

Amendment 6

Initiative Petition Protections

VOTE NO

A citizen-initiated amendment that expands constitutional protection for the initiative and referendum process and for measures voters approve through it.

What a YES vote does

- Declares the rights of initiative and referendum fundamental and bars the legislature from weakening them.
- Requires 80% of each legislative chamber (131 of 163 representatives and 28 of 34 senators) before lawmakers can refer a change to a covered citizen-approved measure back to voters.
- Applies that protection to citizen-approved measures adopted since 2010.

What a NO vote does

- Current rules stay in place.
- The legislature can still amend a voter-approved statute, or refer a constitutional change back to voters, by ordinary majorities.
- Changes to the petition process remain possible through the legislature and a statewide vote, as today.

What Act for Missouri Thinks, and Why

Vote No. Amendment 4 gave lawmakers too much power; Amendment 6 takes too much away. Missouri needs balanced reform, not the opposite power grab.

Voter-approved measures deserve serious respect, and parts of Amendment 6 address real concerns. But its 80% requirement means seven senators could block the people from even being asked about a change. The restriction reaches any change that would modify, repeal, supersede, or undermine a covered measure, with no general exception for technical fixes. It would also close the legislative route to reforms that raise the bar for citizen initiatives, including the balanced reform we support.

Our position has not changed since August. Missouri's Constitution is too easy to change, and every amendment, whether it comes from citizens or the legislature, should need a statewide majority plus a majority in a majority of state House districts. **Amendment 4 failed that test by tilting power toward the legislature. Amendment 6 fails it by tilting power the other way.**

The Missouri Supreme Court's September 3 ruling in *Harris v. Hoskins* put Amendment 6 on the ballot. That decision was about ballot access, not the merits. The Court did not endorse it.

The bottom line

Changing the Constitution should require broader agreement than passing an ordinary law, by every path, without making reasonable correction impossible. Neither Amendment 4 nor Amendment 6 meets that test.