

2010 ARIZONA Ballot Props • Election Nov. 2, 2010

DON'T VOTE EARLY • Things change at the last minute, candidates die or get arrested/indicted, wait until election day • DON'T VOTE EARLY

106—YES: Health Care Freedom Act. Simple and good. Prevents gov't from forcing you to buy a health care plan it approves of, though you could still buy it if you want, and lets you to pay for any legal health-care insurance or doctor service you want, if you want. Helps gut Obamacare.

[Excerpt]: "To preserve the freedom of Arizonans to provide for their health care: 1. A law or rule shall not compel, directly or indirectly, any person, employer or health care provider to participate in any health care system.

"2. A person or employer may pay directly for lawful health care services and shall not be required to pay penalties or fines for paying directly for lawful health care services. A health care provider may accept direct payment for lawful health care services and shall not be required to pay penalties or fines for accepting direct payment from a person or employer for lawful health care services." <snip>

107—YES: Stop Affirmative Action. Prevents state and local governments (state agencies, cities, counties and school districts) from giving or withholding preferential treatment to favored groups, typically called affirmative action.

"This state shall not discriminate against or grant preferential treatment to any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education or public contracting."

109—YES: Right to Hunt and Fish. Provides a constitutional state guarantee of the right to hunt and fish. Part of major national effort to resist animal-rights radicals.

A. The citizens of this State have a right to hunt, fish and harvest wildlife lawfully. Wildlife belongs to this State and is held in trust for the benefit of the citizens of this state.

B. Exclusive authority to enact laws to regulate the manner, methods or seasons for hunting, fishing and harvesting wildlife is vested in the Legislature, which may delegate rule making authority to a game and fish commission. No law shall be enacted and no rule shall be adopted that unreasonably restricts hunting, fishing and harvesting wildlife or the use of traditional means and methods. Laws and rules authorized under this section shall have the purpose of wildlife conservation and management and preserving the future of hunting and fishing.

C. Lawful public hunting and fishing shall be a preferred means of managing and controlling wildlife.

D. this section shall not be CONSTRUED to modify any provision of common law or statutes relating to trespass or property rights.

110—NO: Allow state to exchange Trust land for other public lands and sell, lease or manage land without auction or advertisement. No law can prevent the disposition of state trust lands to prevent encroachment on military bases. (see lengthy resolution in file, rejected repeatedly since 1990). "Save Luke AF Base" rhetoric seems BS, almost no state land there to matter; removes constraints on disposing of state trust land to developers, eliminates controls, Sierra Club, AZ C of C, and Nature Conservancy support it. Quite complex, I'm open to reconsider this one.

111—NO: (Secretary of State renamed Lt. Governor in 2015, must be same party): Very bad. Requires the LG candidate to run on same ticket as the governor, reducing choices (one vote for two offices, though primaries will be separate votes). Ensures party continuity in event of a replacement, but also prevents a change (like Brewer for Napolitano). A (bad in my opinion) argument says people don't understand that secy. of state replaces governor and this clarifies it—passing law to fix ignorance is hopelessly misguided, won't erase the ignorance anyway. Should we change AG's title for same reason (3rd in succession)? Fixes something that isn't broken, and forces election of a person you don't get to vote for, bad idea. Also, totally freezes out independent candidates, and puts control of elections into Gov's office, not separate. Whose idea was this? Why?

112—HMMM: (Make petition deadlines 2 months earlier). Unclear what the effect will be; would we prefer easier or more difficult petition drives; all drives or just some? Well informed friends are split on this. Apparently would make it harder for poorly organized groups to put initiatives on the ballot. Ballot props step away from a Republic and toward a Democracy, an undesirable feature of initiatives. I dunno.

113—YES: Save our Secret Ballot in union elections. Prevents union thugs from organizing by learning and threatening voters' choices. Would stop so-called "Card Check," the union-backed plan to control all labor by eliminating secret balloting; shame on them for even trying such a scheme, under a plan to disguise what they're up to. Ought to yield a racketeering charge for the proponents. Untenable union demands promote bankruptcy, generate fiscal crises, create abusive elitist pension ponzi schemes.

203—YES: Medical marijuana. Allow people with specific medical conditions to get the benefits of a plant-based drug for relief of symptoms. A liberty litmus test—should you or the state decide to be your nanny ("This is bad (according to somebody) for you, don't touch it"), a victimless offense. Indirectly addresses the vegetable-importation problem euphemistically called the war on some drugs. This war has failed miserably since startup 40 years ago with no hope of improvement (though it is an expensive and popular federal jobs program with more than 60,000 employees). Prop 203 is unlikely to be popular with so-called conservatives who prefer gov't control of individual choices (in this case, personal medicine). Opponent's case relies on fear mongering.

301—NO: Put land conservation fund money in the general fund. Some very good politicians want this passed; the "balanced" budget they strung together and promoted depends on this money. Without it we are assured of further cuts to state services—but serious cuts is what smaller gov't is all about. This is a balanced-budget trick, steals funds from Peter to pay Paul, reduces valuable pressure on reducing government and *really* balancing the budget. These voter-approved funds are "protected" and can't be touched without this new vote. \$123MM already set aside to help preserve land near cities would be wiped out, the budget fix is minor and temporary, legislators would rather get their hands on the money and fill budget holes instead of fixing root cause of financial troubles.

302—YES: Repeal First Things First program, an assistance program supposedly for literacy, abuse prevention and more. Deemed a massive waste by opponents: "Ridiculous program not only duplicates existing child-health programs, but has hoarded money instead of spending on kids, wasted tons on administration, and now, on self-promotion ads." (\$600K on new :30 TV ad; profligate ads now appearing for "no on 302" are from the people who get the money—ugh.) From inception in 2006 thru 2009 spent no money on kids' programs, just expensive admin (cigarette smokers pay for this at 80¢/pack tax; the 31 "councils" got \$135 million last year). Another expert: "a wasteful unaccountable bureaucracy with their own stream of taxpayer money, so they're arrogant too. They have mostly hired staff and office space with our money, but when they do offer services, they urge parents to sign up for all the gov't programs to "help" raise children. It's everything we should be against." As in 301, state needs the money to make "balanced" budget scheme fly, or else face more shrinkage. On this, sweep the cash, then sweep out the program (and tax goes to general fund).