

PROPOSITIONS:

Prop: Vote YES on 114

Russell Pearce (Pearce the author)

Protect victims from lawsuits by criminals

SUPPORT Proposition 114 - The Crime Victims Protection Act of 2102

Here is a simple and good idea. Let's stop the bad guys from suing their victims. Do you believe a criminal should be able to sue you, after assaulting you, robbing you, and/or raping you? An unrestricted constitutional "right to sue" exists, which even permits criminals to sue those they victimize." A person's home is their castle", however our Arizona Constitution allows anyone to sue for any reason and offers little protection to a property owner who defends his family, or his property from violent criminals (home invasion, burglary, arson, etc.). For example, a burglar breaks into your home and your dog bites him, you can be successfully sued for any injury sustained by the burglar!

Here is a likely scenario - - a burglar fell through a kitchen skylight of a home, landing on a knife that was left on the kitchen counter. The burglar impaled himself on the knife, and then sued the homeowner for an "unsafe condition"; the court awarding him damages for his injuries. That is not justice! This kind of abuse happens on a regular basis because of Arizona's Constitution has no limits on who can be sued, why they can be sued or virtually any limitation on lawyers getting clients to sue.

Those defending the rights of criminals to sue will argue state statutes already protect property owners from such travesties of justice. If that were true, then why would they try to defeat this Proposition? The fact is the Arizona Court of Appeals has ruled our statutes are insufficient, therefore a constitutional amendment is needed to stop criminals from suing victims of crime. A criminal should not be able to victimize their victim twice and this amendment is necessary to protect victims of crime.

Please vote yes on Proposition 114, the Crime Victims Protection Act, and let's ensure that a criminal is never able to sue the very person they victimized.

Hon. Russell Pearce, Former President of the Arizona State Senate, Mesa

Vote YES on 115

Russell Pearce, Eddie Farnsworth, Gov Brewer (Pearce the author)

Judicial System, takes control away from the Bar and allows all qualified candidates names to be presented to the Gov.

Prop. 115 is a consensus measure that strengthens Arizona's method of selecting and retaining judges.

The State Bar of Arizona, the Arizona Judicial Council, the Arizona Judges Association, and the Arizona Legislature worked together to craft Prop. 115.

Prop. 115 is designed to make the judicial nomination process turn on the individual merit of the candidates. Ensuring that each and every candidate will be considered on the basis of merit means Arizona will continue to have excellent candidates apply to be judges.

Prop. 115 also extends the terms of sitting judges, and allows judges to serve to the age of 75. Currently, all judges in Arizona must retire at the age of 70. That's way too early. In fact, four of the

nine Justices on the United States Supreme Court are already older than 70. Arizona will be well served by allowing judges to serve with excellence beyond the age 70. Finally, Prop. 115 gives voters more information about the judges that are on the ballot. Everybody wins when voters are equipped with information. To learn more about Prop. 115 please visit: www.YesOnProp115.com .

Eddie Farnsworth, State Representative, Chairman, Making Merit Selection Stronger, Yes on Prop. 115, Chairman, Judiciary Committee, Arizona House of Representatives, Gilbert

Vote YES on 116

Russell Pearce, Andy Biggs

Jobs bill, reduces the personal business property tax that double taxes and punishes investments in small businesses

Let's bring Arizona out of the recession! History shows that small businesses are the source of two-thirds of all new private sector jobs when we come out of an economic downturn. I believe it's the responsibility of government to do what it can to help our small businesses lead us to growth and prosperity. That doesn't mean government should pick winners and losers and it certainly doesn't mean spending taxpayer dollars on outright subsidies. No, our small businesses succeed in spite of government intervention not because of it.

A highlight of my legislative service has been working with small business job creators to write the referendum you see as Proposition 116, the Small Business Job Creation Act. It's a straight-forward proposal designed to get government out of the way by rolling back the unwise policy Arizona adopted a century ago that punishes private sector investment in the equipment and machinery essential to creating jobs. This tax is something small businesses incur the moment they acquire new equipment and machinery and before they hire one worker or make any product to sell.

Proposition 116 will create thousands of new jobs in Arizona by removing one of the heaviest drags on our small businesses. It does so without creating a new bureaucracy or foolishly spending the taxpayers' money. The new investment spurred by passage of Proposition 116 will be 100% financed by the private sector—precisely where it ought to be financed from.

It's a testament to the public policy soundness of Proposition 116 that it was unanimously adopted by our lawmakers who all too often cannot agree on much of anything substantial. I urge you to join me, our small business job creators and leaders from across the political spectrum to vote "yes" on Proposition 116.

Andy Biggs, State Senator, Majority Leader, Arizona State Senate, Gilbert

Vote NO on 117

Russell Pearce

Property tax

Anytime the Tax and Spend Party crosses the line to support a tax limitation or decrease be aware!! Democrats voted for this and I believe because it sounds good, but really has no real effect on capping property tax.

Let quote Lynn Weaver on this issue: "Vote NO on Proposition 117, Property Tax Assessed Valuation.

Prop 117 does nothing to limit your property tax bill or annual tax increases. Prop 117 just pretends to offer property tax relief or reform. It lacks any restraint on tax rate increases so does nothing to curb how much money taxing districts can collect from you. It still allows the addition of new taxing districts, more debt, and higher tax "overrides" to your bill.

The Legislature put Prop 117 on the ballot and at the same time came close to passing HB 2405. Passage would have allowed every school district in the state to double their bond debt capacity which would then double the 2nd largest item on your property tax bill. Many in the Legislature are working to raise your property taxes, not limit them. Prop 117 is proof that property tax reform won't come from the Legislature. We must do it ourselves using the initiative process.

Prop 13 Arizona, a Citizens Initiative for the 2014 ballot, is the reform we need. It uses purchase price (or decline-in-value provisions) as your tax basis, limits valuation increases to no more than 2% per year, and caps your total tax rate at 0.5% for all residential property or 1% for all other real property. No parcel taxes, overrides or exceptions to the tax caps. Prop 13 Arizona provides plenty of tax revenue for the government, just not unlimited tax increases as the current system allows. It puts family budgets first, not government's desire to tax and spend without limit.

Vote NO on Proposition 117. It does nothing to fix our broken tax system.”

Vote YES on 118 Permanent funds

Dear Arizona Taxpayer,

Prop 118 is a fair and practical way to smooth out earnings distributions from Arizona's \$3.4 billion Land Endowment.

By avoiding the usual boom-and-bust distribution cycle, Prop 118 will help the beneficiaries of the State Land Trust Fund (mainly public education) to achieve a more predictable income stream year after year. At the same time, smoother budgeting over the business cycle will help beneficiaries during boom years to avoid developing unreasonable expectations about future spending growth. This is a common sense solution to a problematic funding formula.

Prop 118 is a rare event in Arizona politics: it's a win-win for all of the stakeholders, whether those stakeholders are government employees providing education services, or taxpayers working hard to support their families and build our economy.

PLEASE VOTE YES ON PROP 118.

For more ideas about state and local tax and budget policy, and to help us enhance freedom and protect free enterprise, contact the Arizona chapter of Americans for Prosperity, at www.aztaxpayers.org, (602) 478-0146, or tjenney@afphq.org.

Tom Jenney, Phoenix

Undecided on 119 (has been on the ballot about 8 times and has failed, this is a better version than the past, but still concerns me)

State Trust lands

ANALYSIS BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

In 1910, the United States Congress passed the Arizona-New Mexico Enabling Act, allowing Arizona to become a state. The Enabling Act granted Arizona approximately 10.9 million acres of land, referred to as "state trust land". The state land trust is intended to produce revenue for various public institutions (schools, colleges, prisons, etc.). The state can lease or sell trust land, and the natural products (timber, minerals, etc.) of the land, only to the "highest and best bidder" at public auction.

In 1936, Congress amended the Enabling Act to give Arizona more flexibility in managing and disposing of trust land by allowing the state to exchange trust land for other public or private lands. Arizona did not amend its state Constitution to incorporate that authority for land exchanges. The Arizona Supreme Court has determined that without amending the Arizona Constitution, the state cannot conduct land exchanges.

Proposition 119 would amend the Arizona Constitution to allow the state to exchange state trust land for other public land in this state if the following requirements are met:

1. The exchange must be in the best interest of the state land trust.
2. The purpose of the exchange must be to either assist in preserving and protecting military facilities in this state from encroaching development or to improve the management of state lands for the purpose of sale or lease, or conversion of state land to public use.
3. There must be two independent appraisals that show that the true value of the land the state receives in the exchange is equal to or greater than the true value of the trust land the state conveys. There also must be two independent analyses that detail the income to the state land trust before and the projected income to the trust after the exchange, the financial impact of the exchange on each county, city, town and school district in which the lands are located, the physical, economic and natural resource impacts of the exchange on the local community and the impacts on local land uses and land use plans.
4. A detailed public notice of a proposed exchange must be given, public hearings must be held and an opportunity for public comment must be given.
5. A proposed exchange is not effective unless it is approved by the voters at a statewide November general election.

Vote YES on 120

Russell Pearce, Sylvia Allen

State Sovereignty; a 10th Amendment issue on states rights.

Freedom requires being sovereign. Our federal Constitution established two systems for separation of powers to preserve our liberty. Unfortunately only the separation of the three branches of government is reported. Equally important is the separation of powers between federal government and sovereign states. States gave limited authority for the federal government under our

Constitution. All powers not specifically granted to the federal government are reserved for the states and the people.

Prop 120 is an Arizona constitutional amendment to re-establish this necessary constitutional separation/balance of power to protect our liberty and civil rights. It declares our public lands and natural resources, are under our sovereign control, as provided in the NW Ordinance of 1787 and SW Ordinance of 1790 for the admission of states, excluding Indian lands and lands under Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

Over the last century, the separation between federal and state powers has been eviscerated. Without Senate accountability to our legislatures we are the recipients of unfunded federal mandates and restrictions which take our civil constitutionally guaranteed rights under the guise of giving us a faux benefit we can't pay for. This abuse is demonstrated by; the denial of century old water rights for Tombstone; denial for Arizona to manage Arizona forest lands resulting in devastating fires; denial of Arizonans to commercially and environmentally regulate our own natural resources; and denial to protect our citizens at the border. In 2009 we caught 29,000 illegals from terrorist designated countries! What better stewards are there of our land and safety, than the citizens that live with their decisions? When the Feds screw up - they have no consequences - but we do!

The feds propose "anti-bully" rules for our schools but what we need is an anti-federal bully rule. We the people Vote for Prop 120!

William Sandry, Mesa

Vote NO on 121

Pearce, Biggs, Allen, Gov Brewer

Do away with Primary election and intended to eliminate Conservatives from the General Elections - (top two vote getters)

OPPOSE Proposition 121 The so-called "Open Elections/Open Government Act" Initiative

Don't be fooled. This initiative effectively blocks candidates who are not Republican or Democrat from making it onto your General Election ballot. Smaller parties and Independent candidates will not have the votes needed to make the "top two" and will not have the opportunity to win. Even worse, they won't even have the opportunity to try to win. Americans love choices and we ought to have lots of them, especially in our politics and candidates. Telling Arizonans that they are only allowed to have two candidates to choose from is un-American. This initiative discriminates against smaller parties and Independents. It actually will discriminate against Republicans and Democrats too. Because most districts are very Republican or very Democrat, voters in those districts will have two candidates from the same party to choose from. In roughly 20 of Arizona's 30 legislative district, you won't even have two parties to choose from, so Democrats in Republican districts will only have two Republicans to choose from and Republicans in Democrat districts will only have two Democrats to choose from.

This initiative will decrease voter turnout. Arizona already has very high turnout relative to other states. Arizona's 2010 primary turnout was more than 30% while California's first primary under these new rules was 15%. And it makes sense. If you offer voters fewer choices they will be less interested. Our system is not perfect, but it is far superior to this new scheme. Supporters of this initiative say they want to change the rules because they want to change the type of candidate who

wins, but rigging the rules to ensure that only a specific type of candidate can win is un-American and very dangerous for Arizona.

Hon. Russell Pearce, Former President of the Arizona State Senate, Mesa

NOT GOOD FOR ARIZONA

THIS IS NOT A GRASS ROOTS EFFORT *but rather politics as usual by those that can't win straight-up elections, so they resort to manipulating the system. With nearly one million dollars spent gathering signatures by paid out-of-state solicitors, please don't tell voters this is a grass roots initiative. In fact, big business, big labor, academia, and big money injected huge amounts of cash into this effort with plenty more on the way. In 2008, in the heavily Democrat State of Oregon, voters soundly REJECTED their own top-two initiative 66% to 34% because the truth was revealed by the media. With an initiative so soundly defeated in Oregon why would big business, big labor, academia, and big money even try to introduce it in Arizona? Interesting question, interesting answer... follow the money.*
VOTE NO to *big money* interests.

Beth Jamison, Chairperson, Arizona Citizens for Honest Elections, Phoenix

Vote NO on 204

Pearce

Taxation; a permanent 18% increase in sales tax and a broken promise as a 3 year tax and a promise to go away

Quality Education and Jobs Act 201200362

No, No, No, Lies, Lies and more Lies from the tax and spenders, As President of the Arizona Senate I made sure we balanced Arizona's budget and we did it the right way - in accordance with our Constitution, by holding the line on spending, and without tax increases. Why? Because that was our job and that was the right way to do it. Our families and our businesses cannot spend more than they have, and while the Federal Government can just print money to pay its bills, the state of Arizona cannot. Plus, our families and businesses are already overtaxed, and increasing taxes will only hurt our economy and cost us more jobs.

In 2010 the voters of Arizona supported a TEMPORARY sales tax increase that the politicians and groups supporting it promised would be temporary. They gave their word. That three-year long tax increase has not even expired yet and they are already breaking their promise. Shame on them!

Enough is enough. I hope that the taxpayers and freedom loving citizens of this great state will make themselves heard loud and clear. A deal is a deal, a promise is a promise, and No New Taxes! Government already takes too much, and in these tough times we must reduce the burden that taxes place on working families. We have 17 million Americans out of work, record foreclosures and yet the special interests want even more of your money to pay for their pet projects.

This same idea was defeated in California. If even California can figure out that it is a bad idea, then I trust the message will be sent loud and clear from the good citizens of this state. Vote No on this permanent, job-killing, multi-billion dollar tax increase! It also locks in spending limits never to be change no matter how bad a recession gets.

Hon. Russell Pearce, Former President of the Arizona State Senate, Mesa

Proposition 204 (1-16-2012) - Earmarking at its worst

The Arizona Tax Research Association (ATRA) encourages a NO vote on Proposition 204 (1-16-2012). ATRA has long opposed *ballot-box budgeting*, where special interests use the initiative process to earmark revenues outside the state's budgeting process. This initiative is arguably the most egregious earmarking effort ever placed before Arizona voters and it should be rejected.

This permanent sales tax increase locks in place an estimated \$25 billion in spending over the next 17 years that can never be changed. Regardless of one's perspective on the adequacy of education or transportation funding, putting spending for 12 different earmarks on auto-pilot is simply irresponsible. The Great Recession taught us a number of lessons regarding budgeting mistakes that aggravated Arizona's chronic budget deficits. The biggest lesson was to avoid making permanent budget decisions that tie up billions of taxpayer dollars on the belief that neither the economy nor the state's priorities will ever change.

In addition to a permanent sales tax rate increase in a state with the second highest combined rates in the nation, the initiative also takes the extraordinary step of freezing the current sales tax base. Freezing the sales tax base will undermine the growing momentum to reform Arizona's antiquated state and local sales tax code and demonstrates not even a modicum of consideration for the taxpayers saddled with complying with this tax increase.

Lastly, funding for K-12 schools has always been the largest state expenditure. K-12 appropriations are driven by many complicated formulas that account for differences across Arizona schools. Prop 204 (1-16-2012) handcuffs policymakers' ability to change these funding formulas. Presuming there will never be a legitimate reason to modify these statutes is shortsighted and an abuse of the initiative process.

Kevin J. McCarthy, President, Arizona Tax
Research Association, Gilbert

Lori Daniels, Board Member, Arizona Tax
Research Association, Chandler