

# Let People Vote on I-1000

## The Difference between I-1000 and I-200

> **I-1000 can be summed up in one sentence: It would abolish the standard of equality for all, regardless of race, as required by I-200, and replace it with a system that uses different rules for people of different races.**

> A student applying for a college education would have her race used as a factor in deciding what school she could get in.

> A small business owner would find that his or her race would be a factor in deciding whether they would receive a government contract.

> Someone applying for a government job would find that her or his race could determine whether they are hired.

> How can this not divide people? Should't we all be protected from discrimination based on our skin color?

> While claiming to oppose preferential treatment, I-1000 actually allows it by *changing the definition of preferential treatment!* Under I-1000 "preferential treatment" only happens when race or gender is the "sole" factor in choosing someone - a nearly impossible standard to prove. Bluntly put, **if I-1000 is passed, the government can openly and legally discriminate against Asian male or Asian female in employment, contracting, and especially in college admissions.**

> **Legislative staff acknowledged that in last Thursday's joint hearing that I-1000 will remove preferential treatment that honorably discharged veterans earned with their services.**

> I-1000 seeks to repeal I-200, a voter approved initiative. **Voter approved I-200 by more than 58% of votes in 1998. Why shouldn't voters be allowed to decide whether to change it?**

## Facts about I-200

> I-200 does not end all affirmative action programs. It does not end outreach programs, it does not end affirmative action based on helping people who are lower income or economically disadvantaged.

> **I-200 prohibits only those programs that use race or gender to select a less qualified applicant over a more deserving applicant for public job, contract or admission to a state college or university.**

> AG Office issued opinion in 2017 and said 'Initiative 200 does not categorically prohibit all uses of race- or sex- conscious measures in state contracting. The measure allows the use of measures that take race or gender into account in state contracting without elevating a less qualified contractor over a more qualified contractor.'

> The most recent data from National Center for Education Statistics are showing that, among total postsecondary student population in Washington in 2016, 62.9% was white, 13.0% was Hispanic, 10.1% was Asian, 4.8% was Black. During that time, 69.7% of the state's general population was White, 12.6% was Hispanic, 8.0% was Asian, 3.6% was Black.

> Seattle Times also recently reported that UW campus in Bothell was "among the highest in the U.S. for its student body that demographically reflects the state's share of black young adults" and "The UW campuses in Seattle and Tacoma also earned high nods for black student enrollment."

> OMWBE's own data shows that % of OMWBE certified Asian American firms increased from 14.8% in 1997, the year before I-200 passed, to 23.6% in 2018; African American firms increased from 14.9% to 15.2%; Hispanic firms increased from 8.9% to 10.6%; Caucasian firms, on the other hand, decreased from 56.1% to 44.3%. In other words, diversity among OMWBE firms *increased*.