Parents can be trusted to help daughters, but this goes too far

October 31, 2008

“Where advocates of this measure fail to make their case is in demonstrating that this is more than a hypothetical — that a number of caring parents of young girls in California are actually being left in the dark. What problem is being fixed by this measure?”

Editorial: Prop 4: No

October 31, 2008

“Ideally, girls would confide in their parents if they were pregnant, and most do. Some girls cannot. The Star agrees with Proposition 4 opponents that no law can force family communication and that parental notification does not belong in our state constitution.”
Endorsements and Guide for
California’s 12 Propositions
October 30, 2008

“The Coast Report Votes No: We need to protect people who cannot speak for themselves. It is not the state's prerogative to mandate personal decisions.”

Vote no on Prop. 4
October 30, 2008

“California's rates of teen pregnancy, birth and abortion have all declined in the past years thanks to comprehensive sex education and affordable family planning options. Those truly seeking to reduce abortions and protect young women should focus their efforts on these successful methods rather than detrimental, divisive initiatives.”
Proposition 4: Waiting period and parental notification before termination of minor’s pregnancy: NO

October 30, 2008

“This proposition has the potential to cause pregnant young women to go to drastic measures for an abortion. Proposition 4 requires parents’ signatures on a notification form, which disapproving parents may refuse to sign, delaying the abortion.”

Proposition 4 – No

October 30, 2008

“Ideally, communication should occur between parents and minors, but legislation cannot force this. This proposition puts minors in risk of abuse from parents, and increases their chances of obtaining illegal, unsafe abortions and other dangerous acts.”

2008 election: Complete IJ endorsements

October 29, 2008

“Proposition 4: No”
Vida endorses candidates, propositions
October 29, 2008

“Proponents call this the parental notification measure. We believe this measure will cause more harm than good for those girls who don’t have a strong family environment and support should they become pregnant.”

Pride Proposition Endorsements,
October 29, 2008

“Prop 4 feigns concessions to address these dangers by allowing exceptions to parental notification, but these exceptions are entangled in a mess of red tape that leaves too much discretion in the hands of the courts and not enough in the hands of the individuals to whom the issue is most relevant.”

Endorsement Guide,
October 29, 2008

Prop. 4

“This proposition’s aim is to amend the California Constitution to make it illegal for a minor to get an abortion without her parents being notified. Teens who live in abusive homes will suffer if Prop. 4 passes. No on Prop. 4.”
California Propositions Cheat Sheet,
October 29, 2008

“Many teens that are unable to confront their parents become scared and desperate, and this can often lead them to make dangerous decisions such as back alley, illegal abortions. Prop 4 has nothing to do with “family involvement” and everything to do with damaging the livelihood of a pregnant and scared teen.”

Endorsements: Propositions,
October 28, 2008

“The safety and privacy of young women are at stake. Vote No on Proposition 4.”

“There can be good reasons why a teen doesn’t want to involve her parent in the first place. Cases of rape or incest are some of the most extreme.”
State can't legislate family communication,
October 28, 2008

“Some opponents of Prop 4 see it as an attack on Roe v. Wade and abortion rights. If the main concern is unwanted pregnancies, sex education curriculum - and not necessarily abortion - should be re-examined.”

Vote ‘no’ on Props. 2, 4 and 8,
October 25, 2008

“Any teenager under 18 who becomes pregnant should seek the help and advice of her parents, and the experts say most girls do just that.

“But for those who don’t or can’t, no law can force them to seek their parents’ counsel.”

“Prop. 4 guarantees nothing and if it passes, may actually push a teen in trouble in the wrong direction.”

Santa Monica Mirror Endorsements,
October 24, 2008

“Another one of those measures trying to block and make difficult abortion decisions. Ideologically motivated at the expense of teens in crisis.”
No on Proposition 4: The parental notification measure is virtually the same as two previous anti-abortion measures that failed.

October 23, 2008

“The supporters of Proposition 4 have managed to frame their campaign around two ideas, both misleading, that hold particular appeal for voters. One is that, in addition to allowing girls to seek court permission for an abortion, it will give those who justifiably fear telling their parents an “out” by allowing them to notify another adult relative instead. This would indeed give the measure more credence, if it were true. But in order to use it, the girl would have to accuse her parents, in writing, of child abuse, with the accusation to be forwarded to law enforcement authorities. It’s the equivalent of telling girls they can get an abortion by walking into a police station and having their parents arrested.”

THE HERALD RECOMMENDS

October 23, 2008

“Proposition 4, Parental notification on abortion: Anti-choice motivations.”
“But Prop 4 opponents rightly point out that in most functional families parental notification isn’t an issue; pregnant teens will usually go to Mom. It’s in dysfunctional families - families in which there may be abuse and incest - where pregnant girls need protection.”

“To blow your own mind, try imagining an underage girl going through the trauma of an unwanted pregnancy, who can’t turn to the adults in her life but will stand up in a courtroom of strangers to fight to have an abortion. It’s like trying to comprehend infinity.”

“In loving, stable families with the proper lines of communication, this occurs anyway, and there is no need for Proposition 4.”

“But this is not the real world. Many teenagers do not have healthy relationships with parents.”
Notification measure no better this time
October 21, 2008

“The sad fact is that if this measure were to pass, desperate Southern California teens unable to communicate with parents would likely seek abortions elsewhere - illegally, self-induced, south of the border, in other states. Quite clearly they would wait longer.”

“California is doing a good job dramatically reducing teen pregnancies and abortions. We should keep working together toward that end, and again reject a measure voters have twice rejected before.”

NEW UNIVERSITY, UCI

Props to Students Who Vote This Election
October 20, 2008

“While any reasonable voter would agree that aiming for fewer abortions is ideal, this proposition fails to protect teens like it claims to do and is a poor way to reduce abortions or unwanted pregnancies.”

“If this proposition passes in California and in other states that have similar initiatives, Roe v. Wade could face some setbacks in the future.”

Propositions in review
October 19, 2008

“For those teenagers without responsible parents, the telling may cause more harm. This is a flawed ballot measure that could endanger pregnant teenagers.”
Our View: No on parental notification

October 18, 2008

“We are concerned that the notification law may increase the number of second-trimester abortions. Some teens, wary of having their parents notified, may delay decisions.”

“Seeking medical treatment as early as possible in these circumstances is in the best interest of all concerned.”

---

Vote ‘no’ on Proposition 4, parental notification measure: Law may increase number of second-trimester abortions

October 17, 2008

“We don’t think that is a reasonable option for a frightened girl, especially since she would have to provide a written statement that she had been subject to a pattern of physical, sexual or emotional abuse by her parent.”

“We are concerned that the notification law may increase the number of second-trimester abortions. Some teens, wary of having their parents notified, may delay decisions.”
AsianWeek Endorsements: 4 NO

October 17, 2008

“Another in the unending attacks on abortion rights. The voters and the courts have already decided this.”

Vote ‘no’ on parental notice Proposition 4

October 16, 2008

“While we are sympathetic to the purported target of the initiative (protecting children), we urge voters to vote “no” on Proposition 4, as it does little to advance that goal.”

“We fear, as do many others, that this proposition is yet another attempt at eliminating abortion rights in California.”

Flawed measures should be rejected

October 16, 2008

“The proposal isn’t about parental notification. It’s about stopping abortion, and it won’t do that. It’ll just force teens underground. Vote no on Proposition 4.”
Some losing propositions, Props. 1 through 5 deserve to be voted down

October 15, 2008

“We do not live in a perfect world. Too often, communications between parent and child are strained or nonexistent. The very real danger is that a frightened and desperate pregnant teen would resort to unsanitary and dangerous treatment out of fear of facing her parents.”

——

Fast trains, Astroturf green and bizarre ideas from the Neanderthal right

October 15, 2008

“To blow your own mind, try imagining an underage girl going through the trauma of an unwanted pregnancy, who can’t turn to the adults in her life, but will stand up in a courtroom of strangers to fight to have an abortion.”

“The spin on Sarah’s story is that older men prey on underage girls and then cart them off to an abortion clinic to cover up their sexual crimes. It’s all very Law & Order, but the simple truth is this is just a cynical ploy.”
Prop. 4 should be rejected

October 15, 2008

“The sad fact is that if this one were to pass, desperate Southern California teens unable to communicate with parents would likely seek abortions elsewhere - illegally, self-induced, south of the border, in other states. Quite clearly they would wait longer.”

No on Prop. 4 endorsement

October 14, 2008

“A better name for Prop. 4 is ‘Jim’s Law’—for Jim Holman, the editor and publisher of the San Diego Reader and anti-abortion crusader who has bankrolled Props. 73, 85 and 4 to the tune of more than $5 million.”

“The proponents can dress it up any way they want; this is still a religion-based attack on reproductive rights. Please vote no on Prop. 4.”
Third time no charm for parental notification on abortions

October 14, 2008

“The backers of this proposition say they only care about the health and welfare of teens. But their relentlessness on an issue that voters have rejected not once, but twice, makes it appear that the real motive has less to do with families, and more about chipping away at the state’s abortion laws.”

“Voters should once again reject this initiative, and perhaps the third time will be the charm to put this issue to rest.”

Parental Notification and Gay Marriages Two Controversial Propositions

October 10, 2008

“The voters have made their position on this issue loud and clear, that a minor does not need to notify their parents/guardian.”
As We See It: Vote no on Prop. 4  
October 10, 2008

“It would be wonderful to live in a world where families talk to each other and every decision is thoughtfully considered. But that’s not the real world. Some children have good reason to fear their parents. Proposition 4 puts those teens at risk of violence from their parents and at risk of unsafe abortions.”

“Proposition 4 attempts to force that trust by legislating family communication. But try as we might, we cannot make reasoned, caring discussion happen by passing a law.”

The Santa Barbara Independent Voters’ Guide for the November Election  
October 09, 2008

“Waiting Period and Parental Notification Before Termination of Minor’s Pregnancy: The handiwork of dedicated anti-abortion rights advocates…”

“The scary fact is that in a small but significant number of instances, it is the parents themselves that the pregnant teens need to be most protected from. And it is because of them that this measure should be rejected out of hand.”
Can't mandate family talks
October 09, 2008

“We agree with the physicians’ group that parents “rightfully want to be involved in their teenagers’ lives and want their daughters to come to them if they become pregnant.” But this type of communication does not exist in all families and cannot be mandated through a constitutional amendment.”

Say ‘No’ to all propositions except 11
October 09, 2008

“Other states with notification laws have seen an increase in the number of second-trimester abortions because teens, wary of having their parents notified, delay decisions.”

“While everyone would prefer that teens talk with parents about an unexpected pregnancy, the state should not be forcing that conversation.”
NO, NO, NO
October 8, 2008

“This measure was horrible when it was on the ballot twice before, in 2005 and in 2006, and it’s still horrible now.”

“Opponents say it’s a dangerous law that will drive more kids seeking abortions underground and do nothing to truly improve family relations. This proposal represents another erosion of abortion rights.”

Our simple stance on nine propositions? No
October 8, 2008

“A scared, pregnant teen who can’t go to her parents can feel trapped and desperate. Instead of seeking the counseling and safe medical care she needs, she may choose an unsafe, back-alley, illegal abortion, go across the border or even contemplate suicide.”

Proposition 4 would not keep teen girls safer
October 7, 2008

“Some teens will go to extreme and even life-threatening lengths to conceal their sexual activity, let alone that they’ve gotten pregnant and want an abortion. It is far better that they receive safe, prompt, professional care than that they avoid the doctor’s office for fear of what their parents would learn.”
“Proposition 4 represents a variation with respect to previous measures by including an ‘alternative family member notification.’ Actually, given its legal dynamics, this change could create more problems for the minor afraid of telling her parents about the pregnancy.”

“The government should not be in the business of mandating parent-child communication. And it certainly should not be required constitutionally.”

“But the laws that allow teenagers to confidentially seek medical help with pregnancies and other sexual concerns were not designed for the good parents. They were designed to protect teenagers whose families are horribly dysfunctional.”
Warning: Both Propositions 4 and 3 may be harmful to children. Two more propositions, two more thumbs down.

October 3, 2008

“It’s unlikely that teen pregnancies will diminish if abortion is more difficult, but it is possible that mandatory notification laws would create delays to put pregnant teens at risk or make them opt for illegal abortions.”

It’s baaack!

October 2, 2008

“Let’s get this straight: Parental-involvement laws don’t stop teens from getting pregnant. They don’t result in fewer abortions. They don’t turn dysfunctional families into healthy ones.”

Voters to become lawmakers again Nov. 4 when propositions need deciding

October 1, 2008

“But it [parental notification] is an effort to get the government to intrude into personal family relationships and decision-making.”
Proposition 4
October 2008

“This amendment is similar to others defeated by voters in 2005 and 2006, and it’s proposed by the same backers as the prior two. We have the same view now as we did then. It creates additional barriers and delays for pregnant minors seeking medical assistance and creates potential penalties for doctors who attempt to serve them using their best medical judgment.”

The Oakland Tribune
www.oaklandtribune.com
AND
CONTRA COSTA TIMES
ContraCostaTimes.com

Vote No on prop. 4
September 30, 2008

“A pregnant teen without caring parents could easily find herself in a situation where she might delay getting health care or even try to get a secret abortion by someone who is not qualified to perform one.”

“As it is, a waiver process is far too cumbersome and is not likely to be effective in protecting a pregnant teen from abuse.”
Deceit Deserves Defeat: Proposition 4 isn’t really about parental notification

September 25, 2008

“The story behind “Sarah’s Law” says a lot about it...The girl's name wasn't Sarah; she lived in Texas, not California; and though she was 15, she already had a child and was in a common-law marriage, which means she wouldn't have been covered by the law Californians are being asked to consider. That's how far the Proposition 4 campaign reached to come up with a poster girl.”

“In fact, under the guise of protecting underage girls, this proposal really is just the latest attempt to impose an obstacle in the exercise of reproductive freedom.”

No on 4

September 25, 2008

“Prop. 4 demonstrates that flawed ideas do not improve with repetition.”

“Prop. 4 would put onerous requirements on teens already in distress. Ideally, all pregnant teens would reach out to their parents for support, but not all families meet that ideal.”

“Pregnant teens cannot realistically be expected to navigate a daunting court system to avoid parental notification.”
Vote No on Prop 4
September 24, 2008

“Voters can not legislate, via the ballot box, trusting ties between parents and teens. Voters cannot ensure parents and teens are talking about the issues and making decisions together, or even that parents will act in the best interests of their children at all times.”

“...Proposition 4 only adds responsibilities and pressure on young women and their families when they are most vulnerable and the situation most volatile. That serves no one.”

San Francisco Chronicle

Daughters at Risk: California Proposition would undermine abortion rights
September 18th, 2008

“As we have said before, the arguments for parental notification may sound reasonable, but the real-world experience of the medical professionals who deal with scared pregnant teens suggest that its requirements are unnecessary — and even insidious.”

“The previous two parental notification measures were defeated – and this one, Proposition 4, should be rejected by voters who care about the safety and privacy rights of young women.”
Vote No on Proposition 4

September 12, 2008

“This is the third time in four years California voters have been asked to place a ‘notification hurdle’ in the way of minor women obtaining an abortion.”

“Proposition 4 is a law looking for a problem to solve. Proponents claim their intent is to protect young women from the risks of dangerous medical procedures and from having coerced abortions. But they are unable to cite statistics as to how many minor women are forced to have abortions, or are injured or killed as a result.”

Editorial: Election 2008: Proposition 4

August 10, 2008

“From top to bottom, Proposition 4 is the most deceptive measure on the ballot this fall.”

“California has a proud history of putting the health and safety of a child before a parent’s right to know – not just for abortions but in cases of drug abuse, mental illness and sexually transmitted disease.”

“Reducing the number of teenage abortions is an excellent goal. The way to make that happen is through education and effective contraceptive – not by preying on the most troubled of pregnant teens to make a political point.”
Sarah’s abortion story can stay on ballot, judge rules in Proposition 4 case

August 9, 2008

“On Friday, a Sacramento judge ruled that Sarah’s story may remain on official ballot guides to be mailed to 13 million California voters – even though there is no ‘Sarah.’”

Fisher: Anti-abortion ballot measure still bad idea

August 6, 2008

“After similar measures were defeated at the polls in 2005 and 2006, you might think the anti-abortion folks would be getting desperate. You'd be right. That’s why they came up with ‘Sarah’s Law.’”
Prop. 4 backers admit girl’s death is not applicable

April 14, 2008

“Campaign spokeswoman (Katie) Short...acknowledges that the measure is promoted by those who favor outlawing abortion. ‘Do we think abortions are bad? Yes,’ she said. ‘That’s why we support this law. It reduces teen pregnancies and abortions.’”