

Ballot Measures: Other

PROPOSITION 89: Public financing for state elections

This measure would provide public funds for candidates running for state office, beginning January 2007. It would also limit campaign contributions by corporations and unions. The measure would be funded by a 0.2% tax increase on corporations.

Candidates would

- need \$5 contributions from enough voters to be eligible
- agree not to accept money from most private sources
- receive a fixed amount of money for their race
- get additional money, if needed, to match opponents' spending.

SUPPORTERS SAY

"Children are the last consideration in Sacramento," says Charles Idelson of the California Nurses Association, because of lobbying by special interests. Prop. 89 would

- **Limit the power of corporations** because they would no longer be able to spend millions to end health and welfare protections.
- **Improve how politicians do their jobs** because they wouldn't have to fundraise in office.
- **Improve the election system.** In states with public funds for elections, more women and people of color run for office, voter turnout increases, and campaign costs decrease.

Supporters: Yes on 89 (800-440-6877; <http://yeson89.org>), California Nurses Association, California League of Women Voters, Consumer Federation of California

OPPONENTS SAY

Prop. 89 would

- **Reduce the voice of teachers** by "severely limiting the ability of unions to fight for our students," says Mike Myslinski of the California Teachers Association.
- **Lead to "bad" laws,** says the California Chamber of Commerce, such as SB 2 (which would have required employers to provide health coverage).
- **Not address real problems** such as fraud, health care, schools, and transportation.
- **Not limit spending by wealthy candidates** on their own campaigns.

Opponents: No on 89 (916-448-4234), California Chamber of Commerce, California Small Business Roundtable, California Taxpayers' Association, California Teachers Association, National Tax-Limitation Committee

—Jessine Foss

PROPOSITION 1C: Housing and Emergency Shelter



The legislature put this measure on the ballot. It would borrow \$2.9 billion by issuing bonds to provide support for homebuyers (\$500 million) and housing for seniors, low-income families, and emancipated foster youth (\$395 million); people with disabilities (\$195 million); and farm workers (\$135 million). It would also fund shelters and transitional housing for battered women and people at risk of homelessness (\$195 million), and parks and transportation for new housing.

SUPPORTERS SAY

Prop. 1C would be

- **Good for kids:** It would provide stable homes for children, says Julie Spezia of Homes 4 California. California's affordable housing crisis is threatening children's well-being with overcrowding, unsafe housing, and homelessness.
- **Good for the economy:** It would create 87,000 full-time jobs, \$3.5 billion in wages in the housing industry, and millions in tax revenue.
- **Good for the environment:** It would prioritize building on under-utilized land and pay for cleaning up polluted sites.
- **Good for women and kids leaving abusive relationships:** Over 5,000 women and children were turned away last year from full battered-women's shelters. (Children who witness domestic violence often have emotional or behavioral problems.)

Supporters: Homes 4 California (916-447-0503, www.homes4ca.org), AARP, California Chamber of Commerce, California Partnership to End Domestic Violence, California Teachers Association, Housing California

OPPONENTS SAY

Prop. 1C would

- **Badly use bond funds:** "It is improper to use general obligation bonds to create a home for an individual" instead of paying for public services such as roads and dams, says Lew Uhler of the National Tax-Limitation Committee.
- **Increase California's debt** by borrowing more money through bonds.

Opponents: National Tax-Limitation Committee (916-786-9400), Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, Assemblymember Chuck Vore

—Aimee Strain