Protection of Marriage Amendment

Number: PETITION

Date: November 29, 2005

The Honorable Barbara J. Pariente Chief Justice, and Justices of
The Supreme Court of Florida
The Supreme Court Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1925

Dear Chief Justice Pariente and Justices:

In accordance with the provisions of Article IV, section 10, Florida Constitution, and section 16.061, Florida Statutes, it is the responsibility of the Attorney General to petition this Honorable Court for a written opinion as to the validity of an initiative petition circulated pursuant to Article XI, section 3, Florida Constitution.

On August 24, 2005, this office received from the Secretary of State an initiative petition seeking to amend the Florida Constitution to define marriage. The full text of the proposed amendment states:

"BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF FLORIDA THAT:

A new section for Article I is hereby created to add the following:

Inasmuch as marriage is the legal union of only one man and one woman as husband and wife, no other legal union that is treated as marriage or the substantial equivalent thereof shall be valid or recognized."

The ballot title for the proposed amendment is "Florida Marriage Protection Amendment." The summary for the proposed amendment states:

"This amendment protects marriage as the legal union of only one man and one woman as husband and wife and provides that no other legal union that is treated as marriage or the substantial equivalent thereof shall be valid or recognized."

Article XI, section 3, Florida Constitution, provides in relevant part:

"The power to propose the revision or amendment of any portion or portions of this constitution by initiative is reserved to the people, provided that, any such revision or amendment, except for those limiting the power of government to raise revenue, shall embrace but one subject and matter directly connected therewith."

The single-subject provision "is a rule of restraint designed to insulate Florida's organic law from precipitous and cataclysmic change." *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General--Save Our*

Everglades, 636 So. 2d 1336, 1339 (Fla. 1994); *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General--Tax Limitation,* 644 So. 2d 486, 490 (Fla. 1994).

To comply with the single-subject requirement, an initiative must manifest a "logical and natural oneness of purpose." *Fine v. Firestone,* 448 So. 2d 984, 990 (Fla. 1984). This Court stated in *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General--Restricts Laws Related to Discrimination*, 632 So. 2d 1018, 1020 (Fla. 1994), that "[t]o ascertain whether the necessary 'oneness of purpose' exists, we must consider whether the proposal affects separate functions of government and how the proposal affects other provisions of the constitution."

Section 101.161(1), Florida Statutes, provides in relevant part:

"Whenever a constitutional amendment . . . is submitted to the vote of the people, the substance of such amendment . . . shall be printed in clear and unambiguous language on the ballot . . . . The wording of the substance of the amendment . . . shall be an explanatory statement, not exceeding 75 words in length, of the chief purpose of the measure. . . . The ballot title shall consist of a caption, not exceeding 15 words in length, by which the measure is commonly referred to or spoken of."

This Court has stated "that the ballot [must] be fair and advise the voter sufficiently to enable him intelligently to cast his ballot." *Askew v. Firestone*, 421 So. 2d 151, 155 (Fla. 1982), *quoting, Hill v. Milander*, 72 So. 2d 796, 798 (Fla. 1954). While the ballot title and summary must state in clear and unambiguous language the chief purpose of the measure, they need not explain every detail or ramification of the proposed amendment. *Carroll v. Firestone*, 497 So. 2d 1204, 1206 (Fla. 1986). The ballot, however, must give the voter fair notice of the decision he must make. *Askew v. Firestone, supra* at 155. This Court has stated that the purpose of section 101.161, Florida Statutes, is to ensure that voters are advised of the amendment's true meaning.

Therefore, I respectfully request this Honorable Court's opinion as to whether the constitutional amendment, proposed by initiative petition, complies with Article XI, section 3, Florida Constitution, and whether the amendment's ballot title and summary comply with section 101.161, Florida Statutes.

Sincerely,

Charlie Crist
Attorney General

CC/tfl

cc: Ms. Glenda Hood
Secretary of State

The Honorable Jeb Bush
Governor, State of Florida

The Honorable Tom Lee

President, Florida Senate

The Honorable Allan G. Bense
Speaker, Florida House of Representatives

John Stemberger,
Chair, Florida4Marriage.org