**DATE:** April 3, 2001

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT ANALYSIS

BILL #: HJR 825

**RELATING TO:** Constitutional Amendments / Approval

**SPONSOR(S):** Representative Gardiner

TIED BILL(S): None

# ORIGINATING COMMITTEE(S)/COUNCIL(S)/COMMITTEE(S) OF REFERENCE:

- (1) JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT YEAS 6 NAYS 3
- (2) RULES, ETHICS, & ELECTIONS
- (3) SMARTER GOVERNMENT

(4)

(5)

# I. SUMMARY:

This joint resolution amends Art. XI, s.5(c), Fla.Const., to require approval of proposed constitutional amendments by a two-thirds majority vote of the electors, rather than a simple majority vote.

**DATE**: April 3, 2001

PAGE: 2

# II. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS:

# A. DOES THE BILL SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING PRINCIPLES:

1.	Less Government	Yes []	No []	N/A [x]
2.	Lower Taxes	Yes []	No []	N/A [x]
3.	Individual Freedom	Yes []	No []	N/A [x]
4.	Personal Responsibility	Yes []	No []	N/A [x]
5.	Family Empowerment	Yes []	No []	N/A [x]

For any principle that received a "no" above, please explain:

### B. PRESENT SITUATION:

# Amending the Florida Constitution

Article XI of the Florida Constitution provides the following four methods for proposing constitutional amendments:

- **Proposal by legislature** Art.XI, s.1, Fla.Const., provides that an amendment of a section or revision of one or more articles, or the whole, of the constitution may be proposed by joint resolution agreed to by three-fifths of the membership of each house of the legislature.
- Revision commission Art. XI, s.2, Fla.Const., provides that a revision of all or part of the Florida Constitution may be proposed at the conclusion of the meeting of a Constitutional Revision Commission. This commission is required to be established within thirty days before the convening of the 2017 regular session of the legislature, and each twentieth year thereafter, and is to be composed of thirty-seven members.
- Initiative Art.XI, s.3, Fla.Const., reserves the right of the people to propose a revision or amendment of any portion or portions of the constitution by initiative. Section 3 requires that any such revision or amendment, except for those limiting the power of government to raise revenue, shall have one subject matter. The right of initiative may be invoked by filing with the secretary of state a petition signed by eight percent of the electors in half of the state congressional districts and eight percent of the electors statewide in the preceding presidential election.
- **Constitutional convention** Art.XI, s.4, Fla.Const., reserves to the people the power to call a convention to consider a revision of the entire state constitution.

### **Adoption of Constitutional Amendments**

Art.XI, s.5(c), Fla.Const., provides that if the proposed amendment or revision is approved by vote of the electors, it shall be effective as an amendment to or revision of the constitution of the state on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in January following the election, or on such other date as may be specified in the amendment or revision.

### **Amending Other State Constitutions**

The states do not have uniform methods for amending their constitutions. The states have roughly five different methods of making amendments, with several variations upon these basic themes.

**DATE**: April 3, 2001

**PAGE**: 3

There are currently 14 states that use a 2/3 majority in the legislature, 10 that use a 3/5 majority, 8 that use a majority of each house, 8 that use a majority of each house in two successive meetings of the legislature, and 4 that use the voter initiative as the sole means of amending their constitutions.

# • Two-Third Majority

Fourteen states require a 2/3 majority of the legislators in each house to vote for a proposed constitutional amendment, before the amendment can be submitted to the electorate, and a majority of electors voting in an election to ratify. These states are as follows: Alaska, Colorado, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming. Additionally, there are 6 other states that base their amendment process on a 2/3 majority in the legislature and a majority of electors, but differ in various other ways.

- Hawaii requires a 2/3 majority of the legislators in each house, ratified by a majority constituting at least 35 percent of votes cast at a general election or 30 percent of the total number of registered voters at a special election.
- Vermont requires a 2/3 majority of the senate, a simple majority of the house, and a majority of the electorate.
- Delaware requires a 2/3 majority of the legislators of each house, in two successive legislative assemblies, to amend its constitution. Delaware forgoes the requirement of ratification by the electorate.
- California requires a 2/3 majority of each house of the legislature, or a voter initiative, to propose constitutional amendments, and a majority of the electorate to ratify.
- Idaho requires a 2/3 majority of each house of the legislature, and requires the
  proposed amendment to be published 3 times in every newspaper along with
  arguments for and against before the next general election, where a majority of
  electors are required in order to ratify.
- Montana requires a 2/3 majority of either house of the legislature, or an initiative signed by at least 10 percent of the electors, to propose an amendment, and a majority of the electors to ratify.

### • Three-Fifths Majority

Ten states require a 3/5 majority of the legislators in each house to submit proposed amendments to the electors, and a majority of the electors to ratify. These states are Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Maryland, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Illinois, Nebraska, and New Hampshire. Of these, Florida and Illinois allow amendments to be proposed by voter initiative. Illinois, Nebraska, and New Hampshire all share the common characteristic, however, of requiring more than a simple majority of the electorate to ratify amendments.

- Illinois requires a 3/5 majority of the electors voting on the question, or a majority of those voting in the election.
- Nebraska requires a majority of not less than 35 percent of the total number of votes cast in the election.
- New Hampshire requires a 2/3 majority of the electors voting in order to ratify amendments.

### Majority of Each House

Eight states require a majority of the legislators in each house to vote for a proposed amendment, before it is submitted to the electorate, and a majority of the electors to ratify. These states are as follows: Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Arizona, and Rhode Island. Of these states, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, and Arizona provide the additional amendment option of voter initiative.

**DATE**: April 3, 2001

PAGE: 4

# Majority of House in Two Successive Assemblies

Eight states require a majority of the legislators in each house to vote for a proposed constitutional amendment during two separate meetings of the legislature, before the amendment can be submitted to the electorate, which decides whether to adopt the amendment by a majority vote. These states are Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, New York, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Tennessee.

- Pennsylvania requires a 3/4 majority (not merely a majority) in both houses at both legislative assemblies.
- Tennessee requires a plain majority in the first legislative assembly and a 2/3 majority in the second assembly.

### Voter Initiative

Four states allow constitutional amendments to be proposed solely through implementation of the voter initiative. These are Arkansas, Massachusetts, Nevada, and North Dakota. Arkansas and North Dakota provide for ratification of amendments by majority of electors.

- Massachusetts ratifies by majority vote of legislature in two consecutive sessions, finally followed by majority vote of the electors.
- Nevada requires amendments to be ratified by a majority of electors in two successive elections.

# C. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Amends Art.XI, s.5(c), Fla.Const., by adding the requirement that at least two-thirds, rather than a simple majority, of the electors vote on and approve the proposed amendment or revision in order for the amendment or revision to be ratified.

D. SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS:

See Effect of Proposed Changes

### III. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT:

Λ	EISC VI	INIDACT	ON STATE	GOVERNMENT:	
_	CI.N. AI		(		

1. Revenues:

N/A

2. Expenditures:

N/A

- B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:
  - 1. Revenues:

N/A

Expenditures:

N/A

**DATE**: April 3, 2001

**PAGE**: 5

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:

N/A

D. FISCAL COMMENTS:

N/A

### IV. CONSEQUENCES OF ARTICLE VII, SECTION 18 OF THE FLORIDA CONSTITUTION:

A. APPLICABILITY OF THE MANDATES PROVISION:

A mandates analysis is unnecessary to an analysis of a proposed constitutional amendment.

B. REDUCTION OF REVENUE RAISING AUTHORITY:

A mandates analysis is unnecessary to an analysis of a proposed constitutional amendment.

C. REDUCTION OF STATE TAX SHARED WITH COUNTIES AND MUNICIPALITIES:

A mandates analysis is unnecessary to an analysis of a proposed constitutional amendment.

### V. COMMENTS:

# A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

Art. XI, s. 1, Fla.Const., provides that a constitutional amendment may be proposed by joint resolution of the Legislature. Final passage in the House and Senate requires a three-fifths vote in each house; passage in a committee requires a simple majority vote. If the joint resolution is passed in this session, Art. XI, s. 5, Fla.Const., provides that that the proposed amendment would be placed before the electorate at the 2002 general election. Once in the tenth week, and once in the sixth week immediately preceding the week in which the election is held, the proposed amendment or revision, with notice of the date of election at which it will be submitted to the electors, must be published in one newspaper of general circulation in each county in which a newspaper is published. If the proposed amendment or revision is approved by vote of the electors, it will be effective as an amendment to or revision of the constitution of the state on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in January following the election.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:

None

C. OTHER COMMENTS:

None

# VI. AMENDMENTS OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES:

N/A

DATE PAGE	E: April 3, 2001 E: 6	
VII.	SIGNATURES:	
	COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL OVERSIGHT:	
	Prepared by:	Staff Director:
	Dishard Mast	Lucia Overten ID
	Richard Mast	Lynne Overton, JD

STORAGE NAME:

h0825a.jo.doc