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.

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.

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.

Proposition O means bad government.
A handful of citizens would choose supervisors in low voter turn-out “off-year” elections. VOTE NO ON O.

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

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.

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

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 Beloe
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
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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                 B.E. Castro
Louis Theolecke            Douglas Parsons
William Carright           Thomas Thompson
Hugh Fontaine              Michael Wilson
Gunter Loarentz            Solomon Tesfa
George Grath               II Tong lm
Eric Raskin                John Kelly
Jamal Nijem                 Carl Amme
Grover Morris              Mike Dooley
Robert Coffee              Steve Goldfarb
Carol Fenner               Joseph Hatemarian
Mark Bosia                 John Elfond
Laurie Naumann             Ronald Bosia
Martin Bresloff            Al Dillon
John Chames                Ron Zammataro
Sam Ford                   Frank Glade
C.W. Waseleski             Curt Emmuns
Arthur Lembke              Jose Leon
Alek Lilavita              Gabe Kriz
Wai Yuen Tong               Danilo Villarina
Luis Hujer                 Yasub Suzuki
Lakew Melesse              Rodolfo Contillo
Donald Jones                Allen Kizzian
Robert Wood                Djamel Mekhali
F.A. Geeslin               Ali Pusgategan
Martin Smith               J.S. Johnston

A.W. Pickering             Robert Casey
Dennis Evans               Joseph Sue
Robert Bousquet            Sanford Friebl
Jimmy Naber                Michael Welky
Eric Friedman              Gay Ho Keyng Yee
Willie Ramsey              Rick Burkett
Gerald Baldwin             William Steinway
Joan Mahoney               James Don Elly
Paul Harting               Robert Milne
Robin Trodrung             David Fisher
Ashwanl Aeri               Ali Khaladj
Dean Turner                Kwing Hung Gee
Francis Liu                Dennis Lawson
Paul O'Meara               J.P. Agoni
David Chow                 Roger Miosza
Charles Evans              Arash Batomchi-T
Jon Garin                  Joao Silverstein
Cesar Cypriano             Bob Steward
Robert Venegas             Mark Braley
Smith Wong                  J. Wingender
Surinder Partap Singh       Fidel Bastida
Abdel Gaditalaa            Howard Fein
B.J. Ruthstrom             Ciro Matarazzo III
P. Michelson               Brian Pelot
Jim Chitinski
J. Nekevs

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
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