1996

Prohibition Against Discrimination or Preferential Treatment by State and Other Public Entities.

Prohibition Against Discrimination or Preferential Treatment by State and Other Public Entities. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Official Title and Summary Prepared by the Attorney General

PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION OR PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT BY STATE AND OTHER PUBLIC ENTITIES. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Prohibits the state, local governments, districts, public universities, colleges, and schools, and other government instrumentalities from discriminating against or giving preferential treatment to any individual or group in public employment, public education, or public contracting on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin.
- Does not prohibit reasonably necessary, bona fide qualifications based on sex and actions necessary for receipt of federal funds.
- Mandates enforcement to extent permitted by federal law.
- Requires uniform remedies for violations. Provides for severability of provisions if invalid.

Summary of Legislative Analyst's Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:

- The measure could affect state and local programs that currently cost well in excess of $125 million annually.
- Actual savings to the state and local governments would depend on various factors (such as future court decisions and implementation actions by government entities).

Analysis by the Legislative Analyst

BACKGROUND

The federal, state, and local governments run many programs intended to increase opportunities for various groups—including women and racial and ethnic minority groups. These programs are commonly called "affirmative action" programs. For example, state law identifies specific goals for the participation of women-owned and minority-owned companies on work involved with state contracts. State departments are expected, but not required, to meet these goals, which include that at least 15 percent of the value of contract work should be done by minority-owned companies and at least 5 percent should be done by women-owned companies. The law requires departments, however, to reject bids from companies that have not made sufficient "good faith efforts" to meet these goals.

Other examples of affirmative action programs include:

- Public college and university programs such as scholarship, tutoring, and outreach that are targeted toward minority or women students.
- Goals and timetables to encourage the hiring of members of "underrepresented" groups for state government jobs.
- State and local programs required by the federal government as a condition of receiving federal funds (such as requirements for minority-owned business participation in state highway construction projects funded in part with federal money).

PROPOSAL

This measure would eliminate state and local government affirmative action programs in the areas of public employment, public education, and public contracting to the extent these programs involve "preferential treatment" based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. The specific programs affected by the measure, however, would depend on such factors as (1) court rulings on what types of activities are considered "preferential treatment" and (2) whether federal law requires the continuation of certain programs.

The measure provides exceptions to the ban on preferential treatment when necessary for any of the following reasons:

- To keep the state or local governments eligible to receive money from the federal government.
- To comply with a court order in force as of the effective date of this measure (the day after the election).
- To comply with federal law or the United States Constitution.
- To meet privacy and other considerations based on sex that are reasonably necessary to the normal operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.

FISCAL EFFECT

If this measure is approved by the voters, it could affect a variety of state and local programs. These are discussed in more detail below.

Public Employment and Contracting

The measure would eliminate affirmative action programs used to increase hiring and promotion opportunities for state or local government jobs, where sex, race, or ethnicity are preferential factors in hiring, promotion, training, or recruitment decisions. In addition, the measure would eliminate programs that give preference to women-owned or minority-owned companies on public contracts. Contracts affected by the measure would include contracts for construction projects, purchases of computer equipment, and the hiring of consultants. These prohibitions would not apply to those government agencies that receive money under federal programs that require such affirmative action.

The elimination of these programs would result in savings to the state and local governments. These savings would occur for two reasons. First, government agencies no longer would incur costs to administer the programs. Second, the prices paid on some government contracts would decrease. This would happen because bidders on contracts no longer would need to show "good faith efforts" to use minority-owned or women-owned subcontractors. Thus, state and local governments would save money to the extent they otherwise would have rejected a low bidder—because the bidder did not make a "good faith effort"—and awarded the contract to a higher bidder.

Based on available information, we estimate that the measure would result in savings in employment and contracting programs that could total tens of millions of dollars each year.

Public Schools and Community Colleges

The measure also could affect funding for public schools (kindergarten through grade 12) and community college programs. For instance, the measure could eliminate, or cause fundamental changes to, *voluntary* desegregation programs run by school districts. (It would not, however, affect *court-ordered* desegregation programs.) Examples of desegregation spending that could be affected by the measure include the special funding given to (1) "magnet" schools (in those cases where race or ethnicity are preferential factors in the admission of students to the schools) and (2) designated "racially isolated minority schools" that are located in areas with high proportions of racial or ethnic minorities. We estimate that up to $60 million of state and local funds spent each year on voluntary desegregation programs may be affected by the measure.

In addition, the measure would affect a variety of public school and community college programs such as counseling, tutoring, outreach, student financial aid, and financial aid to selected school districts in those cases where the programs provide preferences to individuals or schools based on race, sex, ethnicity, or national origin. Funds spent on these programs total at least $15 million each year.

Thus, the measure could affect up to $75 million in state spending in public schools and community colleges.

The State Constitution requires the state to spend a certain amount each year on public schools and community colleges. As a result, under most situations, the Constitution would require that funds that cannot be spent on programs because of this measure instead would have to be spent for *other* public school and community college programs.

University of California and California State University

The measure would affect admissions and other programs at the state's public universities. For example, the California State University (CSU) uses race and ethnicity as factors in some of its admissions decisions. If this initiative is passed by the voters, it could no longer do so. In 1995, the Regents of the University of California (UC) changed the UC's admissions policies, effective for the 1997–98 academic year, to eliminate all consideration of race or ethnicity. Passage of this initiative by the voters might require the UC to implement its new admissions policies somewhat sooner.

Both university systems also run a variety of assistance programs for students, faculty, and staff that are targeted to individuals based on sex, race, or ethnicity. These include programs such as outreach, counseling, tutoring, and financial aid. The two systems spend over $50 million each year on programs that probably would be affected by passage of this measure.

Summary

As described above, this measure could affect state and local programs that currently cost well in excess of $125 million annually. The actual amount of this spending that might be saved as a result of this measure could be considerably less, for various reasons:

- The amount of spending affected by this measure could be less depending on (1) court rulings on what types of activities are considered "preferential treatment" and (2) whether federal law requires continuation of certain programs.
- In most cases, any funds that could not be spent for existing programs in public schools and community colleges would have to be spent on other programs in the schools and colleges.
- In addition, the amount affected as a result of *this* measure would be less if any existing affirmative action programs were declared unconstitutional under the United States Constitution. For example, five state affirmative action programs are currently the subject of a lawsuit. If any of these programs are found to be unlawful, then the state could no longer spend money on them—regardless of whether this measure is in effect.
- Finally, some programs we have identified as being affected might be changed to use factors other than those prohibited by the measure. For example, a high school outreach program operated by the UC or the CSU that currently uses a factor such as ethnicity to target spending could be changed to target instead high schools with low percentages of UC or CSU applications.

For the text of Proposition 209 see page 94

209 Prohibition Against Discrimination or Preferential Treatment by State and Other Public Entities. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 209

THE RIGHT THING TO DO!

A generation ago, we did it right. We passed civil rights laws to prohibit discrimination. But special interests hijacked the civil rights movement. Instead of equality, governments imposed quotas, preferences, and set-asides.

Proposition 209 is called the California Civil Rights Initiative because it restates the historic Civil Rights Act and proclaims simply and clearly: "The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group, on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting."

"REVERSE DISCRIMINATION" BASED ON RACE OR GENDER IS PLAIN WRONG!

And two wrongs don't make a right! Today, students are being rejected from public universities because of their RACE. Job applicants are turned away because their RACE does not meet some "goal" or "timetable." Contracts are awarded to high bidders because they are of the preferred RACE.

That's just plain wrong and unjust. Government should not discriminate. It must not give a job, a university admission, or a contract based on race or sex. Government must judge all people equally, without discrimination!

And, remember, Proposition 209 keeps in place all federal and state protections against discrimination!

BRING US TOGETHER!

Government cannot work against discrimination if government itself discriminates. Proposition 209 will stop the terrible programs which are dividing our people and tearing us apart. People naturally feel resentment when the less qualified are preferred. We are all Americans. It's time to bring us together under a single standard of equal treatment under the law.

STOP THE GIVEAWAYS!

Discrimination is costly in other ways. Government agencies throughout California spend millions of your tax dollars for costly bureaucracies to administer racial and gender discrimination that masquerade as "affirmative action." They waste much more of your money awarding high-bid contracts and sweetheart deals based not on the low bid, but on unfair set-asides and preferences. This money could be used for police and fire protection, better education and other programs—for everyone.

THE BETTER CHOICE: HELP ONLY THOSE WHO NEED HELP!

We are individuals! Not every white person is advantaged. And not every "minority" is disadvantaged. Real "affirmative action" originally meant no discrimination and sought to provide opportunity. That's why Proposition 209 prohibits discrimination and preferences and allows any program that does not discriminate, or prefer, because of race or sex, to continue.

The only honest and effective way to address inequality of opportunity is by making sure that *all* California children are provided with the tools to compete in our society. And then let them succeed on a fair, color-blind, race-blind, gender-blind basis.

Let's not perpetuate the myth that "minorities" and women cannot compete without special preferences. Let's instead move forward by returning to the fundamentals of our democracy: individual achievement, equal opportunity and *zero tolerance for discrimination against—or for—any individual.*

Vote for FAIRNESS . . . not favoritism!

Reject preferences by voting YES on Proposition 209.

PETE WILSON
Governor, State of California

WARD CONNERLY
Chairman, California Civil Rights Initiative

PAMELA A. LEWIS
Co-Chair, California Civil Rights Initiative

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 209

THE WRONG THING TO DO!

A generation ago, Rosa Parks launched the Civil Rights movement, which opened the door to equal opportunity for women and minorities in this country. Parks is against this deceptive initiative. Proposition 209 highjacks civil rights language and uses legal lingo to gut protections against discrimination.

Proposition 209 says it eliminates quotas, but in fact, the U.S. Supreme Court already decided—twice—that they are illegal. Proposition 209's real purpose is to eliminate affirmative action equal opportunity programs for qualified women and minorities including tutoring, outreach, and mentoring.

PROPOSITION 209 PERMITS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN.

209 changes the California Constitution to permit state and local governments to discriminate against women, excluding them from job categories.

STOP THE POLITICS OF DIVISION

Newt Gingrich, Pete Wilson, and Pat Buchanan support 209. Why? They are playing the politics of division for their own political gain. We should not allow their ambitions to sacrifice equal opportunity for political opportunism.

209 MEANS OPPORTUNITY BASED SOLELY ON FAVORITISM.

Ward Connerly has already used his influence to get children of his rich and powerful friends into the University of California. 209 reinforces the "who you know" system that favors cronies of the powerful.

"There are those who say, we can stop now, America is a color-blind society. But it isn't yet, there are those who say we have a level playing field, but we don't yet." Retired General Colin Powell [5/25/96].

VOTE NO ON 209!!!

PREMA MATHAI-DAVIS
National Executive Director, YWCA of the U.S.A.

KAREN MANELIS
President, California American Association of University Women

WADE HENDERSON
Executive Director, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

 Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

Prohibition Against Discrimination or Preferential Treatment by State and Other Public Entities. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

209

Argument Against Proposition 209

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 209

HARMS EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN AND MINORITIES

California law currently allows tutoring, mentoring, outreach, recruitment, and counseling to help ensure equal opportunity for women and minorities. Proposition 209 will eliminate affirmative action programs like these that help achieve equal opportunity for women and minorities in public employment, education and contracting. Instead of reforming affirmative action to make it fair for everyone, Proposition 209 makes the current problems worse.

PROPOSITION 209 GOES TOO FAR

The initiative's language is so broad and misleading that it eliminates equal opportunity programs including:

- tutoring and mentoring for minority and women students;
- affirmative action that encourages the hiring and promotion of qualified women and minorities;
- outreach and recruitment programs to encourage applicants for government jobs and contracts; and
- programs designed to encourage girls to study and pursue careers in math and science.

The independent, non-partisan California Legislative Analyst gave the following report on the effects of Proposition 209:

"[T]he measure would eliminate a variety of public school (kindergarten through grade 12) and community college programs such as counseling, tutoring, student financial aid, and financial aid to selected school districts, where these programs are targeted based on race, sex, ethnicity or national origin." [*Opinion Letter to the Attorney General,* 10/15/95].

PROPOSITION 209 CREATES A LOOPHOLE THAT ALLOWS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN

Currently, California women have one of the strongest state constitutional protections against sex discrimination in the country. Now it is difficult for state and local government to discriminate against women in public employment, education, and the awarding of state contracts because of their gender. Proposition 209's loophole will undo this vital state constitutional protection.

PROPOSITION 209 LOOPHOLE PERMITS STATE GOVERNMENT TO DENY WOMEN OPPORTUNITIES IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT, EDUCATION, AND CONTRACTING, SOLELY BASED ON THEIR GENDER.

PROPOSITION 209 CREATES MORE DIVISION IN OUR COMMUNITIES

It is time to put an end to politicians trying to divide our communities for their own political gain. "The initiative is a misguided effort that takes California down the road of division. Whether intentional or not, it pits communities against communities and individuals against each other."

— Reverend Kathy Cooper-Ledesma
President, California Council of Churches.

GENERAL COLIN POWELL'S POSITION ON PROPOSITION 209:

"Efforts such as the California Civil Rights Initiative which poses as an equal opportunities initiative, but which puts at risk every outreach program, sets back the gains made by women and puts the brakes on expanding opportunities for people in need."

— Retired General Colin Powell, 5/25/96.

GENERAL COLIN POWELL IS RIGHT.

VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION 209—
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MATTERS

FRAN PACKARD
President, League of Women Voters of California

ROSA PARKS
Civil Rights Leader

MAXINE BLACKWELL
Vice President, Congress of California Seniors, Affiliate of the National Council of Senior Citizens

Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 209

Don't let them change the subject. Proposition 209 bans discrimination and preferential treatment—period. Affirmative action programs that don't discriminate or grant preferential treatment will be UNCHANGED. Programs designed to ensure that all persons—regardless of race or gender—are informed of opportunities and treated with equal dignity and respect will continue as before.

Note that Proposition 209 doesn't prohibit consideration of economic disadvantage. Under the existing racial-preference system, a wealthy doctor's son may receive a preference for college admission over a dishwasher's daughter simply because he's from an "underrepresented" race. THAT'S UNJUST. The state must remain free to help the economically disadvantaged, but not on the basis of race or sex.

Opponents mislead when they claim that Proposition 209 will legalize sex discrimination. Distinguished legal scholars, liberals and conservatives, have rejected that argument as ERRONEOUS. Proposition 209 adds NEW PROTECTION against sex discrimination on top of existing ones, which remain in full force and effect. It does NOTHING to any existing constitutional provisions.

Clause c is in the text for good reason. It uses the legally-tested language of the original 1964 Civil Rights Act in allowing sex to be considered only if it's a "bona fide" qualification. Without that narrow exception, Proposition 209 would require unisex bathrooms and the hiring of prison guards who strip-search inmates without regard to sex. Anyone opposed to Proposition 209 is opposed to the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Join the millions of voters who support Proposition 209. Vote YES.

DANIEL E. LUNGREN
Attorney General, State of California

QUENTIN L. KOPP
State Senator

GAIL L. HERIOT
Professor of Law

~~enforcement agency, and a brief description of the threat. No more than five thousand dollars ($5,000) in surplus campaign funds may be used, cumulatively, by a candidate or elected officer pursuant to this subdivision. Payments made pursuant to this subdivision shall be made during the two years immediately following the date upon which the campaign funds became surplus campaign funds. The candidate or elected officer shall reimburse the surplus campaign fund account for the fair market value of the security system no later than two years immediately following the date upon which the campaign funds become surplus campaign funds, upon sale of the property on which the system is installed, or prior to the closing of the surplus campaign fund account, whichever comes first. The electronic security system shall be the property of the campaign committee of the candidate or elected officer.~~

~~(b) The payment of the outstanding campaign expenses.~~

~~(c) Contributions to any candidate, committee, or political party, except where otherwise prohibited by law.~~

~~(d) The pro rata repayment of contributors.~~

~~(e) Donations to any religious, scientific, educational, social welfare, civic, or fraternal organization no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual or to any charitable or nonprofit organization which is exempt from taxation under subsection (c) of Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code or Section 17214 or Sections 23701a to 23701j, inclusive, or Section 23701l, 23701n, 23701p, or 23701s of the Revenue and Taxation Code.~~

~~(f) Except where otherwise prohibited by law, held in a segregated fund for future political campaigns, not to be expended except for political activity reasonably related to preparing for future candidacy for elective office.~~

SEC. 42. Section 89519 of the Government Code is repealed.

~~89519. Upon leaving any elected office, or at the end of the postelection reporting period following the defeat of a candidate for elective office, whichever occurs last, campaign funds raised after January 1, 1989, under the control of the former candidate or elected officer shall be considered surplus campaign funds and shall be disclosed pursuant to Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 84100) and shall be used only for the following purposes:~~

~~(a) (1) The payment of outstanding campaign debts or elected officer's expenses.~~

~~(2) For purposes of this subdivision, the payment for, or the reimbursement to the state of, the costs of installing and monitoring an electronic security system in the home or office, or both, of a candidate or elected officer who has received threats to his or her physical safety shall be deemed an outstanding campaign debt or elected officer's expense, provided that the threats arise from his or her activities, duties, or status as a candidate or elected officer and that the threats have been reported to and verified by an appropriate law enforcement agency. Verification shall be determined solely by the law enforcement agency to which the threat was reported. The candidate or elected officer shall report any expenditure of campaign funds made pursuant to this section to the commission. The report to the commission shall include the date that the candidate or elected officer informed the law enforcement agency of the threat, the name and phone number of the law enforcement agency, and a brief description of the threat. No more than five thousand dollars ($5,000) in surplus campaign funds may be used, cumulatively, by a candidate or elected officer pursuant to this subdivision. Payments made pursuant to this subdivision shall be made during the two years immediately following the date upon which the campaign funds became surplus campaign funds. The candidate or elected officer shall reimburse the surplus campaign fund account for the fair market value of the security system no later than two years immediately following the date upon which the campaign funds become surplus campaign funds, upon sale of the property on which the system is installed, or prior to the closing of the surplus campaign fund account, whichever comes first. The electronic security system shall be the property of the campaign committee of the candidate or elected officer.~~

~~(b) The pro rata repayment of contributions.~~

~~(c) Donations to any bona fide charitable, educational, civic, religious, or similar tax-exempt, nonprofit organization, where no substantial part of the proceeds will have a material financial effect on the former candidate or elected officer, any member of his or her immediate family, or his or her campaign treasurer.~~

~~(d) Contributions to a political party or committee so long as the funds are not used to make contributions in support of or opposition to a candidate for elective office.~~

~~(e) Contributions to support or oppose any candidate for federal office, any candidate for elective office in a state other than California, or any ballot measure.~~

~~(f) The payment for professional services reasonably required by the committee to assi in the performance of its administrative functions, including payment for attorney's fees litigation which arises directly out of a candidate's or elected officer's activities, duties, s status as a candidate or elected officer, including, but not limited to, an action to enjoin defamation, defense of an action brought of a violation of state or local campaign, disclosure, or election laws, and an action arising from an election contest or recount.~~

SEC. 43. Section 89519 is added to the Government Code, to read:

89519. Any campaign funds in excess of expenses incurred for the campaign or for expenses specified in subdivision (d) of Section 85305, received by or on behalf of an individual who seeks nomination for election, or election to office, shall be deemed to be surplus campaign funds and shall be distributed within 90 days after withdrawal, defeat, or election to office in the following manner:

(a) No more than ten thousand dollars ($10,000) may be deposited in the candidate's officeholder account; except such surplus from a campaign fund for the general election shall not be deposited into the officeholder account within 60 days immediately following the election.

(b) Any remaining surplus funds shall be distributed to any political party, returned to contributors on a pro rata basis, or turned over to the General Fund.

CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 44. This act shall be liberally construed to accomplish its purposes.

LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS

SEC. 45. The provisions of Section 81012 of the Government Code which allow legislative amendments to the Political Reform Act of 1974 shall apply to all the provisions of this act except for Sections 84201, 85301, 85303, 85313, 85400, and 85402.

APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS

SEC. 46. Nothing in this law shall exempt any person from applicable provisions of any other laws of this state.

SEVERABILITY

SEC. 47. (a) If any provision of this law, or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this law to the extent it can be given effect, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby, and to this extent the provisions of this law are severable.

(b) If the expenditure limitations of Section 85400 of this law shall be held invalid, the contribution limitations specified in Sections 85301 through 85313 shall apply.

CONFLICTING BALLOT MEASURES

SEC. 48. If this act is approved by voters but superseded by any other conflicting ballot measure approved by more voters at the same election, and the conflicting ballot measure is later held invalid, it is the intent of the voters that this act shall be self-executing and given full force of the law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 49. This law shall become effective January 1, 1997.

AMENDMENT TO POLITICAL REFORM ACT

SEC. 50. This chapter shall amend the Political Reform Act of 1974 as amended and all of its provisions which do not conflict with this chapter shall apply to the provisions of this chapter.

Proposition 209: Text of Proposed Law

This initiative measure is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article II, Section 8 of the Constitution.

This initiative measure expressly amends the Constitution by adding a section thereto; therefore, new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE I

Section 31 is added to Article I of the California Constitution as follows:

SEC. 31. (a) The state shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.

(b) This section shall apply only to action taken after the section's effective date.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as prohibiting bona fide qualifications based on sex which are reasonably necessary to the normal operation of public employment, public education, or public contracting.

(d) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as invalidating any court order or consent decree which is in force as of the effective date of this section.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be interpreted as prohibiting action which must be taken to establish or maintain eligibility for any federal program, where ineligibility would result in a loss of federal funds to the state.

(f) For the purposes of this section, "state" shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the state itself, any city, county, city and county, public university system, including the University of California, community college district, school district, special district, or any other political subdivision or governmental instrumentality of or within the state.

(g) The remedies available for violations of this section shall be the same, regardless of the injured party's race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin, as are otherwise available for violations of then-existing California antidiscrimination law.

(h) This section shall be self-executing. If any part or parts of this section are found to be in conflict with federal law or the United States Constitution, the section shall be implemented to the maximum extent that federal law and the United States Constitution permit. Any provision held invalid shall be severable from the remaining portions of this section.

Proposition 210: Text of Proposed Law

This initiative measure is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article II, Section 8 of the Constitution.

This initiative measure adds a section to the Labor Code; therefore, new provisions proposed to be added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

PROPOSED LAW

LIVING WAGE ACT OF 1996

Section 1. The People of California find and declare that:

Because of inflation, Californians who earn the minimum wage can buy less today than at any time in the past 40 years;

At $4.25 per hour, the current minimum wage punishes hard work. It is so low th minimum wage workers often make less than people on welfare;

Increasing the minimum wage will reward work by making it pay more than welfare;

Because good paying jobs are becoming so hard to find, it is more important than ever that California has a living minimum wage;

The purpose of the Living Wage Act of 1996 is to restore the purchasing power of the