

Voter guide ([CA Secretary of State](#)) ([SF Chronicle](#))

Summary:

- [51 School Bonds. Funding for K-12 School and Community College Facilities. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [52 Medi-Cal Hospital Fee Program. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.](#)
- [53 Revenue Bonds. Statewide Voter Approval. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.](#)
- [54 Legislature. Legislation and Proceedings. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.](#)
- [55 Tax Extension to Fund Education and Healthcare. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.](#)
- [56 Cigarette Tax to Fund Healthcare, Tobacco Use Prevention, Research, and Law Enforcement. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.](#)
- [57 Criminal Sentences. Parole. Juvenile Criminal Proceedings and Sentencing. Initiative Constitutional Amendment and Statute.](#)
- [58 English Proficiency. Multilingual Education. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [59 Corporations. Political Spending. Federal Constitutional Protections. Legislative Advisory Question.](#)
- [60 Adult Films. Condoms. Health Requirements. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [61 State Prescription Drug Purchases. Pricing Standards. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [62 Death Penalty. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [63 Firearms. Ammunition Sales. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [64 Marijuana Legalization. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [65 Carry-Out Bags. Charges. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [66 Death Penalty. Procedures. Initiative Statute.](#)
- [67 Ban on Single-Use Plastic Bags. Referendum.](#)

Prop. 51 - Authorizes \$9 billion in general obligation bonds for new construction and modernization of K–12 public school facilities;

The Guevara Take: No

Wait, didn't we already do exactly this last time? And the money went to giving teachers raises? Yeah, we did. So they're just seeing exactly how stupid we really are. "It's for the children." Right.

Even Jerry Brown opposes this stinker. From SF Gate: "Critics including Brown say the money can be siphoned off by large districts fielding flocks of consultants who are adept at pitching construction projects." Uh, yeah. If any of it goes to construction at all, that is.

Prop. 52 - Extends indefinitely an existing statute that imposes fees on hospitals to fund Medi-Cal health care services, care for uninsured patients (Que?), and children's health coverage.

The Guevara Take: Yes

My first reaction was to oppose this, but then I saw that the SEIU opposes it too. The "con" argument includes such gems as "This initiative takes money from needy Californians and gives it to rich millionaires instead" (Are there poor millionaires as well? I missed that.) and then goes whole hog on populist demagoguery. ("I'm already struggling to make ends meet and can't afford to take my children to the doctor. Now they want to take what little I have and give it to the special interests and corporations who run for - profit hospitals, no questions asked."—*Jovita Salcedo, Medi-Cal Patient*)"

Prop. 53 - Requires statewide voter approval before any revenue bonds can be issued or sold by the state for certain projects if the bond amount exceeds \$2 billion.

The Guevara Take: Hell Yes

May knock high speed rail on the head. It is opposed by the firefighters' and police unions, which by itself would be good enough for me to support it.

According to [SF Gate](#), which opposes Prop. 53, the measure is being bankrolled by a Stockton farmer who "takes dead aim at two targets: the struggling high-speed rail line connecting the Bay Area and Los Angeles, and Gov. Jerry Brown's twin-tunnel water diversion plan for the delta."

I'm liking this guy already. Let the salmon take the HIGH. SPEED. RAIL. upstream.

Prop. 54 - Prohibits Legislature from passing any bill unless published on Internet for 72 hours before vote. Requires Legislature to record its proceedings and post on Internet. Authorizes use of recordings.

The Guevara Take: Yes

Could in principle facilitate more openness in state government, which God knows needs it. The "no" argument demonizes "special interests like tobacco, oil, and drug companies from delaying passage of state laws."

Well, that sounds like a good thing to me. The "con" argument is pure demagoguery, straight up:

("BIG MONEY IS BEHIND PROP. 54: DON'T BE FOOLED

Just look at its main backer: the California Chamber of Commerce. This group—whose members include big oil, tobacco and drug companies—spent a record-shattering \$4.3 MILLION lobbying the Legislature last year, according to the Secretary of State. Prop. 54 will give these special

interests even MORE power in Sacramento. That's the reason one billionaire, backed by big, out-of-state corporations, is bankrolling Prop. 54.”)

I'm liking this guy too.

Prop. 55 - Extends by twelve years the temporary personal income tax increases enacted in 2012 on earnings over \$250,000, with revenues allocated to K–12 schools, California Community Colleges, and, in certain years, healthcare. Increased funding for schools, community colleges, health care for low-income people, budget reserves, and debt payments.

The Guevara Take: No. Not just no. Hell no.

This is just another wrinkle on “make the rich pay their fair share, at least until they move out of the state. Give the Democrats the money, which you can be sure they’ll spend wisely.” /laughs bitterly

Budget reserves? Please.

Health care for low-income people? How about bus tickets to somewhere else for low-income people? Mexico leaps to mind in this connection.

Even [SF Gate](#) opposes this one (on grounds that reliance on the wealthy will increase revenue volatility in economic downturns as capital gains decrease.) They cite a fun fact: The top 1 percent of families account for 77.2 percent of the income-tax revenue generated by Prop. 30 (Prop. 55 predecessor).

The “pro” argument: “Prop. 55 helps children thrive! Prop. 55 prevents \$4 billion in cuts to California's public schools, and increases children's access to healthcare, by maintaining current tax rates on the wealthiest Californians—with strict accountability requirements.” Need I say more?

Yet more evidence that there’s nothing so permanent as a “temporary” tax increase.

Prop. 56 - Increases cigarette tax by \$2.00 per pack, with equivalent increase on other tobacco products and electronic cigarettes containing nicotine. Revenues would be used primarily to augment spending on health care for low-income Californians.

The Guevara Take: No

Sure, let’s demonize tobacco once again. It’s for the children! (I’m not a smoker, but let’s give the demonization a rest.)

And let’s provide health care for “low-income” people. That’ll discourage them from coming here and living parasitically off others.

Prop. 57 - Allows parole consideration for nonviolent felons. Authorizes sentence credits for rehabilitation, good behavior, and education.

The Guevara Take: No

Another stinker, and a Constitutional amendment to boot. The liberals are just phoning it in now. “Non-violent?” Right. They will probably define “non-violent felons” as those who murdered fewer than a dozen people with a chainsaw.

The last election freed a bunch of criminals, and somehow, inexplicably, the crime rate upwards.

[SF Gate's](#) endorsement has this priceless line: “But policies advertised as “tough on crime” have only resulted in a state prison system that’s bursting at the seams.” Fox Butterfield smiles in appreciation.

The “pro” argument in the state voter guide features this gem: “The state prison system could award additional sentencing credits to inmates for good behavior and approved rehabilitative or educational achievements.” Good one. No opportunity to game that one.

Prop. 58 - Preserves requirement that public schools ensure students obtain English language proficiency. Requires school districts to solicit parent/community input in developing language acquisition programs. Requires instruction to ensure English acquisition as rapidly and effectively as possible. Authorizes school districts to establish dual-language immersion programs for both native and non-native English speakers.

The Guevara Take: No

“A NO vote on this measure means: Public schools would still be required to teach most English learners in English-only programs.”

Sounds good to me. Immersion is practically the only way to learn a language. There is no such thing as “dual-language immersion.” You’re either immersed in the language you’re learning, or you’re not. Plus, there have been numerous stories on “dual-language” teachers who don’t themselves speak English.

[SF Gate's](#) endorsement disingenuously features a Chinese kid with Chinese ideographs behind him. Yeah, the Chinese and their lousy academic performance are a big problem.

The “pro” argument is made by the California State Council of Service Employees, *i.e.*, public sector union. Need I say more?

Prop. 59

Asks whether California's elected officials should use their authority to propose and ratify an amendment to the federal Constitution overturning the United States Supreme Court decision in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*.

The Guevara Take: No

Citizens United really gets the liberals' panties in a wad. Surprisingly, they don't have a problem with UNIONS spending on politics, just corporations.

[SF Gate](#), in its endorsement, says: "Citizens United gave rise to the creation of super PACs that effectively run parallel campaigns for and against candidates on the ballot. Some of the biggest donors, such as Tom Steyer on the left or Sheldon Adelson on the right, have poured tens of millions into these outside spending groups."

It's almost as if they care about super PACs. Some of them, anyway. Perhaps we should send them links to Project Veritas.

Prop. 60 - Requires adult film performers to use condoms during filming of sexual intercourse. Requires producers to pay for performer vaccinations, testing, and medical examinations. Requires producers to post condom requirement at film sites.

The Guevara Take: No (Shouldn't this have been Prop. 69?)

Seriously? This is the biggest problem facing California?

If they're going to start with legislation to hinder the spread of STDs, how about coming down on gay bars and bathhouses, which are a MUCH bigger problem in this regard?

Prop. 61 - Prohibits state from buying any prescription drug from a drug manufacturer at price over lowest price paid for the drug by United States Department of Veterans Affairs. Exempts managed care programs funded through Medi-Cal.

The Guevara Take: No

How about we just let the market sort this out, hmm? Presumably the state already gets the best deal it can on drug purchases.

After citing two cases of egregious price hikes, [SF Gate](#) in its endorsement goes all-in on populist demagoguery: "Neither the Republican-controlled Congress in Washington nor the Democratic-controlled Legislature in Sacramento has proved willing to stand up to an industry that is determined to bat down any proposal that might threaten its fat profits."

Also, for my money, the state shouldn't be in the health care business in the first place. And why is Medi-Cal exempted?

Prop. 62 - Repeals death penalty and replaces it with life imprisonment without possibility of parole. Applies retroactively to existing death sentences. Increases the portion of life inmates' wages that may be applied to victim restitution.

The Guevara Take: No

Without possibility of parole. Until later, that is, after people stop paying attention to a given murderer, in which case he'll be turned loose with the thanks of a grateful state.

Prop. 63 - Requires background check and Department of Justice authorization to purchase ammunition. Prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines. Establishes procedures for enforcing laws prohibiting firearm possession by specified persons.

The Guevara Take: No

Specified persons? You mean, like conservatives? Because the Bloods, the Crips, and the Muslims will have no problem circumventing this, once they stop laughing. It's law-abiding taxpayers who will have trouble.

Proposition 63 would tighten a set of sensible gun-control laws recently signed by Gov. Jerry Brown and enact others that state legislators have failed to pass.

"This closes all kinds of loopholes," said Lt. Gov. Gavin Newsom, a chief promoter of the initiative. I think that that's all we need to know.

Prop. 64 - Legalizes marijuana under state law, for use by adults 21 or older. Imposes state taxes on sales and cultivation. Provides for industry licensing and establishes standards for marijuana products. Allows local regulation and taxation.

The Guevara Take: No

Even Dianne Feinstein opposes this stinker, which is supported by a laundry list of Communist front organizations and assorted malefactors.

"Prop. 64 was drafted to reflect the recommendations of a blue-ribbon commission put together by Lt. Gov. Gavin Newsom in October 2013." I say again: I think that that's all we need to know.

"One of the critical elements of Prop. 64 is that — unlike its predecessor, Prop. 19 — it preserves the right for cities and counties to add their **own overlays of regulations and taxes**, or even bans, on marijuana businesses." Ah. I think I just figured out why the liberals are all for this.

Prop. 65 - Redirects money collected by grocery and certain other retail stores through mandated sale of carryout bags. Requires stores to deposit bag sale proceeds into a special fund to support specified environmental projects.

The Guevara Take: No

Now we're getting on to the important stuff: grocery bags, which for some reason drive liberals wild.

More feel good do-gooder liberal rubbish. A special fund to support specified environmental projects? You mean, the Democrat Party is now an environmental project?

One of the arguments for it is reducing litter. You mean, like the litter that pervades the ghetto? That kind of litter? To this point, SF Gate's opposition to Prop. 65 (but endorsement of Prop. 67) features a photo of plastic bags fished out of a storm drain in ***Oakland***. I say no more.

Prop. 66 - Changes procedures governing state court challenges to death sentences. Designates superior court for initial petitions and limits successive petitions. Requires appointed attorneys who take noncapital appeals to accept death penalty appeals. Exempts prison officials from existing regulation process for developing execution methods.

The Guevara Take: Yes

The "con" argument includes this priceless line: ""Instead of reckless, costly changes to our prison system, we need **smart investments** that are proven to reduce crime and serve victims."—*Dionne Wilson, widow of police officer killed in the line of duty.*"

Uh, what "smart investments" would those be, exactly?

Villaraigosa is against it. That alone makes me for it.

Prop. 67 - A "Yes" vote approves, and a "No" vote rejects, a statute that prohibits grocery and other stores from providing customers single-use plastic or paper carryout bags but permits sale of recycled paper bags and reusable bags.

The Guevara Take: No

Again with the bags. More liberal crap. We're 49th in the country in educational results, we're overrun with illegal aliens, we've got 30% of the country's welfare recipients, we've got gangs and drive-bys all over the place, and the liberals are worried about PLASTIC BAGS??

Also, as pointed out above, one of the arguments for it is reducing litter. You mean, like the litter that pervades the ghetto? That kind of litter? To this point, SF Gate's opposition to Prop. 65 (but endorsement of Prop. 67) features a photo of plastic bags fished out of a storm drain in ***Oakland***.
