

September 6, 2000

## COURT STRIKES DOWN MICHIGAN'S DRUG TESTING OF WELFARE RECIPIENTS

(*Marchwinski v. Howard*)

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan last week struck down as unconstitutional a Michigan law that provides for the drug testing of Michigan welfare recipients. The Washington Legal Foundation (WLF) filed a brief in July with the court, urging it to reject the American Civil Liberties Union's (ACLU) lawsuit that challenges the drug testing program. The State of Michigan is expected to appeal the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

In 1996, Congress enacted the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. This landmark welfare reform legislation abolished the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program and replaced it with the Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) program. Under TANF, the States are authorized to design their own public assistance programs, which may include testing welfare beneficiaries for illegal drugs and imposing consequences for failing such tests.

In *Marchwinski v. Howard*, the ACLU challenged Michigan's drug testing program, claiming that the tests constitute unreasonable searches and seizures in violation of the Fourth Amendment. The purpose of Michigan's program is to identify those recipients who need treatment in order to put them back in the workforce and to prevent child abuse and neglect. Positive test results are *not* used for the purpose of reducing welfare benefits, removing children from the home, or for criminal prosecution.

In its brief, WLF argued that because welfare is not an entitlement, Michigan has a right to place reasonable restrictions or conditions on the receipt of discretionary government benefits, including the waiver of any Fourth Amendment rights that may be implicated by this minimally intrusive program. WLF cited Supreme Court cases where the Court has upheld drug testing for those participating in other voluntary programs, such as students who participate in interscholastic athletics, or those who choose to apply for government jobs that require drug testing.

In her opinion granting the ACLU's motion for a preliminary injunction, District Judge Victoria Roberts ruled that the testing program violated the recipients' Fourth Amendment rights to be free of unreasonable searches and seizures. While the court conceded that testing welfare recipients for drugs is a "laudable and understandable" means to address substance abuse as a barrier to employment, that goal is not a sufficient

"special need" to warrant drug testing. The court interpreted prior case law as authorizing drug testing only if public safety is at stake. For example, the Supreme Court has upheld drug testing of U.S. Customs Agents who are involved in drug interdiction efforts, and high school students who are engaged in school-sponsored sports where the student athlete may injure himself or other students if drug-impaired. On the other hand, the Supreme Court ruled in another case, *Chandler v. Miller*, that the State of Georgia could not require candidates for State office to pass a drug test because public safety was not in jeopardy.

Michigan argued that the drug testing program did raise safety concerns inasmuch as drug testing can help prevent child abuse by welfare recipients. The district court, however, ruled that such concerns were insufficient; otherwise, said the court, the state could test other recipients of public funds or benefits for this reason. The court also indicated that Michigan had alternative means of identifying and screening drug users, such as the use of questionnaires that request welfare applicants to divulge their drug use history.

WLF's brief was filed with the *pro bono* assistance of David G. Leitch and Christopher Bartolomucci of the Washington, D.C. law firm of Hogan and Hartson, LLP.

\* \* \*

For further information, contact Paul D. Kamenar, WLF's Senior Executive Counsel, at 202-588-0302.