

Amendment 3

Abortion Amendment Replacement & Minors' Gender-Transition Ban

VOTE NO

Repeals the 2024 reproductive-rights amendment and replaces it with a new constitutional provision on abortion, and bans gender-transition procedures for minors.

What a YES vote does

- Removes the abortion-rights amendment voters approved in 2024.
- Replaces it with a new provision that prohibits most abortions, but expressly permits them for medical emergencies, fetal anomalies, and rape or incest through 12 weeks.
- Lets the legislature regulate abortion providers, facilities, and procedures.
- Writes a ban on gender-transition procedures for minors into the Constitution.

What a NO vote does

- The 2024 abortion-rights amendment stays in the Constitution.
- No abortion exceptions are written into the Constitution.
- Gender-transition procedures for minors remain governed by existing state law rather than the Constitution.

What Act for Missouri Thinks, and Why

Vote No. Repealing the 2024 amendment is right; writing new abortion exceptions into the Constitution in its place is not.

Amendment 3 is not a straight repeal. It replaces the 2024 language with a provision that says abortion **may be performed** in cases of fetal anomaly and of rape or incest. A child conceived in rape committed no crime; a child with a terminal diagnosis is still a child. Once the Constitution divides unborn children into protected and unprotected classes, it establishes that some human beings may lose the protection of life because of circumstances they did not choose. **You cannot build equal protection by first constitutionalizing unequal protection.**

Supporters say the exceptions can be tightened later, but the final text has no rape-reporting requirement and no second-opinion requirement for a fetal-anomaly diagnosis. And if these exceptions are acceptable enough to write into the Constitution now, on what principle would they become unacceptable later?

A "no" leaves the 2024 amendment in place for now, and we do not minimize that. But it is not an endorsement. It is a demand for a clean repeal, or a personhood amendment that protects every unborn child equally.

The bottom line

Amendment 3 would restrict abortion by Missouri providers: its reach is the clinics, the physicians, and the standards they must follow. It would not stop a Missouri woman from traveling to a nearby state or, far more likely, ordering abortion pills from an out-of-state telehealth provider. It regulates the provision of abortion; it does not establish that the unborn child is a person entitled to the law's protection. Vote No, and ask your legislators for a recorded vote on personhood.

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.

Amendment 7

Show-Me Prosperity Fund

VOTE NO

Creates a permanent state investment fund in the Constitution, with the long-term goal of replacing state taxes with investment earnings.

What a YES vote does

- Creates the Show-Me Prosperity Fund, invested in S&P 500 index funds, with permanent principal that cannot be spent, pledged, or borrowed against.
- Leaves deposits to future legislatures; no amount is required.
- Allows no money to leave the fund until the prior year's earnings, after fees, can replace **all** listed state taxes at once.
- Caps annual spending from the fund at 3% of its five-year average value.

What a NO vote does

- No fund is created.
- Tax cuts and tax policy continue through the normal legislative process.
- The legislature remains free to create a savings or investment fund by statute.

What Act for Missouri Thinks, and Why

Vote No. A permanent, potentially \$267 billion commitment written into the Constitution before anyone answers how it is funded, who manages it, or what it costs.

Amendment 7 does not eliminate taxes one at a time. Nothing leaves the fund until earnings can replace the individual income tax, the sales and use tax, the corporate income tax, and all other state taxes together. Combined with the 3% cap, replacing an illustrative \$8 billion a year would require a fund of roughly **\$266.7 billion**. Missouri could contribute for generations before a single tax goes away.

Management fees come out before the trigger is tested, yet the amendment sets no fee cap, requires no competitive bidding, and has no conflict-of-interest protections for choosing investment firms. At a 0.06% fee, a fund that size would pay about \$160 million a year.

The ballot says the measure has no costs or savings. That is because deposits are left to future legislatures, not because it is free. And it arrives during a budget squeeze: the State Auditor warned the FY2027 budget spends more than \$1.7 billion above ongoing revenue.

The bottom line

A sound constitutional amendment should settle funding, fees, procurement, conflicts of interest, and the tax-replacement math before asking voters for permanent authority. Amendment 7 settles none of them.

Amendment 8

County Sheriffs

VOTE NO

Writes the elected county sheriff into the Missouri Constitution and changes how sheriffs are staffed and removed, in every county except three.

What a YES vote does

- Constitutionally requires elected sheriffs, serving four-year terms, as each covered county's chief law-enforcement officer.
- Lets the sheriff appoint deputies and staff and set their pay within the budget the county provides.
- Allows a sheriff to be removed **only** by a quo warranto action initiated by the Attorney General.
- Excludes St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and St. Charles County.

What a NO vote does

- Sheriffs are still elected every four years under existing state law.
- Current removal paths remain: the Attorney General **or** a local prosecuting attorney can initiate quo warranto, and citizens can start a misconduct removal through their local prosecutor.
- Sheriff staffing rules stay in statute, including judicial approval in some counties.

What Act for Missouri Thinks, and Why

Vote No. We support a constitutional sheriff, but not one that exempts three jurisdictions and makes the Attorney General the only official who can start a removal.

We like the idea of a constitutional sheriff. An independently elected sheriff whose office cannot be abolished by an ordinary bill is a sound principle, and giving sheriffs control over their own staff within their budget has real merit. If Amendment 8 did that for every Missourian, we would be glad to support it.

It does not. It expressly excludes St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and St. Charles County. A principle worth putting in the Constitution should be worth applying statewide.

The bigger problem is removal. Accountability for a county officer would run through a single statewide official in Jefferson City instead of local prosecutors and local citizens. We objected to the same kind of exclusive Attorney General power in Amendment 4, and the principle has not changed. A "no" vote does not end elected sheriffs; Missouri already elects them.

The bottom line

A constitutional sheriff is worth doing, for every county, with local accountability intact. Amendment 8 bundles a good idea with a carve-out and a single statewide gatekeeper. Vote No, and ask for a clean version.

Proposition A

Congressional Map Referendum (HB 1)



A referendum asking voters whether to approve the congressional map the legislature passed in a 2025 special session.

What a YES vote does

- Approves HB 1.
- The 2025 congressional map governs future elections, replacing the map adopted in 2022.

What a NO vote does

- Rejects HB 1.
- The 2022 congressional map remains in place for future elections.

Either way, your November 3, 2026 congressional races are held under the 2022 districts. Prop A decides which map governs future elections.

What Act for Missouri Thinks, and Why

Lean Yes. The mid-decade redraw was done the wrong way, but on balance we lean toward using the new map going forward.

We don't feel as strongly about Prop A as we do about the other measures on this ballot, and we want to be honest about that. Redrawing the map mid-decade in a special session was not the right way to change Missouri's congressional districts. In our view, this is the map that should have been adopted in 2022, and we believe it better reflects the state as a whole.

The referendum put the final decision in voters' hands, which is exactly how a check on the legislature should work. Judged on the map itself rather than the process that produced it, we lean Yes.

The bottom line

A close call where reasonable conservatives can land on either side. Whatever you decide, make sure you know which vote does what.