



**Summaries of 2024 Florida Proposed Constitutional Amendments
from the LWV of Florida Vote411 Voter Guide
General Election – November 5, 2024**

Amendment 1 – Partisan Election of Members of District School Boards

A Yes Vote changes School Board Elections to partisan elections in 2026, requiring candidate’s political party to be designated on the ballot and triggering closed primary elections.

A No Vote leaves School Board elections as nonpartisan with no closed primaries, allowing all voters to vote for a candidate.

Opponents, including Florida Tax Watch and the League of Women Voters of Florida, argue that partisan school board races would exclude NPAs from voting in primaries and increase political polarization. Schools should not be politicized and everyone should be welcome at schools regardless of party affiliation.

Supporters, including the majority of the Florida Legislature, state that since public education has become polarized through cultural issues reflected in new legislation that school board elections may have already become partisan. Additionally, a candidate’s party affiliation may predict how they will vote on controversial school board issues.

Amendment 2 – Right to Fish and Hunt

A Yes Vote establishes a constitutional right to hunt and fish in Florida and the preferred means of responsibly managing and controlling fish and wildlife.

A No Vote does not establish a constitutional right to fish and hunt, but the 2002 Florida statute preserving the right to fish and hunt remains in place.

Supporters of this amendment, including All Florida, American Sportfishing Association, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, Bonefish & Tarpon Trust, Coastal Conservation Association, Congressional Sportsman Foundation, Delta Waterfowl, Everglades Coordinating Council, Florida Airboat Association, Florida Guides Association, Florida Sportsman’s Conservation Association, Future Hunting in Florida, International Order of T. Roosevelt, National Deer Association, National Shooting Sports Foundation, and Safari Club International, state the economic value of fishing and hunting provides Florida with approximately \$15 billion annually and that enshrining the right in the constitutions will ensure that there are no future bans on fishing and hunting.

Opponents, including the Sierra Club Florida Chapter, Florida National Organization for Women, American Ecosystems Inc., Animal Wellness Action, Bear Defenders, Center for a Humane Economy, Florida Bar Animal Law Section, Humane Society of the US, League of Humane Voters of Florida, Paws and Recreation, Save-a-Turtle.org, Speak Up for Wildlife, World Animal Protection, are concerned that science-based methods of managing and controlling wildlife and fish will become secondary to hunting and fishing. The phrase “traditional methods” could be interpreted as a return to currently prohibited methods of hunting and fishing, such as steel traps, spearfishing and gill nets. They also say, if we have a statute protecting the right to hunt and fish already, why does this need to be placed in the Constitution now? Opponents warn of potential interference with private property rights by trespassing hunters.

Amendment 3 – Adult Personal Use of Marijuana

A Yes Vote legalizes recreational marijuana use in Florida by adults 21 years old and older, allowing possession of up to three ounces of marijuana and authorizes existing Medical Marijuana Treatment Centers to acquire, cultivate, process, manufacture, sell and distribute marijuana products and accessories. Allows the FL Legislature to enact additional legislation restricting where people can smoke and to license other entities to acquire, cultivate, process, manufacture, sell and distribute marijuana products and accessories.

A No Vote does not legalize marijuana or adult recreational use in Florida and maintains the current regulations for medical use.

Supporters, including Smart & Safe Florida, Trulieve, Howard Bellamy and David Bellamy, say that tax revenue from the legal cannabis industry for federal and state governments are projected to reach over \$4 billion in 2025, and there is no evidence that legalizing marijuana for medical or recreational use at the state level, as 37 states have already done, has boosted underage consumption from the regulated marketplace.

Opponents, including Floridians Against Recreational Marijuana, Drug Free America, the Florida Chamber of Commerce, Florida Attorney General, Ashley Moody, and the Florida Republican Party, say the proposed amendment is misleading and marijuana is illegal under federal law and will remain illegal even if proposed Amendment 3 passes. Additionally, some fear usage may lead to use of more serious addictive illegal drugs.

Amendment 4 – Limit Government Interference with Abortion

A Yes Vote prevents any law from prohibiting, penalizing, delaying, or restricting abortion before viability or when necessary to protect the patient’s health as determined by the patient’s health care provider.

A No Vote does not provide a constitutional right to abortion before viability and leaves Florida current 6-week abortion ban in place.

Supporters, including Floridians Protecting Freedom, the ACLU of Florida, Planned Parenthood, Florida Women’s Freedom Coalition, Florida Rising, SEIU 1199 Florida, Women’s Voices of Southwest Florida and the League of Women Voters of Florida, say “All Floridians deserve the freedom to make personal medical decisions, free of government intrusion.”

Opponents, including the Republican Party of Florida, Florida Voters Against Extremism, the Florida Conference of Catholic Bishops, Florida Family Policy Council, Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America, Florida Family Action, say the amendment is too vague and will lead to an unregulated abortion industry.

Amendment 5 – Annual Adjustments to the Value of Certain Homestead Exemptions

A Yes Vote increases the homestead exemption amount each January 1, beginning 2025, if the Consumer Price Index increases, thereby reducing the amount of property taxes on primary residences and reducing the amount of tax dollars available for county, city, and special district programs and services.

A No Vote leaves the current homestead exemption amount as is.

Supporters, including the majority of the Florida Legislature, say the amendment could lead to more savings for property owners who apply for homestead property tax exemptions.

Opponents, including the League of Cities, say the amendment would reduce revenue available to cities and counties by millions of dollars.

Amendment 6 – Repeal of Public Campaign Financing Requirement

A Yes Vote repeals Section 7, Article VI from the Florida Constitution passed in 1998 and repeals the Florida Campaign Financing Act, ending Florida’s public campaign financing program and spending limits for publicly-funded candidates for Governor, Attorney General, Chief Financial Officer, and Commissioner of Agriculture.

A No Vote leaves the current public financing program, including spending limits for publicly funded candidates in place.

Opponents, including Common Cause and the League of Women Voters of Florida, state that the matching fund program gives small-dollar donors a greater voice and encourages candidates to seek support from broad groups of voters. Further, if the program is repealed, wealthy donors and special interest groups would no longer be limited in the amounts they can contribute to these candidates. In addition, public financing enables candidates who are not wealthy or who have more limited access to financing to be able to run for office, leading to a more diverse pool of candidates.

Supporters, including the majority of the Florida Legislature, state that this financing, which comes from Florida’s general fund, could be used for other programs such as education, health care or housing.