RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

STATE OF MICHIGAN

MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT

In re Request for Advisory Opinion
Regarding 2018 PA 368 and 2018 PA 369,

Supreme Court Case Nos.
159160 and 159201

Andrea Hansen (P47358)
Doug Mains (P75351)
Counsel for the Michigan House of Representatives and Senate, and Michigan Restaurant and Lodging Association
Honigman LLP
222 N Washington Sq. Ste 400
Lansing, MI 48933
Telephone: (517) 377-0709
ahansen@honigman.com

Gary P. Gordon (P26290)
Jason T. Hanselman (P61813)
Counsel for Small Business for a Better Michigan Coaliation
DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
201 Townsend Street, Suite 900
Lansing, Michigan 48933
Telephone: (517) 374-9100
GGordon@dykema.com
jhanselman@dykema.com

Mark Brewer (P35661)
Counsel for Michigan One Fair Wage, Michigan Time to Care, and National Employment Law Project
Goodman Acker, P.C.
17000 W. 10 Mile Rd., 2nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075
Telephone: (248) 483-5000
mbrewer@goodmanacker.com

Andrew Nickelhoff (P37990)
Counsel for Michigan State AFL-CIO
Nickelhoff & Widick, PLLC
2211 East Jefferson, Ste. 200
Detroit, MI 48207
Telephone: (313) 496-9429
anickelhoff@michlabor.legal

THE COALITION'S AMICUS CURIAE AMENDED BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATURE'S REQUEST FOR AN ADVISORY OPINION ON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF 2018 PA 368 AND 2018 PA 369

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED[1]

[1] Pursuant to MCR 7.312(H)(4) counsel for Amicus Small Business for a Better Michigan Coalition attests that they authored the brief in whole and that no counsel or parties made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of the brief.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES iii

STATEMENT OF BASIS OF JURISDICTION v

STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED vi

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

I. The Coalition Members 3

II. Procedural History Of The Acts 7

ARGUMENT 8

I. The Court Should Grant The Michigan Legislature's Request To Issue An Advisory Opinion 8

II. Article 2, Section 9 Of The Michigan Constitution Permits The Legislature To Enact An Initiative Petition And Subsequently Amend That Law During The Same Legislative Session 9

A. Article 2, Section 9 must be interpreted according to its plain language 9

B. Article 2, Section 9 does not place any limitations on the authority of the Legislature to amend an initiated law enacted by the Legislature 10

1. Article 2, Section 9 does not require a popular vote or approval of three-fourths of each legislative house to amend an initiated law enacted by the Legislature 12

2. Article 2, Section 9 does not limit when the Legislature may amend an initiated law enacted by the Legislature 14

C. Laws initiated by petition and enacted by the Legislature have the same stature as laws enacted solely through the legislative process and, therefore, may also be amended during the same legislative session 16

III. The Legislature Enacted The Amended Acts In Accordance With Article 2, Section 9 Of The Michigan Constitution And Must Be Presumed To Be Constitutional 19

CONCLUSION 20

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Advisory Opinion on Constitutionality of 1982 PA 47,
418 Mich 49; 340 NW2d 817 (1983).. 13

AFT Mich v State,
497 Mich 197; 866 NW2d 782 (2015).. 20

Attorney Gen ex rel O'Hara v Montgomery,
275 Mich 504; 267 NW2d 550 (1936).. 11

Detroit United R v Barnes Paper Co,
172 Mich 586; 138 NW 211 (1912).. 17

Frey v Dep't of Mgt & Budget,
429 Mich 315; 414 NW2d 873 (1987).. 2, 10, 18

In re Proposals D & H,
417 Mich 409; 339 NW2d 848 (1983).. 17, 19

In re Request for Advisory Opinion Regarding Constitutionality of 2012 PA 348 & 2012 PA 349,
493 Mich 1016; 829 NW2d 872 (2013).. 9

Leininger v Secretary of State,
316 Mich 644 (1947) 18

Luker v Curtis,
64 Idaho 703; 136 P2d 978 (1943) 18

Mich United Conservation Clubs v Sec'y of State,
464 Mich 359; 630 NW2d 297 (2001).. 9, 10, 14, 16

Michigan Farm Bureau v Secretary of State,
379 Mich 387; 151 NW2d 797 (1967).. 15

People v Bulger,
462 Mich 495; 614 NW2d 103 (2000).. 9

People v Collins,
3 Mich 343 (1854) 20

Peppers v Beier, 7
5 Ohio App3d 420; 599 NE2d 793 (1991).. 18

Taxpayers of Mich Against Casinos v Michigan,
471 Mich 306; 685 NW2d 221 (2004).. 2, 11, 12

Statutes

2018 PA 337 .... 1, 19

2018 PA 338 .... 1, 19

2018 PA 368 .... passim

2018 PA 369 .... passim

2018 SB 1094 17
2018 SB 1162 17
MCL 437.1517a 17

Rules

MCR 7.303(B)(3) .... v, 8

Constitutional Provisions

Const 1963, art 2, § 9 .... passim
Const 1963, art 3, § 8 .... v, 1, 8, 9
Const 1963, art 3, § 34 17
Const 1963, art 4 .... 17, 18, 19
Const 1963, art 4, § 1 18
Const 1963, art 4, § 27 .... 2, 18
Const 1963, art 4, §24 .... 18, 19

Other Authorities

2 Official Record, Constitutional Convention 1961 11
OAG, 1963-1964, No. 4303 (March 6, 1964) 15, 16
OAG, 1975-1976, No. 4932 (January 15, 1976) 13, 15, 16
OAG, 2017-2018, No. 7306 (December 3, 2018) 2, 9, 13, 16
Statements of Sens. Colbeck, Hertel, and Ananich, Senate Journal No. 64 8

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

STATEMENT OF BASIS OF JURISDICTION

The Michigan Constitution authorizes either house of the Legislature to "request the opinion of the supreme court on important questions of law upon solemn occasions as to the constitutionality of legislation after it has been enacted into law but before its effective date." Const 1963, art 3, § 8. Both the Michigan Senate and the Michigan House of Representatives timely requested an advisory opinion from this Court on the constitutionality of 2018 PA 368 and 2018 PA 369, which laws took effect on March 29, 2019. This Court, therefore, has jurisdiction pursuant to Const 1963, art 3, § 8 and MCR 7.303(B)(3).

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. Should this Court exercise its discretion to grant the Michigan Legislature's request to issue an advisory opinion in this matter?

The Coalition's answer: Yes

II. Does Article 2, Section 9 of the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963 permit the Legislature to enact an initiative petition into law and then subsequently amend that law during the same legislative session?

The Coalition's answer: Yes

III. Were Public Act 368 of 2018 and Public Act 369 of 2018 enacted in accordance with Article 2, Section 9 of the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963?

The Coalition's answer: Yes

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

INTRODUCTION

In adopting the Michigan Constitution, the People authorized the Legislature to enact and amend laws. Whether a law begins as an initiative or a "blueback" does not alter its character in a manner that would diminish the Legislature's constitutional authority to amend that law. The ballot initiative's proponents[2] seem to proffer a new theory that laws the Legislature enacts through the initiative process possess a heretofore unrecognized exemption from the Legislature's constitutional authority. This position is without merit, support, or precedent and must be rejected.

The question is well settled by precedential decisions, the record of the Constitutional Convention, and Article 2, Section 9's plain language. The issue is, therefore, not one this Court would ordinarily review. However, due to the confusion attempted by opponents seeking to undermine the legislative process and the Legislature's adoption of 2018 PA 368 and 2018 PA 369 (the "Amended Acts"), the Small Business for a Better Michigan Coalition (the "Coalition") supports the Legislature's request that this Court grant the Legislature's advisory opinion request, consider the question, affirm that the Michigan Constitution allows the Legislature to amend an initiated law at the same session in which it was adopted, and affirm that the Legislature properly enacted the Amended Acts in accordance with Const 1963, art 2, § 9.[3]

Public Acts 337 and 338 of 2018 (the "Original Acts") were initiated by petition and enacted by the Legislature pursuant to Article 2, Section 9 of the Michigan Constitution. Those laws address the minimum wage (2018 PA 337) and mandatory paid sick leave (2018 PA 338).

---

[2] "Proponents" refers collectively to those parties and positions in the March 2, 2019 brief of Michigan One Fair Wage, *et al.*

[3] The Michigan Constitution authorizes "[e]ither house of the legislature or the governor" to "request the opinion of the supreme court on important questions of law upon solemn occasions as to the constitutionality of legislation after it has been enacted into law but before its effective date." Const 1963, art 3, § 8.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

The Amended Acts amend the same laws, with 2018 PA 368 amending the minimum wage law and 2018 PA 369 amending the paid sick leave law. The Amended Acts became effective on March 29, 2019, ninety-one days after adjournment of the 2018 regular legislative session. Const 1963, art 4, § 27; *Frey v Dep't of Mgt & Budget*, 429 Mich 315, 318; 414 NW2d 873 (1987).

Because the Legislature may enact a law posed by initiative and amend it during the same legislative session, the Amended Acts were constitutionally enacted and the Legislature's amendments to the minimum wage and paid leave laws replace the Original Acts, whose genesis was an initiative petition. Based on this Court's precedents and other legal authority, Attorney General Schuette correctly opined that the Legislature acted within its power when it amended the initiated laws during the same legislative session they were enacted. As the Attorney General recognized, the Michigan Constitution acts not as a grant of power to the Legislature, but rather as a limitation on its inherent authority. *Taxpayers of Mich Against Casinos v Michigan*, 471 Mich 306, 327; 685 NW2d 221 (2004).[4] If the Constitution does not limit or prohibit an action by the Legislature, then the Legislature has plenary power to exercise its authority. Here, Article 2, Section 9 of the Constitution does not prohibit the Legislature from amending an initiated law that it enacted during the same session, so the Legislature has plenary power to do so.

Although Attorney General Bill Schuette affirmed the legality of the amendments' enactment in December 2018 (see OAG, 2017-2018, No. 7306 (December 3, 2018)), a new request for a formal opinion was submitted to Attorney General Dana Nessel on February 13, 2019, asking the new Attorney General to issue a directly contrary opinion on the identical question answered

[4] But the initiative proponents incorrectly claim otherwise. " …--the branches of Michigan government only have such powers as the people expressly grant them in the State Constitution." March 22, 2019 brief of Michigan One Fair Wage, *et al*, p 5.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

two months prior. The request to Attorney General Nessel claimed that Opinion No. 7306 "poses serious threats to the constitutional power of initiative reserved to the people". Chang, Letter Requesting Formal Opinion from A.G. Nessel (Feb. 13, 2019). However, subsequent to this Court's April 3, 2019 Order establishing briefing and argument, Attorney General Nessel denied the request.[5]

Thus, an advisory opinion from this Court is needed to: (1) bring certainty to employers and employees seeking to enter into and continue existing employer–employee relationships confirming that the Legislature's properly enacted amendments govern; and (2) to confirm that the Legislature may enact and subsequently amend an initiated law during the same legislative session, consistent with the Michigan Constitution.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

I. The Coalition Members

The Coalition is comprised of Michigan Manufacturers Association, Michigan Restaurant and Lodging Association, National Federation of Independent Businesses, Small Business Association of Michigan, Michigan Chamber of Commerce, Associated Builders and Contractors, Grand Rapids Area Chamber, Homebuilders Association of Michigan, Lansing Regional Chamber of Commerce, Mackinac Center for Public Policy, Michigan Farm Bureau, Michigan Retailers Association, West Michigan Policy Forum and the Michigan Freedom Fund.

The Michigan Manufacturers Association: The MMA is the state's leading advocate solely dedicated to the interests of Michigan manufacturers consisting of almost 1,700 members from small manufacturers to the world's largest and most well-known corporations. Michigan manufacturers employ 631,500 people and produce $93.5 billion in total manufacturing output.

[5] Attorney General press release, April 25, 2019, "Chang Opinion Request Declined."

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

The MMA, and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The MMA also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Michigan Restaurant and Lodging Association: The Michigan Restaurant and Lodging Association is the leader in Michigan's Hospitality Industry representing hundreds of restaurants and lodging facilities employing nearly 600,000 and generating $40 billion in statewide revenue. The Michigan Restaurant and Lodging Association and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The Association also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

NFIB Michigan—National Federation of Independent Businesses: The NFIB is the leading small business advocate in Michigan and is also a national organization with representation in all 50 state capitols on behalf of hundreds of thousands of small and independently owned businesses. NFIB and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. NFIB also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Small Business Association of Michigan (SBAM): SBAM is the Premier Organization for Michigan's small business owners with over 26,000 diverse members from every industry, spread across all 83 of Michigan's counties. SBAM and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. SBAM also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

Michigan Chamber of Commerce: The Michigan Chamber is the leading voice of business in Michigan. The Chamber advocates for job providers in the legislative and legal forums and represents approximately 6,000 employers, trade associations, and local chambers of commerce of all sizes and types in every county of the state. The Chamber's member firms employ over 1 million Michiganders. The Chamber and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The Chamber also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Associated Builders and Contractors of Michigan: ABC is a statewide trade association representing commercial and industrial construction entities. The ABC members develop people, and its employer members work safely, ethically, profitably and for the betterment of the communities in which ABC and its members work. ABC and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. ABC also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Grand Rapids Area Chamber: The Grand Rapids Chamber promotes West Michigan businesses to create a dynamic, thriving, and prosperous West Michigan for all. The Grand Rapids Area Chamber and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The Chamber also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Home Builders Association of Michigan: The Home Builders Association of Michigan is the largest association representing construction in the state. Its members develop and build single family and multifamily homes throughout Michigan. One of its primary goals is to provide

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

the opportunity for all Michigan residents to own or rent affordable housing. To promote this goal and others, the Association seeks to oppose laws and court decisions which delay, restrict or otherwise impede the ability of the Association's members to construct affordable housing in Michigan.

Michigan Retailers Association: The Michigan Retailers Association is the voice of Michigan's retail industry which provides more than 870,000 jobs to Michigan workers through its 5,000 businesses and over 15,000 stores and websites. The Retailers Association and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The Retailers Association also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Lansing Regional Chamber of Commerce: The Lansing Chamber serves as the voice of Lansing businesses on issues and policies that impact the business community and economic climate of the Greater Lansing region. The Lansing Chamber and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The Chamber also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Mackinac Center for Public Policy: The Mackinac Center is a nonprofit institute that advances the principles of free markets and government. The Mackinac Center challenges government overreach and advocates for free-market approaches to public policy. The Mackinac Center has a direct interest in this matter because the case deals with employer-employee relations, will impact public policy and involves the constitutionality of the legislative process.

Michigan Farm Bureau: The Michigan Farm Bureau, established in 1919, is the voice of agriculture in Michigan representing over 42,000 farm families. It provides every Farm Bureau

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

member the opportunity to participate regarding issues pertinent to the agricultural industry. The Farm Bureau and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The Farm Bureau also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

West Michigan Policy Forum: The West Michigan Policy Forum advocates throughout Michigan for pro-business policy reform, works with various partners to build a strong Michigan job base through other chambers of commerce, business leader groups, organizations and associations. The West Michigan Policy Forum and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member employers will be required to operate. The Forum also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

Michigan Freedom Fund: The Michigan Freedom Fund is a nonprofit Michigan organization that advocates for free markets, a competitive business environment and individual rights. It also seeks to protect the rights of families and job providers. The Freedom Fund and its members have a direct interest in this matter since the court's decision will impact the terms and conditions under which its member job providers will be required to operate. The Freedom Fund also has an interest in maintaining the integrity of the legislative process.

II. Procedural History Of The Acts

The Coalition incorporates the Statement of Facts the Michigan Legislature presented in its Brief in Support of its Request for an Advisory Opinion on the Constitutionality of 2018 PA 368 and 2018 PA 369 (filed in Case Nos. 159160 and 159201 for the House and Senate, respectively, on March 5, 2019) herein by reference.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

ARGUMENT

I. The Court Should Grant The Michigan Legislature's Request To Issue An Advisory Opinion.

Article 3, Section 8 of the Michigan Constitution provides that "[e]ither house of the legislature or the governor may request the opinion of the supreme court on important questions of law upon solemn occasions as to the constitutionality of legislation after it has been enacted into law but before its effective date." This Court may or may not issue such an advisory opinion, in its discretion. *Id.*; MCR 7.303(B)(3). Here, the Court should issue an advisory opinion for the benefit of all employers and employees in Michigan to dispel any uncertainty sown by the proponents of the initiatives as to which minimum wage and paid leave provisions are operative.[6]

Although the legal resolution of the issue is clearly dictated by the Constitution's plain language and other authorities, the issue has more far reaching implications than the legal analysis would indicate. For example, serious questions have been raised by some legislators regarding legislative authority—even though these questions lack merit. See, e.g., Statements of Sens. Colbeck, Hertel, and Ananich, Senate Journal No. 64, pp 1640-42.

The Coalition is also uniquely impacted by the Legislature's request for an advisory opinion because the laws at issue are wage and benefit laws that directly impact businesses as employers. As Justice Markman noted in the context of a request for an advisory opinion on the constitutionality of Michigan's right-to-work laws, "proponents and opponents agree [that such employment laws] . . . have a substantial effect upon both employees and employers, public and private, and upon the economy, throughout this state . . . ." *In re Request for Advisory Opinion Regarding Constitutionality of 2012 PA 348 & 2012 PA 349*, 493 Mich 1016, 1017; 829 NW2d

[6] The initiative proponents also support consideration of the issue by this Court. March 2, 2019 brief of Michigan One Fair Wage, *et al*, p 3.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

872 (2013) (MARKMAN, J., dissenting) (calling for the Court to "grant without further delay the Governor's request . . . for an advisory opinion," rather than additional consideration of and briefing on the request). Here, as there, the issuance of an advisory opinion would:

> [C]onstitute a reasonable exercise of the constitutional authority of this Court; . . . affirm this Court's role as the ultimate arbiter of Michigan law; . . . facilitate [] orderly implementation [of the laws]; . . . minimize the possibility of protracted litigation concerning the validity of the [] laws; and . . . demonstrate comity by this Court with a coordinate branch of state government.

Id. The Court should exercise its discretion to issue an advisory opinion on this "important question of law" on this "solemn occasion." Const 1963, art 3, § 8.

II. Article 2, Section 9 Of The Michigan Constitution Permits The Legislature To Enact An Initiative Petition And Subsequently Amend That Law During The Same Legislative Session.

The Coalition agrees with Attorney General Schuette's December 2018 opinion, which concludes that Article 2, Section 9 of the Michigan Constitution permits the Legislature to enact a law proposed by the people through the initiative process and subsequently amend that law during the same session. See OAG, 2017-2018, No. 7306 (December 3, 2018).

A. Article 2, Section 9 must be interpreted according to its plain language.

To interpret a provision of the Michigan Constitution, the Court determines the provision's original meaning as understood by the people who ratified it. E.g., *Mich United Conservation Clubs v Sec'y of State*, 464 Mich 359, 373; 630 NW2d 297 (2001) (CORRIGAN, C.J., concurring) ("Our primary goal in construing a constitutional provision—in marked contrast to a statute or other texts—is to give effect to the intent of the people of the state of Michigan who ratified the constitution, by applying the rule of 'common understanding.'"); *People v Bulger*, 462 Mich 495, 507; 614 NW2d 103 (2000) ("In construing our constitution, this Court's object is to give effect to the intent of the people adopting it. Hence, the primary source for ascertaining its meaning is to

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

examine its plain meaning as understood by its ratifiers at the time of its adoption." (quotation marks and citation omitted)). This Court undertakes to find the "common understanding" of a constitutional provision, which "is essentially a search for the original meaning attributed to the words of the constitution by those who ratified it." *Mich United Conservation Clubs*, 464 Mich at 374 (CORRIGAN, C.J., concurring). While "[t]his rule of construction acknowledges the possibility that a provision of the constitution may rationally bear multiple meanings, [it] is concerned with ascertaining and giving effect only to the construction, consistent with the language, that the ratifiers intended." *Id.* at 374-75. The interpretational exercise is to objectively examine the ratifiers' common understanding, "not to impose on the constitutional text . . . the meaning we as judges would prefer, or even the meaning the people of Michigan today would prefer, but to search for contextual clues about what meaning the people who ratified the text in 1963 gave to it." *Id.* at 375. Therefore, the analysis begins with "an examination of the precise language used in art 2, § 9 of our 1963 Constitution." *Id.*; see also *Frey v Dep't of Mgt & Budget*, 429 Mich 315, 335; 414 NW2d 873 (1987) ("This interpretation is also in accordance with the 'common understanding rule' [by which we] are limited to the language of the constitution when interpreting its provisions.").

B. Article 2, Section 9 does not place any limitations on the authority of the Legislature to amend an initiated law enacted by the Legislature.

Article 2, Section 9's plain language provides the following procedures: (1) a law may be proposed to the Legislature for enactment by gathering a certain number of signatures on a petition; (2) once the initiated law is submitted, the Legislature must either enact or reject it "without change or amendment within 40 session days . . . ."; (3) if the Legislature enacts the proposed law, it is subject to referendum, like any other law enacted by the Legislature; (4) if the proposed law is not enacted, the law is submitted to the people on the ballot for a vote during the next general election;

and (5) if a law initiated by the people is either enacted by the Legislature or adopted by the people, then it is not subject to the governor's veto power. Const 1963, art 2, § 9. The plain language of article 2, section 9 does not place any limits on whether or when the Legislature may amend a law that was proposed by the people and enacted by the Legislature. *Id.*[7]

This interpretation is consistent with the understanding of the constitution's drafters:

> MR. WAGNER: Yes. A brief question for Mr. Kuhn, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Kuhn, isn't there another difference between initiative and referendum, namely: that referendum cannot result in having a statute on the books which it takes a popular vote to repeal? Whereas, the initiative, if the initiated statute is adopted, means that the people, in order to make any change in that statute, have to vote; and the legislature cannot vote to change it.
>
> MR. KUHN: Well, not exactly. I'll try to explain this a little bit, Mr. Wanger. **If the legislature sees fit to adopt the petition of the initiative as being sent out, if the legislature in their wisdom feel it looks like it is going to be good, and they adopt it in toto, then they have full control. They can amend it and do anything they see fit.** But if they do not, and you start an initiative petition and it goes through and is adopted by the people without the legislature doing it, then they are precluded from disturbing it.

2 Official Record, Constitutional Convention 1961, p 2395. (emphasis added).[8]

As noted, the Michigan Constitution is a limitation on the Legislature's plenary authority and Legislature has power to perform any act not prohibited by the Michigan or U.S. Constitutions. *Taxpayers of Mich Against Casinos v Michigan*, 471 Mich 306, 327; 685 NW2d 221 (2004) (citing *Attorney Gen ex rel O'Hara v Montgomery*, 275 Mich 504, 538; 267 NW2d 550 (1936)). This Court has explained:

[7] Conversely, the petition proponents would have the provision read to include an additional phrase: "and the legislature may not adopt any amendments until the next session of the legislature." March 2, 2019 brief of Michigan One Fair Wage, *et al*, pp 7-8. But there is no such limitation in the Constitution.

[8] Surprisingly, the initiative proponents cite this same exchange and claim that it supports their position that the legislature's ability to amend is somehow limited. Michigan One Fair Wage, *et al*, March 2, 2019 brief, p 10.

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

Unlike the federal constitution, our Constitution is not a grant of power to the legislature but is a limitation upon its powers. Therefore, the legislative authority of the state can do anything which it is not prohibited from doing by the people through the Constitution of the State or the United States. This has been discussed by this Court in the past by analogizing our Legislature to the English Parliament. See *Young v City of Ann Arbor*, 267 Mich. 241, 243; 255 NW 579 (1934), in which this Court stated:

> A different rule of construction applies to the Constitution of the United States than to the Constitution of a State. The Federal government is one of delegated powers, and all powers not delegated are reserved to the States or to the people. When the validity of an act of congress is challenged as unconstitutional, it is necessary to determine whether the power to enact it has been expressly or impliedly delegated to congress. The legislative power, under the Constitution of the State, is as broad, comprehensive, absolute and unlimited as that of the parliament of England, subject only to the Constitution of the United States and the restraints and limitations imposed by the people upon such power by the Constitution of the State itself.

Taxpayers of Mich, 471 Mich 306, 327-328; 685 NW2d 221 (2004).[9] Because the Michigan Constitution establishes negative *limits* on legislative power (by restraining or taking away certain authority), rather than delegating only explicitly granted powers, the Legislature may do all that it is not prohibited from doing. In the context of Article 2, section 9, then, the Legislature may amend—by simple majority vote and within the same session—an initiated law that it enacted within 40 session days after receiving a certified initiative proposal because the Michigan Constitution does not prohibit such amendments.

1. Article 2, Section 9 does not require a popular vote or approval of three-fourths of each legislative house to amend an initiated law enacted by the Legislature.

[9] Again, the petition proponents seem to argue that the legislature may only do that which is specifically allowed by the Constitution—at least with regard to Article 2, Section 9. *Id*. at pp 5-6.

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

In contrast to the Legislature's unlimited ability to amend an initiated law that it adopted and enacted (which will be explored more fully in the next section), if the Legislature rejects an initiated law that is subsequently enacted by the people at the polls, then that law may not be repealed or amended unless: (a) the electors vote to repeal or amend the law; or (b) three-fourths of the members of each house of the Legislature vote to repeal or amend it. Const 1963, art 2, § 9. The popular vote or legislative supermajority requirement applies only to "law[s] adopted by the people at the polls under the initiative provisions of [Article 2, Section 9]," however. The requirement does not apply to initiated laws proposed by the people and *enacted by the Legislature* within 40 session days. *Id.*; see also OAG, 2017-2018, No. 7306 ("Here, however, the Legislature enacted the initiated laws and the three-fourths vote requirement does not apply."). It is uncontested that the Legislature may amend an initiated law that it enacted with a simple majority vote. OAG, 2017-2018, No. 7306 (Attorney General Bill Schuette) ("[T]he Legislature may amend the initiated laws it enacted by a majority vote of the members elected to and serving in each house of the Legislature."); OAG, 1975-1976, No. 4932, p 240 (Attorney General Frank J. Kelley) (January 15, 1976) ("If a measure proposed by initiative petition is enacted by the legislature within 40 session days without change or amendment, the legislature can amend or repeal such a measure by majority votes in each house . . . ."). ("The courts have reasoned that the legislative power retained by the people, through the initiative and referendum, does not give any more force or effect to voter-approved legislation than to legislative acts not so approved. Voter-approved acts are 'on an equal footing' (footnote omitted) with legislation that has not been submitted to the people." *Advisory Opinion on Constitutionality of 1982 PA 47*, 418 Mich 49, 66; 340 NW2d 817 (1983)). Attorney General Frank Kelley indicated in his 1976 opinion on this matter, "had the drafters of the Constitution intended . . . [to] require extraordinary majorities in

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

each house, explicit language to that effect would have been utilized." *Id.* Kelley "interpret[ed] the absence of such language as signifying intent that such laws be adopted by [simple] majorities . . . ." *Id.*

The same rule of interpretation applies to Article 2, Section 9 as to whether the Legislature may amend an initiated law enacted by the Legislature during the same legislative session: If the drafters and ratifiers of the Constitution had intended to require the Legislature to amend such legislation only in subsequent sessions, explicit language to that effect would have been included. As noted above, this Court's primary goal in interpreting the Michigan Constitution is to "give effect to the intent of the people of the state of Michigan who ratified the constitution, by applying the rule of 'common understanding,'" which requires an examination of the precise language used and, correspondingly, an examination of the language *not* used. *Mich United Conservation Clubs v Sec'y of State*, 464 Mich 359 at 373 (CORRIGAN, C.J., concurring).

2. Article 2, Section 9 does not limit when the Legislature may amend an initiated law enacted by the Legislature.

Article 2, Section 9 does not limit when the Legislature may amend initiated laws that it enacts, but it does limit when the Legislature may amend "[l]aws approved by the people under the referendum provision." Const 1963, art 2, § 9. Laws approved by referendum "may be amended by the legislature *at any subsequent session thereof*." *Id.* (emphasis added). A law approved by referendum has been approved twice: once by the Legislature when enacted and once by the people at the polls when presented for potential rejection. *Id.* The Constitution protects such twice-approved laws by providing for amendment only in subsequent legislative sessions. *Id.* That protection does not extend to laws initiated by the people and enacted by the Legislature, however, because similar explicit language limiting when the Legislature may amend such laws

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

does not appear in Article 2, Section 9.[10] Kelley's rule of interpretation—that the explicit language used by the drafters of the Constitution, as well as the absence of certain language, signifies their intent (OAG, 1975-1976, No. 4932, at 240)—applies in this situation: Here, the provision clearly states that laws approved after a referendum may only be amended at a subsequent legislative session, but the same is not said of initiated laws enacted by the Legislature. Thus, the intent behind the absence of a similar limitation is clear: Because Article 2, Section 9 does not explicitly state that the Legislature must wait until a subsequent legislative session to amend an initiated law that it enacted, the limitation does not exist. Therefore, the Legislature may amend such a law during the same session.

Although Attorney General Frank Kelley once offered a different opinion, finding that an "initiative petition enacted into law by the legislature in response to initiative petitions [is] subject to amendment by the legislature at a subsequent legislative session," and that "the legislature enacting an initiative petition proposal cannot amend the law so enacted at the same legislative session without violation of the spirit and letter of Article II, Sec. 9 of the Michigan Constitution of 1963," that opinion did not identify any supporting precedent or constitutional provision and did not meaningfully analyze the issue or provide rationale in support of the conclusion. OAG, 1963-1964, No. 4303, p 309, at 311 (March 6, 1964). As discussed above, Article 2, Section 9 does not limit the Legislature to amendments only during a subsequent legislative session, although such a limitation is explicitly provided for laws approved by the people through the referendum process.

---

[10] The initiative proponent's citation to *Michigan Farm Bureau v Secretary of State,* 379 Mich 387; 151 NW2d 797 (1967) to support their contention that the legislature may not adopt and amend at the same session is invalid as it dealt directly with the constitutional clause regarding referendum—language different from that at issue and inapplicable to the initiative. *Supra*, 13-14.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

Looking to Attorney General Kelley's opinion on whether a simple or supermajority is needed to amend initiated laws enacted by the Legislature, a different rule emerges: For a limitation to apply to the Legislature's authority to amend a law, the limitation must be explicitly stated in the Constitution rather than implied from its spirit, particularly where a similar limitation is expressed elsewhere but absent from the relevant provision. Compare OAG, 1963-1964, No. 4303, p 309, at 311 with OAG, 1975-1976, No. 4932, p 240. Because the appropriate method for interpreting the Michigan Constitution is to objectively examine the ratifiers' common understanding of the language used, "not to impose on the constitutional text . . . the meaning we as judges would prefer, or even the meaning the people of Michigan today would prefer," *Mich United Conservation Clubs v Sec'y of State*, 464 Mich at 375 (CORRIGAN, C.J., concurring), the fact that Article 2, Section 9 does not limit the Legislature to amending a legislatively enacted initiated law only during a *subsequent* legislative session conclusively demonstrates that the Legislature may so amend during *any* legislative session. For these reasons, Kelley's 1964 opinion (which lacked citation to any authority) is not persuasive. See also OAG, 2017-2018, No. 7306 (stating that the "language of the Constitution and subsequent decisions by the Michigan courts . . . cast doubt on the validity of [Kelley's] conclusion").

C. Laws initiated by petition and enacted by the Legislature have the same stature as laws enacted solely through the legislative process and, therefore, may also be amended during the same legislative session.

As examined above, the Constitution does not prohibit the Legislature from amending any act, including one proposed by initiative petition, at the same session at which it was adopted. This conclusion is supported by this Court's previous holding that all duly enacted laws, whether initiated by petition, enacted by the Legislature, or adopted at a general election, have the same stature, unless the Constitution provides otherwise; that is, no special protection is afforded to laws

initiated or enacted by the people.[11] *In re Proposals D & H*, 417 Mich 409, 421-422; 339 NW2d 848 (1983). In *In re Proposals D & H*, this Court rejected the contention that a law enacted by the people through an initiative petition and ballot vote is on a "higher plane" than a law enacted by the Legislature subject to the people's approval by referendum. *Id.* (finding that the Constitution does not "afford[] a 'higher plane' to measures adopted under the initiative provisions of art 2, § 9"). The Court based its holding in part on the "principle that all constitutional provisions enjoy equal dignity." *Id.* at 421 (citing *People v Blachura*, 390 Mich 326, 333; 212 NW2d 182 (1973)). The Court found that an initiated law enacted under Article 2, Section 9 was on equal footing with a law enacted by the Legislature and conditioned on voter approval under Article 3, Section 34.

Here, the same can be said of the Original Acts—initiated laws that the Legislature enacted under Article 2, Section 9—and any other law that is introduced as a bill and enacted by the Legislature under Article 4 of the Michigan Constitution: Such initiated laws are on equal footing with laws that originated as bills in the Legislature. Because no special protections are afforded to initiated laws unless explicitly stated in the Constitution, they are on equal footing such that the Legislature can amend laws initiated by the people under Article 2, Section 9 just like laws introduced by legislators. See, e.g., *Detroit United R v Barnes Paper Co*, 172 Mich 586, 588-89; 138 NW 211 (1912) (holding that when the Legislature enacts two conflicting laws during the same session, "the section stand[s] as last amended"); see also 2018 SB 1162 and 2018 SB 1094, which both amended MCL 437.1517a and were both enacted during December 2018.

[11] The two exceptions explicitly provided for in Article 2, Section 9 are: (1) the popular vote or three-fourths legislative majority requirement to amend or repeal an initiated law enacted by the people at the polls; and (2) the subsequent legislative session requirement to amend a law approved after a referendum vote by the people at the polls.

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

This is consistent with rulings in other states with an initiative and referendum process finding that a law posed by initiative has no higher standing than one originating in the legislature and may be treated the same regarding amendment and adoption. ("Statutes proposed and enacted by the people are subject to the same constitutional limitations as legislative statutes, and after their adoption they exist at the will of the legislature just as do other laws." *Peppers v Beier*, 75 Ohio App3d 420, 425; 599 NE2d 793 (1991); "It is contended, however, that the legislature has no power or authority to amend or repeal an initiative act, for the alleged reason that an initiative act comes directly from the people. That may very well be answered by the fact, that the legislators, who convene on the first Monday of January, following adoption of initiative measures, also come direct from the people, having been elected at the same time and by the same electors who adopted the initiative measure." *Luker v Curtis*, 64 Idaho 703, 706-707; 136 P2d 978 (1943)).

Other Michigan cases consistently have recognized that an initiated law is subject to the same constitutional requirements as a legislatively introduced bill. For example, in *Frey v Department of Management & Budget*, 429 Mich 315, 335 (1987), this Court held that, despite language in the initiative petition stating that the law would take immediate effect, the law could not take immediate effect without approval of two-thirds of each legislative house, as required by Article 4, Section 27 of the Michigan Constitution. This is because all procedural provisions of Article 4 of the Constitution, which establish constitutional limits on "the legislative power of the State of Michigan . . . vested in a senate and a house of representatives" (Const 1963, art 4, § 1), "apply to the Legislature when it votes to enact an initiated law" under Article 2, Section 9. *Id.* at 337. Similarly, in *Leininger v Secretary of State*, 316 Mich 644, 648-649 (1947), this Court held that the title–object clause, currently found in Article 4, Section 24, applies equally to initiated

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933

laws and laws introduced by the Legislature.[12] These cases make clear that the constitutional limitations of Article 4 apply to initiated laws as well as to laws introduced and enacted by the Legislature, and that laws enacted through different constitutional processes "enjoy equal dignity." *In re Proposals D & H*, 417 Mich at 421. Because it is also the case that no part of Article 2, Section 9 or Article 4 prohibits the Legislature from amending a legislatively introduced law during the session that it was enacted, initiated laws may also be amended during the same session.

III. The Legislature Enacted The Amended Acts In Accordance With Article 2, Section 9 Of The Michigan Constitution And Must Be Presumed To Be Constitutional.

The Legislature enacted the Improved Workforce Opportunity Wage Act (2018 PA 337) and Earned Sick Time Act (2018 PA 338) without change and within 40 session days of receipt of the certified initiative petition, as provided by Article 2, Section 9. Then, during the same session, the Legislature enacted Public Acts 368 and 369 of 2018 by majority votes, which amended the initiated minimum wage and medical leave acts, respectively. Public Acts 368 and 369 were enacted in accordance with Article 2, Section 9 of the Michigan Constitution because that section does not prohibit amendment of an initiated law enacted by the Legislature during the same session.

As this Court well knows, laws enacted by the Legislature are presumed to be constitutional unless clearly demonstrated to be unconstitutional:

> [T]his Court is obligated to uphold all laws that do not infringe the state or federal Constitutions and invalidate only those laws that do so infringe. We do not render judgments on the wisdom, fairness, or prudence of legislative enactments. See *Mayor of Lansing v Mich. PSC*, 470 Mich. 154, 161; 680 N.W.2d 840 (2004). Legislation is presumed to be constitutional absent a clear showing to the contrary. *Caterpillar, Inc v Dep't of Treasury*, 440 Mich 400, 413; 488 NW2d 182 (1992).

[12] The title–object clause states, "No law shall embrace more than one object, which shall be expressed in its title." Const 1963, art 4, §24.

RECEIVED by MSC 5/15/2019 3:37:23 PM

AFT Mich v State, 497 Mich 197, 214; 866 NW2d 782 (2015); see also *People v Collins*, 3 Mich 343, 348-349 (1854) ("It is never to be forgotten that the presumption is always in favor of the validity of the law, and it is only when manifest assumption of authority and clear incompatibility between the constitution and the law appears, that the judicial power can refuse to execute it."). Because the plain language of Article 2, Section 9 of the Michigan Constitution does not prohibit enacting and amending an initiated law during the same session, no precedent supports the conclusion that the Amended Acts are unconstitutional and, thus, the Amended Acts must be presumed constitutional.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Coalition supports the Michigan Legislature's requests for an advisory opinion from this Court and respectfully requests that this Court issue an advisory opinion holding that Article 2, Section 9 does not prohibit the Legislature from enacting an initiated law and subsequently amending it during the same legislative session and that 2018 PA 368 and 2018 PA 369 were enacted in accordance with Article 2, Section 9.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

Dated: May 15, 2019

/s/ Gary P. Gordon

Gary P. Gordon (P26290
Jason T. Hanselman (P61813)
Counsel for the Coalition
201 Townsend Street, Suite 900
Lansing, Michigan 48933
Telephone: (517) 374-9100
Fax: (517) 374-9191
GGordon@dykema.com

118192.000001 4810-8963-8295.2

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC • Capitol View, 201 Townsend Street, Suite 900, Lansing, MI 48933