

**ELIMINATES RIGHT OF SAME-SEX COUPLES TO MARRY.
INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**

OFFICIAL TITLE AND SUMMARY

PREPARED BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

ELIMINATES RIGHT OF SAME-SEX COUPLES TO MARRY. INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

- Changes the California Constitution to eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry in California.
- Provides that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.

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

- Over the next few years, potential revenue loss, mainly from sales taxes, totaling in the several tens of millions of dollars, to state and local governments.
- In the long run, likely little fiscal impact on state and local governments.

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

BACKGROUND

In March 2000, California voters passed Proposition 22 to specify in state law that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California. In May 2008, the California Supreme Court ruled that the statute enacted by Proposition 22 and other statutes that limit marriage to a relationship between a man and a woman violated the equal protection clause of the California Constitution. It also held that individuals of the same sex have the right to marry under the California Constitution. As a result of the ruling, marriage between individuals of the same sex is currently valid or recognized in the state.

PROPOSAL

This measure amends the California Constitution to specify that only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California. As a result, notwithstanding the California Supreme Court ruling of May 2008, marriage would be limited to individuals of the opposite sex, and individuals of the same sex would not have the right to marry in California.

FISCAL EFFECTS

Because marriage between individuals of the same sex is currently valid in California, there would likely be an increase in spending on weddings by same-sex couples in California over the next few years. This would result in increased revenue, primarily sales tax revenue, to state and local governments.

By specifying that marriage between individuals of the same sex is not valid or recognized, this measure could result in revenue loss, mainly from sales taxes, to state and local governments. Over the next few years, this loss could potentially total in the several tens of millions of dollars. Over the long run, this measure would likely have little fiscal impact on state and local governments.

★ ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 8 ★

Proposition 8 is simple and straightforward. It contains the same 14 words that were previously approved in 2000 by over 61% of California voters: “Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.”

Because four activist judges in San Francisco wrongly overturned the people’s vote, we need to pass this measure as a constitutional amendment to RESTORE THE DEFINITION OF MARRIAGE as a man and a woman.

Proposition 8 is about preserving marriage; *it’s not an attack on the gay lifestyle*. Proposition 8 doesn’t take away any rights or benefits of gay or lesbian domestic partnerships. Under California law, “domestic partners shall have the same rights, protections, and benefits” as married spouses. (Family Code § 297.5.) There are NO exceptions. Proposition 8 WILL NOT change this.

YES on Proposition 8 does three simple things:

It restores the definition of marriage to what the vast majority of California voters already approved and human history has understood marriage to be.

It overturns the outrageous decision of four activist Supreme Court judges who ignored the will of the people.

It protects our children from being taught in public schools that “same-sex marriage” is the same as traditional marriage.

Proposition 8 protects marriage as an essential institution of society. While death, divorce, or other circumstances may prevent the ideal, the best situation for a child is to be raised by a married mother and father.

The narrow decision of the California Supreme Court isn’t just about “live and let live.” State law may require teachers to instruct children as young as kindergarteners about marriage. (Education Code § 51890.) If the gay marriage ruling is not overturned, TEACHERS COULD BE REQUIRED to teach young children there is *no difference* between gay marriage and traditional marriage.

We should not accept a court decision that may result in public schools teaching our kids that gay marriage is okay. That is an issue for parents to discuss with their children according to their own values and beliefs. *It shouldn’t be forced on us against our will.*

Some will try to tell you that Proposition 8 takes away legal rights of gay domestic partnerships. That is false. Proposition 8 DOES NOT take away any of those rights and does not interfere with gays living the lifestyle they choose.

However, while gays have the right to their private lives, *they do not have the right to redefine marriage* for everyone else.

CALIFORNIANS HAVE NEVER VOTED FOR SAME-SEX MARRIAGE. If gay activists want to legalize gay marriage, they should put it on the ballot. Instead, they have gone behind the backs of voters and convinced four activist judges in San Francisco to redefine marriage for the rest of society. That is the wrong approach.

Voting YES on Proposition 8 RESTORES the definition of marriage that was approved by over 61% of voters. Voting YES overturns the decision of four activist judges. Voting YES *protects our children*.

Please vote YES on Proposition 8 to RESTORE the meaning of marriage.

RON PRENTICE, President
California Family Council

ROSEMARIE “ROSIE” AVILA, Governing Board Member
Santa Ana Unified School District

BISHOP GEORGE MCKINNEY, Director
Coalition of African American Pastors

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 8 ★

Don’t be tricked by scare tactics.

- PROP. 8 DOESN’T HAVE ANYTHING TO DO WITH SCHOOLS

There’s NOT ONE WORD IN 8 ABOUT EDUCATION. In fact, local school districts and parents—not the state—develop health education programs for their schools.

NO CHILD CAN BE FORCED, AGAINST THE WILL OF THEIR PARENTS, TO BE TAUGHT ANYTHING about health and family issues. CALIFORNIA LAW PROHIBITS IT.

And NOTHING IN STATE LAW REQUIRES THE MENTION OF MARRIAGE IN KINDERGARTEN!

It’s a smokescreen.

- DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS and MARRIAGE AREN’T THE SAME.

CALIFORNIA STATUTES CLEARLY IDENTIFY NINE REAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MARRIAGE AND DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS. Only marriage provides the security that spouses provide one another—it’s why people get married in the first place!

Think about it. Married couples depend on spouses when they’re sick, hurt, or aging. They accompany them into ambulances or hospital rooms, and help make life-and-death decisions, with no questions asked. ONLY MARRIAGE ENDS

THE CONFUSION AND GUARANTEES THE CERTAINTY COUPLES CAN COUNT ON IN TIMES OF GREATEST NEED.

Regardless of how you feel about this issue, we should guarantee the same fundamental freedoms to every Californian.

- PROP. 8 TAKES AWAY THE RIGHTS OF GAY AND LESBIAN COUPLES AND TREATS THEM DIFFERENTLY UNDER THE LAW.

Equality under the law is one of the basic foundations of our society.

Prop. 8 means one class of citizens can enjoy the dignity and responsibility of marriage, and another cannot. That’s unfair.

PROTECT FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOMS. SAY NO TO PROP. 8.

www.NoonProp8.com

ELLYNE BELL, School Board Member
Sacramento City Schools

RACHAEL SALCIDO, Associate Professor of Law
McGeorge School of Law

DELAINE EASTIN
Former California State Superintendent of Public Instruction

★ ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 8 ★

OUR CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION—the law of our land—SHOULD GUARANTEE THE SAME FREEDOMS AND RIGHTS TO EVERYONE—NO ONE group SHOULD be singled out to BE TREATED DIFFERENTLY.

In fact, our nation was founded on the principle that all people should be treated equally. EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER THE LAW IS THE FOUNDATION OF AMERICAN SOCIETY.

That's what this election is about—equality, freedom, and fairness, for all.

Marriage is the institution that conveys dignity and respect to the lifetime commitment of any couple. PROPOSITION 8 WOULD DENY LESBIAN AND GAY COUPLES that same DIGNITY AND RESPECT.

That's why Proposition 8 is wrong for California.

Regardless of how you feel about this issue, the freedom to marry is fundamental to our society, just like the freedoms of religion and speech.

PROPOSITION 8 MANDATES ONE SET OF RULES FOR GAY AND LESBIAN COUPLES AND ANOTHER SET FOR EVERYONE ELSE. That's just not fair. OUR LAWS SHOULD TREAT EVERYONE EQUALLY.

In fact, the government has no business telling people who can and cannot get married. Just like government has no business telling us what to read, watch on TV, or do in our private lives. We don't need Prop. 8; WE DON'T NEED MORE GOVERNMENT IN OUR LIVES.

REGARDLESS OF HOW ANYONE FEELS ABOUT MARRIAGE FOR GAY AND LESBIAN COUPLES, PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE SINGLED OUT FOR UNFAIR TREATMENT UNDER THE LAWS OF OUR STATE.

Those committed and loving couples who want to accept the responsibility that comes with marriage should be treated like everyone else.

DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS ARE NOT MARRIAGE.

When you're married and your spouse is sick or hurt, there is no confusion: you get into the ambulance or hospital room with no questions asked. IN EVERYDAY LIFE, AND ESPECIALLY IN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS, DOMESTIC PARTNERSHIPS ARE SIMPLY NOT ENOUGH. Only marriage provides the certainty and the security that people know they can count on in their times of greatest need.

EQUALITY UNDER THE LAW IS A FUNDAMENTAL CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTEE. Prop. 8 separates one group of Californians from another and excludes them from enjoying the same rights as other loving couples.

Forty-six years ago I married my college sweetheart, Julia. We raised three children—two boys and one girl. The boys are married, with children of their own. Our daughter, Liz, a lesbian, can now also be married—if she so chooses.

All we have ever wanted for our daughter is that she be treated with the same dignity and respect as her brothers—with the same freedoms and responsibilities as every other Californian.

My wife and I never treated our children differently, we never loved them any differently, and now the law doesn't treat them differently, either.

Each of our children now has the same rights as the others, to choose the person to love, commit to, and to marry.

Don't take away the equality, freedom, and fairness that everyone in California—straight, gay, or lesbian—deserves.

Please join us in voting NO on Prop. 8.

SAMUEL THORON, Former President
Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays
JULIA MILLER THORON, Parent

★ REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 8 ★

Proposition 8 is about traditional marriage; it is not an attack on gay relationships. Under California law gay and lesbian domestic partnerships are treated equally; they already have the same rights as married couples. Proposition 8 does not change that.

What Proposition 8 does is restore the meaning of marriage to what human history has understood it to be and over 61% of California voters approved just a few years ago.

Your YES vote ensures that the will of the people is respected. It overturns the flawed legal reasoning of four judges in San Francisco who wrongly disregarded the people's vote, and ensures that gay marriage can be legalized only through a vote of the people.

Your YES vote ensures that parents can teach their children about marriage according to their own values and beliefs without conflicting messages being forced on young children in public schools that gay marriage is okay.

Your YES vote on Proposition 8 means that only marriage between a man and a woman will be valid or recognized in California, regardless of when or where performed. But Prop. 8 will NOT take away any other rights or benefits of gay couples.

Gays and lesbians have the right to live the lifestyle they choose, but they do not have the right to redefine marriage for everyone else. Proposition 8 respects the rights of gays while still reaffirming traditional marriage.

Please vote YES on Proposition 8 to RESTORE the definition of marriage that the voters already approved.

DR. JANE ANDERSON, M.D., Fellow
American College of Pediatricians
ROBERT BOLINGBROKE, Council Commissioner
San Diego-Imperial Council, Boy Scouts of America
JERALEE SMITH, Director of Education/California
Parents and Friends of Ex-Gays and Gays (PFOX)