REBUTTAL TO THE ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 1

Proposition 1 is NOT needed to protect abortion rights. But it WILL cost California taxpayers millions.

"California law already allows access to abortion and contraception," says constitutional attorney Heather Hacker. "But unlike state law, which limits late-term abortions unless medically necessary, Proposition 1 has no limit on late-term abortions."

Like other constitutional amendments, Proposition 1 will face numerous lawsuits and court challenges, leaving its fate subject to judicial interpretation.

Do we really want judges deciding this issue?

Equally untrue are claims that Proposition 1 limits late-term abortions.
It does not.

Read Proposition 1 for yourself. It contains NO language limiting late-term abortions, nor does it prevent tax money from being used to fund abortions.

The Legislature has already INCREASED abortion funding by $200 million this year. But advocates of Proposition 1 say that may not be enough.

With Proposition 1, the number of abortion seekers from other states will soar, at the expense of California taxpayers. This is blatantly unfair.

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES

According to *The San Jose Mercury News*, clinics in San Diego, Riverside and Imperial counties have already seen a 1,246% increase in women seeking abortions — just from Arizona.

Proposition 1 is a multi-million-dollar waste of tax money that is not needed to protect women's reproductive freedom. It allows late-term abortions without limitation, and will ignite a protracted legal battle that could take years and cost millions.

To protect taxpayers and existing abortion rights, and to preserve reasonable limits on late-term abortions, vote "NO" on Proposition 1.

Allison Martinez, Executive Director
California Alliance of Pregnancy Care

Brad Dacus, President
Pacific Justice Institute

Dr. Vansen Wong, Gynecologist

SUBJECT TO COURT
ORDERED CHANGES