwer
DeBoer	Kunse	Robinson	Woolford
DeBoyer	Liberati	Roth	Wortz
DeSana	Lightner	Schmaltz	Wozniak
Fairbairn	Linting	Schrivver	

### Nays—38

Andrews	Grant	Miller	Skaggs
Breen	Hope	Morgan	Tate
Brixie	Hoskins	Myers-Phillips	Tsernoglou
Bymes	Koleszar	Neeley	Wegela
Carter, B.	Longjohn	Price	Weiss
Conlin	MacDonell	Puri	Wilson
Dievendorf	Martus	Rheingans	Wooden
Farhat	McFall	Rogers	Xiong
Fitzgerald	McKinney	Scott	Young
Foreman	Mentzer		

In The Chair: Smit

The House agreed to the title of the bill.

Rep. Posthumus moved that the bill be given immediate effect.

The motion prevailed, 2/3 of the members serving voting therefor.

---

Rep. Myers-Phillips, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I am voting No on HB 4002 because this legislation significantly reduces paid sick benefits Michiganders urgently need and lawfully petitioned for. I chose to honor the people’s will and prioritize economic security for Michigan families. We can make Michigan a decent and humane place to live and work. The Earned Sick Time Act would provide Michigan workers four additional earned sick days a year. It would give a small but necessary and dignified reprieve when life’s inevitable difficulties strike. Whether that is an illness, death, or school closures- like we’ve seen this week when the National Weather Service reported that the State Capitol experienced wind chills as low as 17 degrees below zero, the ability to handle one’s personal and necessary affairs without losing a day’s pay is finally possible for over a million Michigan workers. If HB 4002 becomes the law, more than 1.7 million workers would not have access to even one hour of paid sick time. As a working mother, I understand the practical need to attend to your health and that of your family. Lawmakers should not block the expansion of this overdue social safety net.

In addition to providing economic security and dignity for Michigan workers, the Earned Sick Time Act, with its paid sick leave policies, provides better long-term benefits for businesses. This act not only supports the health and well-being of workers but also contributes to a healthier and more productive workforce, which is beneficial for businesses in the long run.

- Paid sick time allows employees to address health concerns promptly and minimizes absences due to illness.
- Paid sick time is not just about addressing immediate health concerns. It also promotes the early diagnosis and treatment of illnesses, potentially leading to lower healthcare costs for employers and workers. By allowing workers to address health issues promptly, paid sick leave can contribute to a healthier workforce and reduce the burden of healthcare costs on employers and workers. Paid sick leave helps employers attract top talent and retain experienced and good workers.
- One study attributed a 1.5% increase in employment to counties that implemented paid sick leave policies.

While some claim this bill is necessary to help small businesses, the reality is more complex. We can support small businesses through targeted incentives, access to capital, and reduced administrative burdens without sacrificing worker protections and workers' families.

Furthermore, HB 4002 doesn't just reduce sick time—it makes it harder for workers to enforce their rights. By cutting the statute of limitations from 3 years to 1 year and eliminating the right to take cases to court, we leave workers especially vulnerable to abuse.

Finally, preserving the Earned Sick Time Act is the right thing to do. Amid a well-documented population decline, these policies are essential to attracting and retaining young families to live and work in Michigan.”

Rep. Xiong, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Expanding earned sick time, an essential social safety net for workers and especially working parents, is integral to ensuring the health of both the workers themselves and those they interact with in the workplace. The Earned Sick Time Act ensures Michigan's workers have more breathing room to take care of themselves and their children without sacrificing income that keeps food on the table. Employers need their workplace to remain free of illness — forcing sick workers to enter the workplace puts others at risk and reduces productivity. I believe in valuing workers' health and the health of their family members. HB 4002 will ensure that more than 1 million workers do not have access to earned sick leave. This bill forces hundreds of thousands of working parents to choose between leaving their child alone when they are sick or forfeiting a day's worth of pay. I believe in promoting policies that allow workers to prioritize their health, from making appointments to seek an early or preventative diagnosis to taking care of their sickness promptly so they can be more productive in the long run. This bill forces many working Michiganders to sacrifice their health and show up at their jobs where others may contract an illness, contributing to a public health crisis. Therefore, I must vote no on HB 4002.”

Rep. Grant, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I voted no on HB 4002 because it fails to strike a balance between ensuring protections for workers and the concerns of businesses in Michigan.”

Rep. Longjohn, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Today I choose to vote 'no' on HB 4002, and I would like to share why. HB 4002 is bad medicine. Research shows that workers without paid sick leave are less likely to seek timely medical care and are more likely to rely on emergency departments for care that could have been avoided. People without sick leave or health benefits don't skip work when they are ill; instead, they will take themselves or a loved one to an emergency room when they are injured or require care, but they are far less likely to skip a shift or diminish their paycheck for routine preventive care. This results in a 33% decrease in having a primary care doctor, a 63% decrease in flu shots, 54% fewer mammograms, 29% decrease in other cancer screening tests, and similar reductions in screenings for diabetes, high cholesterol, etc.

Ensuring access to an annual wellness visit with paid sick leave is good business and good medicine. Access to paid sick leave improves job satisfaction, reduces on-the-job injuries, stops the spread of disease and more. Employees with paid sick leave are more likely to see a medical professional for diabetes screenings, flu shots, cholesterol checks, cancer screening tests, etc. These actions prevent long-term illness and unnecessary, costly care.

Small businesses, as defined by this bill as those with 50 or fewer employees, make up 96% of Michigan's private firms and provide jobs to an estimated 1.4 million Michiganders. Medical claims data show Michigan businesses this size offer health benefits at a rate of 51%, which is significantly less than large businesses. So, roughly 700,000 Michigan workers employed by small businesses in Michigan are already likely either

uninsured or underinsured, and many of these working people and their families rely on Medicaid. Said another way: more than 40% of Michigan's 1.7 million Medicaid enrollees may be exempted from sick leave coverage by HB 4002. Studies have shown a 10% reduction in emergency department visits among Medicaid patients in states with paid sick leave. The lack of paid sick leave for preventive care contributes to higher Medicaid expenditures, as untreated conditions lead to more severe health outcomes and greater reliance on costly, emergency-based care. If 40% of Medicaid enrollees are excluded from paid sick leave protections, then taxpayers will continue to bear the financial burden of preventable care.

Twenty-Five years ago, I took the Hippocratic Oath and committed to a lifetime of promoting health, and 'to do no harm'. I believe that supporting HB4002 would be a violation of that Oath. I cannot in good conscience vote against the health and economic benefits of paid sick leave access for workers."

Rep. Foreman, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

This bill circumvents the will of the people. More than 380,000 Michiganders supported the original ballot initiative language that would have placed the issue before Michigan voters in the 2018 election. Yet, the then Republican-led legislature adopted and amended legislation back in 2018, going against the voice of Michiganders. Now Republicans are again trying to subvert the will of the people by rushing bad legislation.

Economic studies have shown that access to paid family leave significantly increases the likelihood that workers will return to their jobs instead of dropping out of the labor force or spending time out of work to search for a new job.

This bill will leave 1.2 million workers across our state without any right to sick leave. Everyone gets sick at some point. That is just a fact of life. Sick employees should not be forced to come to work sick, just to be able to pay their rent. Not only is this unfair to hardworking Michiganders, it also raises public health concerns among the food service industry and the patrons they serve.

Given all that, I am introducing an amendment for this bill. My amendment would keep the same definition of 'employer' as an entity with one or more employees as provided in the Earned Sick Time Act. As written, House Bill 4002 only applies to employers with 50 or more employees. My amendment makes sure all employees will have access to some form of earned paid or unpaid sick time."

Rep. Rogers, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

*I voted no on House Bill 4002 because it undermines the amount of sick leave an employee receiving tips can use; allows businesses to discriminate and retaliate against their employees; and eliminates an employee's right to bring a civil cause of action. Without earned paid sick time, workers will be forced to choose between going without pay or going to work sick, both of which are unsafe decisions that come with serious consequences for economic security and public health. The COVID-19 pandemic taught us some very important lessons, one of which was the necessity to provide paid sick time to workers in order to prevent contagious illnesses from spreading in workplaces, schools and public spaces. In addition to protecting public health, we can keep our state's healthcare costs down and safeguard the economic security of families by ensuring workers are able to take time off when they are sick without sacrificing their paychecks and possibly even their jobs. How we navigate laws on sick leave may be negotiable, but worker's protections and safety are not."*

Rep. Wooden, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

"Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Much like my no vote explanation for HB 4001, I have heard honest concerns surrounding the full implementation of the new earned sick-time law. I am ready to discuss a meaningful compromise that fixes these concerns while supporting small-business and workers. HB 4002 is not such a compromise. It is an effective gutting of the act.

By exempting all companies with fewer than 50 employees, this bill revokes the right to paid-sick leave to for 1.2 million Michigan workers. I am open to several provisions that have been discussed to streamline compliance with the law and balance the needs of workers and small businesses, I cannot support legislation that takes away access from over a million Michigan workers.

I supported several common-sense amendments that were offered to reach an appropriate balance between businesses and workers. Most notably, I supported the amendment offered by Representative Foreman, restoring this right to the 1.2 million workers. This amendment was not adopted. While I voted against the legislation, I am ready to find a meaningful compromise that supports both workers and businesses."

Rep. Byrnes, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on House Bill 4002 because this bill would result in limitations to employee paid sick leave that would be detrimental to workers’ ability to seek necessary medical care and preventative screenings.”

Rep. Rheingans, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted against HB4002 because it would remove the availability of earned sick time for over one million Michiganders who are set to begin earning it next month. Maintaining earned sick time allows workers to get better and to avoid making others sick, or allows workers to take family members to receive medical care.”

Rep. Mentzer, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no on House Bill 4001 and House Bill 4002, which proposes changes to Michigan’s minimum wage and earned sick time laws. While I’ve heard from countless constituents on both sides of this issue, I believe these bills lack the thorough consideration necessary to effectively address such an important matter. I remain hopeful for the opportunity to consider a more comprehensive and well-crafted version of this legislation in the future.”

Rep. MacDonell, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

Title: We Can Do Better for Michigan Workers – HB 4002

I’m voting no on HB 4002 to allow a continuation of the process to create a just compromise to the Michigan Supreme Court’s decision in Mothering Justice vs. Attorney General. 4002 goes too far, taking paid sick leave away from 1.2 million Michigan workers. I will consider a compromise, but this bill goes too far.”

Rep. McFall, having reserved the right to explain his protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

I voted no because the commonsense amendments to protect workers and our small businesses were not adopted.”

Rep. Young, having reserved the right to explain her protest against the passage of the bill, made the following statement:

“Mr. Speaker and members of the House:

There is legislation coming from the Senate also. Both bill packages provide an opportunity to keep working on this issue, so workers and employers are supported.”

By unanimous consent the House returned to the order of

**Announcement by the Clerk of Printing and Enrollment**

The Clerk announced that the following bills had been reproduced and made available electronically on Wednesday, January 22:

<b>House Bill Nos.</b>	<b>4018</b>	<b>4019</b>	<b>4020</b>						
<b>Senate Bill Nos.</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	

Rep. Wooden moved that the House adjourn.  
The motion prevailed, the time being 2:15 p.m.

The Speaker Pro Tempore declared the House adjourned until Tuesday, January 28, at 1:30 p.m.

SCOTT E. STARR  
Clerk of the House of Representatives