



November 8, 2005 Special Election: BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

To help California progressives navigate the maze of public policy issues presented in this otherwise off-election year, **Speak Out California (www.speakoutca.org)** has prepared information on the initiatives. For continuing special election bulletins, sign up at **your Santa Clara County Democratic Party website – www.SCCDP.org** – today. Voting recommendations are those of the California Democratic Party.

Please pass this along to everyone you know, and if you can, **give a donation**. Thanks!

Propositions

NO on 73 - Threatening teen safety

Requires doctors to notify the parents of any teenager under the age of 18 who seeks abortion services, but provides no real solutions for parents and threatens teen health. Parental notification laws like this one threaten teen safety because they delay teens from seeking safe, professional medical care.

Parents want to be involved in the lives and decisions of their teenagers, but this initiative, which forces the government into sensitive family decisions, is not the answer. The truth is that the overwhelming majority of girls confide in their parents when faced with a difficult decision like an unplanned pregnancy. But if their daughters are reluctant or unable to approach them, most parents want their teens to be safe.

- **Backed by: Extremist anti-choice groups**
- **Opposed by: Groups who support teen safety and access to comprehensive reproductive health care like Planned Parenthood, NARAL Pro-Choice California, the California Medical Association and California Nurses Association, among others.**

NO on 74 - Attacking school teachers

This measure, which requires teachers to wait five years instead of two before they are eligible for tenure, is an attempt to deflect attention from the real problems facing our public school system. Teachers simply do not get paid enough for the work they do educating our next generation of leaders. Taking away a measure of job security, one of the few remaining incentives, will only make it more difficult to recruit and retain quality teachers.

If we really want to ensure our kids have good teachers, we must provide them with the training and support services they need.

- **Backed by: Gov. Schwarzenegger, anti-union groups**
- **Opposed by: Education groups, including CTA.**

NO on 75 - Paycheck deception

Californians have rejected this initiative in the past, and they should do so again. Plain and simple, it is an attempt to handicap unfairly those organizations that give working families a voice in the political process that affects them.

It makes it unreasonably difficult for union dues to be used toward political purposes, and it is no coincidence that many of these organizations support progressive causes and candidates. The same level of scrutiny is not proposed for big corporate campaign donors.

- **Backed by: Grover Norquist, and other Bush Administration advisors**
- **Opposed by: A broad coalition of progressive groups including teachers, nurses and other school employees**

November 2005 Special Election Guide *(continued)*

NO on 76 - Gutting school funding

Aims to give the Governor new powers to single-handedly slash state funding, while gutting the voter-approved education funding requirements in Proposition 98. Poorly written, it could also deprive cities and counties of hundreds of millions of dollars for police, firefighters, healthcare and social service programs. Similar measures proposed by Republican governors have been rejected by Californians before. Voters didn't approve of the power grab then, and they shouldn't now.

- **Backed by: Gov. Schwarzenegger, big business groups**
- **Opposed by: Education and health care advocacy groups**

NO on 77 – Power grab

With all of the problems our state is currently facing, this initiative is merely a distraction. Redistricting should only be done in connection with the next Census, and only then should we decide how that process should unfold.

Republicans in California know that the only way they can gain any seats in the Legislature and Congress is to change the rules about how districts are drawn, because their increasingly strident, right-wing extremist candidates are not popular with California voters.

- **Backed by: Gov. Schwarzenegger, and the same people who brought you the 2003 recall election**

NO on 78 - Weak prescription drug plan

The big problem with this initiative is that it is strictly voluntary, leaving it up to the giant drug companies to decide whether to offer seniors and the working poor cheaper prescription drugs. We lack confidence that the drug companies will always do the right thing and look out for the interests of their consumers.

This measure was designed to confuse voters – it was put on the ballot in response to real prescription drug reform championed by seniors and consumer-rights groups (see 79, below).

- **Backed by: Drug companies**
- **Opposed by: Seniors, consumer rights groups**

YES on 79 - Cheaper prescription drugs

Supported by seniors and consumer groups, this initiative would make it mandatory for drug companies to provide low-income residents with cheaper prescription drugs, or risk being barred from state Medi-Cal contracts.

The discounts would come in the form of rebates that are negotiated between the state and drug makers. This measure also calls for an oversight board and would make certain prescription drug profiteering illegal.

- **Backed by: Seniors, consumer rights groups**
- **Opposed by: Drug companies**

YES on 80 - Blackout avoidance

A response to the deregulation disaster that brought us the energy crisis of the late 1990s, this measure aims to bring stability and reliability back to California's electricity grid.

It will prevent the kind of Enron-style market manipulation that led to rolling blackouts and skyrocketing electricity bills, and further commits California to increased reliance on renewable energy sources.

- **Backed by: Consumer groups, including The Utility Reform Network**