



ESPLER PROJECT

Erotic Service Providers Legal, Education and Research Project inc.

2261 Market Street # A548

San Francisco, California 94114

<http://esplerp.org/> [info@esplerp.org](mailto:info@esplerp.org)

Proposition 35 falls short of its promise, and voters ought to send it back to the drawing board.

Criminalization does not bring protection.

If passed, California will be writing another blank check to the proponents of the C.A.S.E. Act. This short-sighted ballot measure relies on a broad definition of pimping. This includes; parents, children, room mates, domestic partners, and landlords of prostitutes to be labeled as sex offenders. The real goal is to gain access to asset forfeiture to benefit the endorsing law enforcement agencies and non-profits. Proposition 35 has no oversight or accountability. This will open the door to corrupt practiced we've seen before in drug enforcement.

[http://www.contracostatimes.com/news/ci\\_20549513/defendant-cnet-corruption-scandal-gets-federal-prison-sentence](http://www.contracostatimes.com/news/ci_20549513/defendant-cnet-corruption-scandal-gets-federal-prison-sentence)

If passed, this Act will have a detrimental effect on the state budget. This statute relies on resources that criminalize adults who are arrested for prostitution indiscriminately in prostitution stings performed under the guise of rescuing children. <http://www.sfgate.com/default/article/Bay-Area-sweep-nets-child-prostitute-pimp-suspects-3661229.php>

Research shows that most teens arrested for prostitution do not have pimps; thus the idea that this statute will pay for its self is not supported by the evidence.

Lost Boys: New research demolishes the stereotype

<http://www.riverfronttimes.com/2011-11-03/news/commercial-sexual-exploitation-of-children-john-jay-college-ric-curtis-meredith-dank-underage-prostitution-sex-trafficking-minors/>

This Act relies on failed polices that use criminalization as a means to arrest the under-aged all the while calling it "rescue".

UN Advisory group member, Cheryl Overs on Tackling Child Commercial Sexual Exploitation <http://www.plri.org/story/tackling-child-commercial-sexual-exploitation> Don't expand these already failed polices.

<http://www.traffickingpolicyresearchproject.org/>

If passed, the state will likely be required to defend this statute in court as it will likely face legal challenges due to several questionable and possibly unconstitutional provisions including the following: possibly unconstitutionally vague definition of "human trafficking" including the "intent to distribute obscene matter", possibly unconstitutionally "cruel and unusual" punishments including excessive prison terms and fines, possibly unconstitutionally inhibiting a defendant's right to introduce evidence in defense trials.

This Act will cost the state additional unspecified amounts: It would increase the workload to already over-burdened probation departments. Consider that case of Jaycee Duggard and the \$20,000,000 that California had to pay her for not protecting her against a violent sexual predator. It would require training of police officers to enforce the expanded provisions of the Act.

<http://www.sfbg.com/politics/2012/06/16/bringing-heat>

Laws are being enforced.

<http://blog.sfgate.com/incontracosta/2012/06/25/concord-police-assist-with-multi-agency-operation-targeting-child-prostitution/>

This misguided Proposition uses fact-less fear mongering to goad voters into gambling on future fines and fees that risk redirecting scarce state resources away from existing social services intervention programs.

The policy underlying this Act was created outside the effected populations. The Proponents stand to benefit financially by getting their salaries paid "to deliver services" to consensually working sex workers. Sex workers do not want to be forced out of work via criminal laws and forced into receive services from the Proponents. Sex workers demand a voice.

Lets be clear. Criminalization of prostitution is the condition that allows exploitation. Let us instead address that issue.

Vote No on these failed policies.

Vote No on Proposition 35.

Maxine Doogan, President Manual Jimenez, CFO Erotic Service Providers Legal Education and Research Project Inc.

