



## **Arizona Proposition 102**



### ***Constitutional Amendment***

"Only a union of one man and one woman shall be valid or recognized as a marriage in Arizona."

[http://www.azleg.gov/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/legtext/48leg/2r/summary/s.scr1042pshs\\_housechanges.doc.htm](http://www.azleg.gov/FormatDocument.asp?inDoc=/legtext/48leg/2r/summary/s.scr1042pshs_housechanges.doc.htm)

State voters rejected, by a 51–49 margin, a similar ballot measure in 2006, the only such victory by a statewide coalition against an anti-LGBT-marriage ban in the nation. Opponents revived the ban in the legislature in 2008 and, after a bruising debate that incurred editorial and public criticism for the tactics employed in it, succeeded in placing the measure onto the Nov. 4 ballot. Governor Janet Napolitano announced her opposition to the measure.

Passed in the Senate 16–4 (10 abstentions) on June 27, 2008.

Passed in the House 33–25.

Opponents:

No on SCR1042 : [www.votenoprop102.com](http://www.votenoprop102.com)

Equality Arizona: [www.equalityarizona.org/](http://www.equalityarizona.org/)

Supporters:

Center for Arizona Policy: [www.azpolicy.org/legislation.php](http://www.azpolicy.org/legislation.php)

## **Arkansas**

### **Arkansas Adoption and Foster Care Act**



#### ***Initiated Act***

[http://sos.arkansas.gov/newsroom/index.php?do:newsDetail=1&news\\_id=68](http://sos.arkansas.gov/newsroom/index.php?do:newsDetail=1&news_id=68)

On July 7, antigay activists submitted more than 65,000 signatures--exceeding the 61,794 needed to place an initiated act onto the statewide ballot. On July 24, only 57,888 signatures were validated. But the Family Council Action Committee was granted a 30-day extension to gather the nearly 4,000 additional signatures required. On August 21, the committee submitted an additional 32,000 signatures, of which more than 27,000 were deemed valid. The measure thus qualified for the statewide Nov. 4 ballot. However, opponents of the measure have flagged inconsistencies in the signature-gathering process and sought a court hearing on the legitimacy of the measure's qualification.

If approved, the measure would prevent unmarried individuals or couples who cohabit in the state from adopting children or caring for them as foster parents. The initiated act attempts to reinstate a previous regulatory ban on same-sex couples as parents and caregivers implemented by the state's child welfare board in 1999. The state supreme court struck down that policy in 2006. Governor Mike Beebe announced his opposition to the initiated act, saying he would vote against it if it qualified.

Opponents:

Arkansas Families First: <http://arkansasfamiliesfirst.org/>

Supporters:

Family Council Action Committee:

<http://adoptionact.familycouncilactioncommittee.com/index.asp?PageID=14>

Families First Foundation: [www.arfamiliesfirst.org/](http://www.arfamiliesfirst.org/)

## **CALIFORNIA Proposition 8**



### ***Constitutional Amendment***

"Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California."

[http://www.ag.ca.gov/cms\\_pdfs/initiatives/i737\\_07-0068\\_Initiative.pdf](http://www.ag.ca.gov/cms_pdfs/initiatives/i737_07-0068_Initiative.pdf)

The constitutional amendment, certified on June 2 for placement on the Nov. 4 ballot, would nullify a key part of a state supreme court ruling of May 15, 2008, which struck down the state's ban on same-sex marriage. Same-sex couples began marrying legally on June 16, and in the first two month alone, several thousand have done so. Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger announced his opposition to the measure.

Opponents:

Equality for All: [www.equalityforall.com/home.php](http://www.equalityforall.com/home.php)

Supporters:

Protectmarriage.com: [www.protectmarriage.com/](http://www.protectmarriage.com/)

## **Florida Amendment 2**



### ***Constitutional Amendment***

"Inasmuch as marriage is the legal union of only one man and one woman as husband and wife, no other legal union that is treated as marriage or the substantial equivalent thereof shall be valid or recognized."

<http://www.sayno2.com/index.php?submenu=Learn&submenu=Learn&src=gendocs&ref=WhattheAmendme ntSays&category=Learn>

The amendment was certified for the November 4 ballot with 649,346 signatures. Many interpretations of

the broad wording hold that it would forbid not only marriage, but also domestic partnership recognition for committed same-sex couples in the state. Because of an earlier revision to the amendment process passed by the legislature and approved by voters in 2006, amendments now require approval of a super-majority of 60 percent plus one vote of those casting ballots on the question in order to take effect. The change means that opponents need garner only 40 percent plus one vote to quash any amendment.

Opponents:

Fairness for All Families, Vote No on 2: [www.voteno2.com](http://www.voteno2.com)

Say No 2 (Florida Red and Blue): [www.sayno2.com](http://www.sayno2.com)

Supporters:

Florida4Marriage.org : [www.yes2marriage.org/](http://www.yes2marriage.org/)

## **Montgomery County, Maryland**

REPEAL DISQUALIFIED 9-9-08



REPEAL DISQUALIFIED 9-9-08

***Repeal of portions of county ordinance covering discrimination based on gender identity***  
**VICTORY: REPEAL MEASURE REMOVED FROM BALLOT; LAW TAKES EFFECT.**

On November 13, 2007, the Montgomery County Council passed an ordinance adding gender identity to the county's existing civil rights law. In December 2007, a group called Citizens for a Responsible Government (CRG) began collecting the 25,001 signatures needed to place a referendum to repeal the law onto the general-election ballot in 2008. The Board of Elections certified 26,813 signatures on March 7.

Both Lambda Legal and Equality Maryland fought the certification on the grounds that the petition was defective and misleading and that the first set of signatures submitted on February 4 contained numerous defects. On July 24, Montgomery County Circuit Judge Robert Greenberg ruled against the plaintiffs. A civil-rights coalition prepared for the first referendum in the nation dealing with whether or not to repeal human-rights provisions dealing specifically with gender identity. Then, on September 9, however, the Maryland Court of Appeals disqualified the repeal measure and ordered the 2007 law to take effect.

Opponents:

Equality Maryland: [www.equalitymaryland.org](http://www.equalitymaryland.org)

Basic Rights Montgomery: [www.basicrightsmontgomery.org](http://www.basicrightsmontgomery.org)

Supporters:

Citizens for a Responsible Government: [www.notmyshower.net](http://www.notmyshower.net)