PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP O — TWO TERM LIMIT FOR SUPERVISORS

Proposition O is a blatant attempt to remove minorities and progressives from the Board of Supervisors.

Both Supervisor Kennedy and Supervisor Ward will be banned from office by Proposition O.

And the switch to off-year elections is a cynical attempt to take away our hard won voting power.

Don't be fooled. Proposition O is a giant step backwards for San Francisco.

Please. Vote No on O.

Dorothy Lathan, President
Black Leadership Forum *
NAACP, San Francisco Chapter
Lulann McGriff, President
Rev. Amos C. Brown
* For identification only

Proposition O is bad public policy.

A full year with a lame duck board will create untold chaos and especially disrupt the crucial budget process.

And off-year elections will reduce voter participation.

Please Vote No on Proposition O.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

Proposition O will bring chaos, disorder and low levels of experience to San Francisco government. It will increase the importance of money in elections, making it even more likely that the "well-financed" campaigners will prevail. I strongly urge a no vote on Proposition O. It will serve to return us to the "dark ages" of San Francisco politics.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Proposition O means bad government.

A handful of citizens would choose supervisors in low voter turnout "off-year" elections. VOTE NO ON O.

Richmond Community Association
Board of Directors
Jake McGoldrick, President

Opposing Proposition O doesn't benefit me. I'm against it anyway. Proposition O is rejection of our own government, masquerading as reform. Proposition O is divisive and ugly. Don't let this vendetta scar San Francisco.

DON'T THREATEN REPRESENTATION OF SAN FRANCISCO'S ETHNIC DIVERSITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD VITALITY. VOTE NO ON O.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP P — REGULATION OF TAXICABS

Good taxicab service is very expensive to provide. It costs lots of money to keep well maintained rolling stock on the road, to pay for taxicab insurance (which can run as high as $8500 per vehicle per year), and to provide adequate radio dispatch service (which can cost over $150,000 a year for a medium size company). Not every company provides such service. For obvious reasons many cab operators won't incur these expenses unless they are required to do so. That is why we support stronger regulation of the taxicab industry. Our business depends upon the goodwill of the public. When too many cabs are not available for radio dispatched service, are not well maintained, or otherwise fail to serve the public's need, the whole industry suffers. In short, high standards for cab service are good for business. If you want better cabs, more available cabs, and a more responsive taxicab industry, vote for stronger regulation, VOTE FOR PROPOSITION P.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXICAB ASSOCIATION
Herman Wikkeling, City Cab
Mary Warner, Luxor Cab
James Steele, Yellow Cab
Mary Speck, Veterans Cab
Marvin Gralnick, DeSoto Cab

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP O — TWO TERM LIMIT FOR SUPERVISORS

The last resort of opponents of Proposition "O" is to insist that if Supervisor Willie Kennedy is reelected on November 8, she will be ineligible to run again because she will then have been elected to two consecutive four year terms.

This is a deliberate untruth. On November 8, under Proposition "O", Supervisor Kennedy will be elected to and will serve a one year term, not a "full four year term."

Show them that the voters can read and think better than they assume!

Terry A. Francois
Former Supervisor

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP O — TWO TERM LIMIT FOR SUPERVISORS

We're proud that San Francisco has been a leader in electing women to office — from City Hall to Congress. Proposition O would strike a blow against us by removing all five women Supervisors from office next year, including our current Board President. These Supervisors represent a range of ethnic diversity and political opinion and their removal would be a loss to all San Franciscans. Don't risk losing our women Supervisors — Vote No on O.

Congressmember Nancy Pelosi
Shirley Black
Anne Busch
Carole Migden
Joan San Jule
Esta Soler

Passage of Proposition O would be a major setback for organized labor in San Francisco.

Don't let John Barbagelata turn back the clock on democracy with yet another of his extreme recall attempts.

PROPOSITION O MUST BE DEFEATED.

San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO
Stan Smith, Building Trades Council
Leroy King, ILWU
Sherri Chiesa, Restaurant Workers #2
Bay Area Union Labor Party

The backers of Proposition O would like to see a Board of Supervisors the way it was before lesbians and gay men took control of our own political future, the era before Harvey Milk.

John Barbagelata has consistently fought against those who have allowed minority communities to empower themselves. Remember, Barbagelata also tried to recall George Moscone in 1977!

Don't be misled by "good government" rhetoric. We've come too far to allow Barbagelata and the old guard to once again control our lives!

VOTE NO ON O!

Maurice Belote
President, Harvey Milk Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Ron Braithwaite
President, Alice B. Toklas Lesbian/Gay Democratic Club
Bill Paul
President, Stonewall Gay Democratic Club

Attention GOOD GOVERNMENT ADVOCATES: Please vote NO on Proposition O. Prop. O is not positive reform. Prop. O is not a simple two-term limit. Prop. O is a bad idea for San Francisco.

Many of us like the idea of a limit on terms, but the term-limit in PROPOSITION O IS NOTHING BUT A *SMOKESCREEN* FOR SOMETHING ELSE THAT THEY DON'T WANT YOU TO FIGURE OUT. Prop. O would change our local Supervisorial elections to odd-numbered years when much fewer people vote. Even when we elected Supervisors during odd-numbered years in the 70s, voter participation was much lower. Don't forget: A LOWER VOTER TURN-OUT MEANS A LESS REPRESENTATIVE BOARD...and the backers of Prop. O know that. They want to be able to get their people in power with as little voter participation as possible.

Whether you support a term-limitation or not, don't let them pull the wool over your eyes. PLEASE JOIN COMMON CAUSE AND OTHER GOOD GOVERNMENT GROUPS IN VOTING AGAINST LESS DEMOCRACY. Reform is needed, but Prop. O is not the answer. Vote NO on Prop. O. Thank You.

COMMON CAUSE – S.F. CHAPTER
Don Ellison
Daniel Kalb
Sally Lilienthal

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

PAID ARGUMENTS AGAINST PROP O — TWO TERM LIMIT FOR SUPERVISORS

Proposition O is a blatant attempt to remove minorities and progressives from the Board of Supervisors.

Both Supervisor Kennedy and Supervisor Ward will be banned from office by Proposition O.

And the switch to off-year elections is a cynical attempt to take away our hard won voting power.

Don't be fooled. Proposition O is a giant step backwards for San Francisco.

Please. Vote No on O.

Dorothy Lathan, President
Black Leadership Forum *
NAACP, San Francisco Chapter
Lulann McGriff, President
Rev. Amos C. Brown
* For identification only

Proposition O is bad public policy.

A full year with a lame duck board will create untold chaos and especially disrupt the crucial budget process.

And off-year elections will reduce voter participation.

Please Vote No on Proposition O.

Supervisor Jim Gonzalez

Proposition O will bring chaos, disorder and low levels of experience to San Francisco government. It will increase the importance of money in elections, making it even more likely that the "well-financed" campaigners will prevail. I strongly urge a no vote on Proposition O. It will serve to return us to the "dark ages" of San Francisco politics.

Supervisor Richard Hongisto

Proposition O means bad government.

A handful of citizens would choose supervisors in low voter turnout "off-year" elections. VOTE NO ON O.

Richmond Community Association
Board of Directors
Jake McGoldrick, President

Opposing Proposition O doesn't benefit me. I'm against it anyway. Proposition O is rejection of our own government, masquerading as reform. Proposition O is divisive and ugly. Don't let this vendetta scar San Francisco.

DON'T THREATEN REPRESENTATION OF SAN FRANCISCO'S ETHNIC DIVERSITY AND NEIGHBORHOOD VITALITY. VOTE NO ON O.

Pat Norman, Candidate for Supervisor

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP P — REGULATION OF TAXICABS

Good taxicab service is very expensive to provide. It costs lots of money to keep well maintained rolling stock on the road, to pay for taxicab insurance (which can run as high as $8500 per vehicle per year), and to provide adequate radio dispatch service (which can cost over $150,000 a year for a medium size company). Not every company provides such service. For obvious reasons many cab operators won't incur these expenses unless they are required to do so. That is why we support stronger regulation of the taxicab industry. Our business depends upon the goodwill of the public. When too many cabs are not available for radio dispatched service, are not well maintained, or otherwise fail to serve the public's need, the whole industry suffers. In short, high standards for cab service are good for business. If you want better cabs, more available cabs, and a more responsive taxicab industry, vote for stronger regulation, VOTE FOR PROPOSITION P.

SAN FRANCISCO TAXICAB ASSOCIATION
Herman Wikkeling, City Cab
Mary Warner, Luxor Cab
James Steele, Yellow Cab
Mary Speck, Veterans Cab
Marvin Gralnick, DeSoto Cab

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

PAID ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF PROP P — REGULATION OF TAXICABS

The San Francisco Hotel Association supports Proposition P because reform of the taxicab industry is needed. Our Association represents the smaller hotels (under 250 rooms). We rely upon radio dispatched cabs to obtain service for our guests because our member hotels are too small to justify cab stands. We get taxis the same way residents of the City do, by phone. The proposal to return control over taxis to the Board of Supervisors will permit stronger control over taxicabs. We speak for over 80 small hotels which share the need for better taxi service with the residential neighborhoods and everyone who has to make a phone call to get a cab. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION P.

SAN FRANCISCO HOTEL ASSOCIATION
Robert Jacobs, Executive Director

We, the undersigned full-time San Francisco taxicab drivers, urge you to VOTE FOR PROPOSITION P, because:

1. The City needs better radio-dispatch of taxicabs.
2. The City sometimes needs extra cabs which cannot be provided under existing law.
3. The City needs a regulatory system that can be changed by the Board of Supervisors whenever change is needed.

VOTE FOR PROPOSITION P.

John Renzi
Louis Thoelecke
William Canright
Hugh Fontaine
Gunter Loarentz
George Grath
Eric Raskin
Jamal Nijem
Grover Morris
Robert Coffee
Carol Fenner
Mark Bosia
Laurie Naumann
Martin Bresloff
John Chames
Sam Ford
C.W. Waseleski
Arthur Lembke
Alek Lilavita
Wai Yuen Tong
Luis Hujer
Lakew Melesse
Donald Jones
Robert Wood
F.A. Geeslin
Martin Smith
B.E. Castro
Douglas Parsons
Thomas Thompson
Michael Wilson
Solomon Tesfa
Il Tong Im
John Kelly
Carl Amme
Mike Dooley
Steve Goldfarb
Joseph Hatemariam
John Elfond
Ronald Bosia
Al Dillon
Ron Zammataro
Frank Glade
Curt Emmuns
Jose Leon
Gabe Kriz
Danilo Villarina
Yasub Suzuri
Rodolfo Contillo
Allen Kizzian
Djamel Mekhaldi
Ali Peusgategan
J.S. Johnston
A.W. Pickering
Dennis Evans
Robert Bousquet
Jimmy Naber
Eric Friedman
Willie Ramsey
Gerald Baldwin
Joan Mahoney
Paul Harting
Robin Trodrung
Ashwani Aeri
Dean Turner
Francis Liu
Paul O' Meara
David Chow
Charles Evans
Jon Garin
Cesar Cypriano
Robert Venegas
Smith Wong
Surinder Partap Singh
Abdel Gadirialaa
B.J. Ruthstrom
P. Michelson
Jim Chizinski
J. Nekews
Robert Casey
Joseph Sue
Sanford Frieb
Michael Welky
Gay Ho Keyng Yee
Rick Burkett
William Steinway
James Don Elly
Robert Milne
David Fisher
Ali Khaladj
Kwing Hung Gee
Dennis Lawson
J.P. Agoni
Roger Miozza
Arash Batomchi-T
Joao Silverstein
Bob Steward
Mark Braley
J. Wingender
Fidel Bastida
Howard Fein
Ciro Matarazzo III
Brian Pelot

We serve the handicapped and elderly communities of San Francisco. We are among those most dependent upon taxicab service. We rely upon radio-dispatch to get taxi service and believe that the City should regulate taxicab dispatch services, which the present law does not do. We believe that reserve cabs are necessary to assure an adequate supply of taxi service in periods of peak demand. Taxicab companies, who enjoy a legal monopoly, ought to pay for the cost of adequate enforcement of taxicab regulation. All these things are made possible by Proposition P: the People Proposition. We urge you to vote yes on Proposition P.

INDEPENDENT LIVING RESOURCES CENTER
SELF-HELP FOR THE ELDERLY