

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** marilyn.childers <marilyn.childers@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 22, 2016 9:49 PM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** Delisting of MI wolves

Dear Ms. Brewer,

My husband and I moved back to Michigan after moving out of state for many years. One of the main reasons we moved back was due to our appreciation of our State's beauty and the state wildlife. We have been both shocked and extremely disappointed in regard to the assault on wildlife in our state. We joined the majority of Michigan voters who have voiced strong support in favor of not delisting nor hunting our state wolves. This was not done on emotion, but rather by becoming knowledgeable about the biology and ecology of the state of Michigan and the important role our wolves play in keeping the balance.

We strongly encourage the committee to listen to and support the voters of Michigan and not pass HCR 22 AND HR 228. When the majority of voters make their voices heard and are not supported by their state legislators, including committees, it is no wonder the Congress is held in such low esteem. Please keep this in mind when deciding how to vote on such an important issue. Let's look at other more humane ways of attracting tourism to our state....not by hunting and killing our wildlife.

Respectfully

Marilyn Childers, MSN, RN-BC

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** Charles, Bonnie <Bonnie.Charles@beaumont.org>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2016 7:23 AM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** HCR 22 and HCR 228

To the members of the House Committee on Tourism and Outdoor Recreation:

I had previously submitted a letter protesting the need for this committee to vote on a show of support for the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act and its House equivalent H.R. 2406, the SHARE Act.

I still feel it is totally unnecessary for members of our House to throw in their support of these pieces of legislation. Both of these pieces of legislation are bad for both wildlife and the environment. The SHARE Act would not only deprive wolves of federal protection but also bar court challenges to this policy. These pieces of legislation include an amendment to strip wolves of their federal protection in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and Wyoming. How many times do the Michigan voters need to make our wishes known on the subject of wolf hunting? Your proposed show of support is a slap in the faces to the Michigan voters as this is in direct opposition to what we have voted.

I ask that you honestly and truly represent the wishes of your Michigan constituents on this matter and not support either of these two resolutions.

Sincerely,  
Bonnie Charles  
61957 Ticonderoga Dr Unit 6  
South Lyon MI 48178

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** Jodi Louth <jlouth3@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2016 7:37 AM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** NO on House Concurrent Resolution (HCR) 22 and House Resolution (HR) 228

I am writing to urge members of the House Committee on Tourism and Outdoor Recreation to please vote NO on House Concurrent Resolution 22 and House Resolution 228, that in part would strip our wolves of their federal protection. The People of the State of Michigan have already voiced their opinion of wolves loud and clear in November of 2014.

Thank you,  
Jodi Louth  
Saline Michigan

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** whapham2@aol.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2016 10:57 AM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** OPPOSE THE HUNTING OF WOLVES

We in Michigan a dead against the hunting of wolves in Michigan!

Tom and Cecelia Whapham  
5007 Timber Lake trail  
Clarkston, Mi. 48346  
248-674-7129  
[whapham2@aol.com](mailto:whapham2@aol.com)

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** Sunday Harvie <sundayharvie@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2016 10:57 AM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** I Oposse the Bipartissn Sportemen's Act.....stop the war on wildlife

The Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act is **bad for wildlife and the environment**. It seems you need to be reminded of the fact Michigan voters **rejected** two wolf hunting laws in the November 2014 general election.

Please listen to the voters and stop pandering to a small vocal minority, validate the voice of the people and **STOP THIS INSIDIOUS WAR ON OUR WILDLIFE!!!!**

Mr. & Mrs. R. Harvie  
3035 S. Hickory Ridge Trail  
Milford, MI 48380

## Joy Brewer

---

**From:** Friedlander Bee <beefriedlander@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 23, 2016 11:28 AM  
**To:** Joy Brewer  
**Subject:** HR 228 and HCR 22: Attorneys for Animals Supplemental Statement

Ms. Brewer,  
Could you please see that the Chair Rendon and members of the Tourism and Outdoor Recreation Committee are given copies of this email at today's hearing? Thank you.

Chair Rendon and Committee Members,  
Attorneys for Animals submitted a statement in opposition to these resolutions for the hearing on March 2, 2016. I am writing to reiterate that opposition, and to emphasize the following points concerning Senate Bill 659, the Bipartisan Sportsmen's Act of 2015:

1. HR 228 and HCR 22 present a selective and incomplete picture of the S 659. Michigan legislators should have a complete understanding of resolutions they are being asked to support before they urge Congress to pass a bill.
2. The provisions of S 659 which require the federal agency to de-list the wolf and then make such action immune from judicial review are particularly egregious given the recent history in Michigan regarding wolves. As you know, the federal de-listing of the wolf led to three separate pieces of legislation by the Michigan Legislature which allowed hunting of wolves (directly or indirectly). Despite the fact that all passed and were signed into law, two of these laws were overturned by voters in the 2014 election; and one was made referendum-proof and therefore was not before the electorate. Taken in that context, HR 228 and HCR 22 can be reasonably seen as further action by the Legislature to thwart the will of a majority of Michigan voters.

The fact that S 659 makes the de-listing immune from judicial review is not mentioned in HR 228 and HCR 22. While not unprecedented, the practice of conferring immunity from court review by legislative action indicates a willingness to subvert the system and raises the issue noted in a recent editorial in the Chicago Tribune: "The only reason to bar court challenges, of course, is to avoid having the legal weakness of your case exposed."

Attorneys for Animals asks that these two resolutions not be voted out of Committee.

Beatrice M. Friedlander  
President, Attorneys for Animals