

THE LIE:

Bond acts or measures are good business.

WRONG!

By Robert Colaco, Founder and National Chairman of Citizens for a Better America.

We, as Citizens of each state elect to our State Legislature, men and women who have the responsibility of taking our tax dollars and using them wisely. Every time we, as voters, approve a Bond Act, we are doing their job. When they can not get their pet projects through the State Legislature and the Governor, they resort to putting Bond Acts on the ballot. The problem is that they are using your money to do it. Each Bond Act is a loan that the State Government takes out which must be repaid over 20, 30, 40 or 50 years. Repayment of these Bonds must be included as part of the State Budget. Since taxes have to be raised to repay what we, as Citizens of the state must borrow, and since increased taxation prolongs recession(s) we at Citizens for a Better America are very much opposed to Bond Acts.

This principle, that the money must be borrowed, is why we oppose deficit spending by the Congress of the United States. In that case you, the Citizen do not actually have the opportunity to make a decision. The decision is made by the men and women you elect to the U.S. Congress and to the U.S. Senate.

One of the reasons we at Citizens for a Better America supports the men and women we do (see pages 5 and 6 for our "GOOD GUYS" list), is that they have the guts to stand against enslaving you. Enslaving you, your children, and your grandchildren to more and more debt being added to the now over \$5,000,000,000,000 (5 Trillion) that we, citizens of the United States, must pay back to those lenders we have borrowed from, plus interest.

We as Citizens are paying \$203 billion, about 14% of the total federal budget on the national debt. In fact to quote the 1995 IRS Publication 17 on Page 330 under Federal Outlays says: "About 86% of total outlays were financed by tax receipts and the remaining 14% were financed by borrowing."

Let's assume you needed \$100 a day, to live on, you earned \$86 a day and you borrowed \$14 a day. Assuming you worked 22 days a month which is common, that means you would have borrowed \$308.00 by the end of the month. In twelve months you would have borrowed \$3,696.00. Assuming that you do not pay anything on the debt, that means you would have paid at just 10% annual interest \$369.60. After 45 years of your working life you would owe a minimum of \$166,320.00 if you had been paying your interest every month. Not only would you not have any money to retire on but you would need to start making monthly payments for the next 30 years at the age of 65 of approximately \$1,663.20. And, if you died you would pass on the debt to your children.

Now, if the opponents of the "GOOD GUYS" are telling you in your district that these "GOOD GUYS" are just out to hurt the poor, infirm, the elderly and so on, you tell them that they are trying to hurt you, your children, your grandchildren and for that matter the United States of America because they want to collapse the

economy, just to perpetuate their careers. Collapsing the economy is a tough charge but just as you can not think about working another 30 years at the age of 65 to pay off your \$166,320.00 during your lifetime, our economy can not handle this same kind of deficit spending. ✗

BALLOT MEASURES:

CALIFORNIA

| | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|
| Prop. 204 - NO. | Prop. 212 - Yes see below |
| Prop. 205 - NO | Prop. 213 - NO |
| Prop. 206 - NO | Prop. 214 - NO |
| Prop. 207 - NO | Prop. 215 - NO |
| Prop. 208 - NO | Prop. 216 - NO |
| Prop. 209 - Yes | Prop. 217 - NO |
| Prop. 210 - NO | Prop. 218 - Yes ✗ |
| Prop. 211 - NO | |

Prop. 212 - Normally at first glance, Citizens for a Better America would be in opposition to such a measure but our Honorary National Chairman, Congressman Bill Dannemeyer who is on the Yes on 212 Advisory Board, made the following convincing argument. In a written statement Congressman Dannemeyer states: "To put this in perspective, when I first ran for the State Assembly in 1962, the total primary and general election expenses did not exceed \$10,000 and I won. The value of the dollar has depreciated by a factor of five since then, so a campaign expenditure of \$50,000 equivalent in 1962 for an Assembly seat has now escalated to the point where it takes between \$250,000 and one million to win today! This quantity of money has escalated to the point where it has corrupted our political system and it has to change. Prop. 212 is the vehicle to achieve this by limiting Out of District contributions to no more than 25% of the total." Signed: Bill Dannemeyer. (Member, U.S. House of Representatives, 1979-1992, Member, California State Assembly, 1963-1966, 1976-1977.) ✗

COLORADO

Amendment 11 - NO, it is ludicrous to tax churches and non profit organizations. ✗