

PROPOSITION 204

OFFICIAL TITLE

AN INITIATIVE MEASURE

PROPOSING AMENDMENT TO TITLE 13, CHAPTER 29, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES BY ADDING SECTION 13-2910.07; RELATING TO CRUEL AND INHUMANE CONFINEMENT OF ANIMALS.

TEXT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Arizona:

Sec. 1. Title

This measure shall be known as the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

Sec. 2. Title 13, Chapter 29 is amended by adding a new section 13-2910.07 as follows: 13-2910.07.

CRUEL AND INHUMANE CONFINEMENT OF A PIG DURING PREGNANCY OR OF A CALF RAISED FOR VEAL

A. NOTWITHSTANDING ANY OTHER PROVISION OF TITLE 3 OR TITLE 13, A PERSON SHALL NOT TETHER OR CONFINED ANY PIG DURING PREGNANCY OR ANY CALF RAISED FOR VEAL, ON A FARM, FOR ALL OR THE MAJORITY OF ANY DAY, IN A MANNER THAT PREVENTS SUCH ANIMAL FROM:

1. LYING DOWN AND FULLY EXTENDING HIS OR HER LIMBS; OR

2. TURNING AROUND FREELY.

B. THIS SECTION SHALL NOT APPLY TO:

1. PIGS OR CALVES DURING TRANSPORTATION.

2. PIGS OR CALVES IN RODEO EXHIBITIONS, STATE OR COUNTY FAIR EXHIBITIONS, OR OTHER SIMILAR EXHIBITIONS.

3. THE KILLING OF PIGS OR CALVES ACCORDING TO THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 13, TITLE 3 AND OTHER APPLICABLE LAW AND REGULATIONS.

4. PIGS OR CALVES INVOLVED IN LAWFUL SCIENTIFIC OR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

5. PIGS OR CALVES WHILE UNDERGOING AN EXAMINATION, TEST, TREATMENT OR OPERATION FOR VETERINARY PURPOSES.

6. A PIG DURING THE SEVEN DAY PERIOD PRIOR TO THE PIG'S EXPECTED DATE OF GIVING BIRTH.

C. A PERSON WHO VIOLATES THIS SECTIONS IS GUILTY OF A CLASS 1 MISDEMEANOR.

D. THE FOLLOWING DEFINITIONS SHALL GOVERN THIS SECTION:

1. "CALF" MEANS A CALF OF THE BOVINE SPECIES.

2. "CALF RAISED FOR VEAL" MEANS A CALF RAISED WITH THE INTENT OF SELLING, MARKETING OR DISTRIBUTING THE MEAT, ORGANS OR ANY PART OF SUCH CALF AS A FOOD PRODUCT DESCRIBED AS "VEAL."

3. "FARM" MEANS THE LAND, BUILDING, SUPPORT FACILITIES, AND OTHER EQUIPMENT THAT IS WHOLLY OR PARTIALLY USED FOR THE PRODUCTION OF ANIMALS FOR FOOD OR FIBER.

4. "PIG" MEANS ANY ANIMAL OF THE PORCINE SPECIES.

5. "TURNING AROUND FREELY" MEANS HAVING THE ABILITY TO TURN AROUND IN A COMPLETE CIRCLE WITHOUT ANY IMPEDIMENT, INCLUDING A TETHER, OR, IN THE CASE OF AN ENCLOSURE (INCLUDING WHAT IS COMMONLY DESCRIBED AS

A "GESTATION CRATE" FOR PIGS AND A "VEAL CRATE" FOR CALVES) WITHOUT TOUCHING ANY SIDE OF THE ENCLOSURE.

Sec. 3. Effective Date

This initiative measure shall take effect December 31, 2012.

Sec. 4. Severability

Each section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase or other portion of this initiative measure as adopted shall be deemed to be a separate, distinct and independent provision. If any portion thereof is held invalid or unconstitutional for any reason by any court of competent jurisdiction, the holding shall not affect the validity or constitutionality of any other portion of this initiative measure, which can be given effect without the invalid provision. To this end, the provisions of this initiative measure are declared to be severable.

Sec. 5. No Mandatory Expenditures

Nothing in this initiative measure proposes a mandatory expenditure of state revenues for any purpose, establishes a fund for any specific purpose, or allocates funding for any specific purpose.

Sec. 6. Conditional Funding Source

Subject to Section 7 of this initiative measure, Title 13, Chapter 29 is amended by adding a new section 13-2910.08 as follows:

13-2910.08. THE HUMANE TREATMENT OF FARM ANIMALS FUND

THE "HUMANE TREATMENT OF FARM ANIMALS FUND" IS HEREBY ESTABLISHED TO BE ADMINISTERED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL UNDER THE CONDITIONS AND FOR THE PURPOSES PROVIDED BY THIS SECTION. UPON RECEIPT, THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SHALL DEPOSIT IN THE FUND ANY MONIES RECEIVED FOR THE STATE AS A RESULT OF ENFORCEMENT OF THE HUMANE TREATMENT OF FARM ANIMALS ACT AND ANY MONIES RECEIVED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AS A MONEY DONATION TO THE FUND FROM ANY PUBLIC OR PRIVATE GROUP, SOCIETY, ASSOCIATION OR INDIVIDUAL. THE MONIES IN THE FUND SHALL BE USED ONLY FOR MANDATORY EXPENDITURES, IF ANY, REQUIRED BY THE HUMANE TREATMENT OF FARM ANIMALS ACT AND ADMINISTRATION OF THE FUND. MONIES IN THE FUND ARE NOT SUBJECT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION. THE FUND IS EXEMPT FROM STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO LAPSING OF APPROPRIATIONS AND SHALL NOT REVERT TO THE GENERAL FUND.

Sec. 7. Conditional Enactment

Section 13-2910.08 does not become effective unless a court of competent jurisdiction holds that section 13-2910.07 proposes a mandatory expenditure of state revenues for any purpose, establishes a fund for any specific purpose, or allocates funding for any specific purpose.

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

ANALYSIS BY LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Beginning January 1, 2013, Proposition 204 would amend the Arizona criminal code to make it a class 1 misdemeanor to tether or confine a pig during pregnancy or a calf raised for veal on a farm for all or the majority of a day in a manner that prevents the animal from lying down and fully extending its limbs or turning around freely. The law would not apply to:

1. Pigs or calves during transportation.
2. Pigs or calves in rodeo exhibitions, state or county fair exhibitions or other similar exhibitions.
3. The lawful slaughter of pigs or calves.
4. Pigs or calves involved in lawful scientific or agricultural research.
5. Pigs or calves while undergoing an examination, test, treatment or operation for veterinary purposes.
6. A pig during the seven day period before the pig's expected date of giving birth.

Proposition 204 would tentatively establish an enforcement and administration fund consisting of fines, penalties and other monies generated by the enforcement of this proposition and donations made to the fund. This fund would only be fully implemented if a court ultimately determined that creation of this fund is required by a separate state law dealing with the funding of programs created by a vote of the people.

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

State law requires the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) Staff to prepare a summary of the fiscal impact of certain ballot measures. State and local governments may receive additional revenues in the form of fines and penalty assessments from violators of provisions of Proposition 204. The language of the proposition states that the measure does not impose mandatory expenditure of state revenues for any purpose. If, however, a court rules that the proposition results in mandatory expenditure of state revenue, a Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Fund is established and funded through enforcement related revenue and donations. The total amount of fines will depend on the level of compliance, which is difficult to predict in advance.

ARGUMENTS "FOR" PROPOSITION 204

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION 204

END THE INHUMANE TREATMENT OF FARM ANIMALS

Arizonans for Humane Farms is a coalition of animal welfare organizations, veterinarians, and conservationists.

The Problem:

- In Arizona, 20,000+ breeding pigs are housed in 2' x 7' metal "gestation crates." Sows are kept immobile for most of their lives and suffer from muscle atrophy, pressure sores, joint maladies, and immense frustration.
- **Family farming operations are threatened, and often put out of business, by these hog factories which refuse to treat animals humanely.**
- Disease and ground water contamination can result from the massive waste produced in these operations.

The Solution:

- **This initiative ONLY requires a larger PEN SIZE** or access to pasture, allowing pigs during pregnancy and calves raised for veal to turn around and fully stretch their limbs.
- **Family farms do not use gestation and veal crates – they are therefore PROTECTED.**
- Crates are still allowed after pregnancy to protect the sow from crushing her offspring, and during medical procedures or transport.
- Rodeos, 4-H and county fairs are exempt from these provisions.
- **There is no cost to taxpayers.**
- **Only one large hog factory farm, an out-of-state Delaware Limited Liability Company, accounts for almost all of the factory-farmed pigs in Arizona** – Arizona does not yet have a meaningful veal industry – however, vote "YES" to discourage large factory farms from coming into our state.
- **Any producer, even the Delaware-based corporation, will have 6 years – until 2013 – to phase in more humane housing methods under the provisions of the Humane Farming Act.**
- **This initiative has nothing to do with your choice to eat meat** – it simply establishes a standard that animals raised for food are humanely treated.

A "YES" vote will result in more humane care for factory-farmed animals.

Cheryl Naumann, Chairwoman, Arizonans for Humane Farms, Phoenix

Paid for by "Arizonans for Humane Farms"

Being a veterinarian and having family involved with pork production, I would like to share my perspective on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act. I have seen the two-foot-wide crates that 450-pound sows are forced to spend pregnancy after pregnancy in. Hormel may trot out their well-paid industry vets to try to convince you that never being able to turn around and lie down with limbs extended is no hardship. They may even try to tell you these pigs are comfortable, but the truth is they are frustrated and scared. Their muscles are weak from inactivity making them prone to injury. Their joints are stiff from lack of use. Behavioral changes such as increased aggression are associated with this confinement. These animals are anguished from never being able to act on a single natural impulse

I would like to make this prediction: Because conditions at Arizona's Hormel factory farm are so horrendous, they will never allow reporters inside. Hormel's PR firm will try to convince you that they care about animals, they care about farmers, and they care about you, and they'll spend a lot of money doing so, but they'll never show

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

PROPOSITION 204

how they are treating animals.

98% of the pigs in Arizona are inside of Hormel's plant. You'll hear about small farmers, but to Hormel they are just competition. Every time Hormel cuts another corner, Arizona farmers have to follow suit or go out of business. I have seen this happen with my relatives and it is happening to farmers here in Arizona. This measure will mean that animals have a basic minimum of room and that the playing field has been leveled for real farmers and corporate agri-business. A vote for this measure will be a vote for both animals and family farms.

Janet M. Forrer, DVM, Tucson

We, the undersigned members of Arizona's veterinary community, endorse the Humane Treatment of Farms Animals Act and urge you to vote "yes" on this important measure. Room for veal calves and pregnant sows to turn around, lie down, and extend their limbs is a modest and reasonable proposal. Farm animals deserve at least this minimum standard of care.

Amy Afek, DVM, Phoenix	Warren H. Ahnell, DVM, Tucson	Lynda Beaver, DVM, Gilbert
Nancy Beeuna, DVM, Tucson	Christina L. Bejarano, DVM, Tucson	Kellee J. Blackwell, DVM, Glendale
Bert Blumenfeld, DVM, Tucson	James Boulay, DVM, MS, DACVS, Tucson	John S. Brett, DVM, Tucson
Holly S. Burgess, DVM, Tucson	Fred Bush, DVM, Flagstaff	Corissa Canny, DVM, Tucson
Pam Clark, DVM, Tucson	Bernard N. Cohen, DVM, Tucson	Edward Cohen, DVM, Phoenix
Walter Cole, DVM, Tucson	Kelly Collins, DVM, Scottsdale	Heather E. Connally, DVM, Tucson
Kayomee Darowalla, DVM, Tucson	Ruth Ann DeCou, DVM, Flagstaff	Todd Driggers, DVM, Gilbert
Randall J. Eberhard, DVM, Tucson	S. Evans-Linsell, DVM, Tucson	Christine A. Farrar, DVM, Mesa
Janice L. Flack, DVM, Scottsdale	T.D. Flack, DVM, Scottsdale	Jim Flegenheimer, DVM, Chandler
Lori A. Forgues, DVM, Tucson	Janet M. Forrer, DVM, Tucson	Desiree Garthe, DVM, Phoenix
Anthony J. Gilchrist, DVM, Scottsdale	Barbe Glenn, DVM, Tucson	Barbara R. Gores, DVM, DACVS, Tucson
Christina Guerrero, DVM, Fountain Hills	Ken Halbach, DVM, Tucson	Steven Hall, DVM, Scottsdale
Mark S. Halver, DVM, Phoenix	Kenneth Harding, DVM, Cave Creek	Havah Haskell, DVM, Tucson
Douglas W. Hauser, DVM, Sun City	Danielle Hettler, DVM, BS, Payson	Suzanne M. Higgins, DVM, Phoenix
Andrea Hilden, DVM, Tucson	Lynne Hoban, DVM, Fountain Hills	Bruce P. Hull, DVM, Phoenix
Duane Hunt, DVM, Mesa	Pollyann P. Johnson, DVM, Sun City	Sharmie Johnson, DVM, Peoria
Harold M. Klein, DVM, Tempe	Jill C. Lang, DVM, Phoenix	Tanya Lopez, DVM, Scottsdale
Linda J. Lueth, DVM, Tucson	Rodolfo Manriquez, CVT, Phoenix	Jennifer Marshall, DVM, Surprise
Michael E. Matz, DVM, Tucson	Melissa McGinnis, DVM, Tempe	Margo McKinney, DVM, Tucson
Karen McWhirter, DVM, Tucson	Laura L. Millikan, DVM, Yuma	Marilyn W. Millman, DVM, Scottsdale
Richard W. Morehouse, DVM, Tucson	Kristen L. Nelson, DVM, Scottsdale	Benjamin Nigg, DVM, Peoria
Gene T. Nightengale, DVM, Tucson	Melanie Olson, DVM, Tucson	Caroline Oreel, DVM, Sedona
Heather Oyan, DVM, Glendale	Judith A. Parker, DVM, Tucson	Robin Paterson, DVM, Kingman

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

Beryl Patterson, CVT, Litchfield Park	Mary L. Pencin, DVM, Willcox	Sally Rademaker, DVM, Tucson
Jessica Reed, DVM, Glendale	Tom Remmler, DVM, Sedona	Elizabeth Reno, DVM, Tucson
Celeste Roy, DVM, Tucson	J.R. Sampson, DVM, Phoenix	Kathryn Schulze, DVM, Tucson
Brian Sessink, DVM, Mesa	Paul Silvagni, DVM, Flagstaff	Leigh Ann Stastny, DVM, Glendale
Richard Stolper, DVM, Scottsdale	Carin Sunderman, DVM, Phoenix	Jennifer Tave, DVM, Phoenix
Rachel Temkin, DVM, Tucson	Tara Lyn A. Temple, DVM, Scottsdale	Gregg A. Townsley, DVM, Scottsdale
Bob Vasilopoulos, DVM, DACVS, Tucson	Bonnie L. Walker, DVM, Cave Creek	William F. Wallace, DVM, Tucson
Charlotte Lee Watson, DVM, Gilbert	Elizabeth Weintraub, VMD, Tucson	Linda Rae Westbrook, DVM, Flagstaff
Teri D. Wiblin, DVM, Phoenix <i>Paid for by "Janet M. Forrer"</i>	Tayna Wyman, DVM, Phoenix	

ARIZONA HUMANE SOCIETY ASKS YOU TO VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION 204

Arizona Humane Society, the state's largest nonprofit animal welfare organization, is asking you to help alleviate animal suffering by voting "YES" on Proposition 204, the "Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act."

Since 1957, we have served Arizona residents through our programs including adoptions, spaying and neutering, humane education, disaster response, animal rescue and cruelty investigation services. We are concerned about alleviating the suffering of ALL animals, regardless of their species. We believe that in a civilized society, **even animals raised for food should receive the most basic types of humane care.**

Currently, in our state, over 20,000 breeding pigs are kept in horrendous conditions by large, corporate "factory farms" – during the entirety of their short lives, **they are forced to lie in their own filth and are kept in pens so small that they can never turn around or fully extend their limbs.**

Although there is no significant veal industry in Arizona yet, we must deter profit-motivated operators from moving into our state. Veal calves are kept in narrow pens, typically tethered at the neck, and are never allowed outside. **When taken to slaughter at 16 weeks of age, most must be dragged because their muscles are so weak they are unable to stand.**

Our state has a rich tradition of family farming, where animals are not treated this way – **family farms are protected by this proposition.** We are proud of our citizens, who year after year have made their voice heard at the polls – unnecessary animal suffering will not be tolerated in Arizona! **Voting "YES" will not cost Arizona taxpayers a dime!** As voters, you have the power to address the horrors of factory farming by your "YES" vote on Proposition 204 - thank you.

Cheryl Naumann, President and CEO, Arizona Humane Society, Phoenix

Paid for by "Arizona Humane Society"

Ann Harwood, Esq., Chairman of the Board, Arizona Humane Society, Phoenix

SHERIFF JOE URGES YES ON THE HUMANE FARMING PROPOSITION

As Sheriff of Maricopa County, I fight crime and do my best to make our communities in Arizona safe.

But there's another aspect of my work that you may know less about.

I have a heart for animals, and I despise cruelty in any form. I have fought for stronger laws to crack down on animal cruelty. The serious abuse of animals is a felony in Arizona. And when our deputies find people breaking laws against animal cruelty, there is always room for them in my jails.

All animals deserve to be treated with respect, and that's why I am supporting the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act on the state-wide ballot this November.

I am a meat eater, and I enjoy a good steak as much as the next guy. But I believe that even animals raised for food deserve a decent life and a merciful death.

It's wrong to put a pig or a veal calf in a crate so small that the animal cannot even turn around. And they are in these crates almost all the time. When I think of their misery, it just makes me sick.

It's one thing for a criminal to be housed in confinement. They deserve to be incarcerated. But the animals didn't do anything wrong, yet they get a life sentence of harsh and constant confinement.

So I say, we have to raise animals for food, but we have to do it the honorable way. Let's not allow people to treat them in a way that causes them to suffer. Join me in voting YES on The Humane Farming Proposition.

Joseph M. Arpaio, Sheriff, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office, Phoenix

Paid for by "Arizona Humane Society"

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

VOTE YES ON 204

IT IS TIME TO STOP KILLING ANIMALS!
IT IS TIME TO STOP KILLING ANIMALS FOR MEAT!
IT IS TIME TO STOP KILLING AND HUNTING ANIMALS!
IT IS TIME TO STOP FARMERS AND RANCHERS FROM KILLING THESE ANIMALS FOR MEAT.
THEIR SLAUGHTERING OF ANIMALS IS CAUSING SUFFERING.

THEIR PRODUCTION OF MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS IS A CRUEL AND BARBARIC PROCESS.

IT IS TIME TO STOP KILLING ANIMALS FOR MEAT. IT IS TIME TO STOP KILLING ANIMALS PERIOD!
LET'S STOP THIS MADNESS OF KILLING OR HUNTING ANIMALS – PROP 204 IS A GOOD PLACE TO START!

Jackie Winsor, Phoenix

Please vote yes on Proposition 204.

There are serious negative environmental impacts from large Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) where thousands of animals are confined in one facility. These facilities are not only inhumane, but they also produce enormous amounts of animal waste. This waste can leak into our rivers and streams contaminating our drinking water and spreading disease. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, hog, chicken and cattle waste has polluted 35,000 miles of rivers in 22 states and contaminated groundwater in 17 states.

Factory farms negatively affect air quality as well. They are the largest source of toxic ammonia air pollution in the U.S., plus the air around factory farms is contaminated with suspended dust particles. These particles can trigger asthma attacks and cause other respiratory problems.

Proposition 204 deals with one aspect of factory farms by ensuring that the animals have more space to turn around and that they are not tethered in a manner that restricts their ability to move around.

Currently, Arizona has relatively few of these operations. We should keep it that way. Proposition 204 moves Arizona another step in the right direction. Please support Proposition 204.

Ken Langton, Chair, Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter, Tucson

Don Steuter, Conservation Chair, Sierra Club – Grand Canyon Chapter, Phoenix

Paid for by "Sierra Club Grand Canyon Chapter"

I strongly support Proposition 204 Here's why.

I was raised on our family farm in North Dakota that has been in my family since 1896. My father was a traditional farmer who practiced responsible sustainable farming practices and took pride in being a steward of the land.

In 2003 we learned that a huge hog operation was being planned a little over a mile from our family farm. Due to the size of this operation we had concerns on how this operation could impact our community; what we found was very disturbing. These operations can have devastating effects on the soil, water quality, and surrounding community. Studies show that living by one of these operations creates health risks and decreases property value. These farms operate under unrestricted agricultural laws when in fact they're industrial. The particular operation by our farm was permitted for 20,900 hogs that would "turn over" 3 times a year. Their terminology is "growing" pigs rather than "raising" them. The term used for factory farms is CAFOs, Confined Animal Feeding Operations, and the "confined" aspect of this industry is what Arizonans for Humane Farms takes issue with.

You don't have to be an "animal rights radical" to have concerns about factory farming, especially when you see hogs packed into metal crates so small they can't turn around. They're fed "specialized diets" with growth hormones and antibiotics. Antibiotics --to help avoid disease among so many animals in confined spaces, and growth hormones because the faster they grow, the faster they can be "turned around". Unfortunately, the term "turned around" only applies to marketing and not to humane treatment.

Arizonans should support family farmers and ranchers and vote yes on the Humane Farming Initiative.

Candace Jackson, Born and Raised in North Dakota (not grown), Mesa

Paid for by "Arizonans for Humane Farms"

PEOPLE OF FAITH SUPPORT HUMANE TREATMENT OF ALL GOD'S CREATURES

As pastor of the Corpus Christi Parish, I'm heartened by the presence of the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act on the ballot, and I encourage voters to support this important initiative.

One of our greatest duties is to be good stewards of the Lord's creation, including the animals with whom we share this planet. Unfortunately, on today's factory farms, good stewardship is sorely absent. Mother pigs are confined in crates too narrow for them to turn around, while calves raised for veal are chained by the neck inside similarly restrictive crates, barely able to move for months on end. These animals are abused in ways that would shock and caring person of faith.

God created these animals with the need to move about. When it comes to their intensive confinement inside tiny crates, little could be a greater perversion of God's will.

Pope Benedict XVI put it best when discussing factory farming, asserting that "this degrading of living creatures to a commodity seems to me in fact to contradict the relationship of mutuality that comes across in the Bible."

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

PROPOSITION 204

While God has given us dominion, that is not a license for ruthless domination of animals, especially those we raise for food. We take so much from these creatures; offering a small amount of common decency in return is truly the very least we owe them.

Catholics, and all people of faith, should support offering the mere ability to turn around and extend all limbs to pigs and calves. Abusing these animals in the ways we commonly do on factory farms is sinful, and we can take a modest step toward reducing our abuse of power over them by voting YES on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

Father Albert Francis Hoorman, Pastor of Corpus Christi Catholic Church, Phoenix

Paid for by "Karen Michael"

The Animal Defense League of Arizona urges you to vote yes on Proposition 204.

Farm animals have the least legal protection of all animals in our state. They deserve the modest protection that would be given, if voters approve the Humane Farming Initiative.

Here is what Proposition 204 does

- Applies only to pregnant pigs and calves raised for veal
- Requires that these animals be given enough room to lie down, turn around and fully extend their limbs
- Gives farms plenty of time—until 2013-- to comply with the new law
- Allows rodeos, county fairs, 4-H and similar events to go on as usual
- Preserves family farms

To clear up misconceptions, Proposition 204

- Does NOT restrict the sale or consumption of meat
- Does NOT change how animals are transported
- Does NOT ban research on animals
- Does NOT cost taxpayers any money
- Does NOT change the methods of slaughter of animals for food

Industrialized, factory farms owned by huge agricultural companies are sweeping across the country and coming to Arizona. They use cruel and inhumane methods to confine livestock. They treat pregnant pigs and calves raised for veal like inanimate production units, rather than thinking, feeling animals. They place them in enclosures so small that they can't move, lie down, turn around or even fully extend their limbs. Sows are kept constantly pregnant, and held in these tiny crates 24 hours a day seven days a week, for almost their entire lives. It is a horrible existence, and it is happening here in Arizona.

To stop cruel and inhumane treatment of farm animals, Vote YES on Proposition 204.

Stephanie Nichols-Young, President, Phoenix

Karen Michael, Secretary, Peoria

Paid for by "Animal Defense League of AZ"

On today's industrialized farms, many pigs are confined in "gestation crates" just two feet wide and calves are tethered in "veal crates" where they can barely move, a source of pain and suffering.

Voting yes on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act upholds the traditional standards of farming by providing these animals with the most basic humane consideration. The proposal simply requires that calves and pigs be given adequate space to turn around and stretch their limbs.

While protecting animals from cruel and relentless confinement, this measure will also help protect the environment from the massive runoff of waste from confined animal feeding operations. And it will help protect family farms and rural communities from the harms of industrialized animal agriculture.

Having cared for farm animals for the past twenty years and holding a masters degree in agricultural economics from Cornell University, I have great respect for family farmers and the values they live by. At their best, they live by the values of personal responsibility, integrity, and compassion.

We oppose factory farming because it is a betrayal of traditional farming values. It puts efficiency above everything, forgetting the duty to treat animals decently. I agree with the Iowa hog farmer who said of factory farmers, "They treat the animal like a machine. But it's not a machine. It's an animal, and it needs care."

Farmers have raised pigs and calves for ages without confining them in narrow crates and treating them as unfeeling units of production. These devices are an insult to honorable farming traditions, and the law should set a higher standard. With the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act, Arizona voters have a chance to relieve many animals of needless misery, and to show that cruelty to animals is not an Arizona value.

Gene Bauston, President, Watkins Glen

Holly McNulty, Secretary/Treasurer, Watkins
Glen

Paid for by "Farm Sanctuary, Inc."

Adapted from Arizona Republic column, February 2006:

"... Pork producers figured out some years ago that if they packed the maximum number of pigs into the minimum space, if they pinned the creatures down into fit-to-size iron crates and turned the 'farm' into a sunless hell of metal and concrete, it made everything so much more efficient. . . . As for veal, it is by definition the product of a sick, anemic, deliberately malnourished calf, a newborn dragged away from his mother in the first hours of life. . . .

"Over the years, one miserly deprivation led to another, ever harsher methods were applied to force costs lower and lower, and so on until the animals ceased to be understood as living creatures at all. . . . 'Cost-saver' in

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

industrial livestock agriculture usually means 'moral shortcut.' For all of its "science-based" pretensions, factory farming is really just an elaborate, endless series of evasions from the most elementary duties of honest animal husbandry. . . . To the factory farmer, in contrast to the traditional farmer with his sense of honor and obligation, the animals are 'production units,' and accorded all the sympathy that term suggests. . . .

" . . . In the quiet of the voting booth, ask yourself why any creature of God, however humble, should be made to endure the dark, lonely, tortured existence of the factory farm. The answer will send an unequivocal message, to factory farmers here and to all concerned, that unbridled arrogance, bad faith, and rank cruelty are not Arizona values."

(Matthew Scully worked for Arizona governors Mecham, Mofford, and Symington. A former special assistant and speechwriter for President Bush, he is author of *Dominion: The Power of Man, the Suffering of Animals, and the Call to Mercy*.)

Matthew Scully, Los Angeles

Paid for by "Arizona Humane Society"

As a conservative, fifth-generation Arizonan and mother of four children, I support the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

I believe we owe a duty of stewardship to the farm animals we raise for food. We fail in that duty when we allow those animals—be they pigs or calves—to be confined day after day in cramped spaces too small for them to even turn around or lie down and extend their legs. The Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act is a measured and reasonable provision that allows Arizona's industrial farm operations several years to adjust their confinement practices. This measure will have no effect on Arizona's traditional farmers or traditional farming practices and will be of no cost to the taxpayers.

As Arizonans, we should honor our conservative heritage and live up to our stewardship.

I urge you to vote YES on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

Julie Dana Young, Phoenix

RE: Arguement FOR Humane Farming ballot proposition

The voters of Arizona now are presented with the grandest opportunity to share in helping animals who are defenseless against acts of cruelty imposed on them. The general public through information and education have come to realize the intense cruelty suffered by pregnant sows and veal calves in that they cannot move their bodies including their limbs while crammed into crates. These acts of cruelty are happening on industrialized animal production facilities commonly known as "factory farms".

Arizona has a high volume factory farm which utilizes about 20,000 sow gestation crates. The sows up to the time of birthing cannot move within these crates. The Humane Farming initiative will permit by act of law the sows to at least be able to stand up, extend their limbs, and turn around. This act will also apply to confined veal calves. The owners of these production facilities, large agri corporations, have until the end of 2012 to comply with the requirements of the law. Thus the costs to expand the crate sizes over a period of 6 years will be very minimal.

The issue of cruelty to animals as addressed in this initiative is a moral one. We the voters of Arizona must take the high road through our hearts to diminish the inhumane treatment of veal calves and pregnant sows. We are their only voices.

Arizonans have already shared their humane hearts in that over 1000 volunteer signature gatherers and 218,000 signers paved the way to place the Humane Farming initiative on the November 2006 ballot. They are all to be congratulated and so shall Arizona voters who will make our State a shining example of treating all animals with humane respect.

Jim Shea, Phoenix

I support Proposition 204, the Humane Farming Initiative, and I grew up on a small farm (which my family still owns) where I participated in the raising and slaughter of pigs and cows for years.

When this initiative was first proposed, the large factory farm lobby started a campaign of name-calling and scare-tactics, claiming that those who supported the Humane Farming Initiative were "radicals" with an "anti-meat" agenda. This is not the case.

The initiative language simply seeks to prevent a pig or calf from being confined so tightly that it cannot lie down or turn around for the majority of a day. This is not a radical or anti-meat concept. At no time were any of the animals on our family farm ever constrained to the point that they could not lie down or turn around for an entire day. I cannot think of a legitimate reason to treat a farm animal so poorly and neither can the large factory farm lobby - - which is why they have decided to launch a campaign against the Initiative's supporters while ignoring the Initiative's true purpose.

Please do not be fooled by the political tactics of big business and vote **YES** on Proposition 204, the Humane Farming Initiative. We CAN farm animals humanely.

Sherry R. Scott, Scottsdale

The Second Chance Center for Animals in Flagstaff encourages Arizona voters to vote "YES" on Proposition 204, "Arizonans for Humane Farms."

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

PROPOSITION 204

As the largest animal welfare organization in the Northern Arizona region, we have had the pleasure of seeing the care and concern that residents of our community, and the other rural communities in our area, have for animals. Many farming and ranching operations dot the countryside of Northern Arizona – cattle and other livestock can be seen grazing over thousands of acres along interstate highways and country roadsides. This is farming and ranching as it was meant to be, as many of us experienced as children, and how some in the “industrial farming” world would have us believe is still the norm. Sadly, these pastoral scenes are becoming a “vanishing resource” and are coming under greater threat of large-scale factory farms who have little regard for animals as anything more than “production units” designed to put money into corporate pockets.

Our organization was founded out of a deep sense of obligation to alleviate the suffering of animals in the northern Arizona community. As a compassionate people, we as citizens of Arizona must speak out against the horrible suffering endured by animals raised in industrialized factory farms. This proposition does not prohibit animal slaughter or restrict the consumption of meat products, as opponents would like to have you think. It is about one thing only – pen size. Who would seek to deny an animal the simple freedoms of laying down, stretching out, and turning around? We must demand basic decency and the reduction of unnecessary suffering from all animals in our great state.

Please join the Second Chance Center for Animals, and our rural neighbors, in voting “YES” for Proposition 204, and setting the standard for humane care for all animals.

Robert W. Koons, President, Board of Directors,
Second Chance Center for Animals, Flagstaff

Richard F. Wilson, Treasurer, Board of Directors
and Founder, Second Chance Center for
Animals, Flagstaff

Paid for by “Second Chance Center for Animals”

As scientists, we are concerned about the serious danger that factory farming presents to public health.

Over half of U.S. farm animals are now concentrated on 5 percent of livestock farms. As these concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) grow, so do health concerns.

CAFOs generate an estimated 2 trillion pounds of animal manure yearly. Stored in open air lagoons, manure wastes generate organic dust, molds, toxic bacteria, and volatile gases such as ammonia and hydrogen sulfide.

Researchers from the Centers for Disease Control, the University of Iowa and Iowa State all agree that CAFO emissions may in fact constitute a hazard to public and worker health, finding increased incidents of headaches, brain damage, gastrointestinal illnesses and even life-threatening pulmonary edema.

Moreover, children who attend school near large-scale livestock farms may be at higher risk for asthma, according to a study in the Journal of the American College of Chest Physicians (June 2006).

To sustain animals in the crowded and unnatural conditions of industrial farming, antibiotics and related drugs are used in massive quantities. This produces antibiotic-resistant bacteria, which can render drugs ineffective in protecting and saving human lives. Children especially are at high risk of infections with drug-resistant organisms linked directly to the agricultural use of antimicrobials. According to a peer-reviewed study by researchers at Johns Hopkins University, inhaling air from industrial hog farms can serve as another pathway for antibiotic-resistant bacteria. Hundreds of organizations, including the American Medical Association, oppose the routine use of antibiotics as feed additives.

The American Public Health Association has issued a call for local, state, and federal officials to enact a moratorium on any new factory farms because of their devastating effects on human health and the environment. Your YES vote on the Humane Farm Act is a crucial step in the right direction.

Cynthia J. Jacquemart, MD, Pediatrics, Phoenix

Jeffrey L. Maxcy, MD, Pediatrics, Glendale

Nolawi M. Mengesha, Internal Medicine,
Phoenix

Sangeeta N. Ojha, MD, Pediatrics, Phoenix

Robin Silver, MD, Emergency Medicine,
Phoenix

Deborah Wilson, MD, Gynecology, Advanced
Laparoscopic Surgery, Paradise Valley

Paid for by “The Law Office of Stephanie Nichols-Young”

Heather Lane, CPNP, Pediatrics, Glendale

Mary J. McGee, MD, Pediatrics, Waddell

Cecil F. Michael, Jr., MD, Pediatrics, Peoria

Krystal Palmer, Pediatrics, Peoria

Carrie L. Walters, Neurosurgery, Phoenix

The Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act is a chance for Arizonans of every background – from conservative Republican to liberal Democrat – to join in agreement that abusing helpless animals is wrong.

Consider what some noted conservatives have recently had to say about factory farming.

Veteran conservative columnist George F. Will wrote of the “intrinsic evil” of cruelty to animals, citing the “pain-inflicting confinements and mutilations” of factory farming that make it a “serious issue of public policy.”

Conservative Fred Barnes, a Fox commentator, observed in The Wall Street Journal: “On the old family farms, pigs and cattle and chickens were raised for food, but they were free for a time. . . . They had a life. On industrial farms they don’t.”

Conservative author Andrew Ferguson wrote in Bloomberg News about the attitude that views farm animals

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the “for” and “against” arguments.

as “mere production units.” Gestation crates that prevent pigs from even turning around are, he observed, “just one of the cruel innovations the modern industrial farm depends upon.”

Conservative Jeffrey Hart of National Review defined factory farming as “the horrific treatment of millions of farm animals.” And Father Richard John Neuhaus of National Review wrote of “the horrors perpetuated against pigs on industrial farms.” The facts of industrial farming, said Father Neuhaus, constitute “a prima facie case that such methods entail cruelty to animals that warrants public and governmental attention.”

Charles Colson, the Christian author, urged his fellow conservatives to find out “the cattle of the earth are treated on factory farms,” because “we have a duty to prevent the needless torment of animals.”

On Election Day, that’s what the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals really comes down to – our duty to prevent cruelty and needless animal suffering. And Arizonans can affirm that simple moral principle with a resounding “Yes” for humane farms.

The Honorable Kathleen Dunbar, Former
Arizona State Representative, Legislative
District 13, Tucson

The Honorable Barbara Leff, Arizona State
Senator, Legislative District 11, Paradise Valley

The Honorable Carolyn S. Allen, Arizona State
Senator, Legislative District 8, Scottsdale

The Honorable Toni Hellon, Arizona State
Senator, Legislative District 13, Tucson

Paid for by “Arizona Humane Society”

The Humane Society of Southern Arizona, an organization dedicated to rescuing, protecting and saving the lives of animals for over sixty years, strongly endorses a “yes” vote on Proposition 204, “Arizonans for Humane Farms.” This ballot initiative will outlaw the cruel and intensive confinement of pregnant pigs and veal calves on factory farms.

For decades, Arizona’s farmers raised animals in a humane manner – allowing them to go outdoors and engage in other natural behaviors. Today, many family farmers have been displaced by corporate farming interests that show little concern for basic animal husbandry standards. Instead, they raise animals in intensive confinement – in conditions so severe that the animals cannot even turn around in their cages or crates. The extreme overcrowded conditions cause suffering for the animals while polluting the air, contaminating groundwater and threatening human health. This proposition will restore Arizona’s tradition of humane farming and protect animals, the environment and human health.

This proposition simply states that calves raised for veal and pregnant pigs should not be confined in a manner that prevents them from lying down and fully extending their limbs, or from being able to turn around freely. It would continue to allow the use of pig farrowing crates, which are commonly used during the time of birthing when the young pigs are most at risk from injury. It would, however, eliminate a cruel practice that has no place in this state.

This is not a radical proposition; even those animals raised for slaughter deserve to be treated decently and humanely. This proposition is about setting clear and ethical standards of animal husbandry within our state, and defining the limits of acceptable treatment to animals raised for food. It bars the worst cruelties of factory farming, and puts the law on the side of compassion.

Susan Wilson, President/CEO, Humane
Society of Southern Arizona, Tucson

M. Jo Smith, Chair Board of Directors, Humane
Society of Southern Arizona, Tucson

Paid for by “The Humane Society of Southern Arizona, Inc.”

As a fourth generation rancher, I urge you to support the Humane Farming Initiative.

Several large housed hog factories were planned and developed near my family’s ranch in northeastern Colorado. As I saw what was involved by the sheer number of hogs and volume of waste, I became very concerned about the Ogallala Aquifer which is the sole source of water for our community and other impact to our way of life. I soon realized that these operations would do more to destroy and devastate rural communities and our way of life than enhance it.

I helped build support for a grassroots citizens’ initiative in the state of Colorado in 1998. We placed an initiative on the ballot that voters approved by 63% to regulate big hog factories. Amendment 14 set-out protections for air standards and water regulations on the waste from large commercial hog operations, in an attempt to keep these industrialized facilities from adversely affecting Colorado’s valuable water, air, and land.

This fight is being waged all over the country on many fronts, pitting small ranchers and farmers and their rural lifestyle against the industrial animal factories, many of which are owned by large, out of state corporations. They tend to divide the communities they locate in and tear the social fabric often beyond repair.

I live near these sites and have first-hand experience on how small, rural communities are affected. Industrialized animal factories also use what I believe to be cruel animal husbandry practices which most traditional family farmers and ranchers do not condone. That’s why I support the efforts of Arizonans for Humane Farms.

Don’t be fooled, in my opinion and experience, Big Agribusiness does not represent the position of family ranchers and farmers.

Sue Jarrett, Wray

Paid for by Karen Michael

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the “for” and “against” arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

Dear fellow Arizonans,

I'm an Arizona resident and I grew up on a small family farm, so I understand what family farming is all about. I'm also aware of what's happened to small family farmers and the environment in our neighbor state of Utah since a mega-factory pork operation opened up in the mid-1990s. I strongly encourage my fellow Arizonans to vote YES on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

In Utah, when a mega-factory pork producer opened up just over a decade ago, it severely harmed the local farming families. The number of small pig farmers in the state has dwindled since the opening of this factory farm, but the number of pigs raised in the state has skyrocketed. In just a three-year period, the number of Utah pig farms fell from 800 to 500, while pork production increased nearly seven-fold: from 44,000 to 295,000 pigs. In addition, the Utah operation had several large "spills" of contaminated waste, resulting in fines and severely harming the environment.

Don't be fooled by the opposition to this initiative. The Humane Farming Act IS about protecting small family farms and the environment. We shouldn't allow Arizona to become like Utah. A YES vote is the right thing for Arizona and it's of no cost to the taxpayer. For the sake of our state's small family farmers and our environment, please VOTE YES on The Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

Kelly Cooney, Queen Creek

The twentieth century has witnessed the rise of industrialized, confinement animal agriculture, a different approach from the traditional animal husbandry eloquently described in the 23rd Psalm, which approach created a fair, symbiotic, mutually beneficial and ancient contract between humans and animals.

In my opinion, as author of books on farm animal welfare and teacher of animal science, veterinary, and philosophy classes, sow stalls represent confinement practices at their worst. Given the natural behavior of sows, involving extensive foraging on soft loam and building nests on hillsides for excreta to run off, and their high intelligence, confining them in small enclosure typically measuring 2' X 7' by 3', called gestation crates, for most of their productive lives is morally unacceptable. No sows can turn around in these crates, and many cannot stand up or scratch; some cannot lie down with their body fully extended. Behavioral anomalies, signs of unmitigated stress, and "production disease" problems arise; not a major problem in extensive situations.

The industrialization of swine production has caused other societal problems. These include the loss of small producers (Between 1974 and 1996 numbers of producers declined from 750,000 to 157,000). Between 1994 and 1996, one out of every four hog producers left the business. This in turn led to loss and devitalization of rural communities based in hog production. In addition, "pig-smart" workers have been replaced by unskilled, minimum-wage labor in many industrial operations. The concentration of hogs in large numbers in confinement operations leads to air and water pollution, problems of waste disposal, odor problems, decline in property values, problems of sustainability and issues of worker health, as well as problems of "political health", with large operations exerting unhealthy influence on the political process. We must recall Jefferson's dictum that small, independent farmers are the backbone of democracy.

Bernard Rollin, Fort Collins

Paid for by "Arizona Humane Society"

As the nation's largest animal welfare group with more than 9.5 million supporters—including 188,000 who live in Arizona, 1 in every 27 state residents—The Humane Society of the United States urges a "Yes" vote on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

- **All animals deserve humane treatment, including those animals raised for food.** Farm animals should not be subjected to cruel and intensive confinement that prevents even the most basic movement. Unrelieved confinement causes their muscles to weaken, joints to stiffen, bones to become brittle and break, and causes the animals undue stress and immense frustration.

- **Leading farm animal welfare scientists oppose these cruel crates.** Farm animal expert Dr. Temple Grandin states, "Gestation crates for pigs are a real problem...Basically, you're asking a sow to live in an airline seat...I think it's something that needs to be phased out."

- **This measure protects traditional farms and their ethic of common sense animal husbandry.** Family farmers have a proud tradition of ensuring that their animals have decent lives. Arizona's pig farms never resembled industrial hog factories, where the animals live their entire lives in crates and never feel the sun or the soil.

- **Just as animals deserve a merciful death, they deserve a merciful life.** There is a law requiring humane slaughter of farm animals, but no laws to require humane treatment while they are being reared.

- **This measure will prevent massive new corporate hog farms from taking root in Arizona.** In Utah, a corporate farm, housing nearly 1 million pigs, set up operation in the Utah desert, with detrimental effects on animals, groundwater, and local communities.

- **Giving animals enough space to turn around and fully extend their limbs is just common sense and common decency.**

Wayne Pacelle, President and CEO, Bethesda

David Wiebers, M.D., Chair, Board of Directors,
Rochester

Paid for by "The Humane Society of the United States"

I have devoted my life to studying animals in the wild, and now I am attempting to use my experience and understanding of animals to advocate for their well-being. I am proud to join my friends at the Arizona Humane

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Society and the Humane Society of the United States in supporting the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

All animals deserve humane treatment, including those raised for food. On factory farms, animals are treated as mere machines. Two of the most notorious factory farming practices are the confinement of pigs and calves in restrictive crates, which this measure seeks to change:

- Pigs are highly intelligent—as intelligent as dogs. Yet sows kept for breeding on factory farms are confined in tiny individual crates so narrow they cannot even turn around. Deprived of nearly all opportunity to express their natural behavior, they bite at anything they can reach. Then they give up, become listless, and behave as though they are in mourning – with head lowered and eyes glazed.

- Most calves raised for veal are chained by the neck inside of similarly restrictive crates. They cannot lie in comfort. They cannot even turn around. At the end, after four months of suffering, they are dragged from their prisons, their legs so weak that they can barely walk.

Not only is this mistreatment of animals unconscionable and inhumane, the future of small family farmers hangs in the balance as more and more traditional farmers give up, unable to compete with the corporate factory farms whose sole aim is to make as much profit per animal as possible.

Anyone concerned about the humane treatment of animals or the viability of small family farms should vote yes on Measure 204, and approve the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

Jane Goodall, PhD, DBE, Founder, Arlington

William Johnston, President, Arlington

Paid for by "The Jane Goodall Institute"

ARGUMENTS "AGAINST" PROPOSITION 204

VOTE NO on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

While the Act on the surface is benign, it represents the beginning of a campaign by Animal Rights – Animal Worshipers to force us to become vegetarians.

- New Zealand has banned cooking live lobsters in boiling water alleging that it is painful for the lobsters. A restaurant in Italy was fined for displaying live lobsters on ice alleging that it was painful. In Norway they tried to have the Government ban the use of worms as fish bait on the grounds that it was painful for the worms. Invertebrates such as lobsters and worms can not feel pain.

- In the U.K they are trying to have angling (sports fishing) banned on the grounds that the fish feel pain when caught on a fishhook. There is no evidence that fish consciously feel pain.

- They are trying to have the Kosher slaughter of cows banned in the United States. It is banned in Germany, Norway, Switzerland, and New Zealand. One of the first actions Nazi Germany took against the Jews was to ban the Kosher slaughter of animals.

- Extremist Animal Rights – Animal Worshipers have burned down animal slaughter plants.

- They have demanded that the University of Arizona shut down its Animal Sciences Program. (Arizona Daily Wildcat, April 22, 2003: p. 1)

- They are opposed to the mutilation of cockroaches (Science, May 19, 2006: p. 979)

Stop this Nonsense Now. Vote No on the Humane Treatment of Farm Animals Act.

Alfred Levinson, Tucson

VOTE NO on Prop 204

It's a sad day when out-of-state, anti-meat, anti-science based interest groups can come to Arizona from back East to push their cruel and inhumane agenda on Arizona's farm families.

They paid petition signature gatherers to spread false-hoods and distort modern, humane and science-based agricultural practices.

The U.S. is already becoming a net importer of agriculture this year.

Vote 'NO' and let the liberal Farm Sanctuary and the other outside backers know that their agenda won't fly in Arizona!

Chris Udall, Executive Director

Agri-Business Council of Arizona, Inc.

N.W. "Bill" Plummer, Secretary

Agri-Business Council of Arizona, Inc.

Chris Udall, Executive Director, Agri-Business Council of Arizona, Inc., Mesa

N.W. "Bill" Plummer, Secretary, Agri-Business Council of Arizona, Inc., Scottsdale

Paid for by "Agri-Business Council of Arizona, Inc."

As a small family producer of pork products and a third generation born and raised Arizonan, I am very concerned of an initiative that will be presented to the Arizona voters by out of state special interest groups in an attempt to place unnecessary regulations on Arizona's pork producers.

Arizona pork producers follow industry guidelines, which are tested, researched, and approved by the American Veterinary Medical Association. A stress free environment is critical to all pork production operations as well as fresh water and nutritious feed. Our herd is fed a fresh ration that is ground on site from corn, soybean, minerals and vitamins. No hormones, old or spoiled products are ever added to our feed.

Arizona pork producers work many long hours from the break of day, feeding and caring for the herd to all hours of the night as sows farrow bringing the next generation into the world. These tasks are necessary to bring the pork product to harvest in State and Federally inspected processing plants.

Many Arizona jobs are dependant on the production of pork in Arizona. Placing impractical restrictions will

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

PROPOSITION 204

effect the production and inevitability put the family farm out of business. This will in turn have the "trickle down" effect with loss of jobs in many other supporting industries that employ Arizona citizens. Arizona we must vote **NO!**

Vicki Trump, Arizona Berkshires, Buckeye

As a small producer of pork products, we ask that the Arizona voters are informed of an initiative that will be presented by out of state special interest groups like HSUS (Humane Society of the United States) Farm Sanctuary, PETA, and others as an attempt to place regulations on Arizona's pork producers.

As an Arizona pork producer for 35 years, we use industry accepted methods in our swine production. Agriculture is an important part of Arizona history as well as its future and feeding Arizonan's is the goal of the pork producer. An environment with the least amount of stress to ensure top quality product for the consumer is imperative to a successful harvest.

Many jobs in Arizona are dependent on Agriculture; initiatives like Proposition 204 will put many Arizona jobs in jeopardy including the occupation of the small pig farmer. We will Vote **NO** on this Proposition.

Pam Fiakas, PamLann Farms, Litchfield Park Lanny Fahs, PamLann Farms, Litchfield Park

I am a contributor to the Arizona Humane Society and I do not support this initiative.

We all have a moral obligation to respect and treat animals humanely. That is why we have laws dealing with cruelty. Farmers and Ranchers go beyond their moral obligation and care for their animals because of the products they produce. Animals that are treated poorly do not produce as well as the animals that are cared for using today's modern, safe, and sanitary practices. Today's food products from these animals are safe, wholesome and affordable.

I hope voters see this initiative for what it is. It was brought to Arizona by two out-of-state animal rights groups with their pro-vegetarian, and anti-meat agendas.

Farmers and ranchers take very good care of their animals as though their family's livelihood depends on it. To say otherwise is HOGWASH.

Please vote NO.

Cecil H. Miller, Jr., Litchfield Park

Out-of State Anti-Farm Groups Target Arizona Farmers and Ranchers.

I am a teacher, counselor and a small family farmer. These out-of-state animal rights groups, Farm Sanctuary and Humane Society of the U.S. shut down two family farm operations in Florida with this same initiative. Now they are here in Arizona with their anti-farm agenda.

I know Arizona farmers large and small treat their animals humanely. I have Christian values that include respecting and caring for God's creations.

Farmers have an additional reason to give proper care and attention to farm animals. Animals that are not treated with proper care do not produce the food products we enjoy at our dinner table.

I hope voters will join me and vote NO on Proposition 204.

Sherry Saylor, Buckeye

PETA and PETA Wannabes Do Not Speak for Arizona.

PETA activists are responsible for burning down buildings, vandalizing businesses and harassing citizens with their pro-vegan, anti-meat, anti-fur, anti-research and anti-farm agenda. Their New York and Washington D.C. based kissing cousins, Farm Sanctuary and Humane Society of the U.S. are telling Arizona voters that Arizona farmers treat their pigs and veal calves inhumanely.

First, we do not raise veal in Arizona so that is their first **lie** to voters.

Second, our one large hog operation that these radicals have targeted, has a clean bill of health from our own Environmental Department. So, that is **lie** number two when they say we are polluting the air and water.

Third, this modern livestock facility provides a safe and sanitary environment that reduces stress on the animals. Their statements that pigs are being treated cruelly and are under stress, is **lie** number three. The American Veterinarian Medical Association says these modern facilities cause no more stress on the animal than do other types of pens.

Fourth, the hogs can lie down and stretch their legs. Their **lie** number four says they cannot.

Their **fifth lie** is that they are protecting the small farmer. These radical groups successfully ran this same initiative in Florida and the result was that the two small family operations that were in Florida are no longer raising hogs.

Their arguments in Arizona are **HOGWASH**. If some of them hold water in other states, they should take the initiative there. Arizona farmers and ranchers should not be saddled with criminal offenses for a problem that does not exist here.

Vote NO on Proposition 204.

Elizabeth Foster, Gilbert

Proposition 204 is **HOGWASH!**

The Humane Society of the United States and Farm Sanctuary, the out-of-state backers of this initiative,

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

have an extremist agenda of eliminating livestock agriculture and meat consumption in this country. They are not friends of farmers. They are not friends of consumers. Their agenda for you is anti-choice. Their agenda for Arizona farmers is anti-meat and anti-science.

Modern agriculture is humane and science based - just ask the American Veterinarian Medical Association. These out-of-state radicals challenge the morality and ethics of farmers at the same time saying they are defending the family farm. This same initiative by these same groups put Florida family hog farmers out of business in 2002. Now they have come to Arizona.

They are defenders only of their extremist agenda, and we hope Arizona voters see through the "hogwash" they serve up - let's label their message "return to sender".

Vote NO on 204. It is HOGWASH!

Kevin G. Rogers, President, Arizona Farm
Bureau, Mesa

James W. Klinker, Chief Administrative Officer,
Arizona Farm Bureau, Mesa

Paid for by "Arizona Farm Bureau"

Vote NO on Proposition 204

As a practicing Veterinarian and life long caretaker of animals - I ask you to join me in voting NO on Proposition 204. It does not provide for a single measure that will actually improve the care or lives of hogs and calves. It ignores decades of animal husbandry and animal science practices which have proven to increase the care and health of these animals.

Most of the animals I see everyday in my veterinary practice are better cared for when they are confined in ways to reduce the stress and competition created by grouping animals of different sizes and ages. Today's modern producer understands the needs and provides the expertise - gained by the experience of watching their animals each and everyday - necessary for their comfort, care and performance.

As a professional veterinarian, I have taken and uphold my medical oath to care for the animals I treat and diagnose. Arizona's livestock producing families follow a strong ethical and economical model when taking care of their animals.

These are practices - which out-of-state animal rights groups neither care to learn or take the time to understand - that make each day with nutritious feed and professional care the best they can get. Not once have any of these out-of-state groups asked me for my professional expertise about improving animal care.

Please join this veterinarian in voting NO on Proposition 204.

Jerry Biwer, DVM, Casa Grande

Out-of-state animal rights groups are coming to Arizona in an effort to give our livestock producers a black eye. Don't fall for their tactics and let's send them back East by voting NO on Proposition 204.

The Flake family has been raising livestock in Arizona longer than animal rights organizations like PETA and Farm Sanctuary have been in business. We know livestock care - we know animal husbandry - and we know it is impossible to make a profit running our businesses if we do not provide the proper care for the animals we produce.

Arizona's livestock producing families have strong ethical, regulatory and economic incentives in place to ensure the proper treatment of the animals under their care and Proposition 204 does not provide a single measure to improve the care of livestock.

I have been in the Legislature for a long time and neither PETA nor the Farm Sanctuary has ever come to see me about livestock care. Not once have they ever asked to visit my ranch or understand what it takes to produce food for families. Proposition 204 and its heavy handed regulatory process will ultimately lead to moving pork production to other places like Mexico and South America. Now I have nothing against those places - but I like the food we produce in the United States just fine. Join me in keeping our jobs and food production in Arizona. Vote NO on Proposition 204.

Senator Jake Flake, Arizona State Senate, Snowflake

The Arizona Cattle Growers Association strongly opposes Proposition 204. Arizona's ranch families continue to practice and support all of those who participate in new and scientifically proven animal husbandry. It is our duty and responsibility to treat our animals with care in order to produce beef as safely as possible to ensure a healthy product for consumers. The association has developed Beef Quality Assurance Guidelines to help ranch families ensure a quality product for all to enjoy.

Proposition 204 goes beyond expanding the stalls of sows and calves; the out-of-state animal rights groups who brought it to our state have a hidden agenda to end all animal agriculture. Producing livestock is more than a job here in Arizona, for many of us it is family tradition to put food on the table of Arizona's families. Do not allow these out-of-state animal rights groups to end these family traditions for those who have worked so hard to keep it alive.

Vote no on Prop. 204.

Bill Brake, President, Arizona Cattle Growers
Association, Scottsdale

Tom Chilton, Vice President, Arizona Cattle
Growers Association, Tucson

Paid for by "Arizona Cattle Growers Association"

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

PROPOSITION 204

Arizona's Livestock Producers Care for Their Animals!

Please join Arizona's livestock producing families in voting NO on Proposition 204. It is a false choice! It is a measure brought to Arizona by out-of-state animal rights groups that disagree with animal agriculture.

Arizona's livestock producing families provide the best of care for their animals. All of our animals receive professional veterinary care. Each and every day we provide them with nutritious feed, vitamins and water – while they provide us with our livelihoods. We never have had a PETA person assist us in feeding these animals when it was 110 degrees outside. We have never found them assisting us when we were knee deep in mud fixing one of the water lines to quench our animals thirst.

Animal husbandry is what we know, what we practice and what we employ when producing food for Arizona's dinner tables. We follow nature's law – we take care of our animals and our animals take care of us.

When we have challenged these groups to join us in providing additional resources for animal health research, animal welfare studies and expanded education efforts – they have been silent. When we explained that the criminal code and jails do nothing for educating or improving animal husbandry – we were ignored. When we have asked them to assist us in overcoming the challenges of producing highly nutritious meals for Arizona's nearly 7 million consumers – they were out protesting. They have not helped.

We join Arizona's voters in seeking to improve animal care – however, Proposition 204 will hurt – not help us in achieving that goal.

Vote NO on 204.

Scott Shill, President, Arizona Cattle Feeders' Association, Welton

Jerry Kennedy, Board Member, Arizona Cattle Feeders' Association, Casa Grande

Paid for by "Arizona Cattle Feeders' Association"

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROP 204

Proposition 204 is an attack on Arizona's Farm and Ranch families. Out-of-state animal rights groups want you to cast a vote against our farm and ranch families. Don't be fooled!

Proposition 204 is about a choice --- You can vote for Arizona's Farm and Ranch Families.....or you can vote for out-of-state animal rights groups.

Vote NO on Proposition 204.

William L. Sawyer, Maricopa

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 204

Radical out-of-state animal rights groups are coming to our great state with yet another anti-farm and anti-meat agenda. Proposition 204 will increase the cost of producing meat in our state by ignoring historically recognized farm animal welfare practices.

Proposition 204 will drive the production of pork to other states and even other countries like Mexico. The Farm Sanctuary ran a similar proposition in Florida which caused the only two family pork farms in Florida to shut down – we don't want this to happen in Arizona. Proposition 204 is about eliminating our choices as consumers. Don't let the Farm Sanctuary take away your choice as a consumer.

Vote NO on Proposition 204.

Norman J. Hinz, Jr., Maricopa

Say NO to the Out-of-State Animal Rights Agenda

The Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry urges Arizonans to vote NO on Proposition 204 because it is unnecessary and its passage will spur other campaigns that threaten one industry after another and the jobs they provide.

Proposition 204 is a government infringement on the rights of Arizona farmers to conduct their operations according to customary industry standards.

Agriculture has long been a foundation of the Arizona economy, and remains so today. This measure singles out hog and veal farming, but could well be extended to other agricultural operations if it passes. Ironically, Arizona has only one hog operation in the state and no veal industry. This begs the question of why they are seeking to put this new law on the books.

The Arizona Republic reported on July 10th ("**Initiatives Attracting Big Money - Out-Of-State Donations at Issue**") that out-of-state animal rights groups have, to that date, funneled \$325,000 into this initiative. Their time and money would have been better spent focusing their efforts on market reforms that rely on free consumer choice rather than government coercion. This same group backed a similar ballot measure in Florida using government coercion which has bankrupted that state's only two hog farms

Arizona voters must stay firm in rejecting the use of our initiative process to target unreasonably specific industries and businesses. **That is why the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry urges Arizonans to vote NO on Proposition 204.**

Steve Twist, Chairman of Board of Directors, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Scottsdale

James J. Apperson, President & CEO, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Scottsdale

Paid for by "Arizona Chamber of Commerce"

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

PROPOSITION 204

Prop 204 is HOGWASH !

Arizona's farmers and ranchers strongly oppose Proposition 204 and ask Arizona voters to do the same.

The initiative is created and funded by out-of-state animal rights organizations as a part of their national political agenda to end meat production in the United States.

Prop 204 sets groundbreaking criminal penalties for farm practices that are veterinarian approved and have been in place for generations.

Indeed, should 204 be approved, farmers and ranchers in Arizona could go to jail and pay thousands of dollars in fines.

Prop 204 would pile unnecessary regulations on Arizona farmers and ranchers with no positive result for farm animals. **These regulations will lead to higher costs and even more pressure to relocate the raising of animals for food to other states, maybe even other countries.**

We don't want to see the U.S. dependent on foreign food like we are dependent on foreign oil.

This proposition is a ridiculous over-reaching political effort by out-of-state extremists.

1. Extreme animal rights agenda.

2. Higher costs for food.

3. Farm operations leaving Arizona.

Proposition 204 is hogwash.

Jim Klinker, Chairman, Campaign for Arizona Farmers and Ranchers

Robert Schuler, Treasurer, Campaign for Arizona Farmers and Ranchers

Jim Klinker, Chairman, Campaign for Arizona
Farmers and Ranchers, Mesa

Robert Schuler, Treasurer, Campaign for
Arizona Farmers and Ranchers, Scottsdale

Paid for by "Campaign for Arizona Farmers and Ranchers"

New Criminal Penalties for Farmers and Ranchers?

Prop 204 would create a new law in Arizona's 'CRIMINAL CODE' that could put farmers and ranchers in prison for 6 months and fine them \$20,000 -- All for raising farm animals as they have for generations.

Why on earth is anyone proposing to turn our farmers and ranchers into criminals?

Vote 'NO' on Prop 204.

Alice Lara, Phoenix

Alice Lara, Phoenix

Hamburger meat from Mexico?

The Prop 204/Hogwash initiative will cause our food to come from foreign countries.

And, those countries **don't necessarily have the same health and safety regulations** as the United States.

We can't continue to run farmers and ranchers out of business and expect our food production to stay in America.

Prop 204? I'm voting 'NO' on Nov. 7!

Faith Willman, Phoenix

Faith Willman, Phoenix

Veterinarians Oppose Prop 204

As professional veterinarians doing business here in Arizona, we all stand in opposition to this ballot measure. It is misguided, unnecessary and not based on sound science or research.

We urge you to vote 'NO'.

Kathryn J. Beers, DVM, Chandler

Alan B. Herring, DVM, Chandler

Stephen A. Smalley, VMD, Chandler

Bruce Ericsson, DVM, Chandler

Marjorie LiNard, DVM, Chandler

Neil B. Holmes, DVM, Buckeye

Niles R. Jennett, Chandler,

Tucson Veterinarian Urges 'NO' on 204

Professionals involved in swine health and production continually evaluate methods of housing and caring for pigs.

Animals that are comfortable and well cared for are more productive.

Good animal care practices are generally appreciated by consumer groups.

A study based on sound scientific investigation was conducted by the American Veterinary Medical Association and resulted in a position statement which concludes that individual husbandry is more important than housing method and indicates that open housing and gestation stalls can be equally acceptable if properly used.

Sound governance would benefit from regulations based on sound science and professional experience rather than **political agendas** that use innuendo and attempt to falsely influence those who have no swine care experience.

Uninformed interference with sound management practices will ultimately result in less available and more expensive food products.

VOTE NO.

Bob Glock, Veterinarian, Tucson

Bob Glock, Veterinarian, Tucson

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

Veterinarian Says Vote 'NO'

This is a cynical attempt by those outside Arizona to denigrate the good work of Arizona farmers and ranchers who raise animals humanely for the production of food.

I am a veterinarian, with a Masters degree in swine production and medicine, and manager of a hog farm in northeastern Arizona. **I and more than 100 highly trained employees have dedicated ourselves to raising animals humanely.** For us, the humane treatment of animals is fundamental to our livelihoods.

We provide our animals nutritious diets of corn, soybeans and vitamins, as well as access to fresh water at all times. We keep them in barns that are specially designed to allow sunlight and fresh air in, while protecting them from extreme heat and cold, snow and rain. We also take steps to protect them from illness and injuries, and we provide prompt medical attention when needed. Consistent with sound scientific data and many years of real world experience, our practices and policies promote the welfare of our animals.

As a veterinarian, I took an oath to protect animal health and relieve animal suffering, which I don't take lightly. As a farm manager, I have a duty to raise animals effectively – and humanely – in order to be successful in the marketplace. These are responsibilities that do not conflict. Indeed, they go hand in hand.

I urge Arizonans to **VOTE 'NO'**.

Don Davidson, Veterinarian, Pinetop

Don Davidson, Veterinarian, Pinetop

Arizona Veterinarian Opposes Initiative

As a veterinarian, I have sworn to protect animal health and relieve animal suffering. **Every day, my work is focused on providing effective – and humane – care to the animals in my charge.**

As an Arizona hog producer, who also holds a Masters degree in swine production and medicine, I understand and accept my responsibility to promote the welfare of animals raised for the production of food. They have free access to fresh water and receive nutritious diets of corn, soybeans and vitamins designed by expert nutritionists. The animals are kept in specially designed barns that protect them from extreme heat and cold, snow and rain, while allowing sunlight and fresh air in. They are protected from illness and injuries that often occur among herds and receive prompt medical attention when needed. Employees who provide hands-on, day-to-day care are highly trained and certified under scientifically based programs developed by leading experts.

I grew up on a farm and, like many other veterinarians, developed a deep respect for livestock early in life.

That respect for animal welfare provided the motivation for a career in veterinary medicine.

At the same time, I have an obligation to consumers to produce safe, high quality pork.

Those of us who raise pigs in Arizona are living proof that it is indeed possible to meet the expectations of the marketplace and society's demand for the humane treatment of farm animals.

I urge Arizonans to VOTE NO.

Mike Terrill, Veterinarian, Pinetop

Mike Terrill, Veterinarian, Pinetop

The success of Arizona livestock producers is dependent upon their ability to produce healthy animals. For generations, farmers and ranchers have prided themselves on providing their animals effective – and humane – care, the result of which is safe, high quality products for consumers.

Arizona hog farmers house their animals in specially designed barns that protect them from extreme temperatures, rain, and snow. Curtain-sided barns allow natural light and fresh air in while also protecting animals from harmful UV rays. The animals are fed nutritious diets of corn, soybeans and vitamins designed by expert nutritionists.

Breeding sows, the female animals that produce the pigs which are sold at market, are kept in group pens and individual stalls, both commonly used and humane methods of housing. Animals kept in stalls during gestation are able to move forward and back, lie down comfortably and fully extend their limbs.

Approved by leading veterinary groups, including the American Veterinary Medical Association and the American Association of Swine Veterinarians, stalls reduce competition for food and minimize aggression that often occur in groups. Stalls also enable caregivers to effectively monitor the medical conditions of animals and provide individualized care efficiently, minimizing occurrences of disease among sows.

More important than housing, however, is the stockmanship of caregivers. Veterinarians, who have sworn to protect animal health and relieve suffering, oversee the care of our animals. Day-to-day care is delivered by highly trained farm employees who receive ongoing education under science-based initiatives designed to promote animal welfare. By providing the tools and expertise to their employees and applying the learnings gained over decades of real life experience, Arizona hog farmers demonstrate their commitment to raising animals humanely and producing safe, nutritious pork products for consumers.

We urge a no vote.

Michael D. Terrill, D.V.M, President, Arizona
Pork Council, Pinetop

Paid for by "Arizona Pork Council"

Tom Miller, Executive Director, Arizona Pork
Council, Casa Grande

The United Dairymen of Arizona is a milk marketing cooperative whose members produce approximately 85% of the milk in the state of Arizona. Our organization represents small, medium and large dairies, all of

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

which are family run businesses. Many of them represent generations of dairy farmers. We are opposed to this initiative for three reasons. First, we know that in order to thrive, livestock operations (whether they are dairy, beef cattle, poultry or swine) must treat their animals humanely. If we don't we can't stay in business. The measure is fundamentally unnecessary. Second, we resent the fact that organizations and individuals with no commitment to Arizona, who have no experience of animal husbandry, and who have nothing to lose in this fight, have stepped in to manipulate the voters of Arizona. Finally, the initiative is NOT about stall size. It's about radical vegans who want to impose their values and beliefs on the rest of the country, one state at a time. This is a tofu-wolf in sheep's clothing, and we urge Arizona voters to vote no on this measure.

Jim Boyle, President, United Dairywomen of
Arizona, Mesa
Paid for by "United Dairywomen of Arizona"

Keith Murfield, CEO, United Dairywomen of
Arizona, Chandler

Beware of the Con

Arizonans should not confuse our local Humane Societies with the Humane Society of the U.S. The HSUS is not affiliated with, nor is it a parent organization for local humane societies, animal shelters or animal care and control agencies. Despite the dogs and cats pictured in its fundraising materials, it doesn't take in stray, neglected or abused pets, nor does it run spay/neuter programs. The HSUS does not operate or have direct control over any animal shelter. It has taken advantage of the common image of animal protection agencies dedicated to **animal welfare** to become the wealthiest **animal rights** organization on earth. With an operating budget of \$95 million in 2005, the HSUS could build and operate an animal shelter facility in every state in the country.

HSUS is related to other animal rights groups in a way similar to a mugger is related to a con man. Both will rob you: they use different tactics, have different timetables, but the result is still the same. The con man may even criticize the mugger for using confrontational tactics and giving all thieves a bad name, but your money is still gone. HSUS preys on the emotional connection that many of us have for animals, and transforms compassionate contributions into campaign after campaign to impose their values (vegan diet, no pets, no animal research, etc.) on all of us.

HSUS is currently under investigation in Louisiana for its activities related to fundraising for Katrina pet rescue efforts. It spent roughly \$6 million of the \$29 million it raised to assist in that effort. Wonder where the other \$23 million went... maybe to help underwrite voter manipulation efforts like the one we're experiencing here in Arizona.

Vote no on 204.

Frances Lechner, Phoenix

As a fourth generation dairy farmer in Arizona, I am outraged that this initiative has attempted to dupe Arizona voters into thinking the goal is to help animals. This campaign is a slap in the face to Arizona farmers and ranchers who have always treated our livestock humanely. To say this is a measure to help family farms is a joke. Just ask the two family-owned pork farms in Florida who were forced to shut down after this same kind of campaign won in 2002. Don't believe their ads; they are just part of a long, well-funded campaign by people who want to dictate our animal raising ethics.

Henry Kibler, Jr., Casa Grande

Voters should not be confused by the apparently tame language of this initiative. This is part of a long, expensive, state-by-state process to eliminate the livestock industry. As a long time dairy farmer, I am one of John "J.P." Goodwin's targets. Goodwin, originally from Tennessee, founded the Coalition Against Fur Trade, and was a spokesman for the Animal Liberation Front. "J.P." dropped out of high school to participate in animal rights protests, has been arrested multiple times for criminal acts and was found guilty of vandalizing fur stores. Now on staff at HSUS, J.P. has a huge budget to pursue his goal: "**The abolition of all animal agriculture.**" This is the same philosophy of Dan Mathews, a vice president at PETA: "We're at war, and we'll do what we need to win. **If we got rid of the slave trade, we can get rid of the beef industry.**" If you eat meat or eggs, if you like ice cream, or cheese on your pizza, if pork sausage is a breakfast treat for you, or if you think others have the right to make these food choices even if they're not your preference, then vote **NO** on this initiative.

Dennis Dugan, Casa Grande

Voters should be asking WHO is behind this campaign, because it will tell them lots more about WHAT this is all about. The two large, deep-pocket organizations behind this campaign share the same philosophy and goals as radical groups like Animal Liberation Front and PETA. Bruce Freidrich, President and Co-founder of PETA says it nicely: "I think it would be great if all of the fast-food outlets, slaughterhouses, these laboratories and the banks who fund them exploded tomorrow. I think it's perfectly appropriate for people to take bricks and toss them through windows. If we really believe that animals do have the same right to be free from pain and suffering at our hands, then of course we're going to be, as a movement, blowing stuff up and smashing windows. For the record, I don't do this stuff, but I do advocate it." Or how about fellow co-founder, Ingrid Newkirk: "Animal liberationists do not separate out the human animal, so there is no rational basis for saying that a human being has special rights. A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy. They're all mammals." She adds that "Even if animal research pro-

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

duced a cure for AIDS, we'd be against it." And Gary Yourofsky, a national lecturer: "What we must do is start viewing every cow, pig, chicken, monkey, rabbit, mouse and pigeon as our family members." And from HSUS, the folks who helped to fund this campaign, Michael Fox a senior scholar says "The life of an ant and that of my child should be granted equal consideration." Is this who we want dictating how food is produced in this country? Not on my watch, thanks. Vote NO on this initiative.

Hector Stechnij, Owner, Mesa

I think people should be highly suspect of deep pocketed out-of-state organizations with hidden agendas, who play on the good people of Arizona's emotions in relation to animals. Apparently they know more about animal husbandry in agriculture operations than all the professionals in the business. I guess we should no longer use or trust years of University research or veterinary experience. We can just let the out-of-state organizations do our thinking for us.

Mike Billotte, Tempe

I am going to vote NO on the Prop 204/Hogwash proposition. My husband and I are former pork producers in Arizona. He spent many years in the national leadership of the pork industry. As a result we have known pork producers in most every state. The nations pork producers are very conscious of their animal's welfare and producing a quality product for consumption by consumers. Arizona pork producers are no different. The out of state activist's who are behind this proposition are all part of the animal rights, anti meat movement that includes HSUS, PETA, Farm Sanctuary and Animal Liberation Front plus others. All nice sounding names but all have the agenda to stop meat animal production and force us to a vegan diet.

The production methods used in Arizona have been in place for over 10 years and have been tested and researched. They are pork industry and American Veterinary Medical Association approved. There has never been one complaint here until these out of state activists came to Arizona after they were successful with a similar campaign of lies in Florida and put family farmers out of business there. They have come to Arizona to do the same thing.

I urge you to just think for a minute and ask yourself would a farmer raise livestock and intentionally put them in a stressful environment? Absolutely not!! This would cause the animals to be non-productive and he would have a losing business.

Don't let these outsiders spread their lies and disrupt good honest agriculture business' and put good hard working families out of work. Vote NO on the HOGWASH initiative.

Jana Miller, Casa Grande

I will vote NO on the Hogwash initiative.

I raise pigs in the Wickenburg area and have for many years. The thought that out of state groups, Humane Society of the United States and Farm Sanctuary, both animal rights activists can come into our state with the agenda of disrupting animal agriculture in Arizona really irritates me. They did almost the exact thing in Florida and put family farmers out of business. Any person raising livestock does so humanely. Anything less would be raising animals under stress and therefore not being productive. Arizona farmers are no different. They follow procedures and use equipment that has been researched and tested for years and is approved by the industry experts and the veterinary associations.

This proposition is Hogwash so please vote NO!!

Elijah Hopkins, Hopkins Ranches, Wickenburg

Paid for by "Hopkins Ranches"

The Hogwash Proposition will get my NO vote. I have been involved in agriculture for 37 years. I have raised pigs and other livestock and have known many people who also raised livestock. I have not known one of these people who would subject their animals to any inhuman or stress conditions. To do this would make absolutely no sense because the farm would be non-productive. Modern livestock production techniques have been tested for many years by research specialists and have their approval as well as veterinary associations. For the sponsors of this proposition to say otherwise tells me they know nothing about livestock production, have a hidden agenda or both. We don't need out of state activists telling our farmers how to run their business.

HSUS, PETA, ALF and Farm Sanctuary and others are groups that go around the country financing initiatives like this. Records show most of the financing for this campaign is coming in from these types of groups. I don't like the fact they can come in here and try to disrupt agriculture operations that have been in business and operating according to industry standards for well over ten years.

This is HOGWASH and I will vote 'NO'.

Leroy Unrast, Willcox

Vote 'NO' on Prop 204

I have been a pork producer in Arizona since I was a child. This totals to more than 44 years. I am on the Board of Directors of the Arizona Pork Council. Producers in this state use only humane methods to raise their animals. To do otherwise, as is being alleged in this proposition would be going against all business sense for running a efficient operation. Livestock producers do not use inhumane methods. If a person just stops and thinks about it, even some on not acquainted with farming would conclude it would make no sense to put you animals under stress.

I know the people involved with the one Arizona operation targeted by this proposition and they run a farm that houses well cared for animals that are fed a nutritious diet of corn, soybeans and vitamins, under the care of trained

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

personal and staff veterinarians. The facilities are kept very clean. They are stewards of the land and environment as well.

The movement for this proposition began when the likes of out of state animal activists groups like PETA, Farm Sanctuary, Animal Liberation Front came to Arizona and duped people here to sponsor their anti-meat, anti-farming agenda.

We don't need out of state groups influencing how our farmers run their business.
Vote NO on the HOGWASH proposition.

Larry Beck, Cochise

Vote No on Prop 204

I will vote NO on the Hogwash initiative. This measure is the result of out of state groups, Humane Society of the United States and Farm Sanctuary, both animal rights activists with the agenda of disrupting animal agriculture in Arizona. They spread their lies in Florida and the result was family farmers being put out of business.

Any person raising livestock does so humanely. Anything less would be raising animals under stress and not being productive. Arizona farmers are no different. They follow procedures and use equipment that has been researched and tested many times and is approved by the industry experts and the veterinary associations.

We do not need extremist's organizations such as PETA, Animal Liberation Front, Farm Sanctuary and others coming to Arizona spreading lies and trying to put Arizona's livestock industry out of business.

Vote NO on the HOGWASH initiative.

Shea Nieto, Casa Grande

The Hogwash/204 proposition gets my NO vote.

I am not a farmer but I have watched as groups like Humane Society of the United States, PETA, Farm Sanctuary and other animal rights goof balls try to make us believe animals are like humans. They show up in states and try to scream their message of lies and lead us to a vegetarian diet.

Now they are here in Arizona trying to make us believe farmers who are raising livestock are treating their animals inhumanely. That is HOGWASH. I have known farmers and to think they would treat animals cruelly that they are raising to support their families is totally ridiculous.

I say to these activists groups, "Go home and leave us alone. Go peddle your lies somewhere else". That is why I am voting NO to their HOGWASH.

Jerry Seppanen, Scottsdale

Farmers Oppose Prop 204

As employees of an Arizona livestock farm, we know first-hand the high level of humane care provided to pigs raised in our state.

Our animals are kept in special barns that protect them from very high and very low temperatures. The design of the barns also protects them from injuries and the competition for food that happens among pigs kept in herds. When illnesses occur, we treat our animals quickly under the close supervision of the farm's veterinarians. The animals are also fed nutritious diets of soybeans, corn and vitamins and have access to fresh water whenever they want it.

The farm's managers provide regular training and education to those of us who care for the animals day to day and ensure that we have the tools to do our jobs effectively.

We're proud of what we do to raise livestock in Arizona humanely and help to provide consumers the safe, healthy pork products they expect to find on grocery store shelves.

Please **VOTE NO** on Prop 204.

Gordon B. Lawler, Lakeside
Janet Magill, Snowflake
Jerry McGraw, Snowflake
William Tate, Snowflake
Doug Johnson, Snowflake
Delbert Begay, Indian Wells

Susan Howard, Snowflake
Jim Mortensen, Snowflake
Cody Maennche, Taylor
Robert Alter, Snowflake
Guillermo Anchondo, Snowflake
Donald Winder, Snowflake

Needless Regulation

Do we really need a new law to tell Arizona farmers and ranchers how to take care of their animals?
Proposition 204 is ridiculous.

Trevor Hardy, Mesa

VOTE NO ON PROP 204

Don't let out-of-state animal rights activists dictate to Arizonans what Arizona law should be.
We in Arizona have a long and proud history of doing things our own way.

That's why we have grown and prospered.

That's why new Arizonans arrive everyday.

People come to Arizona to enjoy the Arizona way of living.

Don't let activists who have decided not to live here tell us how to live our lives.

Robert Shuler, Scottsdale

Robert Shuler, Scottsdale

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

Issued by: Secretary of State Jan Brewer

Arizona Agriculture Is United Against Prop 204

All of Arizona agriculture stands united against the out-of-state animal rights groups. Their emotional arguments are based on junk science and most have never set foot on a farm or ranch, let alone in Arizona.

Farming and ranching is serious business. Food, climate, temperature, veterinary care, water, health, safety, bio-security. Nothing is left to chance. Everything is calculated and accounted for or else the farm or ranch can't operate.

Farmers and ranchers take extremely seriously the trust and confidence that consumers have placed in us to provide them with safe, healthy and affordable food.

We hope you won't let the animal rights activists fool you.

Vote 'NO' on Prop 204.

Clint Hickman, President, Arizona Poultry Federation

Jennifer Hickman, Secretary, Arizona Poultry Federation

Clint Hickman, President, Arizona Poultry Federation, Goodyear

Jennifer Hickman, Secretary, Arizona Poultry Federation, Goodyear

Snowflake Businesses Say Vote 'NO' on Prop. 204

Farming and ranching are a way of life in Arizona and in northeastern Arizona we are privileged to have responsible livestock producers as friends and neighbors.

Our livestock producers are conscientious citizens, valued employers and responsible stewards of their animals. They are respected throughout the local business community for their commitment to their employees and their families, business partners and others whose livelihoods are tied to animal agriculture.

Our local pork producer has taken considerable steps over the years to promote the welfare of its animals, which is critical to its business success. Their farm provides employees the tools and training to **effectively care for their animals** under the close supervision of veterinarians. It utilizes the best science available and decades of experience to **raise pigs humanely**. The result is safe, high quality and affordable pork for consumers.

We have seen firsthand what a responsible and respected livestock producer brings to a community like ours. That's why we're urging Arizonans to stand up for our farmers and ranchers, not outside interests who merely want to use our great state as a stepping stone to achieving their anti-farming agenda.

Vote NO on 204.

Greg Hudson, Executive Director Snowflake Taylor Chamber of Commerce, Snowflake

Keith Baldwin, Treasurer, Snowflake Taylor Chamber of Commerce, Taylor

Paid for by "Snowflake/Taylor Chamber of Commerce"

Livestock production is integral to the way of life for many residents of northern Arizona communities. For generations, families have raised animals for the production of food and the livelihoods of many others have been dependent on animal agriculture.

For those of us in Snowflake, Arizona, hog production, in particular, plays an important and positive role in our community. Our pork producer is a valued employer, productive business partner and respected civic member. It is a responsible steward of the environment and a trusted caretaker of its animals.

Those who work in hog production in Snowflake understand and accept their responsibilities as livestock producers. They combine a keen understanding of animal science with decades of real life experience to promote the welfare of their animals, treating them with great care and respect throughout their lives. Ultimately, the care they provide their animals results in the production of safe, wholesome pork products for consumers.

We take pride in the way our friends and neighbors raise pigs in Snowflake and it is our hope that Arizonans across the state will likewise stand up for Arizona's farmers and ranchers in November.

Mayor Kelly S. Willis, For the Snowflake Town Council, Snowflake

GET REAL

I cannot believe we're wasting space on the ballot with a ridiculous question like Prop 204.

Little by little we're allowing the crazy minority to push their extreme agenda on the rest of us. I for one am tired of it.

The out-of-state animal rights zealots who fund this effort don't speak for me or for any other Arizonan with an ounce of sense.

All it takes is one visit to any fringe animal rights organization website to see these people have a national political agenda to end the raising of pigs, cows, chickens and fish for food.

And to think they have the gall to push their real agenda under the guise of wanting better treatment of pigs.

Get real!

A NO vote on 204 will show the rest of the nation that Arizonans can still tell the difference between a pig and a poke.

Lisa Barnes, Mesa

PROPOSITION 204

Spelling, grammar and punctuation were reproduced as submitted in the "for" and "against" arguments.

BALLOT FORMAT

PROPOSITION 204

PROPOSED AMENDMENT BY INITIATIVE PETITION

<p>OFFICIAL TITLE</p> <p>AN INITIATIVE MEASURE PROPOSING AMENDMENT TO TITLE 13, CHAPTER 29, ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES BY ADDING SECTION 13-2910.07; RELATING TO CRUEL AND INHUMANE CONFINEMENT OF ANIMALS.</p>
<p>DESCRIPTIVE TITLE</p> <p>PROHIBITS CONFINING PREGNANT PIG OR CALF RAISED FOR VEAL FOR ALL OR MAJORITY OF A DAY IN A MANNER THAT PREVENTS LYING DOWN AND FULLY EXTENDING LIMBS OR TURNING AROUND; PROVIDES EXCEPTIONS, INCLUDING TRANSPORTATION, RODEOS/FAIRS, LAWFUL SLAUGHTER AND RESEARCH, VETERINARY PURPOSES; ESTABLISHES MISDEMEANOR PENALTIES AND FUNDING FROM FINES.</p>

PROPOSITION 204

<p>A "yes" vote shall have the effect of establishing misdemeanor fines and penalties for tethering or confining a pregnant pig or a calf raised for veal for all or a majority of the day in a manner that prevents the animal from lying down and fully extending its limbs or turning around freely but excepts transportation of the animal, rodeo and fair exhibitions, lawful slaughters, research, veterinary purposes and the seven day period before a pig's expected date of giving birth.</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>A "no" vote shall have the effect of not changing the existing laws regarding the manner in which pigs and calves are raised.</p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>

PROPOSITION 204