

The CA State Propositions and our position

*Note: LA Greens did not quite achieve quorum at our endorsement meeting, however, these recommendations are based on the consensus or majority opinion of all of those present. For more details see the Minutes of the October meeting found at www.losangelesgreens.org.

73

Proposition 73, if adopted, would amend the California Constitution to require that a physician notify, with certain exceptions, a parent or legal guardian of a pregnant minor at least 48 hours before performing an abortion. The Los Angeles Greens recommend a NO vote on this proposition, primarily for two reasons. Minors seeking abortions who are required to notify their parents of their decision could face violent retribution for such notification. This could lead to more illegal abortions, which can be life-threatening procedures. Also, there is language in the initiative that defines abortion as causing "death of the unborn child, a child conceived but not yet born." If this initiative were adopted, it would make an end-run around California law and set a precedent for defining an unborn fetus as a human being. It isn't hard to see that this initiative is really a Trojan horse for the elimination of abortion rights in the state of California.

Vote NO

74

If this measure were adopted, it would extend the probationary period for new teachers from two to five years, and school districts could dismiss permanent teachers who received two consecutive unsatisfactory performance evaluations using a modified dismissal process. The Los Angeles Greens recommend a NO vote on this proposition. Proposition 74 doesn't reduce class size or provide new textbooks, computers, or other urgently needed learning materials. It doesn't improve teacher training or campus safety. Nor does it increase educational funding or fix one leaking school roof. All this proposition does is make it easier to eliminate would-be educators from an already understaffed profession.

Vote NO

75

This anti-labor initiative prohibits public employee unions from using union dues for political contributions unless they first obtain the employee's permission. It's unnecessary, since there is already a system in place that allows employees to opt out. It also requires unions to maintain and, upon request, report their member's political contributions to the Fair Political Practices Commission (meaning employees could be easily targeted by management).

Vote NO

76

This would consolidate more power in the Executive (Governor Schwarzenegger's) hands over school funding. It would eliminate \$600 per student by limiting state spending to the prior year's level plus three previous years' average revenue growth. It permits the governor (under special circumstances) to reduce the budget appropriations as he sees fit. This could shift costs to local governments. It is also likely to negatively impact other areas of funding such as health care.

Vote NO

VOTE ON TUESDAY NOVEMBER 8, 2005

The CA State Propositions and our position

*Note: LA Greens did not quite achieve quorum at our endorsement meeting, however, these recommendations are based on the consensus or majority opinion of all of those present. For more details see the Minutes of the October meeting found at www.losangelesgreens.org.

77

The group did not achieve consensus on this so we took a NEUTRAL position. This bill amends the state Constitution's process for redistricting California's Senate, Assembly, Congressional and Board of Equalization districts. It is an attempt to get rid of gerrymandering (the bizarre shaped districts that ensure incumbent's reelection). The YES vote argument is that it will take the politics out of district drawing by letting three retired judges (one from each party and a third from independent or third party) to be randomly selected. They cannot have run for political office and the districts they draw must be contiguous and of equal size. The public will vote on it. The NO vote argument is that Arnold is supporting it, it will ensure more Republicans get elected, and it starts in 2006 instead of 2010 (when the next census will be drawn).

You Decide

78

Also known as the "business friendly prescription drug program" because of its voluntary nature, it is preferred by big business. The one you should vote for is Prop 79.

Vote NO

79

This is the better of the two. Prop. 79 provides drug discounts to Californians with qualifying incomes. Funded by state-negotiated drug manufacturer rebates. It prohibits Medi-Cal contracts with manufacturers who don't provide the best price. A YES vote on this measure means: A new state drug discount program would be created to reduce the costs that certain residents of the state, including persons in families with an income at or below 400 percent of the federal poverty level, would pay for prescription drugs purchased at pharmacies. It's not yet universal health care, but it's a step in the right direction.

Vote YES

80

This is also known as a re-regulation of the utilities. After ENRON and Co. it is a much needed reform. Subjects electric service providers to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission. Restricts electricity customers' ability to switch from private utilities to other providers. Requires all retail electric sellers to increase renewable energy resource procurement by 2010. Potential annual administrative costs ranging from negligible to \$4 million, paid by fees. A YES vote on this measure means: The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) would have broadened authority to regulate electric service providers. The renewable energy component: it accelerates the state's 20% renewable energy requirement from 2017 to 2010.

For more info. See <http://www.turn.org/proposition80initiative.shtml>

Vote YES

VOTE ON TUESDAY NOVEMBER 8, 2005