



Approved by
Legal Review #33
8-12-80

1633 E. Fourth Street, #286, Santa Ana, CA 92701 • 714/558-8100

Dear

It was just two years ago that California voters rejected Proposition 5, the initiative that would have prohibited smoking in most offices and work areas.

Believe it or not, here we go again. Proposition 10, a cleverly reworded version of the 1978 initiative, would require the designation of "No Smoking" sections in every enclosed public place, workplace, office building, factory, restaurant or indoor sports facility in the state.

A common misconception is that the current initiative is "not as bad" as its predecessor. Proponents claim that it "solves" the deficiencies of the 1978 proposal by being fair to both smokers and non-smokers.

That is just not the case!

Is it "less bad" that, instead of having to build a physical wall to separate smokers and non-smokers, an appointee of the State Department of Health Services will have virtually blanket authority to determine which areas in office buildings, stores, indoor sports facilities and workplaces must be determined as "No Smoking" areas?

Is it "less bad" to use our law enforcement and court personnel for writing and processing "No Smoking" citations?

Is it "less bad" to take funds away from existing health services for the needy to provide for more bureaucrats to enforce the initiative?

Is it "less bad" that a single employee can demand that his work area be entirely a "No Smoking" area, and that the proprietor or business manager has no say in the matter?

We believe Proposition 10 is a bad law -- one that is costly and unfair to Californians and one that will turn California workplaces into virtual battlefields, pitting smokers against non-smokers.

We believe that the initiative is at least as bad as the 1978 Proposition 5 proposal because of the very ambiguous wording and the lack of restraint on governing agencies. We are very concerned about the implications of Proposition 10 on all Californians - workers, employers, police, the courts, consumers ... and taxpayers.

03623946

NO ON 10
Page Two

Enclosed for your information is a copy of the newest "No Smoking Initiative", along with a copy of our ballot argument in opposition to Proposition 10 and a question and answer fact sheet. We hope you will lend your support toward the defeat of Proposition 10 on November 4, as you did toward the defeat of Proposition 5 in 1978. Please sign the enclosed endorsement card and return it to us immediately.

Sincerely,

~~PETER PITCHESS~~
Sheriff, County of Los Angeles

*David Bugland, Chairman
Californians Against Regulatory Excess*

03623947