

IN THE SUPREME COURT  
STATE OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.: SC 03-857

---

---

ADVISORY OPINION TO THE ATTORNEY GENERAL RE: AUTHORIZES MIAMI-DADE AND  
BROWARD COUNTY VOTERS TO APPROVE SLOT MACHINES IN PARIMUTUEL FACILITIES

---

---

ANSWER BRIEF OF OPPONENTS AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO  
ANIMALS, GREY2K USA, THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, AND NO CASINOS, INC.

---

---

Mark Herron, Esquire  
Florida Bar No.: 0199737  
Thomas M. Findley, Esquire  
Florida Bar No.: 0797855  
Messer, Caparello & Self, P.A.

Post Office Box 1876  
Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876  
Telephone: (850) 222-0720  
Facsimile: (850) 224-4539

Attorneys for Opponents

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|  | <b><u>PAGE NO.</u></b> |
|--|------------------------|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS .....  | i                      |
| TABLE OF CITATIONS .....   | ii                     |
| SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT .....  | 1                      |
| ARGUMENT .....   | 2                      |
| I.    THE SLOT MACHINE INITIATIVE FAILS TO SATISFY THE SINGLE-SUBJECT<br>REQUIREMENT. ....   | 2                      |
| II.   THE BALLOT TITLE AND SUMMARY OF THE SLOT MACHINE AMENDMENT FAIL TO<br>FAIRLY AND UNAMBIGUOUSLY DISCLOSE THE CHIEF PURPOSE OF THE |                        |

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| AMENDMENT .....                 | 3 |
| CONCLUSION .....                | 5 |
| CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE ..... | 5 |
| CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE .....    | 6 |

**TABLE OF CITATIONS**

| <b><u>Cases</u></b>   | <b><u>Page No.</u></b> |
|---|------------------------|
| <i>Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Amendment to Bar Government from Treating People Differently Based on Race in Public Education,</i><br>778 So.2d 888 (Fla. 2000) . . . . .                         | 2,3                    |
| <i>Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re People’s Property Rights Amendments Providing Compensation for Restricting Real Property Use May Cover Multiple Subjects,</i> 699 So.2d 1304 (Fla. 1997) . . . . . | 3                      |
| <i>Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Tax Limitation,</i><br>644 So.2d 486 (Fla. 1994) . . . . .   | 3                      |
| <i>Lee v. City of Miami,</i> 121 Fla. 93, 163 So. 486 (1935) . . . . .  | 3                      |
| <b><u>Florida Constitution</u></b>  |                        |
| Art. X, § 7, Fla. Const. . . . .  | 1,2                    |
| Art. XI, § 3, Fla. Const. . . . .   | 1                      |
| <b><u>Proposed Legislation</u></b>  |                        |
| Fla. SB 64 (2003) . . . . .   | 3                      |

## **SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

Opponents continue to urge this Court to strike the proposed initiative amendment entitled Authorizes Miami-Dade and Broward County Voters to Approve Slot Machines in Parimutuel Facilities from the ballot.

The proposed amendment violates Article XI, Section 3, Florida Constitution, because it contains two subjects. It authorizes the governing bodies in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties to conduct a referendum in each county on the question of whether to authorize slot machines at existing pari-mutuel facilities and, by doing so, it amends the existing constitutional prohibition on lotteries contained in Article X, Section 7, Florida Constitution.

The ballot summary, as does the amendment, fails to define the term “slot machine.” As a consequence, the summary fails to inform the voters of the scope of the amendment, its true meaning, and its ramifications.

## ARGUMENT

### I. THE SLOT MACHINE INITIATIVE FAILS TO SATISFY THE SINGLE-SUBJECT REQUIREMENT

Inherent in the argument of the proponents of the proposed amendment is the assumption that “slot machines” are a subject not otherwise addressed in the State Constitution. Proponents fail to acknowledge that slot machines are lotteries, otherwise prohibited under Article X, Section 7, Florida Constitution. The proposed amendment seeks to establish a procedure to authorize slot machine lotteries at existing pari-mutuel facilities in Miami-Dade and Broward Counties in derogation of the existing constitutional prohibition on lotteries. By so doing, the proposed amendment addresses two subjects.

The absence of a reference to the existing constitutional provision, which is being amended by the initiative proposal, renders the proposed amendment constitutionally infirm. *Advisory Opinion to Attorney General re Amendment to Bar Government from Treating People Differently Based on Race*, 778 So.2d 888, 894 (Fla. 2000). Accordingly, it should be stricken from the ballot.

## II. THE BALLOT TITLE AND SUMMARY OF THE SLOT MACHINE AMENDMENT FAIL TO FAIRLY AND UNAMBIGUOUSLY DISCLOSE THE CHIEF PURPOSE OF THE AMENDMENT

The term “slot machine” is not defined in the proposed amendment. As a consequence, the voter is not informed of the scope of the amendment, its true meaning, and its ramifications. *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re Tax Limitation*, 644 So.2d 486, 490 (Fla. 1994).

In *Advisory Opinion to the Attorney General re People’s Property Rights*, 699 So.2d 1304 (Fla. 1997), this Court “held that the ballot summary was defective because, among other things, it failed to define the term ‘common law nuisance,’ leaving voters unaware of what restrictions would be compensable under the proposed amendment.” *Advisory Opinion to Attorney General re Amendment to Bar Government from Treating People Differently Based on Race, supra* at 898.

In the same way, the ballot summary fails to define the term “slot machines,” as does the text of the proposed amendment. Voters are not informed whether they are being asked to approve “Pin-Games, Marble Tables, and similar

devices of this type” as approved in *Lee v. City of Miami*, 121 Fla. 93, 163 So. 486 (1935) or video lottery type games as defined in SB 64 (2003 Regular Session). Without this type of information, the ballot title and summary are not “clear and unambiguous” as asserted by proponents of the amendment.

Accordingly, the amendment should be stricken from the ballot.



## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein, the proposed amendment entitled Authorizes Miami-Dade and Broward County Voters to Approve Slot Machines in Parimutuel Facilities should be stricken from the ballot.

Respectfully submitted on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of August 2003 by:

---

MARK HERRON

Florida Bar No.: 0199737

THOMAS M. FINDLEY

Florida Bar No.: 0797855

Messer, Caparello & Self. P.A.

Post Office Box 1876

Tallahassee, FL 32302-1876

Telephone: (850) 222-0720

Facsimile: (850) 224-4539

Attorneys for Opponents

## **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

I hereby certify that this Initial Brief has been prepared in Times New Roman 14 point-font in compliance with Rules 9.210(a)(2) and 9.100(1), Florida Rules of Appellate Procedure.

---

Mark Herron

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of this Answer Brief has been forwarded by U.S. Mail to the following on this 25<sup>th</sup> day of August 2003:

1. The Honorable Charles J. Crist  
Attorney General  
PL 01, The Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250
  
2. Stephen H. Grimes, Esquire  
Susan L. Kelsey, Esquire  
Holland & Knight, LLP  
Post Office Box 810  
Tallahassee, FL 32303-0810
  
3. John M. Hogan, Esquire  
Holland & Knight, LLP  
Post Office Box 015441  
Miami, FL 33101
  
4. Ronald L. Book, Esquire  
Ronald L. Book, P.A.  
2999 NE 191<sup>st</sup> Street, PH 6  
Aventura, FL 33180-3117

---

Mark Herron