Political Contributions by Employees, Union Members, Foreign Entities. Initiative Statute.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 226

Proposition 226 is very simple and clear. It will reform California's elections two ways:

- It stops unions and employers from taking money from members or employees paychecks for political purposes without their prior consent.
- It will prohibit contributions to state and local candidates from foreign nationals and foreign corporations.

RANK AND FILE RIGHTS: BOSSES SHOULD NOT SPEND WORKERS' MONEY WITHOUT CONSENT

IT IS MORALLY WRONG—DEAD WRONG—TO TAKE MONEY FROM YOUR PAYCHECK, WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT, AND SPEND IT TO SUPPORT A POLITICAL CANDIDATE OR ISSUE THAT YOU OPPOSE.

Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, said, "To compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical."

The United States Supreme Court agrees and has ruled that it is illegal and unconstitutional to do so. But since Washington refuses to implement the court's *Beck* decision, California must act to end this outrageous violation of fundamental fairness and the rights of California union members.

UNLESS PROPOSITION 226 PASSES, UNION BOSSES—NOT INDIVIDUAL UNION MEMBERS—WILL DECIDE HOW THE MEMBER'S MONEY IS SPENT ON POLITICS. IT'S LIKE LETTING UNION BOSSES GO INTO THE VOTING BOOTH TO MARK THE MEMBER'S BALLOT.

For years, union members have been exploited by union leaders who took their money and spent it for political causes they opposed.

FOR EXAMPLE, UNION MEMBERS SUPPORTED AND VOTERS OVERWHELMINGLY APPROVED THE "THREE STRIKES AND YOU'RE OUT" INITIATIVE FOR HABITUAL CRIMINALS. YET UNION LEADERS SPENT MEMBERS' MONEY TO OPPOSE THREE STRIKES.

No wonder polls show that union members—by a large majority—support Proposition 226. For some union members who don't want to make political contributions, Proposition 226 will save them about $200 a year.

BANNING FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

PROPOSITION 226 WILL ALSO BAN ALL FOREIGN POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO CANDIDATES AND PARTIES.

It will prevent foreign money from buying political influence, ending both the fact and appearance of its corrupting elected officials.

The special interests that oppose Proposition 226 will say and do anything to defeat it. They know it will end their ability to direct tens of millions of dollars to campaigns and candidates that their members do not support.

IT'S BITTER IRONY THAT THE CAMPAIGN TO DEFEAT PROPOSITION 226 WILL BE PAID FOR WITH WAGES OF UNION MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES WHO, BY AN OVERWHELMING MAJORITY, STRONGLY SUPPORT IT.

Union bosses attempt to justify extracting these involuntary contributions, claiming they know better than individual rank and file members what's good for them.

What arrogance!

Proposition 226 will end this unfair and unconstitutional shakedown of California union members, protecting their paychecks and their rights. It will end the influence of foreign money on political candidates.

BECAUSE YOU'RE A UNION MEMBER SHOULD NOT MEAN YOU HAVE TO GIVE UP YOUR RIGHTS AS A CITIZEN.

RANK AND FILE UNION MEMBERS DESERVE THE SAME POLITICAL FREEDOM OF CHOICE AS EVERY OTHER CALIFORNIAN. GIVE THEM A FAIR SHAKE INSTEAD OF A SHAKEDOWN.

Please vote yes on Proposition 226.

PETE WILSON
Governor, State of California

ELIZABETH LEE
Member, California Teachers' Association

ROBERT EISENBEISZ
Member, United Electrical Workers—local 99

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 226

Too often, what proposition sponsors *DON'T* tell you is more important than what they *DO* tell you.

Sponsors of 226 combined two unrelated issues into one measure. They *DON'T* tell you they were combined to get voters who oppose "foreign contributions" to support a measure that is really designed to attack unions and employee organizations.

226 *DOES* increase government bureaucracy and *DOES NOT* reduce foreign contributions to candidates. Existing law already does that.

226 was funded by out-of-state interests to protect big business, not California's working people.

In fact, William Gould, chairman of the U.S. National Labor Relations Board, stated, "This proposal is mischievous, bad policy, and in all probability, unconstitutional." Attempts like this to deceive voters are regularly overturned in court and cost taxpayers millions.

The State Controller estimates 226 will cost millions of dollars to enforce.

226 tips the balance against ordinary people even further, imposing new bureaucratic standards against employee organizations while corporations go unchecked. Two sets of rules are unfair.

The facts are:

- Corporate interests contribute eleven times what employee organizations contribute to politics.
- Union members typically only give one to two dollars monthly for politics, not $200 a year as proponents claim.

Consumer Advocate Ralph Nader says: "I have studied Proposition 226. A careful reading reveals it is a trick and a trap. Handcuffing working Californians increases the power of the few over the many. That always spells injustice."

The only people this initiative is designed to help are those who wrote it.

DON BROWN
President, California Organization of Police and Sheriffs

LOIS WELLINGTON
President, Congress of California Seniors

KIT COSTELLO, RN
President, California Nurses Association

Political Contributions by Employers, Union Members, Foreign Entities. Initiative Statute.

Argument Against Proposition 226

PROPOSITION 226 IS NOT WHAT IT APPEARS TO BE

Are you tired of being asked to vote on another ballot measure that talks about two very different subjects? Are you tired of being asked to vote for ballot measures that say one thing but mean something else?

If you are, please look closely at 226.

226 WILL NOT REDUCE FOREIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

The authors claim 226 bans foreign contributions. But existing law already prohibits foreign contributions to federal, state, and local candidates.

But the fine print of 226 does something else.

You will see that Section 3 contains language clearly stating that foreign nationals should be allowed to contribute to the qualification or passage of California ballot measures. See for yourself by reading the initiative's language in this handbook.

Foreign interests should not be allowed to influence the outcome of our California ballot initiatives or bond measures.

Section 3 also allows subsidiaries of foreign corporations to contribute to candidates.

PROPOSITION 226 WAS PUT ON THE BALLOT BY OUT-OF-STATE INTERESTS

Proposition 226 was not written by people who care about California's working families.

Official campaign disclosure reports filed with the Secretary of State dated November 7, 1997 show that more than 60% of the funds used to place 226 on the ballot came from individuals who do not live in California.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OPPOSES PROPOSITION 226 BECAUSE IT WILL UNFAIRLY CREATE TWO DIFFERENT SETS OF RULES

According to the League of Women Voters, "Everyone should play by the same rules, especially when it comes to elections that determine the future direction of our state and nation. This measure sets up two sets of rules which is why we oppose 226."

Read the language of 226 carefully. Section 85990 talks about deductions from employee wages. But you will not find a single word that protects the individual rights of shareholders when the corporations they own make campaign contributions.

Section 85991 regulates union dues. But there is not one word that restricts how corporate interests and their political allies use their members' dues on politics.

By placing costly new bureaucratic regulations on unions, but not on corporate interests, the backers of 226 are trying to silence unions and give an unfair advantage to corporate interests, starting with the election for Governor this November.

Passing a law that creates two sets of rules at election time just is not fair.

PROPOSITION 226 WILL COST TAXPAYERS MONEY

226 will cost state government millions of dollars to implement. And it will cost local governments and schools even more to implement the new bureaucratic rules required of their employees.

And 226 is so poorly written it will cost California taxpayers additional millions trying to defend it in court.

That is why the California Organization of Police and Sheriffs, the Sierra Club, the Congress of California Seniors, Clean Water Action, the California Public Interest Research Group, and the League of Women Voters of California all urge you to vote NO on Proposition 226.

LOIS TINSON
President, California Teachers Association

HOWARD OWENS
Executive Director, Consumer Federation of California

DAN TERRY
President, California Professional Firefighters

Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 226

Powerful union leaders are waging a deceitful campaign to defeat proposition 226, because it will eliminate their ability to direct tens of millions of dollars to political candidates and causes without approval from their members. THEY KNOW THEY CANNOT DEFEAT 226 ON THE MERITS, SO IT IS THEIR INTENT TO MISLEAD VOTERS.

UNION LEADERS SO FEAR HAVING TO ASK THE MEMBERS' CONSENT TO SPEND THEIR MONEY, THEY'LL SAY ANYTHING TO DEFEAT 226.

HERE ARE THE FACTS:

- Union leaders say 226 will silence unions politically. WRONG. IF RANK AND FILE MEMBERS BELIEVE THEIR LEADER'S POLITICAL AGENDA WILL BENEFIT THEM; THEY WILL GIVE THEIR CONSENT.
- UNION MEMBERS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT 226, AND THE CALIFORNIA POLL SHOWS THAT 72% OF CALIFORNIANS SUPPORT 226.
- Opponents make deliberately misleading claims that EXISTING law prohibits foreign contributions to CANDIDATES. They know that only FEDERAL law does so, and the state has no power to enforce federal law. That's why 226's STATE prohibition is required.
- Opponents claim 226 says that foreign nationals "should be allowed to contribute" to ballot measures. IT DOES NOT. Read it: 226 only provides that its foreign contribution prohibitions "shall not apply" to BALLOT MEASURES, leaving that to EXISTING STATE LAW (signed by Governor Wilson) THAT PRESENTLY PROHIBITS foreign contributions to ballot measures.

REMEMBER: EVERY TIME YOU SEE AN AD TRASHING PROPOSITION 226, IT IS BEING PAID FOR BY UNION *LEADERS*—WITH MEMBERS' MONEY—BUT, WITHOUT THEIR CONSENT.

PROPOSITION 226 IS THE ONLY WAY TO STOP IT.

MARK BUCHER
President—California Foundation for Campaign Reform

LINDA HUNT
Member—California Nurses Association

ROGER HUGHES
Member—California Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO

 Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.