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Abstract: The mandate for law-making in Indonesia before the amendment was highly dominated by the President as if the function of the house of representative of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter DPR) was limited to assisting the President in the process of establishing laws. After the amendment, the authority of the legislators changed from the previous format. The President and DPR have the same authority in terms of the law-making, and even the function of the law-making is also given to the Regional Representative Council (hereinafter DPD) as a regional representative in Indonesia. The problem is that in several law-making processes, often the President and the DPR do not include those mandated by the constitution. This article will discuss the following two issues. First, who is the legislator in Indonesia according to the 1945 Constitution after the decision of the Constitutional Court? Second, how is the position of the DPD in the implementation of the legislative function after the Constitutional Court’s decision? The results of this study explained that the legislator in Indonesia based on the 1945 Constitution, after the decision of the Constitutional Court, has been answered by the amendment of 1945 Constitution. The presence of the DPD must be equal to the DPR in terms of the legislative program in Indonesia. Furthermore, the position of the DPD in the implementation of the legislation function after the Constitutional Court’s ruling has also been addressed by the Constitutional Court’s ruling that the presence of the DPD is a balancer of legislation in Indonesia. The President and the DPR should not be the pendulum of legislative formations, but the DPD must get the attention, and the Ministry must equalize the position of DPD and the DPR in work partner meetings.
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Introduction

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945) is the written legal basis for the Indonesian people. Ni’matul Huda stated that the UUD 1945 is considered as the basic norm so that the basic legal formulation in the articles in the body of the 1945 Constitution is the embodiment of the norms in the preamble of the 1945 Constitution and Pancasila.1 This article discusses the following two issues. The first issue is who is the legislators after the decision of the Constitutional Court Number 92 / PUU-X / 2012, concerning Case Testing of Law Number 27 of 2009 concerning the People’s Consultative Assembly (hereinafter MPR), the House of Representative (hereinafter DPR), the Regional Representative Council (hereinafter DPD), and the Regional House of Representative (hereinafter DPRD), which has been amended by Law Number 13 of 2019, concerning the Third Amendment to Law Number 17 of 2014 concerning the DPR, DPD and DPRD. Moreover, after the amendment of the 1945 Constitution, there was a shift regarding who is mandated by the constitution to make the laws. Concerning the amendments, there are four stages carried out by the MPR for the period 1999-2002. In four years, there were four amendments to the 1945 Constitution, as explained by Aminoto2 in his paper as follows.

1. The first amendment was done in 1999, essentially settled the reduction of the power and authority of the President, including the legislation, the government, and as the head of state;
2. The second amendment was in 2000, essentially continued to determine the reduction of the President’s power, especially as the holder of the central and general government;
3. The third amendment was in 2001, stipulated the change of several power relations between certain state organs;
4. And the fourth amendment was in 2002, settled the continuation of the amendment in several power relations between state organs.3

The author hypothesizes that in the 1945 Constitution amendment process, the president’s power was the most undermined. This was in line with the review of this article; there was a fundamental change on the president’s power in the field of legislation. The 1945 Constitution (before the amendment), Article 5 paragraph (1), stated that the President

has the power to make law with the approval of the DPR. When it is compared to the 1945 Constitution (after the amendment), Article 5 paragraph (1), stated that the President has the right to submit a bill to the DPR. Regarding these two articles, there were fundamental differences in the President’s authority in the field of legislation. The president initially had the full power in law-making, but after the amendment, she/he no longer had the full power, only limited to the right to submit a bill.\(^4\)

In line with the 1945 Constitution (before the amendment), Article 20 paragraph (1), stated that every law requires the approval of the DPR. After the amendment, Article 20 paragraph (1) stipulated that the DPR has the power to form a law. According to Dahlan Thaib, the results of the amendment to the 1945 Constitution has put the process of law-making at an extremely different position, from the executive to the legislative power. The chaos at the constitutional level was a starting point for the problems. The change in the paradigm of the legislative function is carried out by strengthening the role of the DPR, which is applied by cutting down the legislation function owned by the government. Supposedly, to create checks and balances, strengthening the position of the DPR in the legislative process must be followed by granting the authority to the President to give some objections and the possibility of vetoing. Article 20 paragraph (5) of the 1945 Constitution forced the President to accept the bill from the DPR. This article aimed to examine who formed the law in Indonesia, because, after the decision of the Constitutional Court (MK), DPD was allowed to participate in discussing the bill; however this matter was not heeded by the DPR.\(^5\)

The second issue is the position of the DPD in the implementation of the legislation function after the Constitutional Court’s decision only as a decision because Law Number 17 of 2014 concerning MPR, DPR, DPD, and DPRD (hereinafter MD3 Law) regulated the DPD’s position the same as before. If the DPR in drafting the MD3 Law gives equal rights to the DPD, then the legislative function has the same position, including the DPR, DPD, and President. As explained by Ahmad Haris Supriyanto about the legislative function of the DPD, this is motivated by the legislative function of the DPD in the original intent of the formation in the third amendment of the 1945 Constitution, to bridge regional aspirations in central policy and to complement the existence of the DPR as a legislative body in the law-making. However, this has not yet been realized because the DPR is too dominant in the legislative process. The law 22/2003 and its amendments law 27/2009 positioned the DPD as a weak institution that is the sub-ordinate of the DPR. While Law 10/2004 and Law 12/2011 regulated legislative mechanisms that weaken the DPD. Ultimately, this resulted in the decision of the Constitutional Court No. 92 / PUU-X / 2012, which returned the DPD’s authority in submitting, participating in the discussion of the bill and the National Legislation Program (Prolegnas) drafting. Therefore, it needs to be formulated appropriately.\(^6\)

Two issues were examined in this article. First, who is the legislator in Indonesia according to the 1945 Constitution after the decision of the Constitutional Court?. Second, what is the position of the DPD in the implementation of the legislation function after the Constitutional Court’s decision? The research method used was juridical normative with three approaches. First, the legislation approach looked at the substance of the problem by examining the legislation from basic norms, living norms and the initial formation of

\(^4\) Aziz Syamsudin, Proses Dan Teknis Penyusunan Undang-Undang (Sinar Grafika 2011); Suhardi, ‘Kajian Yuridis Tentang Kewenangan Menteri Dalam Negeri Mengawasi Dan Membatalkan Qanun Aceh’ (2016) 1 Petita : Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum dan Syariah.

\(^5\) Subardjo, Kontroversi Undang-Undang Tanpa Pengesahan Presiden (UII Press 2006).

\(^6\) Ahmad Haris Supriyanto, ‘Fungsi Legislasi DPD Menuju Sistem Ketatanegaraan Demokratis’ (Universitas Brawijaya 2014).
legislation regarding the position of the DPD. Second, the historical approach saw and examined the historical conception of the DPD as the third institution and the legislator because the DPD would approach and want to be equal as the senators in the USA. In practice, the senatorial institutions in the USA are equal to the members of parliament. The third model was a conceptual approach, which examined and identified the DPD conceptions as part of the legislators.\(^7\)

**DISCUSSION**

Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Making of Laws and Regulations that have been updated by the DPR and the President with Law Number 15 of 2019 concerning the Making of Laws and Regulations do not include the DPD as part of the legislators. Although this law is called as an organic law because it explicitly implements the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945), Article 22A, which stated that the provisions regarding the procedures for establishing laws are regulated by laws. In line with the Article 20 paragraph (5), it determines that the bill that has been mutually stipulated, but not approved by the President within 30 days after it is approved, the bill shall become the law and compulsory legislated. In case the President does not sign it up to the deadline stipulated in the 1945 Constitution, and the Minister of State Secretary also does not carry out the constitutional obligation to legislate it in the State Gazette of the Republic Indonesia, which has led to the emergence of public discussion evoking various responses.\(^8\)

The main problem to be addressed in this article is that who is actually forming the law?. When it is viewed from the definition, the law-making is part of the activities in regulating society, which consists of a combination of human individuals with all their dimensions. Drafting and making laws that can be accepted by the wider community is a difficult job. This difficulty lies in the fact that the activity of law-making is a form of communication between the legislative authority and the people in a country.\(^9\)

As a democratic country, after the amendment of the 1945 Constitution, it has given the authority to the DPR as a legislative body that holds the power of law-making, as regulated in Article 20 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution. The institution has a very strategic political function, as the determinant of the Republic of Indonesia's constitutional policy direction. The DPR, as the holder of the people's power, should not ignore the community participation and demands to carry out the legislative process well. In establishing the statutory regulation, the DPR is demanded to be able to execute the legislation process well, pay attention to the principles of the formation of legislation and prioritize the interests of the wider community in formulating the substance of the law.\(^10\)

According to Maria Farida Indrati, the amendment of authority in the formation of laws is a result of the amendment in Article 5 paragraph (1) and Article 20 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution. Before the amendment, Article 5 paragraph (1) stated that the President has the power to make laws with the approval of the DPR. In contrast, Article 20 paragraph (1)
stated each law requires the approval of the DPR. However, after the amendment, this has become a crucial change because of the formulation in Article 5 paragraph (1) and Article 20 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution. Both the President and the DPR have an equal position, in the sense that the President can only form laws if there is an agreement from the DPR. In addition, the members of the DPR are also given the right to submit a bill in accordance with Article 21 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution.\footnote{Maria Farida Indrati, \textit{Sistem Pemerintahan Indonesia Pasca Amandemen UUD 1945} (Fakultas Hukum Universitas Airlangga, dan Kementerian Hukum dan HAM RI 2004), 84; Teri L Caraway, \textit{Constitutional Change and Democracy in Indonesia}. By Donald L Horowitz. New York: Cambridge University Press, (2015); Kuskridho Ambardi, R William Liddle and Saiful Mujani (eds), \textit{Introduction: Indonesia and Critical Democracy}, \textit{Voting Behavior in Indonesia since Democratization: Critical Democrats} (Cambridge University Press 2018).}

So far, in the implementation of the state government, the formation of laws originating from proposals of the DPR initiative is very rare, so that the law-making is mostly done by the President. Then, in the amendment, as described by Maria Farida Indrati, the third amendment to the 1945 Constitution happened, as follows: Article 5 paragraph (1) stated that the President has the right to submit a bill to the DPR, while the amendment to Article 20 paragraph (1) stated that the DPR has the power to form laws.\footnote{Rahendro Jati, \textit{Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Proses Pembentukan Undang-Undang Yang Responsif}’ (2013) 1 Jurnal Rechtviniding, 329.}

Amendments to Article 5 paragraph (1) and Article 20 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution have resulted in changes in the formation of laws. Because of the formulation of the two articles, the President is only entitled to submit a bill to the DPR while the power to form laws remains the authority of the DPR. Although the formulation of Article 5 paragraph (1) and Article 20 paragraph (1) actually implies that the power to form the law is the authority of the DPR. Yet, the provisions in Article 20 paragraph (2) and paragraph (4) of the 1945 Constitution fade the authority. Based on Article 20 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution, a bill must be discussed and approved jointly by the DPR and the President. In addition, Article 20 paragraph (4) formulated that the President has the authority to ratify the bill that has been jointly approved into law. This article is the starting point in addressing the question of who actually constitutes the law. It can be seen from the construction of the description above that the legislators are the President and the DPR (Constitutional Court: 92 / PUU-X / 2012).

However, after the judicial review of Law Number 27 of 2009, concerning the MPR, DPR, DPD, and the MD3 Law by the DPD itself, it is necessary to review that the DPD also has the right to be the legislator without specific laws. After the Constitutional Court (MK) decision, the Court gave the right that those who have the authority to form laws in Indonesia are the President, the DPR, and the DPD. However, the presence of the latest MD3 Law did not accommodate what the Court had decided so that the DPD’s position remained the same.\footnote{Maiyestati, \textit{Pembagian Kewenangan Legislati DPR Dan DPD Dalam Sistem Pemerintahan Di Indonesia}’ (2012) 5 Jurnal Hukum, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Bung Hatta, Padang, 747.}

The Position of DPD after the Constitutional Court (MK) Decision.

In her research, Yenny AS stated that after the Constitutional Court’s decision Number 92 / PUU-X / 2012, the system of forming laws and regulations had undergone many changes. In the context of the implementation of the Constitutional Court’s decision, the design in drafting the bill must be changed to accommodate the Constitutional Court’s decision. The scope of the DPD in accordance with the 1945 Constitution Article 22D paragraph (1) that mentioned the authority of the DPD in terms of being able to submit a bill related to the region, the Constitutional Court emphasized that the word “able” to be interpreted as the
The research above became the foundation material in this article to answer the second research question of how the position of the DPD is in the implementation of legislative functions after the Constitutional Court’s decision. After the Constitutional Court’s decision Number 92 / PUU-X / 2012 on March 2, 2013, the real politics of Indonesian state administration especially the model of the legislative process has increasingly emphasized its shape towards the direction of a bicameral parliamentary system. This is the implication after the Constitutional Court granted in part of DPD’s proposal regarding MD3 Law and Law Number 12 of 2011. This material test was carried out to reinforce the constitutional authority of the DPD in terms of the legislative process. In line with this, Yenny AS questioned why this implication was the path to the bicameral parliamentary system. Previously, it is worth observing the condition of the DPD in the Indonesian legislative system before and after the Constitutional Court’s decision.

Before addressing the position of the DPD, this paper will discuss some implications of the decision. The idea of testing the legislative function of the DPD and the Community Coalition includes five things. First, DPD needs to be equally involved in the preparation of the national legislation program. Second, the bill resulted by DPD is treated equally to the bill of the president and the DPR. Third, DPD is involved in the discussion of certain bills from the beginning to the end. Fourth, the discussion of certain bills involves three parties (tripartite), namely the DPR, DPD, and the president. Fifth, as an inseparable part of the discussing process of a particular bill, the DPD is also involved in the approval process of a bill that is discussed in a tripartite manner. The examination of the constitutional authority of the DPD articulated in Article 22D of the third amendment to the 1945 Constitution was carried out to find a constitutional basis which was stated and justified that in the context of Article 22D of the third amendment to the 1945 Constitution that the DPD has the authority equivalent to the DPR and the president. The matter that will be discussed are mainly related to the authority of the DPD to discuss the bill, it was stated in Article 22D paragraph (2) of the third amendment to the 1945 Constitution from the beginning to the end, including the approval stage.

In the petition for testing in the Constitutional Court to the P3 Law and MD3 Law, the Court has decided against the existence of the DPD in the legislative function. The role of the DPD which was previously granted by the 1945 Constitution, is no longer amputated by the two laws, namely the MD3 Law and the P3 Law. The DPD has been constitutionally strengthened in three aspects, first, the authority of the DPD in proposing a bill related to the regions; second, the authority of the DPD to discuss the bill related to the regions; third, the involvement of the DPD in preparing the National Legislation Program (Prolegnas).

In principle, the initial discussion of the bill involved three institutions (tripartite). Therefore, in addition to being submitted in writing by the leader of the DPD to the leader of the DPR, it must also include the president in the bill along with an explanation or statement and/or academic text.

---

The last discussion is about the position of the DPD in the implementation of the legislation function after the Constitutional Court’s decision. Several conditions prompted the DPD to emphasize the constitutionality of its functions, duties, and authorities after the Constitutional Court’s decision.\(^1\) In the bicameral parliamentary system through the testing of the MD3 Law and the P3 Law on the 1945 Constitution in the Constitutional Court, the five main constitutional issues of the DPD can be concluded. First, the authority of the DPD in proposing a bill that is regulated in Article 22D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, which according to the DPD, a bill from the President and the DPR. Second, the authority of the DPD to participate in discussing the bill, which was mentioned in Article 22D of the 1945 Constitution with the DPR and the President. Third, the authority of the DPD gives members approval of the bill, which was articulated in Article 22D. Fourth, the involvement of the DPD in the preparation of prolegnas, which, according to the DPD, is the same as the involvement of the President and the DPR. Fifth, the authority of the DPD considers the bill, as called in the Article 22D.\(^2\)

Based on the study above, the Constitutional Court determined that the position of the DPD in the field of legislation is equivalent to the DPR and the President. On that basis, the DPD is entitled and/or authorized to propose a particular bill, such as drafting the prolegnas within the DPD environment and discussing the particular bill from the beginning to the end of the stages. Still, the DPD is unable to approve or ratify of the bill into law. The consequence of this decision is the creation of a tripartite model legislative process (DPR, DPD, President), specifically for the particular bill. They are the bill related to regional autonomy, central and regional relations, the formation and expansion and merging of regions, the management of natural resources and others economic resources, as well as those related to central and regional financial balances. It is in line with Yenny AS who stressed that the Constitutional Court’s ruling had consequences for the following position and role of the DPD. First, the bill from the DPD is equivalent to the bill from the President and the DPR. In connection with the submission of the proposed bill, the Constitutional Court (MK) decided several things, i.e.:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a)] The position of the DPD is equivalent to the DPR and the President in terms of submitting a bill.
  \item [b)] DPD proposes the bill in accordance with the field of their job description.
  \item [c)] DPD can submit a bill outside the National Legislation Program (prolegnas)
  \item [d)] The proposals of the DPD Bill do not become the proposals of the DPR bill.
\end{itemize}

Second, the discussion of the bill is carried out with three equal parties (tripartite); the President, DPD, and the DPR (not the DPR factions). Third, in the discussion of the bill, the Constitutional Court concluded as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a)] The bill discussion from the DPD must be treated the same as the bill of the President and the DPR.
  \item [b)] Regarding the bill of the President, the President is given the opportunity to provide an explanation while the DPR and DPD only provide their views.
  \item [c)] Regarding the bill of the DPR, the DPR is allowed to provide clarification while the President and the DPD provide the views.
  \item [d)] The bill of the DPD is treated equally, where the DPD is allowed to provide an explanation while the DPR and the President provide the views.
  \item [e)] The discussion of the bill from the DPD should be treated equally as the one
\end{itemize}

\(^{19}\) Adika Akbaruddin, ‘Pelaksanaan Fungsi Legislasi DPR RI Dan DPD RI Pasca Amandemen UUD 1945’ (2013) 8 Pandecta Jurnal Penelitian Hukum.

\(^{20}\) Agus Haryadi, *Bikameral Setengah Hati* (Kompas 2002).
of the President and DPR.
f) The List of Inventory Problem (IDM) is submitted by each State institution (DPR, DPD, Government).\(^{21}\)

This means that the presence of the Constitutional Court’s decision on the MD3 Law has changed the structure of the Indonesian constitution because the President, the DPR, and the DPD have the same position in the bill. There must be an emphasis on the function of the legislation, and it must be seen comprehensively, starting from the submission process to the approval of a bill into the law.

The imbalance function of legislation has become even more apparent with the affirmation of Article 20 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution that the power to form laws in the hand of the DPR. Besides, Article 20A paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution explicitly only mentioned the DPR as the owner of legislative power. However, Law Number 42 the Year 2014 concerning Amendment to Law and Number 17 the Year 2014 concerning the MPR, the DPR, the DPD, and the DPRD was born, but the authority regarding the DPD remained the same.\(^{22}\)

**Conclusion**

After the Constitutional Court’s decision, automatically the lawmakers in Indonesia changed from being only the President and the DPR, and making DPD have strong authorities. After the amendment, the President, the DPR, and the DPD became the legislators or lawmakers. The position of the DPD and DPR in the implementation of the legislation function becomes equal in terms of function and authority. Hence, it is expected that the system is built in three rooms. The legislator in Indonesia, following the 1945 Constitution, after the decision of the Constitutional Court, has been answered by the amendment of 1945 Constitution. The existence of the DPD must be equal to the DPR in terms of the legislative program in Indonesia. Furthermore, the position of the DPD in the implementation of the legislation function, after the Constitutional Court’s decision, has been addressed by the Constitutional Court’s ruling. The presence of the DPD is to balance the legislation in Indonesia. The President and the DPR are not the only pendulums of legislative formation. Instead, the DPD institution must get the attention; even the Ministry must equalize the position of DPD and the DPR in work partner meetings.
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