

THE LIE

Proposition 172 will provide for Public Safety improvement.

WRONG!!

"Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act of 1993". What a great sounding name for a proposition! Has a nice ring to it, doesn't it? All the right buzz words. "Local", "Public Safety", "Protection and Improvement". Who could be against any of these positive sounding things? That's exactly what Pete Wilson thought when he came up with this nifty little gem. Unfortunately, the fine print doesn't fit the nice sounding title.

How can it be called "Local", when it's a state-wide initiative, proposed by the state governor to extend a state-wide sales tax which was supposed to have been terminated across the state in June, 1993. Notice also the explanation in the "Official Sample Ballot" which states that "If this measure is approved by the voters, the tax would be collected in all counties. However, a county would be eligible to receive tax revenues beginning January 1, 1994, only if the board of supervisors votes to participate or voters within the county approve the measure by a majority vote." I'd call that a state-wide tax and I'd also call it taxation without representation. If your county doesn't vote for it, you pay it anyway, but the money is not directed to your local government. Still think it's "Local"?

Let's take a look at the "Public Safety" part. As everyone (including the governor) knows, public safety is a hot issue these days.

Many Republicans (and I'm one of them) especially have a hard time opposing anything with the "public safety" tag on it. Unfortunately, although the Sample Ballot explanation says, "This measure would provide a dedicated revenue resource for public safety purposes", the measure does not require that the revenue be spent on more police, fire-fighters or prisons. Instead, anything a county's Board of Supervisors designates a "public safety" issue would be eligible to have these "dedicated" revenues thrown at it.

The "Protection and Improvement" part rings true to some degree. After all, that's what the gangs call it when they offer to protect your establishment from rival gangs in exchange for a fee after they've already robbed you themselves. After Pete Wilson and the legislature raided local coffers in the last budget, they now offer to help us keep "public safety" if we'll just agree to make the "temporary" half-cent sales tax permanent. If the measure passes but we don't go for it locally, they'll take the money anyway. Sure sounds like extortion to me.

We can all agree that public safety is one of today's most important issues. None of us enjoy the battleground our streets have become. But in this instance, it's time to stand up and tell that gang of thieves in Sacramento that they are just as bad as the gangs in our streets. Vote NO on Proposition 172.

David Shemanski
Los Angeles County, CA
October 1993

BALLOT MEASURES

PROPOSITION 168 - NO

Low Rent Housing Projects.

PROPOSITION 169 - NO

Budget implementation.

PROPOSITION 170 - NO

Property taxes.

If you, as a California Voter, are tired of housing costs eat up your paycheck, vote NO on Prop. 170. Whether you are a tenant or homeowner, current state law protects you to some degree from the voracious appetite of the property tax collector by requiring a two-thirds vote a super majority (66 %) vote to pass local tax increases. These taxes fall directly on homeowners, but tenants also get them in the form of "pass-through" rent increases. Prop. 170 would change the law to require only a simple majority (50% + 1) vote to increase property taxes.

Who wants to see Prop. 170 pass? Developers, local bureaucrats and the "gang of thieves" in Sacramento. Developers like it because it shifts the burden of paying for new schools, (schools they must include in their projects, to service the neighborhoods they are developing), from their shoulders to the shoulders of current property owners. Local bureaucrats and Sacramento spendocrats like it because it makes it easier for them to squeeze money out of taxpayers. We do not need to make passing taxes any easier in California. Over the last five years, 42% of all local general obligation bonds on the ballot passed with a 2/3 vote. That is more than enough! Between 1990 and 1992, California lost 700,000 jobs due in part to high state and local taxes. During this same period, our state and local governments added 8,000 members to their ranks. It's time to tell the spendocrats ENOUGH is ENOUGH.

PROPOSITION 171 - YES

Property Taxation. Transfer of Base Year.

PROPOSITION 172 - NO

(See Analysis this page at left.)

Local Public Safety Protection and Improvement Act of 1993.

PROPOSITION 173 - NO

Housing and Jobs Investment Bond Act.

PROPOSITION 174 - YES

(See Analysis This Issue)

Education, Vouchers.