

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SECRETARY OF STATE'S TOWN HALL

RE: PROPOSITIONS 106 THROUGH 302

Phoenix, Arizona

September 22, 2010

7:00 p.m.

Dawn Archambo  
C.E.R.T. 0231

SECRETARY OF STATE'S TOWN HALL MEETING, REGARDING  
 PROPOSITIONS 106 through 302, held at 7:00 p.m. on September 22,  
 2010, at the Phoenix, College, 1201 West Thomas Road, Phoenix,  
 Arizona, in the presence of the following:

Mr. Rich Dubek, Moderator  
 Dr. Janet Langley, Vice President Services for GateWay  
 Community College  
 Mr. Ken Bennett, Arizona Secretary of State

PROPOSITION 106, HEALTH CARE	<u>Page</u>
Dr. Eric Novack, Speaker (For)	47
Ms. Kyrsten Sinema, (Against)	49
PROPOSITION 107, PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT FOR DISCRIMINTION PROHIBITION	<u>Page</u>
Ms. Jennifer Gratz (For)	10
Mr. Steve Russell (Against)	11
PROPOSITION 109, HUNTING AND FISHING	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Todd Rathner (For)	14
Ms. Stephanie Nichols-Young (Against)	16
PROPOSITION 110, STATE TRUST LANDS	<u>Page</u>
Mr. John Nelson (For)	19
No Opposition	
PROPOSITION 111, THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Tom Simplot (For)	22
Mr. Joe Sigg (Against)	24
PROPOSITION 112, INITIATIVE PETITIONS	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Chad Campbell (For)	26
No Opposition	
PROPOSITION 113, RIGHT TO VOTE FOR SECRET BALLOT REGARDING EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION	<u>Page</u>
Ms. Lucy Morrow Caldwell (For)	28
Mr. Mike Valder (Against)	30

PROPOSITION 203, MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Andrew Myers (For)	33
Mr. Bill Montgomery (Against)	35
PROPOSITION 301, LAND CONSERVATION FUND	<u>Page</u>
Mr. Kevin McCarthy (For)	38
Ms. Sandy Bahr (Against)	39
PROPOSITION 302, EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT AND HEALTH PROGRAMS	<u>Page</u>
Ms. Pam Pickard (For)	44
Ms. Nadine Mathis-Basha (Against)	44

P R O C E E D I N G S

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Good evening everybody and welcome to GateWay Community College in Phoenix. A live audience here in Phoenix, a standing room only crowd, and we are very happy to see that.

My name is Rich Dubek, and I will act as Moderator for this evening, as we cover ten ballot propositions, which will be on the ballot for this November's election. It should be a good night, it should be insightful. We hope that everybody learns a little something about each one of these ballots.

With that in mind, time is tight. We do want to get started, and start by introducing Dr. Janet Langley to come up to the podium now. She is Vice President of GateWay Community College.

DR. LANGLEY: Good evening. It's my pleasure to address you tonight on behalf of President Giovannini and welcome you to the GateWay Community campus for tonight's Arizona Secretary of State Town Hall.

GateWay Community College and Maricopa County College District that we are part of, is strongly committed to the roles that colleges play in fostering a healthy democracy. In fact, civic responsibility is a priority that is made explicit in our

District's Mission Statement as a critical part of our educational mandate. That is why our college and the other Maricopa colleges are so frequently host sites for community issue forums, candidate debates, job fairs and so on. These are not add-on activities for us, but part of a commitment to provide an education for our students that is current, relevant, and of service to the community. The impact of this election will effect our students, employees and community members for many years to come.

And so it is our pleasure and privilege to partner with Secretary of State Ken Bennett, Cox Communications, and SFC -- SCF Arizona, in order to put on this event to help voters make a more informed decision and exercise their right to vote.

Thank you for your participation. And again, welcome to GateWay Community College.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Dr. Langley, thank you, very much. Next up, we would like to introduce the Honorable Ken Bennett, Arizona's Secretary of State.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: Thank you, Rich. I also want to thank GateWay Community College and the Maricopa Community College District, and Cox Communications, for being our partners tonight.

Elections are a cornerstone of our representative democracy. So I'd like to thank everyone in attendance, or

tuning in at home, for taking the time to become better informed about the critical issues that we'll be voting on on November 2.

There are ten propositions on the ballot this fall, and I know it can be difficult for voters to keep up with everything that is being proposed.

To help in that regard, our office is sponsoring twenty-five Town Halls, similar to this one, all over Arizona.

Voters will have the opportunity to hear representatives for and against each of the ballot measures, and to ask questions of the knowledgeable staff from the Secretary of State's Office. This fall, look out for one of these Town Halls coming to a community near you.

For more information on the ballot measures, as well as tips for Election Day, watch your mailbox for a publicity pamphlet, which should be arriving soon, and may have already arrived.

We're mailing approximately two million of these helpful guides across Arizona. And as always, you can check [AZSOS.Gov](http://AZSOS.Gov) for election information, night or day.

Most important of course is to remember to cast your vote this general election. Early voting begins on October 7, and all ballots must be returned to a polling place by 7:00 p.m. on November 2.

Now before we get to the ballot propositions, I'd like to further introduce our Moderator tonight, Rich Dubek. Rich has spent nearly twenty years in the local television news media, most recently as a two-time Emmy award winning reporter at Channel 12.

He now owns and operates Arizona Free Lance TV, where he continues to work in the media on a national stage, for clients like NBC's Today Show and Good Morning America. He also provides private sector and government media training and coaching, as well as corporate video production. Rich Dubek.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, Mr. Secretary, I appreciate that. We do have some ground rules tonight everybody, and we want to make you aware of those ground rules before we begin.

Proponents and Opponents that come up to speak on each of these ballot measures, will each get two minutes. We do have to stay on time. We will move people along if we go over that two-minute mark.

Speakers are asked to keep their statements to the issues and avoid any personal attacks. Let's play nice tonight. And also, as we mentioned earlier, a Q & A section will follow the one-hour program. We ask that you all stay in your seats for that portion, and that portion of the broadcast will be available on Cox on Demand later on at another date.

With that, Secretary Bennett will introduce and describe each ballot proposition, beginning now with Prop 107.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: And yes. Just so that you understand, we are starting with 107. Speakers for 106 will be at the end of the list.

###

PROPOSITION 107, HEALTH CARE SERVICES

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: And starting with 107, a yes vote shall have the effect of prohibiting the State from giving preferential treatment to, or discriminate against any person or group, on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.

The prohibition applies to preferences or discrimination in public employment, education or contracting.

It exempts reasonably necessary qualifications based on sex, existing Court Orders and actions that would result in the loss of federal funds.

The State includes state government, local governments, public college and universities, community colleges and school districts. That's a yes vote.

A no vote on 107 shall have the effect of retaining the current law regarding preferential treatment to, or discrimination against any person or group, based on race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin, in public employment, education or contracting.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. And our first speaker is speaking on the pro side of 107. She is Jennifer Gratz, Spokeswoman for Yes on 107. You have two minutes.

MS. JENNIFER GRATZ: Thank you. No matter what you call it, affirmative action quotas, diversity goals, race preferences, it's all discrimination. And it's a violation of your civil rights.

A yes vote on Prop 107 ensures that civil rights belong to all people. I don't call it civil rights when my husband is shot out of a promotion because of a racial quota. I don't call it civil rights when my friend's construction firm loses a government contract on account of his boss' race. Like the City of Tucson's 7 percent bid preferences to minority contractors.

And when your daughter's good grades can't get her into college because she is the wrong skin color, well, that's just wrong. Some where big government went wrong. Somehow they've confused civil rights with quotas that pay for one group over another.

A yes vote on Prop 107 will stop the government from picking winners and losers based on race and sex in three specific areas, public education, public contracting and public employment.

Despite what my Opponent will say, the language of Prop 107 is simple and straightforward. The State shall not grant preferential treatment to, or discriminate against any group or individual, on the basis of race, sex, color,

ethnicity, or national origin, in the operation of public employment, public contracting and public education.

It's mirrored off of the color-blind language of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. And the same initiative has passed in four states, and has been in place for as many as fourteen years.

My Opponents come from the radical left, like ACORN, and you'll hear many scary "what-ifs" from them. Don't be fooled. They are scare tactics meant to keep these quotas, diversity goals and satisfies in place.

If you don't believe me, simply read the language.

A yes vote on 107 guarantees that everyone, and unlike Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton, I really mean everyone. It's a fair and equal chance to compete for good paying jobs, public contracts, and college admission.

Vote yes on 107.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Right on time. Thank you, Jennifer. Speaking against 107, we'd like to introduce Steve Russell, Member of the Arizona Students' Association. Steve, you have two minutes.

MR. STEVE RUSSELL: Hello. My name is Steve Russell. I'm a Senior at A.S.U., and I represent the Arizona Students' Association. But today, I approach you as a concerned citizen of my home state, the great State of Arizona.

Let me first preference with this point. In Arizona's universities, there are no -- there is no affirmative action, there are no racial quotas, and we all benefit from the equal opportunity programs that are currently in place.

Proposition 107, if passed, will bring great harm to university students by removing funding from important programs, such as our Women's Resource Center, which affords health benefits, or sorry, health services, education and support for the unique needs of women.

It can also harm programs such as the Summer Bridge, which affords everyone an equal opportunity to compete. Or even the Hispanic Mother/Daughter program, which helps young women to reach their full potential in college.

Supporters of 107 would have you believe that it their mission to remove racial biases in society. However, while the wording sounds awesome, historically, identical legislation, has resulted in the removal of resources and support services to students who truly needed them.

This initiative is misguided. It is harmful, and it was created by people that we do not want influencing our politics.

Ward Connerly, the writer of this initiative, once graciously accepted financial endorsement from the KKK, and said "God bless them."

This outsider my friends, does not understand the needs of our state, our home, and our people. In fact, the great State of Arizona already turned him away when Connerly and Crew illegally hired felons, out-of-state special interests to collect petition signatures, falsified signatures and lied to voters to get support for this initiative.

Let me make this point very clearly. The voters in the State of Arizona have already said no to the Ward Connerly initiative, and we must say no again.

On November 2, please vote no on Prop 107. Thank you.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, Steve.

###

PROPOSITION 109, HUNTING AND FISHING

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Next up, we'd like to recall Secretary of State Bennett, to describe Proposition 109.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: Thank you, Rich. Proposition 109, a yes vote, shall have the effect of making hunting, fishing, and harvesting wildlife, a constitutional right.

It would also give the State Legislature exclusive authority to enact laws regulating these activities. It would prohibit laws that unreasonably restrict hunting, fishing and harvesting wildlife, or the use of traditional means and methods. And fourth, it would establish hunting and fishing as a preferred means of managing and controlling wildlife.

A no vote shall have the effect of retaining the current laws regarding hunting, fishing and harvesting wildlife.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: And I apologize for using the word "recall" to bring you up. Probably not the best of words considering the climate we're in here.

We'd like to call up the pro side of Prop 109 to start. He is Todd Rathner, Member of the NRA Board of Directors. Two minutes Todd.

MR. TODD RATHNER: Thank you. The National Rifle Association, Governor Jan Brewer, countless wildlife

conservation organizations, and the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, all encourage you to vote yes on Proposition 109.

Sportsmen through their payment of license fees and taxes, are the primary funders of wildlife and habitat conservation in America.

Over the last century, hundreds have contributed billions of dollars to restore numerous species from the brink of extinction.

Sportsmen also pay for the recovery of non-game species, like our nation's symbol, the bald eagle. Because of sportsmen, not the radicals opposed to Prop 109, the bald eagle is now fully recovered. A primary Opponent of Prop 109, Humane Society President Wayne Pacelle told the Associated Press, "If we could shut down all sport hunting in a moment, we would."

The radicals who oppose Prop 109 think that animals should have the same rights as human beings. They actually equate hunting and fishing to murder.

The Opponents of Prop 109 have asked, what problem does it solve? The problem is them. Their threats to ban hunting are real. They spent well over \$1 million dollars to ban dove hunting in Michigan. They worked to ban bear hunting in New Jersey, and they worked to ban mountain lion hunting in California.

Ironically, California now has taxpayer-funded shooters killing more mountain lions than hunters ever killed.

The extremists have called Prop 109 a Power Grab, which is somehow undemocratic. This is just plain silly. Allowing we, the people to vote on Prop 109, is the essence of democracy.

The extremists also say that Prop 109 will give additional power to the legislature. This is simply a lie. The truth is, that the legislature currently has the power to regulate wildlife. That power will stay the same when Prop 109 passes.

Let me remind you what Prop 109's Opponents have already said in their own words. "If we can shut down all sport hunting in a moment, we would." The only way to stop this extreme agenda, is to vote yes on Prop 109. Thank you.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. Speaking on the con side of 109, is Stephanie Nichols-Young, Chairwoman of Arizonans Against the Power Grab, no, on 109.

MRS. STEPHANIE NICHOLS-YOUNG: Thank you. Hunting and fishing are part of Arizona's culture, and they will continue to be if Arizona voters wisely reject Proposition 109 on November 2.

I and many other Arizonans, who love our state, and love the outdoors, urge you to vote no on 109. Here's why.

109 is a Power Grab. It was referred to the ballot by politicians who want to silence a majority of Arizonans, and keep them from having a voice in Arizona's wildlife management.

109 is designed to stop citizens from running and voting on ballot initiatives, effecting wildlife. Now that is extreme.

It would also limit Arizona Game and Fish Commission and Department Authority, to manage wildlife. Our current system was created primarily by hunters and anglers over eighty years ago. It has largely insulated wildlife management from politics in delegating authority to manage wildlife protection to the Arizona Game and Fish Commission.

This will all change if 109 passes. Wildlife management in Arizona will be a mess. The Arizona Constitution is now silent on wildlife issues. This poorly drafted proposal would go into the State Constitution of Declaration of Rights. It would give the legislature exclusive authority to manage wildlife. It would make hunting the preferred means of managing wildlife, and it would put conflicting provisions in our state constitution that will lead to a bunch of lawsuits that will put Arizona even further in the red.

Science will take a backseat to politics. Who knows what will happen to all the programs that are based on good

science, that the politicians don't like, or that don't involve hunting and fishing as a management tool.

Please read the proposal, especially paragraphs B and C, and then vote no on 109.

###

PROPOSITION 110, STATE TRUST LANDS

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Secretary Bennett now will explain Proposition 110.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: Thank you. A yes vote on Proposition 110, shall have the effect of authorizing the state, or lease of state trust land, without auction or advertisement, in order to protect military installations and operations.

It will also allow voter approved exchanges of state trust land after public notice and hearing, if the exchange is related to either protecting military facilities, or for land management purposes.

A no vote on 110, shall have the effect of retaining current laws regarding the sale, lease and exchange of state trust lands.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. And speaking on the pro side of 110, is John Nelson, Member of the Arizona State Senate.

MR. JOHN NELSON: Good evening. Some people said this couldn't be done. The state trust land reform is too tough to do. This past year I worked with economic development leaders from around Arizona, conservation organizations, Chambers of Commerce, and military leaders, to create Proposition 110. We

knew that protecting Arizona's military installations were more important than politics. Proposition 110 balances a need for environmental stability, with a parallel need for economic sustainability. This is a vital step in protecting Arizona's most valuable investment in America's defense infrastructure.

Arizona's military infrastructure generates more than thirty thousand Arizonan jobs, and more than \$9 billion dollars in economic activity, and hundreds of millions of dollars in revenues on state and local taxes.

Stability of employment and tax revenues produced by the Arizona military industry, are indispensable to the fiscal health of our state. From Yuma to Davis Moffitt, to Fort Wachuka to Luke, Arizona's network of military facilities, comprises an integrated array of bases, testing and training facilities, ranges and air space.

Our location, weather and capabilities combine to create an environment uniquely suited to the mission of objectives and critical to our nation's defense.

Today, there are over nine million acres of state trust land in the state of Arizona. In addition, a significant amount of that acreage is in a checkerboard pattern, created a difficult issue related to land management.

Prop 110 preserves and protects Arizona's lands by converting those special places from restricted state trust lands to public lands managed by other governmental agencies.

The proposition is a transparent process that allows the State Land Commission to exchange lands within the range of military installations and consolidates state trust lands.

With that, the process includes two appraisals, two public hearings, value-for-value exchanges, and voter approval. This is a win-win proposition for Arizona. Please vote yes on Proposition 110.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. And tonight, we do not have any organized opposition to this proposition, so we will move to Prop 111 and ask the secretary to describe that for us.

###

PROPOSITION 111, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BARRETT: Proposition 111. A yes vote shall have the effect of changing the name of the Office of Secretary of State to the Office of Lieutenant Governor. It will also require that each political parties' nominees for Governor and Lieutenant Governor, run on one ticket, and be voted on together in the general election.

A no vote shall have the effect of retaining the current Office of Secretary of State, as a position elected separately from the Office of Governor.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. Speaking on the pro side of 111 is Tom Simplot, Chairman of Yes on 111.

MR. TOM SIMPLOT: Good evening. I'm Phoenix City Councilman, Tom Simplot, and I'm also Chair of Vote Yes on Prop 111 Campaign.

Proposition 111 creates the position of Lieutenant Governor, leaving no doubt in voter's minds what the chain of succession would be in Arizona government. It brings transparency to the forefront of our political system.

The Lieutenant Governor would assume the duties of the Secretary of State, creating better government without bigger government. Starting in 2014, each party would have a gubernatorial candidate, and a Lieutenant gubernatorial

candidate elected on a ticket. Independent voters would still be -- excuse me, independent candidates would still be allowed to run for the offices.

Creating the position of Lieutenant Governor was among the most popular governmental reforms in a recent statewide survey.

Proposition 111 has its origin in the O'Connor House Project. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor and the O'Connor House Project, brought citizens together this past year to discuss problems facing our state, and to find common sense solutions to improve our government, without making it bigger.

Their recommendations represent the views of a diverse bipartisan group of people from across the state.

Proposition 111 would again simply make our government better, without making it bigger.

Arizona is only one of five states without a Lieutenant Governor position. In our state's short history, we've had five Secretary's of State ascend to the Governor's office. Twice as a result of gubernatorial vacancy, the office has switched political parties mid-term. Renaming the Secretary of State to Lieutenant Governor provides voters a clear understanding of our state's executive line of succession.

Under Proposition 111, the legislature would have four years to tailor the duties and responsibilities of the

Lieutenant Governor for Arizona's needs. Much like the Arizona legislature has done for the Secretary of State's Office since statehood.

Please join me and the committee in supporting Proposition 111. Thank you.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. Speaking against Proposition 111 is Joe Sigg, who is a Member of the Arizona Farm Bureau.

MR. JOE SIGG: I get the idea of a Lieutenant Governor. I get the idea that voters have some expectation of four years of continuity when they elect a Governor.

A Lieutenant Governor for Arizona may be a very good idea, but not the way Proposition 111 is written. It's language and argue exceeds the illumination of its headlights. I quote Bob Rob, columnist for the Arizona Republic. "I've been a participant or close observer of the Arizona politics for over three decades. Proposition 111 is one of the most poorly thought out ballot propositions I've seen during that long stretch, and believe me, that's not an easy list to crack."

The Arizona Farm Bureau opposes Proposition 111 for three reasons. One, it forces partisan primary victors to run as a team. This idea of forcing people who may not like one another, or the others policies, can run as a team just because they're the same political party, deserves another look.

Two, the Chief Election Officer that as the Secretary of State, becomes the Lieutenant Governor, and as a team member subservient to the Governor. This idea of having the Chief Elections Officer tied so closely to the Governor, deserves another look. There may come a time when the elector will appreciate a clear separation of powers.

Three, the language of Proposition 111 precludes a run by an independent, because it would prescribe by constitutional language, a process determined by party and primary. Independents have neither. Obviously, you can't block by process independents running for obvious -- running for office. Obviously, that's unconstitutional. Obviously, that would likely prompt a Court case, which the state would lose, at which time the elector will think, why didn't we think through that before?

Well, we can think through that now, and vote no on Proposition 111.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much.

###

PROPOSITION 112, INITIATIVE PETITIONS

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Up next, Proposition 112.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: A yes vote on Proposition 112 will have the effect of changing the initiative filing deadline from four months to six months, prior to each general election.

And a no vote on 112, has the effect of preserving the current initiative the filing deadline at four months.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: And speaking on the pro side of Proposition 112, is Chad Campbell, Member of the Arizona House of Representatives.

MR. CHAD CAMPBELL: Thank you, very much. My name is Chad Campbell. I am a Member of the Arizona House of Representatives, and I will be very brief tonight. Proposition 112 does one very simple thing. It moves the initiative-filing deadline for your signatures back from four months to six months, and it does this for three very simple reasons.

One, it allows more time for the County Recorder's Offices and election officials, to verify the signatures and make sure they are valid and legal signatures. We've had problems with this in the past. It's a very critical problem we need to address in this state.

Two, it actually gives more time for citizens and other groups to see if they need to file litigation on this piece of ballot measure, and make sure that they are doing so in a proper fashion.

And three, it allows more time for the voters to actually learn about the issue and debate the issue, and make an informed vote in November.

I will say one very important thing. This is done at actually no cost to the taxpayers, it will not raise any fees, will not raise any taxes, and it was a very bipartisan measure that was supported unanimously by both the House and the Senate.

It was a measure that came out of an effort by Sandra Day O'Connor and others, to reform Arizona State government, and make our government more efficient, more accountable and more transparent, moving into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century for Arizona.

There is no opposition to this measure that's organized, and it's because it's a very simple solution for a very important problem.

And with that, I hope you join me and others in supporting Proposition 112. Thank you.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: With forty seconds to spare on the clock, apparently not ruffling any feathers on that Prop, there is no organized opposition.

###

PROPOSITION 113, RIGHT TO VOTE FOR SECRET BALLOT  
REGARDING EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATION

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Up next is the explanation on Prop 113.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: Proposition 113, a yes vote shall have the effect of guaranteeing the right under state law, of individuals to vote by secret ballot in elections, designations or authorizations for employee representation, including unions and employee organizations.

A no vote shall have the effect of maintaining current law regarding secrecy in voting.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. And on the pro side of 113 is Lucy Morrow Caldwell, Campaign Coordinator for Save Our Secret Ballot Arizona.

MS. LUCY MORROW CALDWELL: Thank you. President Obama and Democrats are right now working to fundamentally change the way that shops get unionized. The goal of Save Our Secret Ballot is to ensure that their plan never takes effect in Arizona.

Currently, when Unions wants to organize a business, they have to collect signatures from 30 percent of employees. Then there's a campaign where both the Union and the company get to make their case. Then there's a vote. Workers get to vote

on whether or not they want to unionize, and their ballots are secret. A pretty good system.

But Union bosses want to take away workers rights to secret ballots. Instead, they want to be able to go directly to workers homes, maybe at night or on weekends, and use tactics to persuade them to sign Union cards.

They're proposing a law where one-half of employee's sign Union cards, the company is immediately unionized. No campaign, no election, certainly no secret ballot.

These new rules would apply to businesses with as few as ten employees. If you think economic recovery is slow now, imagine how slow it would be if the Unions have their way.

A businessman with nine employees and thinking of hiring his tenth, would have weigh the upside of growing a business against the downside of potentially having his business unionized overnight.

Why do Union bosses want this? Membership has waned in recent years, but if this policy passes, they predict their Union membership will triple, which will drastically increase their funding for political activism.

I would bet my Opponent is going to tell you that Prop 113 is sharply slanted toward allowing employer intimidation. But if it's intimidation you fear, why would not want a secret

ballot? Employee intimidation is wrong. It's wrong when it comes from the employee's boss and from the Union boss.

But with the secret ballot, you the worker are the boss. That's probably why time after time this issue polls highest among Union households. No one is more aware of the threat of Union intimidation than Union members. They don't want to take away the secret ballot. It's the privileged Union bosses who do.

All 113 does is make sure that workers have a secret ballot where no intimidation can take place. When you vote by secret ballot, you can't be intimidated. Let's protect that.

My Opponent tonight is a long-time Clean Elections Advocate, and so I would ask, what's cleaner than a secret ballot? Vote yes on Prop 113 and save workers rights.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. Opposed to 113 is Mike Valder, President of the Arizona Advocacy Network.

MR. MIKE VALDER: Good evening. The Arizona Advocacy Network is a good government organization, and she's right. We do support public funding for political campaigns. It's an effort to keep the big money, special interest, from totally governing everything.

That's what Prop 113 is about. It's one more effort by the big money special interest to weasel itself into the

fabric and structure of state law, so that the middle class, which isn't doing so well these days, just won't have a chance to do any better.

That's what labor unions are about. It offers middle class people a chance to advance. And the shrinking of the American middle class is directly linked to the decline in Union membership. As Union membership has plummeted, corporations have dramatically increased compensation for top executives, while middle management and working people's wages have stagnated or declined.

Workers deserve the right to choose, to organize a Union through a simple process without the long delays that are exploited by employers to try to scare employees against voting for the Union.

Worker organizers assert that the secret ballot process for forming Unions, has become entirely corrupted by business interests, who have succeeded in watering down regulations and neutering the Labor Relations Board.

You know, 89 percent of companies' force employees who are trying to unionize, to attend multiple mandatory closed-door meetings against the Union. Folks, you have no idea of the pressures and manipulations that are employed by employers to try to resist and defeat any efforts to form Unions.

And yet, Union membership is what has really made America strong with a strong middle class. We urge you not to support this misnamed and misleading proposition.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much.

###

PROPOSITION 203, MEDICAL USE OF MARIJUANA

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Up next is Proposition 203.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: A yes vote on Proposition 203 will have the effect of authorizing the use of marijuana for people with debilitating medical conditions, who obtain a written certification from a physician, and establishing a regulatory system, governed by the Arizona Department of Health Services, for establishing and licensing medical marijuana dispensaries.

A no vote shall have the effect of retaining current law regarding the use of marijuana.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: And speaking on the pro side of 203, is Andrew Myers, Treasurer for the Arizona Medical Marijuana Policy Project Supporting Proposition 203.

MR. ANDREW MYERS: Proposition 203 is about protecting seriously and terminally ill patients from arrest and prosecution. Right now, there are already thousands of patients all across Arizona, who are already using marijuana with their doctor's recommendation, and these patients face a terrible choice. They must either continue to suffer with severe and debilitating medical symptoms from a serious or even terminal disease, or they have to go to the criminal market, putting

themselves, and in many cases, their family members at risk for felony prosecution.

Arizona is unique in that possession of any amount of marijuana can be prosecuted as a felony in our state. And the risks don't stop with arrests. On the streets, patients must deal with criminals to acquire product of unknown origins, which may contain mold or pesticides, or be laced with other drugs. And unfortunately, in Arizona, much of the marijuana supplied to the criminal market, comes from Mexican Drug Cartels. So under current law, these patients are unwittingly lining the pockets of some of the world's worst criminals.

Prop 203 will allow patients safe, reliable and legal access to medication, that for many, can be life saving. Our proposal is restrictive and common sense. Unlike states like California, where there is no statewide regulation of the medical marijuana industry, our proposal limits medical marijuana access to seriously and terminally ill patients with a defined list of medical conditions.

It also limits the number of dispensaries to 124 statewide. So we will not have an overwhelming number of facilities that places like Los Angeles have.

Also unlike other states, the cultivation, distribution of the medication, will be tightly controlled. All marijuana in the system must be drawn by licensed dispensaries,

and any diversion of marijuana to an individual who is not a registered patient, will be prosecuted as a Class 2 Felony, punishable up to 25 years of prison. The same as manslaughter.

Our Opponents will raise red haring arguments regarding such things as employment issues used by minors. But the simple truth is, that our law puts far greater restrictions on the use of marijuana than exist for far more addictive and dangerous medications, like narcotic painkillers that are freely and legitimately prescribed by physicians every day.

Patients should not be prosecuted for following their doctor's advice. A vote for Prop 203 is a vote for patient's rights.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. Bill Montgomery is opposed to Proposition 203. Bill is a Representative of Keep AZ Drug Free.

MR. BILL MONTGOMERY: Arizona voters should not just vote no on Proposition 203. They should vote hell no. We are tired of being a lab for social experiments, and this is just one more measure where an out-of-state drug lobby has dumped \$600 hundred thousand dollars into our state, in an effort to set conditions for the future legalization of drugs.

What does Prop 203 really do? It creates a protected class of drug user that would inhibit the ability of employers

to ensure that they have a drug free workplace, a place safe for people to work in.

It also would inhibit the ability of law enforcement to successfully investigate drug-impaired drivers. Prop 203 would also allow for dispensaries to be established within 200 yards of an elementary school. It also would allow a dispensary not just to cultivate or grow marijuana at that location, but also one other location.

Ultimately, you would have more marijuana grown out of those two locations than could legitimately be expected to be used by the small percentage of terminally ill patients in Arizona, who might, who might have a therapeutic result from using it. And let's not make any mistake here. The list of illnesses that could be used to qualify for recommendation, is not restricted. A toothache could get you a recommendation for marijuana. A bad back. Lumbago. Wearing high heels all day. These are the very sorts of conditions that have permitted people in other states to get a "recommendation" for marijuana.

And it is not a medicine-based product. You are getting a recommendation from a doctor. You're not getting a prescription. You're not getting it from a pharmacy. You're getting it from a dispensary.

And let's look at those states that have been polled into a passing measure such as this. In California, where just

within the last year, you've had three different dispensaries involved in murders, because of the criminal element that gets invited in the neighborhoods.

We should say no on 203. No on 203 for our kids, for our communities. Keep Arizona drug free.

###

PROPOSITION 301, LAND CONSERVATION FUND

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: A yes vote on Proposition 301 will have the effect of transferring the balance of money in the Land Conservation Fund, which was established by voters in 1998 as part of the Growing Smarter Act to the State General Fund.

A no vote shall have the effect of keeping the balance of the money in the Land Conservation Fund.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Kevin McCarthy is a Proponent of 301. Kevin is President of the Arizona Tax Research Association.

MR. KEVIN MCCARTHY: The Arizona Tax Research Association is a statewide taxpayer association, and we're here to urge your support for Proposition 301.

As all Arizonans are painfully aware, the national recession has hit Arizona particularly hard, and it has left our state budget in a chronic budget deficit. Arizona's state budget has lost over 40 percent of the State General Fund revenue in the last three years alone. We lead the country with the percentage deficits that we face.

The Arizona Legislature has responded to that challenge by cutting spending to the tune of one point one billion. We've raised taxes one point two billion, and in

addition to that they have used a variety of one-time revenue sources to try to Band-Aid the budget as the economy recovers.

What you're being asked to do with Prop 301 is to support the use of the one-time revenues that are left in the State Land Conservation Trust. Those monies were originally earmarked to purchase the land and to conserve state trust land.

We urge you to support that because we think that Prop 301 is pretty simple. It's about setting priorities. We can use this money for K-12 schools, universities, low income healthcare, or prison funding, which we think are decidedly higher priorities for the use of state taxpayer money, than to use it to buy open space when we are at the depth of the recession, and we encourage you to support Prop 301. Thank you.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. Speaking against Prop 301 is Sandy Bahr, Treasurer of No on 301.

MS. SANDY BAHR: Thank you. We ask Arizona voters to please vote no on Proposition 301 and to reject this legislative sweep of the Land Conservation Fund.

Prop 301 proposes to raid the Land Conservation Fund established by the voters' back in 1998. It sweeps the dollars into the general fund where the Legislature appropriates them. Legislators argue that if they can't get their hands on this fund, then they'll have to further cut education. However, Prop

301 would actually harm both conservation and education, which is why teachers and conservationists alike, are opposing it. The Land Conservation Fund provides a match for communities to conserve important state trust land, including lands in the Phoenix Sonoran Preserve, Pima Counties, Sonoran Desert Conservation Plan, the McDowell Sonoran Preserve, among many others. Dollars can only be used to conserve state trust land, and they go directly into the trust to benefit primarily public schools.

The Arizona Legislature has had many bad ideas over the years, and is frequently out-of-touch with the voters. That's why so often we must resort to the initiative process to advance important issues, such as funding for land conservation, parks and wildlife. And that's also why we the voters, have had to act a safeguard voter approved measure and pass the Voter Protection Act.

The Voter Protection Act is the only reason that Prop 301 is on the ballot. Without it, the Legislature would have already raided the Land Conservation Fund like they have so many others.

Yes, these are tough economic times, but it's no time to ignore our responsibility to future generations by eliminating these dollars. Our children will benefit from both conservation and the dollars these lands generate for the Trust.

That's much more than we can count on from the Legislature.

Please vote no on 301.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much.

###

PROPOSITION 302, CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT  
AND HEALTH PROGRAMS

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. We are making excellent time. We are down to two propositions. Secretary Bennett will explain Proposition 302.

STATE SECRETARY KEN BENNETT: Thank you, Rich. A yes vote on Proposition 302 will have the effect of terminating Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board and Programs, which were established by the voters in 2006, as part of the Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health initiative.

It would require the transfer of money remaining in the Early Childhood Development and Education Fund on December 1 of 2010, to be deposited into the State General Fund. Thereafter, it would require tobacco tax monies collected pursuant to the initiative, to be deposited into the State General Fund and used for health and human services for children.

A no vote shall have the effect of retaining the Arizona Early Childhood Development and Health Board and programs, and keeping any money in the Early Childhood and Education Fund.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Speaking on the pro side of Prop 302 is Pam Pickard, Chairwoman of Kids First - Yes on 302.

MS. PAM PICKARD: Thank you. Good evening. In 2006, voters passed an Early Childhood proposition allowing taxpayers money to be used to provide training for early childhood providers. In the past four years, what has been created is a massive bureaucratic agency that is providing many duplicate programs to preschool children.

The 2006 proposition required that only 10 percent of the tax monies collected be spent for administration. Yet according to the Arizona Republic, to date, about 14 percent, or roughly \$40 million dollars has been spent to create this bureaucratic agency of approximately 140 employees and 31 councils.

This agency is bigger than many state agencies with basically little to no oversight. Of the few grants that have been given out, 50 percent, or approximately \$17 million dollars was given to three groups in a non-competitive process.

Very few programs have actually been started. The Early Childhood Agency has stated it took almost four years to get started because they wanted local feedback to meet local needs. Yet again, so little has been accomplished. Besides

creating this bureaucracy, it has collected tax money about \$324 million dollars in the bank.

With the deficit of the state budget and the cuts to other programs effecting children, the voters need to reassess the 2006 proposition. By voting yes on 302, the money will still go to health and human services for children, but in a much more efficient and accountable way.

The money will be redirected to agencies already providing those services. These agencies have seen cuts and they may see even deeper cuts.

So please put kids first, have your tax dollars accountable, help other agencies from deeper cuts, vote yes on 302. Thank you.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: And opposed to 302, we have Nadine Mathis-Basha, Chairwoman of Save First Things First on 302.

MS. MATHIS-BASHA: They say we get the representation we deserve. I don't think that that's true in Arizona. Here in this state that we all love, there is an enormous gulf between the priorities of our voters and state legislature. Arizona voters have spoken clearly over the past four years even as the state has faced economic hardship.

We place protecting education and healthcare at top of our priorities. That's why voters approved First Things

First in 2006. We wanted to help kids by using tobacco taxes to build a comprehensive early childhood development and health system, a system that has already helped over three hundred and thirty thousand Arizona children.

This system has meant better educated teachers in the classroom, better childcare, emergency services for families in need. 90 percent of these funds go directly to these programs for children.

By law, First Things First has helped Arizona children begin school ready to succeed and healthy. Voters reaffirm their support for children in May, when Proposition 100 won by a landslide. Again, the message was clear. Project education and health care, and give every child a fair start in life.

Unfortunately, the Arizona Legislature doesn't see it that way. The Legislature put Prop 302 on the ballot for one reason. They covet the revenues voters created specifically to fund First Things First. The same body responsible for spending the state into the red, now wants to spend this money too.

Not only do they want to do whatever -- take whatever revenue First Things First has set aside for kids, they want to take the revenue stream, the tobacco tax dollars and put it into the General Fund.

The Legislature thinks it knows better than we the voters, that their priorities should take precedence over ours.

Don't let that happen. Don't let Arizona's children who have no voice at the polls, suffer at the hands of the legislature with wrong priorities.

Please join me and thousands of our fellow Arizonans on November 2. Please vote no on 302. Thank you.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you very much.

###

PROPOSITION 106, HEALTH CARE SERVICES

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you very much. We are down to our final Proposition of the evening, and that is Proposition 106.

SECRETARY OF STATE KEN BENNETT: Proposition 106, a yes vote will have the effect of prohibiting the enactment of laws or rules that would require any person, employer, or health care provider, to participate in any health care system.

It will also allow a person or employer to forego health insurance, and pay for health care services directly, without a penalty, and will allow health care providers to accept direct payment without a penalty. It will specifically allow health insurance in private health care systems.

A no vote shall have the effect of retaining the current law regarding a person or entities health care choices.

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Speaking on the pro side of 106, is Dr. Eric Novack, Chairman of Arizonans for Health Care Freedom.

DR. ERIC NOVACK: Hi. I am Eric Novack, the Chairman of Arizonans for Health Care Freedom - Yes on Prop 106.

Proposition 106, the Arizonan Health Care Freedom Act will amend our state constitution and do two things and two things only.

Number one, it says that all people in Arizona shall have the right to choose to not participate in any health care system plan, without paying a penalty, fine or tax of any kind. Secondly, it says that if a health care service is legal, no bureaucratic, public or private, ought to ever be able to tell an Arizona family that they cannot spend their own money to get access to that legal health care service.

That's it. Two basic freedoms regarding our healthcare that will go alongside our cherished freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press.

What will Prop 106 not do. Proposition 106 will have absolutely no impact on the state's Medicaid system. It has no impact on AHCCCS at all. It has no impact on Medicare, no impact on Tri-Care benefits, no impact on any health service benefits, no impact on VA benefit. All it does is place basic rights to choose to not participate in the hands of Arizona patients and families.

We need rational health care in this country, with a sustainable safety net health care system. Fundamental to that is keeping the right of health care decision making in the hands of patients and families, and out of the hands of politicians.

Please vote yes on Proposition 106 this November.  
Please learn more at [Yes106.com](http://Yes106.com), [Yes106.com](http://Yes106.com).

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you. Speaking against Proposition 106 is Kyrsten Sinema. She is a Member of the House of Representatives.

MS. KYRSTEN SINEMA: Good evening. I'm here to talk a little bit about Proposition 106, which is a colossal waste of taxpayer dollars and voters time.

In 2008, voters rejected a measure similar to Proposition 106 for merely the same reasons.

The new Federal health law has already gone into effect and is currently law in our country. While the Proponents of Proposition 106 would like to pretend that this isn't true, the bottom line is that they cannot change it.

Proposition 106 if passed, would change absolutely nothing about Arizona's health care system. What it would do however, is prompt lengthy and expensive litigation that our state cannot afford. Arizona is already in two lawsuits concerning the Federal health care law. We do not need a third law, especially not a law that is being litigated at the expense of Arizona's voters. Those funds should go to fund education, which has been severely cut in our state over the last two years.

The individuals who support Proposition 106 hate the new Federal law and would like to see it repealed. But that means that they would repeal important new provisions that have

just gone into effect. Such as provisions that ensure that insurance companies will no longer take away health care benefits from children who are born with pre-existing health conditions. Plans that ensure that young adults, whose parents want to keep them on health care, can protect them until the age of 26. Using emergency rooms outside of your plan's network and insuring that the insurance companies no longer have the right to choose your doctor for you.

These are all provisions in the new Federal law that are at jeopardy if continuous and expensive litigation ensues. I would encourage voters to do what they did in 2008, to reject this proposition, and save Arizonans dollars for more worthy measures.

Vote no on Proposition 106.

###

MODERATOR RICH DUBEK: Thank you, very much. Kyrsten you had the last word tonight. That wraps up our Propositions. We want to thank all of you for being a part of the 2010 Arizona Town Hall, including the Secretary of State, Maricopa County Community Colleges, and Cox Communications, for hosting this event.

We also want to thank Cox viewers for watching. Of course, we encourage all of you to learn as much as possible about what's on that ballot before this November's election. And whatever you do, don't forget to vote.

I'm Rich Dubek, good night.