

# Campaign law back on books

By BUD O'BRIEN

Santa Cruz County supervisors voted Tuesday morning to reinstate the campaign spending limit ordinance they had voted last month to repeal.

The situation was heavy with irony. The three supervisors who had voted to repeal the ordinance in the first place — Pat Liberty, Dan Forbus and Marilyn Liddicoat — were the most insistent this morning that it be reinstated immediately. The two who had opposed the repeal — Gary Patton and Chris Matthews — fought against reinstating the ordinance in favor of having the matter put on the ballot.

The confusion came about when the supervisors discovered that their action in repealing the ordinance would be retroactive, meaning that anyone who had violated the ordinance while it was in effect would be free from subsequent prosecution. Because a Grand Jury investigation of the June primary election is currently underway, such a retroactive provision would

give at least the appearance of board interference in the investigation.

As a consequence, the three who had voted to repeal the ordinance pledged to reinstate the ordinance, at least until the Grand Jury investigation is concluded.

In the meantime, however, a group of supporters of the campaign ordinance, angered at the repeal, organized as Citizens for a Clean Election and began gathering petitions designed to thwart the board majority's action.

The petition drive was enormously successful and Tuesday its sponsors turned in petitions containing more than 10,000 signatures, presumably of registered voters. But this also complicated matters. The law says that if enough signatures of registered voters are gathered, the board must either reinstate the ordinance or submit the matter to a vote of the people.

The option chosen yesterday by the board majority was to reinstate the ordinance. However, that leaves supervisors free to repeal it again anytime they wish. That's why Patton and Matthews were reluctant to approve the reinstatement. They would have preferred the matter go to a vote, which would have taken the matter out of the hands of the majority.

But Matthews' motion to put the matter on the ballot failed, with the "conservative" majority voting against it.

Supervisor Liddicoat, who was absent on vacation when much of the controversy took place, had the most to say about the entire issue. She repeated arguments she had used many times before in explaining why she originally voted to repeal the ordinance: That it was discriminatory (applying only to county officials, not to city candidates); that it was

used mainly to harass law-abiding citizens ("That's the way the left stays in office"); and that it was "unconstitutional."

Nevertheless, Mrs. Liddicoat said she was going to vote to reinstate the ordinance "only because I don't want to be accused of interfering with the Grand Jury's inquisition." (Mrs. Liddicoat argued, as she had previously, that the Grand Jury investigation was politically motivated and a waste of the taxpayers' money in light of the investigation of the June election already conducted by the Secretary of State's office and the failure of lawsuits aimed at overturning the election).

Mrs. Liberty contended that the petitions signed by the 10,000 or so people were worded so that the signers probably thought they were calling for a spending ordi-

nance for the whole county, including the four incorporated cities. In any event, she said by voting to repeal the repeal, the board was abiding by the mandate of the petitions. She also argued that a thorough overhaul of the campaign spending laws on a national and state level, as well as on a county level, was the only way to reasonably approach the problem.

In the end Patton voted to support the reinstatement of the ordinance, even though he would much prefer to "let the public's will be done and put it on the ballot." On the final vote Matthews abstained.

The campaign ordinance, which is now officially reinstated, limits the amount of money an individual can give to a candidate to \$100 and the amount a person can donate on behalf of or in opposition to a ballot measure to \$500.

## Student charged

A student manager of the Aptos High School snack bar was arrested Monday on a charge of stealing funds from the store's daily receipts.

According to a sheriff's report, the student, Craig David Dixon, 18, of 600 Cabrillo Park Court, Aptos, is accused of having taken a total of \$865 since January.

Dixon is said to have told a sheriff's deputy he took a different amount of money each day and then "altered the books" to cover the deficit. The student told the officer he had taken the money "to cover his expenses" after he was removed out of his parents' home in January, due to family troubles.

## Rio residents

By BOB SMITH

Long distance busing should not be used to break segregated schools in the Pajaro Valley Unified School District, Rio del Mar Improvement Association directors agreed Monday afternoon.

The directors told Ray Garcia, chairman of the school district's desegregation committee, that they didn't believe students should be bused from one end of the district — the largest in the county — to the other as a solution to the segregated schools found in the southern Pajaro Valley.

Garcia said 47 percent of the students in the district have been identified as members of a minority group.

And in designating a school as "segregated," the committee decided that 62 percent or more of the students must be from minorities.

Nine schools, all located in the southern portions of the

district now carry the designation, Garcia said. They are: Linscott, 99 percent minority; Radcliff, 93 percent, Freedom, 78 percent; Pajaro, 77 percent; E.A. Hall, 76 percent; Mintie White, 76 percent; Hyde, 70 percent, Hall Elementary, 65 percent; and MacQuiddy, 63 percent.

The designation applies only to the numbers of minority students in a school. "We are not looking at the reverse — the majority isolated schools," said Garcia.

Garcia said the committee will be submitting its report to the school board later this year, and he doesn't believe there will be busing.

"I don't think there will be busing to any degree, at least not long distance busing," Garcia said.

"Ninety five percent of the committee favors short-range busing," as a solution," Garcia said, "particularly when 63 percent of the