ARGUMENT AGAINST
PROPOSITION 1

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 1

Those of us signing this argument have differing views on many issues, including abortion.

But we all agree Proposition 1 is an extreme, expensive, and pointless waste of tax money that will allow unrestricted late-term abortions costing taxpayers millions. This is not the answer.

Proposition 1 was put on the ballot for one reason — to score political points, not to make serious policy.

Women already have the right to choose under current California law. The recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling did not and will not change this. Proposition 1 is NOT needed to protect women's health or their reproductive rights.

Abortions are already legal in California with reasonable limits on late-term abortions, which are allowed if medically necessary to protect the life or health of the mother.

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

Proposition 1 will destroy this important balance and bake the most extreme abortion law possible into our state constitution.

Proposition 1 will allow late-term abortions at taxpayer expense WITHOUT limitation for any reason at any time up to the moment of birth — even when the mother's life is not in danger, even when the healthy baby could survive outside the womb.

Instead of preserving our state's compassionate and carefully balanced limits on late-term abortions, Proposition 1 will push California far outside the mainstream. Today, most states and 47 European countries limit late-term abortions, including California. A recent Harris Poll found that 90% of Americans support limits on late-term abortions. Likewise, recent polling shows that most California voters support limitations on late-term abortions, as well.

By allowing abortion without limit, Proposition 1 will turn California into a "sanctuary state" for thousands, possibly millions, of abortion seekers from other states, at a staggering cost to taxpayers.

The pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute estimates that California could see a nearly 3,000% increase in the number of people from other states seeking

abortions here, with many coming for more expensive late-term abortions. According to the report, California's annual out-of-state patient load could climb from 46,000 people a year to 1.4 million.

Without limits on late-term abortions, Proposition 1 will push these numbers even higher, draining millions of tax dollars at a time when taxpayers are struggling with inflation and sky-high gas prices.

The Legislature has already committed over $200 million this year to expand abortion and reproductive services, including tens of millions to pay the expenses for abortion seekers from other states. With a 3,000% increase in the number of people from other states wanting abortions, millions of dollars more will be required to meet soaring demand.

Proposition 1 is an extreme and costly proposal that does nothing to advance women's health or their right to choose. It punishes taxpayers and eliminates all limits on late-term abortions in defiance of what most voters want.

Proposition 1 is a cynical political stunt that was put on the ballot to score political points, not make sensible policy. As usual, taxpayers will pay the price.

We urge a "NO" vote on Proposition 1. It deserves defeat.

ARGUMENT AGAINST
PROPOSITION 1

Dr. Anne Marie Adams, Gynecologist

Tak Allen, President

International Faith Based Coalition

Assemblymember Jim Patterson

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES