



Craig Huey, small business owner, author, Fox TV and radio commentator and publisher of *Reality Alert*.



Community Election Forum

www.ElectionForum.org 20+ Years of Recommendations

“Vote Your Beliefs and Values” 2016 General Election Voter Guide

More details at www.ElectionForum.org

**General Election
November 8,**

PRESIDENT				
Candidate	Hillary Clinton—Democrat Government Rating: Big 86% Small 14% Worldview Rating: Conservative/ Christian 11% ; Liberal/Secular 89%	Gary Johnson—Libertarian Government Rating: Big 36% ; Small 64% Worldview Rating: Conservative/ Christian 38% ; Liberal/Secular 62%	Jill Stein—Green Government Rating: Big 98% ; Small 2% Worldview Rating: Conservative/ Christian 3% ; Liberal/Secular 97%	Donald Trump—Republican Government Rating: Big 35% ; Small 65% Worldview Rating: Conservative/ Christian 72% ; Liberal/Secular 28%
United States Supreme Court	Judicial activist	Strict constructionist	Judicial activist	Strict constructionist
Economy	More government involvement	Less government involvement	More government involvement	Less government involvement
Minimum wage	Yes, to \$12 an hour	No	Yes, to \$15 an hour	No, states decide
College tuition	Make college affordable without loans	No government involvement, Abolish Department of Education	Make college free	Reduce interest rates On college loans
Same-Sex Marriage	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Partial birth abortion ban	No	Yes	No	Yes
California taxpayers support of abortion	Yes	No	Yes	No

Parental consent for Abortion	No	Yes	No	Yes
Transgender Bathroom Bill	Yes	No	Yes	No
Entitlement Reform	No	Yes	Yes	
Government-run healthcare system (Obamacare)	Keep, and expand	Repeal	Expand into Single-Payer System (totally government run)	Repeal
Balanced Budget Plan?	No	Yes	No	Yes
More Gun Control	Yes	No	Yes	No
Educational choice	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Increase taxes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Increase Regulations	Yes	No	Yes	No
Allow fracking/Energy exploration	No	Yes	No	Yes
Immigration/amnesty	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Immigration: Build a Wall	No	No	No	Yes

United States Senate

Candidate	Kamala Harris—Democrat Government Rating: Big 93% ; Small 7% Worldview Rating: Conservative/ Christian 1% ; Liberal/Secular 99%	Loretta Sanchez—Democrat Government Rating: Big 86% ; Small 14% Worldview Rating: Conservative/ Christian 9% ; Liberal/Secular 91%
United States Supreme Court	Judicial activist	Judicial activist
Economy	More government involvement	More government involvement
Minimum wage increase	Yes,	Yes
College tuition	Make College Free	Make College Free

Same-Sex Marriage	Yes	Yes
Partial birth abortion ban	No	No
California taxpayers support of abortion	Yes	Yes
Parental consent for doctors	No	No
Transgender Bathroom Bill	Yes	Yes
Entitlement Reform	No	No
Government-run healthcare system (Obamacare)	Keep and repair	Keep and repair
Balanced Budget Plan?	No	No
More Gun Control	Yes	Yes
Educational choice	No	No
Increase taxes	Yes	Yes
Increase Regulations	Yes	Yes
Allow fracking/Energy exploration	No	No
Immigration/amnesty	Yes	Yes
Immigration: build a wall	No	No

<p>PROPOSITION 51 - Authorizes \$9 billion in general obligation bonds for modernization of K-12 public school facilities; \$1 billion for charter schools and vocational education facilities; and \$2 billion for California Community Colleges facilities. TOTAL ESTIMATED COST: \$19 BILLION</p>			
<p>YES: Our Schools are in disrepair. Our kids need technology and Internet innovations. This bond will ensure more money for our kids and our schools to have a bright future.</p>	<p>NO: California doesn't have a revenue problem, but a spending problem. Big Labor and Big Bureaucrats keep spending our money on pensions, lawsuits, and other costly, sometimes unnecessary projects. California's taxpayers will be on the hook for the interest--twice the cost of the bonds--for decades.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS Lt. Gov. Gavin Newsom California Democratic Party Los Angeles County Democratic Party Contributions: \$8,344,477</p>	<p>OPPONENTS Governor Jerry Brown California Taxpayers Action Network San Diego Union-Tribune Contributions: \$0.00</p>

<p>PROPOSITION 52 - Ensures that the hospitals' fee to California would be used for its designated purpose by requiring voter approval of changes to the fee program to ensure that California uses the fees for the purpose of supporting hospital care.</p>			
<p>YES: Changes in funding and taxation should not take place without the widespread support of the legislature. If it takes a two-thirds vote to pass taxes, that should include the fees imposed on hospitals.</p>	<p>NO: Funding streams are vital for health care providers. There should be no delay to pay for uninsured patients</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California Hospital Association California Democratic Party California Republican Party Contributions: \$59,939,023.70</p>	<p>OPPONENTS Service Employees International Union, United Health Care Workers West Californians for Hospital Accountability Contributions: \$11,547,674</p>

<p>PROPOSITION 53 - Requires statewide voter approval for revenue bonds that exceed \$2 billion. Prohibits dividing projects into multiple separate projects to avoid voter approval.</p>			
<p>YES: Statewide bonds are expensive, wasteful to raise revenue. Requiring statewide voter approval ensures that any bonds have the support of those paying them.</p>	<p>NO: Bonds are a necessary measure to raise funding for emergency projects, especially during economic downturns. We should not throw another roadblock in the way of raising necessary funds through a bond.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California Republican Party Central Coast Taxpayers Association Contributions: \$4,559,188.77</p>	<p>OPPONENTS California Chamber of Commerce State Building and Construction Trades Council Contributions: \$1,082,000</p>

<p>PROPOSITION 54 - Bills must be printed, published and on the Internet at least 72 hours before a vote, except in cases of public emergency. Requires the Legislature to provide recordings and post them on the Internet. Authorizes any person to record legislative proceedings. Allows use of recordings for any legitimate purpose, without a fee.</p>			
<p>YES: Sunlight is the best disinfectant. Californians should know the bills before our legislators vote on them.</p>	<p>NO: Requiring such rapid publication of legislation will cost money. Legislature may try to turn more controversial bills into a public emergency.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California Republican Party California Federation of Republican Women California Taxpayers Association Contributions: \$7,932,974</p>	<p>OPPONENTS The California Labor Federation The California Democratic Party Contributions: \$0.00</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 55 - Extends Prop 30 tax hikes by twelve years for K-12 schools and California’s Community Colleges</p>			
<p>YES: Voters approved Prop 30 in 2012 because education faced a massive cash crunch. The new tax rates simply asked that the rich just pay more of their fair share. We need to keep these tax rates for school funding.</p>	<p>NO: Prop 30 made California home to the highest taxes in the country. Businesses are fleeing. The job growth is anemic. We need to end those taxes for good!</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS AFSCME (Public Sector union) AFT Local 3267 (Teachers union) Los Angeles County Democratic Party California School Boards Association Contributions: \$41,963,964</p>	<p>OPPONENTS California Republican Party California Chamber of Commerce Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association National Federation of Independent Business Contributions: \$0.00</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 56 - This tax amendment would increase the tax on cigarettes by \$2 a pack and other nicotine products (i.e. electronic cigarettes). The revenue would increase funding for existing healthcare programs, tobacco use prevention and tobacco-related disease research.</p>			
<p>YES: Smoking is a costly habit, kills lives, and puts further strain on our healthcare systems. Let’s discourage smoking and help those who are hooked right now.</p>	<p>NO: Another tax will not save lives, but give more to government programs who waste the money. Also, do we really want to encourage another underground economy?</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS Los Angeles County Democratic Party San Francisco AIDS Foundation CA School Board Association Contributions: \$17,098,157</p>	<p>OPPONENTS California Republican Party Philip Morris USA Inc. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company Contributions: \$35,558,860</p>

<p>PROPOSITION 57 - This measure increases the chance for parole for non-violent offenders. Establishes judges, and not prosecutors, as the deciding factor to try juveniles as adults in court.</p>			
<p>YES: More research into the adolescent brain reveals that full development is not complete until 25. Juvenile offenders should not be so harshly punished for crimes they committed.</p>	<p>NO: A criminal could have a long list of prior convictions, then commit another crime, and be eligible for parole. California's streets are already unsafe. Do we need to risk more citizens' lives and property?</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS Gov. Jerry Brown Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom California Democratic Party Contributions: \$6,942,832</p>	<p>OPPONENTS Criminal Justice League Foundation California Republican Party CA District Attorneys Contributions: \$0.00</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 58 - This legislation would repeal key aspects of Proposition 227, which was passed by voters in 1998. This legislation would reinstate bilingual education, permitting English Language Learners in California schools to learn core subjects in their first language instead of English.</p>			
<p>YES: There is an incredible diversity in the United States. We should encourage students to learn and be proficient in more than one language, and that should start early!</p>	<p>NO: English acquisition is essential to growth and development in education. Learning many languages is good, but English should come first.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS State Senator Ricardo Lara (D) California Teachers Association Los Angeles County Office of Education Contributions: \$627,868</p>	<p>OPPONENTS US English California Republican Party California Federation of Republican Women Contributions: \$0.00</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 59 - Serves as a statewide initiative, which would appeal to the federal government and the states to pass a Constitutional Amendment overturning Citizens United, SCOTUS Decision allowing unlimited, third-party campaign contributions.</p>			
<p>YES: There is too much money in politics. Corporations are injecting so much money, that they can blanket a competitive district and basically buy a race. Get the money out of politics, and lets send a message to Washington: Overturn Citizens United!</p>	<p>NO: There isn't too much money in politics. More individuals can participate through independent PACs, and force incumbents to fight harder for their careers. Studies have also shown that more money spent in an election does not guarantee a win.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS Gov. Jerry Brown Lieutenant Governor Gavin Newsom California Democratic Party Contributions: \$6,942,832</p>	<p>OPPONENTS Criminal Justice League Foundation California Republican Party CA District Attorneys Contributions: \$0.00</p>

<p>PROPOSITION 60 - Requires performers in adult films to use condoms during filming. Requires producers of adult films to pay for vaccinations, testing, and medical examinations related to STDs. Producers must obtain state health licenses and post condom requirement at film sites.</p>			
<p>YES: This is a public health issue, as well as a concern about employee safety and security. Venereal diseases have hit an all-time high in California, and we need to do something to stop it.</p>	<p>NO: This law is discriminatory and unfair. It can set industries up for lawsuits. This legislation is moving the adult film industry out of state.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS AIDS Healthcare Foundation California State Association of Occupational Health Nurses Contributions: \$2,382,071</p>	<p>OPPONENTS The California Democratic Party The California Republican Party The California Libertarian Party Contributions: \$102,105</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 61 - Prohibits agencies from paying more for drugs than the lowest price paid by the US Department of Veteran Affairs. It would also apply when the state provides the funding for the purchase of the drugs even if not purchased directly by a government agency.</p>			
<p>YES: The government needs to have a strong hand to ensure that individual consumers, particularly our veterans and most needy, are paying the lowest price for medication.</p>	<p>NO: This legislation will actually increase the cost of medications, and reduce the number of choices available to patients. Government intervention to the pharmaceutical industry is a bad idea.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California County Democratic Parties AIDS Healthcare Foundation California Nurses Association (CNA) Contributions: \$9,462,638</p>	<p>OPPONENTS Pharmaceutical Research of America (PhRMA) California Republican Party California Life Sciences Association Contributions: \$70,279,724</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 62 - Repeals death penalty as maximum punishment. Applies retroactively to persons already sentenced to death.</p>			
<p>YES: The death penalty is antiquated, unjust and unevenly imposed. Miscarriages of justice threaten the integrity of our system, and the finality of the death penalty is too great for us to make a mistake.</p>	<p>NO: The death penalty serves as a necessary deterrent to crime, and strengthens the plea bargaining power of our prosecutors. The vilest of murders deserves the severest punishment.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California Democratic Party Leaders California Democratic Elected Officials Bernie Sanders Contributions: \$4,181,652</p>	<p>OPPONENTS District Attorneys and Sheriffs Throughout CA California Federation of Republican Women California Republican Assembly Contributions: \$3,546,729</p>

<p>PROPOSITION 63 - Prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition magazines, and requires their disposal by sale to dealer, destruction, or removal from state. Requires background checks and ammunition sales through licensed ammunition vendors.</p>			
<p>YES: Firearms which use high-capacity magazines are blanketing our streets. Violent crimes are soaring. We need to make it harder for criminals to purchase ammunition, and we need to keep tabs on ammo purchasers.</p>	<p>NO: The last thing that California needs is more gun control. Crime rates are not going down because of gun control, but proper deterrence and law enforcement. The Second Amendment should be protected, and the right of lawful gun owners respected.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer Lt. Governor Gavin Newsom Contributions: \$4,181,652</p>	<p>OPPONENTS The Coalition for Civil Liberties - No on 63 California Sheriff's Association The National Rifle Association Contributions: \$425,986</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 64 - Legalizes marijuana and hemp under state law, including the regulation and taxation of the product for distribution and sale.</p>			
<p>YES: The Drug War has been a failure. Many lives have been ruined because of possession and use of a controlled substance. It's time to treat marijuana like any other drug, and addition as a health problem instead of a crime.</p>	<p>NO: Marijuana use leads to higher crime rates, less economic activity, and endangers our youth and our communities. We need to keep the restrictions and criminal penalties in place.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California Democratic Party Congressman Dana Rohrabacher California Medical Association Contributions: \$11,470,778</p>	<p>OPPONENTS California Republican Party California Association of Highway Patrolmen Libertarian Party Contributions: \$229,385</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 65 - Redirects money collected by grocery and certain other retail stores through sale of carry-out bags to environmental causes</p>			
<p>YES: Not only should we applaud the ban on plastic bags, but all the money from the sale of brown and reusable bags should be used for conservation and environmental causes. After all, the ban is all about saving the planet.</p>	<p>NO: Any money derived from the sale or purchase of any item should belong to the business, corporation, or salesman. No one should take profit from any private firm.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS American Progressive Bag Alliance California Taxpayer Protection Committee California Senior Advocates League Contributions: \$6,129,383</p>	<p>OPPONENTS California Republican Party League of Women Voters of California Clean Water Action Contributions: \$0.00</p>

<p>PROPOSITION 66 - Limits successive petitions to challenge death penalty convictions and sentences. Imposes time limits on state court death penalty review. States death row inmates must work and pay victim restitution.</p>			
<p>YES: The death penalty is an adequate deterrent, but must be implemented consistently and efficiently. Families of victims should be compensated, and the appellate process needs to be limited so that justice can be done without greater cost to taxpayers.</p>	<p>NO: The death penalty is abhorrent. The appellate process should not be limited, since miscarriages of justice are final. What does it matter how long a trial costs?</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California Republican Party CA District Attorneys Law Enforcement Leaders and Associations Contributions: \$3,521,729.95</p>	<p>OPPONENTS California Federation of Teachers California Labor Federation SEIU California Contributions: \$6,129,383</p>
<p>PROPOSITION 67 - Should the state of California Keep the Statewide Plastic Bag Ban?</p>			
<p>YES: Plastic bags litter the oceans and kill wildlife. The garbage in the ocean threatens our ecosystem. The trash in our streets creates health and safety concerns, too. Keep the plastic bag ban.</p>	<p>NO: Groceries and individual shops should be allowed to provide plastic bags. This ban was a crony deal between Big Labor and Big Business to take more money from individual consumers. Plastic bags provide convenience for a number of uses, too.</p>	<p>SUPPORTERS California Democratic Party Gov. Jerry Brown Lt. Gov. Gavin Newsom (D) Secretary of State Alex Padilla Contribution: \$2,397,606</p>	<p>OPPONENTS Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association California Federation of Republican Women California Republican Assembly Contribution: \$6,129,383</p>

JUDICIAL RATINGS

Judges sitting on California courts may be incompetent, corrupt or lazy. Even worse, many are political opportunists with a political agenda.

There are two types of judges. One is the “judicial activist.” A judicial activist legislates from the bench. Instead of strictly *interpreting* California law, these judges *make* the laws. Instead of applying the law to facts, they rule based on their own values

Judicial activists have:

- Overturned voter-passed initiatives and laws passed by the state legislature because they personally have a different belief system. They twist the law to rationalize their decisions.
- Imposed their own moral codes, political beliefs and secular values in an effort to reshape our society and promote social engineering.

The second judicial philosophy, “**strict constructionist**,” is one in which the judge impartially arrives at a fair judgment based on law.

Judicial activists are usually more liberal; strict constructionists are usually more conservative.



SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY JUDICIAL ELECTION

Superior Court Judge Office 24

Denise Trager Dvorak

Judicial Index Average: 6

Activist-Constructionist rating: 6

Qualifications Rating: 7

Susan Slater

Judicial Index Average: 7

Activist-Constructionist rating: 8

Qualifications Rating: 5

Congress:

State Senate:

State Assembly:

County Supervisor:

For all other campaigns, all other California counties, a Voter Guide to distribute and more, go to **www.ElectionForum.org**.