

**Guiding Questions:**

1. What is an independent contractor?
2. What is the difference between independent contractor and employee?
3. What values do you think are at stake in this proposition?
4. What does Deuteronomy have to say about this topic?
5. How can we apply our own values and the values in Deuteronomy to make a decision.

**Pro on 22:** By a 4:1 margin, independent surveys show app-based drivers overwhelmingly prefer to work as independent contractors, not employees. These drivers have other jobs, family obligations or health issues and need flexibility to continue this work and supplemental income to support their families. Prohibiting independent contract work for app-based drivers would eliminate hundreds of thousands of jobs. Eliminating drivers' ability to work as independent contractors will end the flexibility the vast majority of drivers need, severely damaging the proven on-demand model that quickly matches customers with drivers. The result will be much longer wait times, significantly higher consumer prices, and the permanent shutdown of services in many areas. **A Yes Vote** Means: Protects the choice of app-based drivers to work as independent contractors. Improves app-based work by requiring companies to provide new benefits, including guaranteed minimum earnings, funding for health benefits, medical and disability coverage for on-the-job injuries. Creates expanded public safety protections, including requiring ongoing background checks and safety courses, zero tolerance for drug and alcohol offenses, and criminal penalty for impersonating a driver.

**California Proposition 22, App-Based Drivers as Contractors and Labor Policies**

**Initiative** *Classifies drivers for app-based transportation (rideshare) and delivery companies as "independent contractors," not "employees," unless company sets drivers' hours, requires acceptance of specific ride and delivery requests, or restricts working for other companies. Independent contractors are not covered by various state employment laws—including minimum wage, overtime, unemployment insurance, and workers' compensation. Instead, independent-contractor drivers would be entitled to other compensation—including minimum earnings, healthcare subsidies, and vehicle insurance. If passed, Proposition 22 would (in addition to the above) criminalize impersonation of drivers and restrict certain local regulation of app-based drivers.*

**Deuteronomy 24:14-15**

14) לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂק שֹׁכֵר עִבִּי וְאֶבְיֹן מֵאֲחֵיךָ אִם מִגֵּרְךָ אֲשֶׁר בְּאַרְצְךָ בְּשַׁעֲרֶיךָ:

You shall not abuse a needy and destitute laborer, whether a fellow countryman or a stranger in one of the communities of your land.

15) בְּיוֹמוֹ תִּתֵּן שֹׁכְרְךָ וְלֹא־תְבוֹא עָלָיו הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כִּי עִבִּי הוּא וְאֵלָיו הוּא (נִשָּׂא אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ וְלֹא־יִקְרָא עָלֶיךָ אֶל־יְהוָה וְהָיָה בְּךָ חַטָּא: ס)

You must pay him his wages on the same day, before the sun sets, for he is needy and urgently depends on it; else he will cry to God against you and you will incur guilt.

**Con on 22:** Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash paid to put Proposition 22 on the November ballot. They hired lawyers to write this misleading initiative and paid political operatives millions to collect the voter signatures needed. Why? To create a special exemption for themselves that will legally deny their driver's basic rights and protections at work like paid sick leave, workers' compensation, or unemployment benefits. Prop. 22 only applies to Uber, Lyft, DoorDash, and other app-based delivery and transportation companies. Their goal is profit. Only these companies would profit from this special exemption. Current law requires Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash to provide their drivers with a minimum wage, healthcare, paid sick leave, unemployment, and workers' compensation coverage, just like every other California business. The Attorney General recently sued them for breaking the law and for relentlessly avoiding responsibility to their drivers for years. With your vote, you can help make them stop! **Vote NO on Prop. 22. A No Vote** Means: App drivers, many Latino, Black, or from other communities of color, should have sick leave, healthcare, unemployment benefits, and flexibility in their scheduling. So don't let Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash confuse the issue. They claim this is about "flexibility" for "part-time" drivers. However, current law in no way limits driver flexibility. Prop. 22 was written by Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash for Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash, NOT their drivers. That's why tens of thousands of drivers have joined us to urge a NO vote. Don't let Uber, Lyft, and DoorDash write their own special law.

1. What is affirmative action?
2. Why might affirmative action be beneficial to society?
3. Why might it be harmful?
4. What values do you think are at stake in this proposition? Underline them!
5. How can you apply the Jewish texts at the bottom? What is the main Jewish value in Genesis?
6. How can we apply our values and that from genesis to a yes or no vote on this proposition?

**Pro on 16:** The racial disparities in COVID-19-related deaths and unemployment, and police violence against Black and Latino people have demonstrated the existence of systemic racism and the lack of progress in achieving equality. California's current ban on affirmative action has hindered the ability of women and underrepresented minorities to get hired, win state contracts and attend universities. Proposition 16 would ensure all Californians are given equal opportunities. But it will not allow for the use of racial quotas, which are unconstitutional. **A Yes Vote:** repeals Proposition 209 (1996) Allows race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin to be used in decision-making for admissions/employment decisions (state government, local governments, public universities, and other public entities)

**California Proposition 16 "Allow Diversity as a Factor in Public Employment, Education, and Contracting Decisions. Legislative Constitutional Amendment"** What it is: Proposition 16 would repeal Proposition 209, passed in 1996, which banned discrimination and preferential treatment on account of a person's or group's race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin from being used in decisions about public employment, public education, and public contracting. Essentially, Proposition 209 banned affirmative action in terms of race-based or sex-based preferences in California; Prop 16 would bring it back. If passed, the state government, local governments, public universities, and other political subdivisions and public entities would be allowed to develop and use affirmative action programs that grant preferences based on race, sex, color, ethnicity, and national origin in public employment, public education, and public contracting.

**Con on 16:** Reinstating affirmative action would not eliminate racism or sexism. Instead, it would violate several state and federal laws. It would only provide a superficial fix to deeper socioeconomic problems. Proposition 16 is based on partial evidence and is discriminatory and divisive

**A No Vote:** Keeps Proposition 209 (1996) Keeps the ban on discrimination against or the granting of preferential treatment to persons on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin in public employment.

**Genesis 1:27**

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים | אֶת-הָאָדָם בְּצַלְמוֹ בְּצַלְמֵ אֱלֹהִים בָּרָא אֹתוֹ זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה בָּרָא אֹתָם:

And God created a human being in God's image, in the image of God God created it; male and female God created them.

**Yalkut Shimoni, 1:13**

God formed Adam out of dust from all over the world: yellow clay, white sand, black loam, and red soil. Therefore, no one can declare to any race or color of people that they do not belong here since this soil is not their home.