



**CALIFORNIA PROLIFE**

State Office

(916) 442-8315

California ProLife Council  
2306 J Street, Suite 200  
Sacramento, CA 95816

Regional Offices

*Angeles Region*  
California ProLife Council  
109 West College, Suite 200  
Covina, CA 91723  
818-859-2040

*Bay Area*  
California ProLife Council  
PO Box 700055  
San Jose, CA 95170  
408-257-1988

*Central Valley*  
Fresno Right to Life  
1574 N. Van Ness Ave.  
Fresno, CA 93728  
209-266-1000

*San Diego*  
California ProLife Council  
PO Box 17004  
San Diego, CA 92177  
619-468-1441

...And Local Chapters Statewide

# California ProLife Council, Inc.

## VOTER INFORMATION PROJECT

March 13, 1998

Please respond by March 31, 1998  
FAX Number (916) 441-7508

Dear Candidate:

As you know, abortion and euthanasia are major political and social issues in the United States today.

One of the responsibilities of the California ProLife Council is to compile and disseminate information as to where candidates for public office stand on issues currently on state and national agendas.

Please fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the envelope provided, or send it by FAX to the number above.

Please feel free to call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Janet B. Carroll  
Legislative Analyst

Enclosures



The California Affiliate of the National Right to Life Committee, Inc.



**1998 VOTER INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRE  
Candidates For State Office**

Please complete this form and return it to the above address, or fax to (916) 441-7508.

**Please Note:** On every question, "YES" is the pro-life response. (Explanations for some questions are included here.)

**ABORTION QUESTIONS**

(1) Would you vote for a law that would prevent abortions, except those necessary to prevent the death of the mother?

YES \_\_\_ NO

(2) If it was not possible to pass such a law, would you vote for a law that would prevent abortions, except to prevent the death of the mother, or when the pregnancy is the result of forcible rape (reported to a law enforcement agency within 7 days), or when the pregnancy of a minor is the result of incest (with the perpetrator reported to a law enforcement agency)?

YES \_\_\_ NO

(3) Would you vote for a law that would prevent the use of abortion as a means of birth control?

YES \_\_\_ NO

(4) Would you vote for a law that would prevent abortion for sex selection?

YES \_\_\_ NO

(5) Would you vote for a law that would prohibit the performance of a "partial-birth abortion," defined as "an abortion in which the person performing the abortion partially vaginally delivers a living fetus before killing the fetus and completing the delivery," except if necessary to prevent the death of the mother?

YES  NO \_\_\_



**California ProLife Council, Inc.**

2306 J Street Suite 200 • Sacramento, CA 95816 • voice: (916) 442-8315 • fax: (916) 441-7508  
<http://www.californiaprolife.org> • e-mail [prolife@californiaprolife.org](mailto:prolife@californiaprolife.org)

(6) Would you vote to require parental consent for abortions on minors?

YES  NO

(7) Would you vote for a constitutional amendment which requires, consistent with decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court, that physicians obtain the consent of a minor's parent prior to performing an abortion on that minor, thus overturning *American Academy of Pediatrics v. Lungren*, the California Supreme Court decision which declared unconstitutional the 1987 parental consent law passed by the California Legislature?

YES  NO

(8) Would you vote for an "informed consent" law requiring that doctors provide information on the development of the unborn child, alternatives to abortion, and medical risks of abortion at least 24 hours before an abortion is performed?

YES  NO

(9) Would you vote for a law to get government out of the abortion business by preventing the use of state facilities to perform abortions not necessary to prevent the death of the mother, and by preventing state employees from performing, referring or counseling for abortions, other than those necessary to prevent the death of the mother?

YES  NO

(10) Would you vote to prevent the use of tax funds for abortions other than to prevent the death of the mother?

YES  NO

(11) If it was not possible to pass the law described in #10, would you vote to prevent the use of tax funds for abortion other than to prevent the death of the mother, when the pregnancy is the result of a forcible rape (reported to a law enforcement agency within 7 days), or when the pregnancy of a minor is the result of incest (and the perpetrator of the crime has been reported to a law enforcement agency)?

YES  NO

(12) Would you oppose the establishment or funding of “health clinics” or health services in public schools, unless there are explicit prohibitions against providing abortion counseling or referral or referring to any entity which counsels for, refers for or does abortions?

YES  NO

(13) Would you vote to prevent the use of tissue and organs from deliberately aborted children in transplants or medical experiments?

YES  NO

(14) Would you vote to oppose any ERA (Equal Rights Amendment), unless it contained explicit “abortion neutralization” language?

YES  NO

(15) Would you oppose the testing and marketing of “RU 486” in the United States for abortion?

YES  NO

### EUTHANASIA QUESTIONS

(16) Would you vote to prevent involuntary denial of life-saving treatment by providing that when  
1) a patient has explicitly directed life-preserving medical treatment, food, or fluids, and  
2) the treatment, food, or fluids in fact would have a significant possibility of sustaining the patient’s life  
then the patient’s doctor cannot deny it pending the patient’s transfer to another doctor willing to follow the patient’s wishes?

YES  NO

(17) In 1991, Oregon approved a health care rationing plan for its Medicaid program. The primary basis for denial of treatment is the expected degree of disability or medical need, or poor “quality of life” it is claimed a patient would be likely to have after treatment. This is a form of involuntary euthanasia. Would you vote to oppose any legislation in this state that, like the Oregon plan, would impose rationing that intentionally denies treatment **on the basis** of disability, degree of medical need, or “quality of life” of those denied treatment?

YES  NO

(18) Would you oppose any legalization of lethal injections or any other measures to kill a person or to "assist" in committing suicide, or "active euthanasia?"

YES  NO

(19) Would you vote to prevent the use of tax funds for "assisting suicides," or "active euthanasia?"

YES  NO

### POLITICAL FREE SPEECH

(20) Will you defend the First Amendment rights of issue-oriented groups to continue to conduct "independent expenditure" campaigns that support or oppose candidates for office, and will you oppose devices such as government-mandated "compensation" (see enclosed explanation) that would chill or curb political free speech by citizens and citizen groups?

YES  NO

---

---

Candidate's Signature: Gerald J. Klaas Date: 3-19-98

Print or type name: GERALD KLAAS

Phone Number: (916) 482-0208 Political Party: Libertarian

Candidate for (name of office, district number if applicable): State Senate District 6

Name of campaign committee, address, phone, and fax numbers: \_\_\_\_\_

KLAAS FOR SENATE

4711 El Camino Ave Suite #222

Carmichael CA 95608

**California ProLife Council's  
EXPLANATIONS FOR SELECTED QUESTIONS**

**QUESTION 3: Would you vote for a law that would prevent the use of abortion as a means of birth control?**

Public opinion surveys have shown that the public is overwhelmingly opposed to abortion as a means of birth control (87%), yet 43% of abortions are now repeat abortions.

To use an abortion as a means of birth control means to use it for the same reason as one would employ any method of birth control, such as contraceptives or natural family planning. People use birth control to space children, to avoid interference with career or education, or for a variety of other motivations that all have one thing in common: the desire to avoid having any child at this time. There are other categories of abortion that might be sought even by someone who genuinely wants a child: abortions performed to prevent death or serious physical health damage to the mother, or in case of rape or incest, or in cases in which the unborn child would have serious disabilities.

For purposes of clarity and enforceability, a law preventing the use of abortions as a means of birth control defines such abortions as covering other than those in the five categories described in the previous sentence.

**QUESTION 4: Would you vote for a law that would prevent abortion for sex selection?**

Babies are being aborted in the U.S. just because they are of the “wrong” sex, typically female. In one survey of the medical geneticists, 60% said they would either perform sex-testing for sex selection abortion, or refer to other geneticists who would do so.

**QUESTION 8: Would you vote for an “informed consent” law requiring that doctors provide information on the development of the unborn child, alternatives to abortion, and medical risks of abortion at least 24 hours before an abortion is performed?**

Such a law would ensure that women considering abortion are informed about the medical risks of the procedure and are given an opportunity to read information about agencies that provide alternatives to abortion, as well as objective, scientifically accurate information about the development of the unborn child.

**QUESTION 10: Would you vote to prevent the use of tax funds for abortions other than to prevent the death of the mother?**

Since the mid-70's the federal government has restricted funding for abortions to those necessary to save the life of the mother, or sometimes additionally for the abortion of those babies who are conceived by rape or incest-- life, rape and incest are the current federally funded exceptions.

Unfortunately, California is one of the 14 states (plus the District of Columbia) which fund abortion on demand. In 1996, the last year for which statistics are available, California taxpayers funded nearly 115,000 abortions with more than \$38 million. (Approximately 350,000 abortions are performed annually in California.)

Almost 20% of these were done on teenagers, most without parental consent. The repeat abortion rate in this program is astounding; more than seven percent of the women had more than one tax-funded abortion in the same calendar year.

Thirty states fund abortions only when the life of the mother is endangered. Six others additionally fund abortions when the babies are conceived by rape or incest, and several of these when the baby might be born with handicaps.

**QUESTION 12: Would you oppose the establishment or funding of “health clinics” or health services in public schools, unless there are explicit prohibitions against providing abortion counseling or referral or referring to any entity which counsels for, refers for or does abortions?**

Planned Parenthood and other abortion promoters have long sought to establish school-based clinics on the junior and senior high school campuses, or more recently-- to offer such health-care services with mobile units. These clinics are established ostensibly as general health care facilities, but their primary purpose is to deal with “reproductive health care.” Some clinics already in operation offer abortion counseling (pregnancy testing and informing a pregnant teenage girl she has the right to an abortion, in most cases without parental consent) and direct abortion referrals (sending the pregnant girl to an abortion facility). In other clinics that do not send the girls directly to the abortionist, the staff will arrange indirect abortion referrals. They do so by sending pregnant teenage girls to an agency outside of the school which does not perform abortions, but which does send the girl to the abortionist. In this way, the school-based clinic staff claim that they are not performing abortion referrals, but that is a semantic misrepresentation. Moreover, studies by school-based clinic proponents reveal that these clinics do not decrease the incidence of teenage pregnancy; in fact, two of the clinics in one authoritative study actually increased the pregnancy rate.

**QUESTION 13: Would you vote to prevent the use of tissue and organs from deliberately aborted children in transplants or medical experiments?**

Currently, tissue and organs from aborted babies are being used in experimental transplants to other humans and animals. Proponents of this scavenging of aborted children argue that since the children are going to die anyway, parts of their bodies might as well be put to medical use. But pro-life advocates agree with Dr. Louis Sullivan, the former Secretary of Health and Human Services, who concluded that there could be no ethical way to foster such transplants because they would encourage abortions. On a societal level, the demand for organs that would be created by institutionalization of such transplantation could be satisfied only by keeping abortion legal. On an individual level, women considering abortion would be influenced by the feeling that “good” would come out of having the abortion.

Further, if the development of medical treatments which are dependent upon abortion are funded, encouraged, or allowed, the research will be wasted if abortion is prevented. It is better to develop treatments which are at the same time more ethical and provide a more permanent treatment. Promotion of the abortion-dependent research rather than non-abortion dependent research also discriminates against pro-lifers who need treatment because they cannot in good conscience use abortion-dependent treatments.

**QUESTION 14: Would you vote to oppose any ERA (Equal Rights Amendment), unless it contained explicit “abortion neutralization” language?**

In at least four states (CT, HI, MA, and PA), attorneys for pro-abortion groups like the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) have filed lawsuits arguing that failure to provide tax funding of abortions violates the state’s Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). In 1986, a Connecticut court ruled that the state’s ERA requires funding of elective abortions.

Therefore, pro-life advocates oppose the adoption of any ERA unless a simple “abortion neutralization” amendment is added, reading: “Nothing in this article (the ERA) shall be construed to grant, secure or deny any right relating to abortion or the funding thereof.”

**QUESTION 15: Would you oppose the testing and marketing of “RU 486” in the United States for abortion?**

In France, the abortion technique known as “RU 486” uses two powerful synthetic steroids (RU 486 and prostaglandin) to abort women who are five to seven weeks pregnant. “RU 486” kills an unborn baby whose heart has begun to beat, and it is dangerous to women. In France it has killed one woman and caused life-threatening heart attacks in two others.

As to American experiments with RU 486, The Des Moines Register reported that Dr. Mark Louviere, a pro-abortion family practitioner told of an incident with a woman he treated, because the press had been reporting that there were NO complications among the 238 woman participating at Planned Parenthood of Central Iowa. The September 21, 1995 article revealed that Louviere’s patient “lost more than half of her blood , came close to death , and needed surgery two weeks after taking RU-486...” Pro-abortion activist Meredith Turshen, a professor at Rutgers University, was quoted in the July 31, 1992 Boston Herald saying, “my feeling is there are probably a lot more near-deaths or ‘accidents’ than we know about.”

Abortion proponents have also exaggerated very small and preliminary tests of the NON-abortion related uses, which the American Medical Association characterized as “conjecture.” But the U, S, Food and Drug Administration’s Import Alert prohibiting importation for personal use had no effect on NON-abortion related testing of RU 486 in the U.S.

**QUESTION 16: Would you vote to prevent involuntary denial of life saving treatment by providing that when**

- 1) a patient has explicitly directed life-preserving medical treatment, food, or fluids, and**
- 2) the treatment, food, or fluids in fact would have a significant possibility of sustaining the patient’s life**

**then the patient’s doctor cannot deny it pending the patient’s transfer to another doctor willing to follow the patient’s wishes?**

For years, the debate over the provision of life-saving medical treatment has been framed as one of patient autonomy: it has been argued that the patients or their families should be able to refuse such treatment. Now, however, when euthanasia advocates want to kill people who clearly want to live, the opposite argument is being used: they are claiming that physicians should be able uni-laterally to decide that a patient’s life is not worth living, even when the patient disagrees. They (euthanasia advocates) insist they should be able to cut off treatment, food, and fluids so as to allow the patient to die against the patient’s will. The pro-euthanasia movement has revealed itself to be, not pro-autonomy, but pro-death. The proposed legislation would not require doctors to give medically unproved treatments or create any new obligation to provide care for which a doctor is not reimbursed. It would simply respect a patient’s right to have his or her own choice for life to be honored when treatment, food, or fluids have a significant possibility of preserving it. A doctor who disagreed could transfer the patient, as long as requested life-saving treatment was provided until the transfer was completed.



**QUESTION 17: In 1991, Oregon approved a health care rationing plan for its Medicaid program. The primary basis for denial of treatment is the expected degree of disability or medical need, or poor “quality of life” it is claimed a patient would be likely to have after treatment. This is a form of involuntary euthanasia. Would you vote to oppose any legislation that, like the Oregon plan, would impose rationing that intentionally denies treatment on the basis of disability, degree of medical need, or “quality of life” of those denied treatment?**

The Oregon health care rationing plan “solves” the problem of extending health care to groups who do not now have it by taking health care away from the very people who need it most-- those with disabilities or medical needs. It rations care, not on the basis of its effectiveness in preserving life or health, but rather on the basis of how valuable-- or lacking in value-- someone thinks the life that is preserved will be. Under this plan, the greater degree of expected disability or medical need, the greater the danger of being denied health care. Under the Oregon plan, human beings are not treated as equal citizens with the most vulnerable needing more, not less consideration. Rather the Oregon plan treats people as things which are abandoned in direct correlation to their degree of disability or medical need.

Pro-lifers believe that any change in the nation’s health care system should be made without losing respect for the people involved. The Oregon plan just replaces an inadequate system with a discriminatory one. It is worse because it replaces neglect with intentional denial and because its victims are those least able to defend themselves.

There are more humane alternative health care plans being proposed. Some states have been working on creative new funding ideas, reorganization for greater efficiency, or other plans which do not involve discriminatory denial of health care.

Of course, disability rights groups have been vocal in their opposition to the Oregon plan. Other opponents include the Southern Baptist Convention and the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, who argue the plan does not treat people with disabilities as precious children of God, but as disposable objects; liberal members of Congress who argue the plan cuts coverage for the poorest of the poor in order to provide it to others; and other advocates of health care reform who argue that the Oregon plan creates a bureaucracy heavy system of governmental control.

**QUESTION 20: Will you defend the First Amendment rights of issue-oriented groups to continue to conduct “independent expenditure” campaigns that support or oppose candidates for office, and will you oppose devices such as government-mandated “compensation” that would chill or curb political free speech by citizens and citizen groups?**

Current federal law allows an organization that advocates a point of view on particular issues-- for example, abortion-- to form a political action committee. The courts have ruled that such PAC’s may conduct unlimited “independent expenditures” in support of (or opposition to) candidates for federal office, as long as such campaigns are not authorized by a candidate or coordinated with his or her campaign.

However, the Congress and some states are considering major “campaign reform” measures in an attempt to limit the involvement of citizen action groups, such as PAC’s, in federal and state races. (Proposition 208, opposed by California ProLife Council and recently stricken in a federal court, is one extreme example of such so-called reform.) These measures often include a penalty for those who conduct independent expenditures-- for example, by giving publicly funded TV time, or other compensation, to the opponents of candidates who are supported by independent expenditures, as well as to candidates who are opposed by independent expenditures. Such compensation given to candidates who are opposed by private independent expenditures would chill or curb the political free speech of citizens and citizen groups.