



## Right to Farm and Ranch Constitutional Amendment 1 Frequently Asked Questions

*Q: What anti-agriculture initiatives have been enacted in other states?*

A: Those actually enacted include the following, and many more have been proposed—

Sow gestation stalls banned—FL ballot measure (2002), AZ ballot measure (2006), OR legislation (2007)

### 2008

- CO—legislation banned gestation stalls and veal calf stalls
- CA—ballot measure banned gestation stalls, veal calf stalls and cages for egg-laying hens

### 2009

- CA—legislation banned dairy cow tail docking
- ME—legislation banned gestation stalls and veal calf stalls
- MI—legislation banned gestation stalls, veal calf stalls and cages for egg-laying hens

### 2011

- OR—legislation banned cages for egg-laying hens

### 2012

- RI—legislation banned gestation stalls and veal calf stalls

*Q: What impact do these initiatives have on farmers, ranchers and consumers?*

A: Some farmers and ranchers will make modifications to facilities, equipment, and management practices to meet the new standards. Others will discontinue production. One hog farmer in Florida who stopped raising hogs due to costs resulting from the voter-approved ban on gestation stalls has won a lawsuit seeking damages for the taking of property by the state.

Consumers are likely to see higher prices and fewer choices. Since the European Union banned conventional cages for egg-laying hens, increased egg prices up to 44% have been reported.

*Q: How will this constitutional amendment help Missouri farmers and ranchers?*

A: : This amendment would be added to the “bill of rights” in Missouri’s constitution, the highest law of the land, thereby protecting farming and ranching as a fundamental right. Like other constitutional protections, its applicability will be determined by the courts. It is intended to strengthen legal arguments against legislation and ballot measures that place unreasonable restrictions on farming and ranching.

*Q: Will this constitutional amendment exempt farmers and ranchers from laws and regulations?*

A: No, laws and regulations with which farmers and ranchers now must comply will not be affected by this constitutional amendment. However, if future laws or regulations impose unreasonable restrictions on farming and ranching, courts may find them illegal based on this constitutional amendment.

*Q: Why should farming and ranching have constitutional protection when other occupations do not?*

A: Farming and ranching have been a way of life for generations of Missouri families, and many more are taking advantage of opportunities to raise food and fiber for themselves and others. Unfortunately, well-funded animal rights groups and other critics of modern crop and livestock production have succeeded in recent years enacting laws that make farming and ranching more difficult by imposing costly and unnecessary restrictions. These activists, in many cases from out-of-state, have the wherewithal to far outspend agriculture in advocacy campaigns, and they continue to aggressively push their policy agenda. Moreover, they use scare tactics to take advantage of the general public's lack of practical farm knowledge and experience.

*Q: Why not prohibit out-of-state anti-agriculture activists, like HSUS, from running ballot initiatives in Missouri?*

A: It would likely be found illegal under freedom of speech protections. Courts have overturned some related laws. Perhaps most notably, in 1999 the US Supreme Court ruled that states could not allow only registered voters to circulate initiative petitions. Similarly, in 1988 the US Supreme Court ruled against laws prohibiting payment of signature gatherers.

***Keep Missouri Farming—Vote YES on Constitutional Amendment 1***