

## Official Ballot Language Proposal 06-1

### A PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE THAT MONEY HELD IN CONSERVATION AND RECREATION FUNDS CAN ONLY BE USED FOR THEIR INTENDED PURPOSES

#### *The proposed constitutional amendment would:*

- Create a Conservation and Recreation Legacy Fund within the Constitution and establish existing conservation and recreation accounts as components of the fund.
- Use current funding sources such as state park entrance and camping fees; snowmobile, ORV and boating registration fees; hunting and fishing license fees; taxes and other revenues to fund accounts.
- Establish the current Game and Fish Protection Fund and the Nongame Fish and Wildlife Fund within the Constitution.
- Provide that money held in Funds can only be used for specific purposes related to conservation and recreation and cannot be used for any purpose other than those intended.

Should this proposal be adopted? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**YES** Proposal 1 would establish the "Conservation and Recreation Legacy Fund", the "Game and Fish Protection Trust Fund" and the "Nongame Fish and Wildlife Trust Fund" within our State Constitution. Voting "Yes" will constitutionally protect boating, hunting, fishing, snowmobile, ORV, state park and forest entry fees, and camping fees that you pay from being raided to balance the state budget.

This is not a tax hike or fee increase, and will not change any fees. This protects the funds that you already pay into when you buy a license, pay DNR fees, or register your snowmobile, ORV or boat. Activities such as upkeep of boating and camping facilities, trail development, wildlife management and habitat, conservation officers, and public access sites are all supported by these funds and get no monies from the general fund state budget.

Proposal 1 has broad, bi-partisan support. It passed the House and Senate overwhelmingly and is supported by Michigan United Conservation Clubs, the Michigan Boating Industries Association, the Sheriff's and Deputy Sheriff's Association, the Michigan Chamber of Commerce, Lt. Gov. John Cherry, Secretary of State Terri Lynn Land and many others.

**Provided by: Rep. Randy Richardville, Legislative sponsor of this proposal**

**NO** Opponents of this proposal say that this proposal is simply another attempt to earmark state revenue for special purposes and should not be put in the state's Constitution. The Legislature needs flexibility to respond to economic conditions—not constitutional limitations that cannot be changed to meet current needs. This amendment will mean the Legislature can not use these funds for any other purposes, no matter what the other needs of the state might be. By protecting these funds, this proposal will limit the Legislature and the Governor's ability to use their judgment in determining the best way to balance the state's budget and to spend tax dollars to best serve current and future Michigan residents.

The language in this proposal is virtually the same as the current statutory language restricting these funds so all this amendment will accomplish is to make it more difficult and costly to change these restrictions if that is needed in the future.

## Official Ballot Language Proposal 06-2

### A PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE STATE CONSTITUTION TO BAN AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS THAT GIVE PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT TO GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS BASED ON THEIR RACE, GENDER, COLOR, ETHNICITY OR NATIONAL ORIGIN FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION OR CONTRACTING PURPOSES

#### *The proposed constitutional amendment would:*

- Ban public institutions from using affirmative action programs that give preferential treatment to groups or individuals based on their race, gender, color, ethnicity or national origin for public employment, education or contracting purposes. Public institutions affected by the proposal include state government, local governments, public colleges and universities, community colleges and school districts.
- Prohibit public institutions from discriminating against groups or individuals due to their gender, ethnicity, race, color or national origin. (A separate provision of the state constitution already prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin.)

Should this proposal be adopted? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

**YES** Michigan's economy is struggling badly, with working people from all backgrounds finding their jobs in danger. As we rebuild the Michigan economy, it is crucial that every person gets an equal chance to compete based on his/her merits. But, government agencies at all levels in Michigan treat people differently, based on their race and skin color – job quotas, "minority" contract set-asides, and extra points in college admissions. These practices are WRONG and it is time that we got rid of them.

The Michigan Civil Rights Initiative will restore fairness in how people are treated by government. This Initiative mirrors the landmark 1964 Civil Rights Act and advances civil rights by prohibiting discrimination and preferential treatment based on race, sex and color. Unfortunately, those who support race and gender preferences have waged a negative campaign based on fear. Much like the die-hard segregationists, they have chosen fear as their tool.

EQUAL TREATMENT is the essence of "civil rights." Proposal 2 will end race and gender preferences and restore fairness in public employment, public education and public contracting. Proposal 2 will end dividing us by the color of our skin. Vote YES on Proposal 2: It's the right thing to do.

**Provided by: Michigan Civil Rights Initiative Campaign**

**NO** Michigan this fall will decide whether it will continue to have doors open to opportunity for women and people of color, or roll back the progress we have made in addressing discrimination. Proposal 2 would amend our state's constitution to immediately eliminate affirmative action policies in state and local governments, banning use of the best tool we have in achieving equal opportunity.

Opposing Proposal 2 are more than 200 groups joining as One United Michigan, including business, labor, religious and civic organizations. Governor Jennifer Granholm and Republican Dick DeVos both oppose the amendment. Proposal 2 is just too extreme, rolling back the positive steps Michigan has made in addressing inequities faced by women and people of color. The amendment would eliminate high school programs that encourage girls and minorities to enter math and science careers. It would ban housing and lending programs to ensure women and minorities are treated fairly when buying homes and applying for loans. After a similar proposal passed in California, lawsuits were filed to end state funding for battered women shelters and breast, prostate and cervical cancer screenings.

Michigan should continue to move forward and not roll back progress. Vote NO on Proposal 2.

**Provided by: One United Michigan**