1960

Voter Information Guide for 1960, General Election

Proposed

AMENDMENTS TO CONSTITUTION

PROPOSITIONS AND PROPOSED LAWS

Together With Arguments

To Be Submitted to the Electors
of the State of California at the

GENERAL ELECTION
TUESDAY, NOV. 8, 1960

Compiled by RALPH N. KLEPS, Legislative Counsel
Distributed by FRANK M. JORDAN, Secretary of State

Part I—Arguments

FOR THE CALIFORNIA WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BOND ACT.
This act provides for a bond issue of one billion, seven hundred fifty million dollars ($1,750,000,000) to be used by the Department of Water Resources for the development of the water resources of the State.

1

AGAINST THE CALIFORNIA WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BOND ACT.
This act provides for a bond issue of one billion, seven hundred fifty million dollars ($1,750,000,000) to be used by the Department of Water Resources for the development of the water resources of the State.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 1, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel *

This proposed bond act, entitled the California Water Resources Development Bond Act, would provide $1,750,000,000 derived from state general obligation bonds to assist in constructing a State Water Resources Development System. This System would consist of:

(1) The "State Water Facilities," which would include the Oroville Dam and other dams, aqueducts and facilities needed to transport water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to designated delivery points in various areas as far south as San Diego County and which would also include a provision for the expenditure of $130,000,000 for loans and grants for local water development projects.

(2) Facilities now or hereafter authorized by Congress as part of the Central Valley Project or the California Water Plan; and

(3) Additional facilities which the Department of Water Resources deems necessary and desirable to meet local needs, including flood control, and to augment supplies of water in the Delta.

The $1,750,000,000 to be authorized in general obligation bonds would be used to construct the designated "State Water Facilities." However, the measure would specifically require available California Water Fund money (derived principally from revenues received by the State from tideland oil and gas) and surplus project revenues to be first expended on the "State Water Facilities." It would also make bond proceeds, in an amount equal to such expenditures from the California Water Fund, available for the construction of facilities the Department of Water Resources deems necessary and desirable to meet local needs, including flood control, and to augment supplies of water in the Delta. When California Water Fund money and surplus project revenues are no longer needed for the "State Water Facilities," they could be expended upon any facilities of the State Water Resources Development System.

This bond act would pledge the full faith and credit of the State for the payment of the bonds and would appropriate from the General Fund the sum necessary to pay the principal and interest on the bonds. Annual transfers of project revenues to the General Fund would be made to meet bond service payments. If project revenues in any year were insufficient to meet such payment, an amount of money equal to the deficiency would be transferred to the General Fund from project revenues as soon as it became available, with simple interest thereon at the same rate as borne by the bonds.

The Department of Water Resources would be required to enter into contracts for the sale, delivery or use of water or power, or for other services and facilities made available by the State Water Resources Development System, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Legislature. The measure would provide that such contracts shall not be impaired by subsequent acts of the Legislature during the time any of the bonds are outstanding.

* Section 1509.7 of the Elections Code requires the Legislative Counsel to prepare an impartial analysis of measures appearing on the ballot.

Argument in Favor of California Water Resources Development Bond Act

Your vote on this measure will decide whether California will continue to prosper.

This Act, if approved, will launch the statewide water development program which will meet present and future demands of all areas of California. The program will not be a burden on the taxpayer; no new state taxes are involved; the bonds are repaid from project revenues, through the sale of water and power. In other words, it will pay for itself. The bonds will be used over a period of many years and will involve an approximate annual expenditure averaging only $75 million, as compared, for example with $600 million a year we spend on highways.

Existing facilities for furnishing water for California's needs will soon be exhausted because of our rapid population growth and industrial and agricultural expansion. We now face a further critical loss in the Colorado River supply. Without the projects made possible by this Act, we face a major water crisis. We can stand no more delay.

If we fail to act now to provide new sources of water, land development in the great San Joaquin Valley will slow to a halt by 1965 and the return of cultivated areas to wasteland will begin. In southern California, the existing sources of water which have nourished its tremendous expansion will reach capacity by 1970 and further development must wholly cease. In northern Cali-

fornia desperately needed flood control and water supplies for many local areas will be denied.

This Act will assure construction funds for new water development facilities to meet California's requirements now and in the future. No area will be deprived of water to meet the needs of another. Nor will any area be asked to pay for water delivered to another.

To meet questions which concerned southern California, the bonds will finance completion of all facilities needed, as described in the Act. Contracts for delivery of water may not be altered by the Legislature. The tap will be open, and no amount of political maneuvering can shut it off.

Under this Act the water rights of northern California will remain securely protected. In addition, sufficient money is provided for construction of local projects to meet the pressing needs for flood control, recreation and water deliveries in the north.

A much needed drainage system and water supply will be provided in the San Joaquin Valley.

Construction here authorized will provide thousands of jobs. And the program will nourish tremendous industrial and farm and urban expansion which will develop an ever-growing source of employment and economic prosperity for Californians.

Our Legislature has appropriated millions of dollars for work in preparation, and construction is now underway. It would be tragic if this impressive start toward solution of our water problems were now abandoned.

If we fail to act now to insure completion of this constructive program, serious existing water shortages will only get worse. The success of our State is at stake. Vote "Yes" for water for people, for progress, for prosperity!

HUGH M. BURNS
State Senator, President Pro Tem
Fresno County

RICHARD RICHARDS
State Senator
Los Angeles County

Argument Against California Water Resources Development Bond Act

We are entitled to know whether the State really needs a water program of this huge scale. If we do not rush headlong into this undertaking it is entirely possible that a less costly method of supplying our water needs may be found. The claim that a mammoth water development program must be launched immediately should be carefully examined. California has plenty of water and it very well might be less costly to let the people go to the water rather than attempt to move the water to the people. A bond issue in the amount of $1,750,000,000 could impair the credit of the entire State of California. The interest which must be paid on this amount of money is substantial and a question exists as to whether it is something the State can afford.

Northern California can meet its flood control and local water supply problems without running the risk of this development to meet its future requirements. Is there any assurance that additional projects will be built once the works authorized in this Act are completed?

Under the terms of this Act the Legislature is denied its traditional powers to approve or disapprove construction of additional units of the project as they are undertaken. The possibility exists that some additional units of the project may prove to be uneconomical with the result that their construction would have to be financed out of general state taxes unless the Legislature is given the power to halt such a waste of funds.

The Act fails to insure enough water for the north and that the future needs of the areas of origin will be met. In addition, southern California now faces a critical new threat to its future water supplies from the Colorado River as a result of the recent proposed decision of the U. S. Supreme Court Special Master.

Unless this proposal is reversed by the Supreme Court itself, we can be sure that every effort will be made by southern California representatives to further weaken historic northern rights to northern water. It should be remembered that the Special Master's proposed decision would claims to water based on historic usage.

Proponents of this Act claim that many northern water needs can be met through the provision that would make 130 million dollars in loans and grants available for local projects. Yet there is nothing in the Act which directs that any of these loans and grants be made to local agencies in the north. It is entirely possible under the language of the Act that all or most of this money could be awarded to southern California.

If this is a worthy program it should have been established on a continuing basis. Instead, there is no provision for further loans and grants once the 130 million dollars has been exhausted. Even the money repaid as a result of these loans will not go into continuation of this program.

It is evident that all areas of the State will need more protection than this act affords.

Vote No.

CHARLES BROWN
State Senator
28th District—Alpine,
Inyo and Mono Counties

TERMS OF ASSEMBLYMEN. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 15. Provides that terms of members of Assembly elected in 1960 and thereafter shall be four years; one-half of members elected in 1960 shall vacate office at expiration of second year, so that half of the members of the Assembly shall be elected every two years.

2

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 5, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The 80 Members of the Assembly are now elected for a term of two years under the provisions of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution. Under this measure, which would amend that section, the terms of Members of the Assembly would be increased to four years. The seats of the 40 Assemblymen elected from odd-numbered Assembly districts in 1960 would be vacated, however, at the end of two years. This would provide four-year staggered terms thereafter, with one-half of the 80 Members of the Assembly being elected in November of each even-numbered year.

This constitutional amendment would also repeal obsolete provisions in Section 3 which were needed to place the 1879 Constitution into operation. To this extent it has the same effect as the amendment to Section 3 of Article IV proposed by Proposition 12, but in respect to the length of terms of Members of the Assembly this measure conflicts with Proposition 12. If both measures are adopted by the voters, however, this constitutional amendment will prevail since Proposition 12 contains a specific provision to that effect. (See paragraph numbered "Sixteenth" in Proposition 12.)

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 15

This proposition deserves the active support and a "yes" vote by all Californians for a number of important reasons.

1. It would save millions of dollars for the taxpayers of our State.

2. It would accelerate the operations of our republican form of government and our democratic processes.

3. It would encourage the highest type of men and women to follow careers as elected representatives in State government.

4. It would handcuff "influence peddlers" who endeavor to obtain legislative preferment for their clients.

5. Its passage would add to the prestige of the State of California among all of the other States of the Union.

6. It would assist in the adoption of sound legislation covering all areas of human relationships.

7. It has the support of outstanding members of all political parties, all agencies of organized labor and management, educators, veterans, farm groups, churchmen; professional and fraternal organizations, and leaders among all other representative and important segments of our California way of life.

Competent authorities have estimated that a four-year term for Members of the California State Assembly would result in the saving of millions of dollars in taxpayer money because a four-year term would eliminate the present costly and cumbersome system of a statewide election for these 80 public officials every 24 months. A two-year term of office for an elected state official is ludicrous in our modern complex form of government. There is considerable truth in the remark that a freshman legislator barely has time enough in which to learn where to hang his hat before he is required to return to the hustings in an effort to defend his record in office.

Fewer elections would encourage political parties to offer their best qualified candidates for the consideration of voters. Political party responsibility would rise to a new high level.

It is well known that public servants whose terms of office run for four or more years are less susceptible to the blandishments of pressure groups than those who must seek re-election every 24 months.

This proposal would represent a striking example of California's liberalized form of government and would serve as a beacon for less enlightened States of the Union. Legislators who remain in office for four or more years are able to devote more time, better thinking, and more constructive efforts on the job than those who are constantly harassed by the necessity of continually campaigning while pursuing their legislative duties.

The swift pace of our new interplanetary age is revolutionizing every facet of human relationships —including lawmaking. Not only new ideas, but a complete revamping of our political machinery is utterly necessary if we hope to cope successfully with the intricacies of our nuclear age.

The approval of this proposition by our voters will enable our elected representatives in the California State Assembly to play their assigned roles in this new age in a constructive, progressive and capable manner.

ALAN G. PATTEE
Assemblyman, 34th District
Monterey County

CARLEY V. PORTER
Assemblyman, 69th District
Los Angeles County

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 15

This measure should be defeated.

The adoption of this measure will in no way be of benefit to the people of California. On the contrary it takes away from the people the right they have always had in California, namely the right to elect an entire new lower house of the Legislature each two years. This is a traditional and important right, one that our forefathers in their wis-

dom, provided in both our State and Federal Constitutions. I submit it has successfully stood the test of time.

The only benefit to be derived from this measure is by Assemblymen who will be spared the trouble and expense of having to submit their records to the people each two years. Such a change will in no way improve legislation, instead it will tend to make the Legislature less responsive to the will of the people in whom the final legislative power is supposed to rest. If service in the Legislature has become too great a financial burden to those who are not blessed with independent wealth, as many observers believe it has, the remedy is to request the voters to approve an increase in salaries—not to increase the length of the term of office to avoid the expense of an election.

This measure simply makes the Assembly in second Senate. Those who believe in our tr tional American legislative system of having all of one house of the Legislature subject to biennial review by the voters will vote "no" on this measure.

S. C. MASTERSON
Member of the Assembly
Eleventh District
Contra Costa County
(Now Judge, Superior Court, Contra Costa County)

3 **DISABLED VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 21.** Permits totally disabled veteran entitled to $5,000 exemption on a home to transfer it to subsequently acquired home.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 5, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The Legislature now has authority to exempt from property taxes the homes of veterans of this State who, as a result of service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service of the United States, are permanently and totally disabled due to the loss, or loss of use, of both lower extremities from specified causes. Present authority is limited, however, to exempting homes acquired with the assistance of the Federal Government.

This constitutional amendment would amend Section 1¼ of Article XIII without change except that the last paragraph thereof would constitute a new Section 1¼a. The new section would extend the exemption to any home acquired and occupied by such a totally disabled veteran after disposing of the home acquired with Federal assistance, whether or not the new home is acquired with such assistance.

Proposition No. 11 also would amend Section 1¼ of Article XIII and would add a Section 1¼a to that article. The two measures are therefore in conflict and in the event that both are adopted by the voters, the one receiving the higher vote will prevail.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 21

In 1954 the electorate approved a special $5,000 tax exemption for certain paraplegic veterans. The present exemption is limited to those veterans who received special assistance in the form of a grant from the Federal Government for the construction of homes specially equipped with ramps, modified plumbing fixtures, etc. Under existing law the exemption applies only to the first home upon which the federal grant was made. If a veteran sells this home and buys another, then, he loses the exemption.

Experience has shown that a fixed pattern is followed in the process of rehabilitation of the paraplegic veteran. Upon discharge from the hospital, the veteran will require additional outpatient services of the hospital and will locate his family near the hospital facility. During the ensuing year, he will complete this out-patient care and go into some professional or craft training program in this same community and will make his total adjustment to society. Invariably, thereafter, he will find better job opportuni- in his newly chosen craft or profession in c localities. He then must dispose of his resid and locate his family in a place where he will then make his home and become an independent citizen. By making this inevitable move, he loses the benefits that were intended under the present existing law.

In addition to the above, there are several situations in which the paraplegic veteran could lose his first home through action taken by governmental agencies such as the following example.

The Veterans Administration closed their hospital in Van Nuys which served many of these veterans. Their out-patient treatment was transferred to Long Beach Veterans Hospital. This meant that many veterans in the Van Nuys area had to relocate somewhere in the Long Beach area and in this required change, they lost their exemption. Others have been dislocated by eminent domain actions brought by the Highway Department, Flood Control or other governmental agencies, and again, through no fault of their own, lost their exemption in the process of relocation.

This amendment allows the veteran to sell or dispose of the original home and still receive the exemption, provided the veteran habitually occupies the other dwelling as a home. In 1957 there were 466 paraplegic veterans receiving the exemption. In the absence of another war, the passage of this constitutional amendment will not re in an increase in the amount of property ex from taxation, but it will prevent many of the

handicapped veterans from losing their exemption.

RICHARD T. HANNA
75th Assembly District
Orange County

WILLIAM BIDDICK, JR.
12th Assembly District
San Joaquin County

4 **TERMS OF OFFICE.** Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1 (1960 First Extraordinary Session). Permits Legislature to provide terms of office not to exceed eight years for members of any state agency created by it to administer the State College System of California.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 6, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would amend Section 16 of Article XX of the Constitution. It would authorize the Legislature to provide terms of office of up to eight years for the members of any state agency which it creates in the field of public higher education to manage the State College System of California.

Such an authorization would constitute an exception to the present provisions of Section 16 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now prohibit the Legislature from fixing the term of any officer or commissioner at more than four years.

At its 1960 First Extraordinary Session, the Legislature enacted the Donahoe Higher Education Act (Stats. 1960, 1st Ex. Sess., Ch. 49). This legislation established the State College System and provided for its administration by a board to be known as the Trustees of the State College System of California. The terms of the trustees were fixed at four years but they will become eight year terms under the provisions of that act if this constitutional amendment is adopted by the people. This measure, therefore, would fix the terms of the trustees at eight years, commencing on March 1, 1961. (Education Code, Section 22601.5, as added by Chapter 49.)

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1 (1960 First Extraordinary Session)

This constitutional amendment is a part of the Master Plan for Higher Education as developed through a study team of distinguished educators and embodied in Senate Bill No. 33 (Miller), enacted by the 1960 Session of the Legislature. Whereas the Legislature chose to establish the Master Plan in statutory form rather than using the Constitution for that purpose, an existing constitutional limitation on the length of terms of office which the Legislature may establish made this constitutional amendment necessary.

Included in the Master Plan is the establishment of a governing board for the state colleges designated as the Trustees of the State College System of California. The board is composed of four ex officio members: the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction and the chief executive officer of the State College System. There are also 16 appointive members appointed by the Governor, except that the members, as of the effective date of the Act, of the State Board of Education shall serve ex officio as and among the first appointive members.

The Master Plan statute also provides that the terms of the appointive trustees shall be eight years. This constitutional amendment is required to enable the Legislature to establish terms up to eight years for boards of higher education governing the state colleges. It is traditional in this country that governing boards of public collegiate institutions shall be appointed for terms in excess of four years, by reason of the complexity of the institutions and the need for continuity of policy in the decisions made by the boards. The importance which is attached to this historic Master Plan and the role of the new Trustees of the State College System makes it vital that this limited authority be given to the Legislature.

This would not in any way alter or affect the terms of members of the Board of Regents of the University of California. Vote YES.

GEORGE MILLER, JR.
State Senator, 17th District

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1 (1960 First Extraordinary Session)

The 1960 Special Session of the Legislature enacted the essential elements of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California to economically provide excellent educational facilities and opportunities for our exploding student population.

In addition to defining the functions of the University of California, state colleges and junior colleges, the Master Plan created an independent board, designated as the Trustees of the State College System of California, to administer the state college system.

In enacting the legislation effectuating the Master Plan for Higher Education, considerable attention was given to the length of term of the members of any state agency created in the field of public higher education which is charged with the management, administration and control of the State College System of California.

The present constitutional limitation of 4 years for such members was felt to be too short; a proposed term of 16 years, as in the case of the Regents of the University of California, too long. This Constitutional Amendment would enable the Legislature to provide a more practical and realistic term of 8 years.

A YES vote is recommended.

DONALD L. GRUNSKY, State Senator
Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties
Chairman, Senate Fact Finding
Committee on Education

ERNEST R. GEDDES, Assemblyman
49th District
California Legislature

Argument Against Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1 (1960 First Extraordinary Session)

The desire of officials to freeze themselves into their jobs is not only undemocractic, but also shows a lack of confidence in their own worth. If their work in the job proves their ability, they can be assured that a thankful people will see that they continue in office. On the other hand if they are lacking in capacity they can then be replaced. A United States Congressman holds office for 2 years, so 4 years should be ample for members of the Board of Trustees. VOTE NO.

WM. T. McMANUS
9461 Vons Drive
Garden Grove, California

COMPENSATION OF LEGISLATORS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 31.

5 Sets salary of members of the State Legislature at $750 per month. Provides that increased compensation provided by this amendment shall not increase retirement benefits for those legislators already retired.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 6, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would amend Section 2(b) of Article IV of the Constitution to increase the monthly compensation paid to Members of the Legislature from $500 to $750.

The constitutional amendment would provide, also, that the retirement benefits payable to persons who have retired under the Legislators' Retirement System prior to the operative date of the measure shall not be increased as the result of such increased compensation. The operative date of this amendment, if adopted by the voters, will be November 8, 1960.

Under the Legislators' Retirement System retirement allowances are based upon the compensation payable, at the time the allowances fall due, to the current incumbent of the office (Sec. 9359.1, Gov. C.). Thus, under the existing law if the compensation of Members of the Legislature is increased, the retirement allowances paid to retired legislators under the Legislators' Retirement System would be automatically increased. This measure would prevent such an increased retirement allowance for former legislators who have retired prior to November 8, 1960.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 31

California legislators are among the most underpaid lawmakers in the nation, according to a survey conducted under supervision of the Citizens Legislative Advisory Commission.

The Citizens Legislative Advisory Commission is composed of a cross section of the press, business, industry, labor, the professions, educators, and legislative representatives. These citizens have had considerable experience with state legislation. Their task was to suggest ways and means to improve the legislative process.

As part of the assignment, the Commission employed a professional survey organization to interview the state legislators, press, legislative representatives, and others who could testify from first-hand knowledge what the job of being an Assemblyman or Senator in California really requires in the way of time and ability.

Based upon this factual study, the Commission found:

1. The tremendous growth of California is without parallel in the entire United States, and this factor alone makes the legislative work load very heavy. Growth is constant, not intermittent, and the Legislature must keep pace to keep State government responsive to the needs of the people.

2. Combined with the growth of the state as a whole has come an unbelievable expansion of metropolitan areas which present a greater number and variety of legislative problems.

3. Legislators in these metropolitan districts have a full-time job—attending to the problems of their districts and looking after the needs of their constituents. The survey showed that almost all of our Assemblymen and Senators spend three-fourths or more of their time on the job.

4. Increasing demands on the time of the average legislator is causing many good men to leave the office. To do the job right means that a professional man must sacrifice his practice and the man engaged in any business must depend upon others to carry on for him. While the satisfaction of public service, well performed, is rewarding, it will not pay the family's bills, nor will it compensate for the two homes a legislator must maintain during much of his term of office.

Good men and women should not be forced to give up public service in the Legislature because they cannot afford the financial sacrifice. Democracy shortchanges itself when it allows this to happen. It discredits the very branch of State government which is directly representative of and responsive to the people.

The Citizens Legislative Advisory Commission, after long study of the problem, felt that a step in the right direction was to reduce the financial sacrifice involved in the legislative job by increasing the pay. Thereby it is hoped that good men can run for the office and can continue in office when elected.

It was for this reason, and as a result of fact study of the job of being a legislator in California,

that in 1958 the Commission recommended an increase in compensation to $750 per month.

A "yes" vote on Proposition No. 5 will cost e in the way of money, but will return hand- dividends in good government.

Vote "YES" on Proposition No. 5.

MAX EDDY UTT, Chairman
Citizens Legislative Advisory Commission

ROBERT G. SPROUL
University of California

THOS. L. PITTS
Secretary-Treasurer
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

Argument Against Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 31

At a time when State expenditures and taxes are at an all-time high, the voters are being asked to increase the salary of State legislators from $500 to $750 per month, or from $6,000 to $9,000 per year. This is a 50% raise over the 66⅔% increase granted in 1954. In other words, in 1951 the law was amended to grant State legislators $3,600 per year, or $300 per month. In 1954, the law was amended again to raise the legislator's pay to $6,000 per year or $500 per month, whether the legislature is in session or not. Now, by this proposition the legislators propose to increase their salaries from the current $500 to $750 per month. If the proposition is adopted, the result be a 150% pay increase for the legislators 1951. This is too high.

The legislator's job is only part-time. The proposition would be more justifiable if it proposed to make the legislator's job full-time, but it doesn't.

I believe the voters of California do not want their State legislators to become highly paid, professional, career-type politicians at public expense, all on a part-time basis. The position of legislator should be one of public service and duty and not a money-making job.

As the law now stands, California State legislators are treated well financially. They get office expenses, mileage, death benefits, and a superior retirement payment, on their part-time job.

Currently, the legislator gets a salary of $500 per month, for each month of his elected term. He contributes 4% of his salary to his retirement system. After only 15 years of service and at the age of 63 years, the legislator's retirement payment is $375 per month. This proposition in effect would increase the retirement payments to legislators with 15 years service to the very generous amount of $565 per month, at age 63. The maximum comparable benefits under Social Security is $127 per month, for a single man.

Under present law, it is permitted for legislators to hold other positions at the same time that they are legislators. In fact, most of them do that. For example, a legislator may be a public school teacher and receive both salaries at the same time.

In addition, it is common for legislators to draw as much as $20,000 during a term for committee work alone.

I believe the proponents of this proposition have not shown justification for the 50% pay increase they are asking for legislators. The voters should study this matter and demand a full debate on this proposition. I believe the proposition should not receive a "Yes" vote, unless the voter is convinced he wants part-time, highly paid, professional, career politicians as State Legislators.

Vote "No" on this proposition.

Submitted by,

RICHARD M. FRISK
Teacher and Attorney

ASSESSMENT OF GOLF COURSES. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29.

6 Establishes manner in which non-profit golf courses should be assessed for purposes of taxation.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 7, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment would add Section 2.6 to Article XIII of the Constitution. It would prohibit an assessor, in assessing real property for taxation, from considering any factors other than those related to its use for golf course purposes if (a) the property consists of one parcel of ten acres or more and (b) it has been used exclusively for nonprofit golf course purposes for at least two successive years. The measure would not, however, preclude the assessor from considering the existence of any minerals (including oil and gas), mines or quarries in assessing the property.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29

w would you like the golf courses nearest r home to be converted into noisy factory layouts, clamorous supermarkets, traffic-jammed shopping centers, or brick-and-mortar apartment units?

Proposition 6 is designed to save these courses and their benefits to you and your family as wooded, planted, open space areas giving greenbelt breathing space to California's growing cities.

Proposition 6 provides clarification of assessment and taxation for these privately-paid-for parks, which under present short-sighted assessment practices are being taxed out of existence and taxed into overbuilt industrial and commercial developments.

Here's why Californians should vote YES:

1. TAX ELIMINATION OF NON-PROFIT COURSES WILL RAISE YOUR TAXES by forcing your county or city to assume and operate

them as public courses. This means increased taxpayer expense for courses previously operated at private cost with simultaneous removal of taxpaying property from tax rolls.

2. NON-PROFIT COURSES WILL CONTINUE TO PAY TAXES.

Proposition 6 does not give tax exemption or decrease to courses. Non-profit courses will continue to pay their taxes. Proposition 6 clarifies assessment practices and provides a fair tax formula benefiting every Californian by conserving the outdoor surroundings and fresh air for our cities at private cost while continuing to yield substantial tax revenues.

3. TAX REVENUE LOSS DUE TO DEPRECIATING VALUE OF SURROUNDING LAND WILL BE AVOIDED.

Residential areas surrounding courses pay higher taxes because of scenic charm and prestige. Unfair taxes on the courses, forcing them to sell out and convert into commercial use, drops the value of the residential areas surrounding, erodes the tax base and throws a heavier tax burden on remaining taxpayers.

4. PROPOSITION 6 WILL HELP PROTECT OUR TOURIST AND CONVENTION INDUSTRY.

These courses are a leading tourist and convention attraction. Tourists bring more than $1 billion in new outside money yearly into California. This means jobs for thousands. Fair taxation under Proposition 6 will help protect a major facility sustaining this source of employment.

5. TAX PRESSURE HURTS THE THOUSANDS WHO SEEK RECREATION ON PUBLIC LINKS.

Courses cut down by the "tax ax" throw their membership into the public links, adding to the already great pressure there. Thus thousands who cannot afford to belong to private golf clubs will be victimized.

6. OUR CITIES NEED OP 'N AREAS AND "GREEN BELTS."

Civilian defense authorities say golf courses are indispensable facilities for use as mobilization areas in case of emergency. Parks and planted areas operated at private cost contribute to the beauty, health, and appeal of our growing metropolitan areas. Planted areas help decontaminate the air because plants absorb carbon dioxide and give off oxygen, thus combatting air pollution.

7. YOUR STATE LEGISLATURE, BY TWO-THIRDS VOTE OF BOTH HOUSES, PASSED PROPOSITION 6 TO PRESERVE OPEN AREAS AND PARKLIKE SURROUNDINGS AT NO COST WHATSOEVER TO TAXPAYERS.

ALAN G. PATTEE
Republican State Assemblyman

MRS. BOB HOPE

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
Democratic State Assemblyman

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29

This legislation should never have been put the ballot. Its purpose is to give golfers privil not enjoyed by people who happen to prefer t nis, swimming, fishing, or any other sport. It has always been the practice in this State to tax property on the basis of the "highest and best use" to which it could be put, that is to say, what it is really worth on the open market.

This amendment, if adopted, could have an appreciable effect upon the tax structure of the State. In all probability the revenue from California golf courses will reach $2,000,000 by 1961 or shortly thereafter. The nonprofit courses will probably account for at least $1,500,000 of this. In all likelihood, some courses that are now profit-seeking enterprises would convert to nonprofit organizations if there were an important tax advantage to be gained thereby.

If this amendment is adopted some of these two million dollars could be lost to local governments which are already hard pressed to satisfy demands for schools, fire departments, police protection, and hundreds of other services.

The meaning of the phrase "used exclusively for nonprofit recreational purposes" is not clear and might stimulate litigation. It may be that ownership by a nonprofit corporation will be the principal criterion of nonprofit use. Under California law, carrying on business at a profit as an incident to the main purposes of the corporation is permitted to nonprofit corporations, and such corporations are allowed to distribute gains, profits, or dividends to their members upon dissolution.

The adoption of this amendment could make possible for land speculators to form a nonprofit corporation, start a golf club on the fringe of an expanding city and maintain it at the lowest possible cost for a number of years while making a profit as an incident to the main purposes of the corporation. Then, if the land value sky-rocketed, the land could be sold, the corporation dissolved, and the profits realized as a result of this special tax status could be distributed to the shareholders.

A law was passed in 1959 which makes adoption of this amendment wholly unnecessary. Under this new law, a county or city may acquire by purchase or gift a restriction on a golf course that will preserve it as an open area. When such a restriction has been created, the land will not be assessable as a potential subdivision or building site. If golf course owners are really interested in preserving their properties as golf courses and not merely in property tax reduction, here is a means of achieving their objectives that does not contain the objectionable features of the proposed constitutional amendment.

Apart from the danger of underwriting land speculators at public expense, there still remains no reason to adopt this amendment. Either all sports and recreational facilities should be taxed as recreational areas or none should be.

JOHN A. O'CONNELL
Assemblyman 23rd Dis
San Francisco County

7 **CHIROPRACTORS. Amendment To Chiropractic Initiative Act, Submitted By Legislature.** Permits two, rather than one, board members from same chiropractic school or college to be members of board at same time. Provides that Legislature may fix fees of applicants and licensees and per diem compensation payable to board members.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 7, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure submits to the voters for approval or rejection amendments made by Chapter 1768 of the Statutes of 1959 to the Chiropractic Initiative Act of 1922. That act provides for the organization of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners and for educational and licensing requirements for the practice of chiropractic in this State.

This measure would authorize two persons whose first diplomas were issued by the same school or college of chiropractic to serve simultaneously on the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners. Only one such person may now serve on the board at a time.

It would also authorize the Legislature to fix the amount of the fees payable by applicants for a chiropractor's license and by licensees, and to fix the amount of per diem compensation payable to the members of the board. These amounts are now specifically prescribed in the intiative act as follows: applicant's fee, $25.00; licensee's renewal fee, from $2.00 to $10.00; and board member's per diem compensation, $10.00 per day.

Argument in Favor of Amendment of Chiropractic Initiative Act

This measure would amend the Chiropractic Initiative Act as follows: (1) Provide that not more than two persons, rather than no two persons, whose first diplomas were issued by the same school or college of chiropractic may serve simultaneously on the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners; (2) Authorize the Legislature to establish the amount of the per diem compensation payable to members of the board for time spent in the performance of their official duties and the amount of the fees to be paid by applicants for chiropractic licenses and persons holding such licenses.

The purpose of the first amendment is to broaden the Governor's range of selection in appointing members of the board. In view of the relatively small number of approved chiropractic schools now in existence, the present strict limitation may give rise to difficulties in finding a sufficient number of persons qualified for board membership.

The second amendment would permit the Legislature to fix the compensation for service on this board in the same manner and at the same uniform rate as is the case with other boards in the Department of Professional and Vocational Standards which perform similar licensing functions. It would also permit the Legislature to provide operating revenues for the board in the same manner as it does for other licensing boards and as meet what is likely to be a critical need for additional revenues for this board in the near future.

SWIFT BERRY
State Senator

Argument in Favor of Amendment of Chiropractic Initiative Act

This measure will accomplish two desirable objectives in the interests of governmental efficiency. First, it will permit two persons whose first diplomas were issued by the same school of chiropractic to serve simultaneously on the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners. At present, only one person from any such school may serve on this Board. Due to the limited number of chiropractic schools, it has become increasingly difficult to select five persons, each from a different school, who are willing and able to serve on the Board. This measure would ease the problem by permitting a wider selection of persons who could qualify for appointment, while still not permitting any one school to gain a majority representation on the Board.

Second, the measure authorizes the Legislature to fix the amount of the fees payable by licensees and applicants for licenses, and also the amount of per diem compensation payable to members of the Board. Presently these amounts are specifically fixed by the existing Chiropractic Act and the Legislature has no power to revise them to meet changing conditions. By vesting the Legislature with power to fix these amounts, this measure would simply give the Legislature the identical authority it now possesses in regard to the license fees and per diem payable to other State boards. Under this measure, the Legislature could set such amounts in accordance with changes occurring in the costs of administering the functions of the Board, as it already does with other licensing agencies.

FRED S. FARR
State Senator, Monterey County

Argument Against Amendment of Chiropractic Initiative Act

If two graduates of the same chiropractic institute were permitted to serve on the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners, the fact that they both attended the same institution would present a great possibility of one influencing the other's judgment. This in turn would tend to unify the decision of the two and thus be in contrast of the very reason they have a Board of Examiners rather than one person. This unity would have a great influence on the decision of the Board and the possibility of a wrong decision being made would be greatly increased. The degree of in-

crease would be greater than if you were to remove one man from the Board. It is with this reasoning that I urge you to veto this proposition. Vote No!

ROBERT L. FEGEL
7425 Kengard St.
Whittier, California
Insurance Agent

8 ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 5. Changes prohibitions of eligibility to vote from those convicted of infamous crime to those convicted of felony during punishment therefor and those convicted of treason.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 8, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment would amend Section 1 of Article II of the Constitution to permit a person who has been convicted of a felony, other than treason or the embezzlement or misappropriation of public money, to vote and exercise other privileges accorded an elector, upon paying the penalties prescribed by law for his offense, including any period of probation or parole. At the present time, under the Constitution, a person who is convicted of a felony loses his privileges as an elector and cannot regain those privileges unless he is pardoned by the Governor.

The constitutional provision being amended presently refers to "infamous crimes" rather than "felonies." The courts have indicated that every felony constitutes an infamous crime, but have given no indication as to whether the term includes any other type of offense. This measure would eliminate any question in that regard by substituting the term "felony" for "infamous crime."

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 5

There are approximately 20,000 young people in California who are presently law abiding citizens endeavoring to live honest lives who are deprived under an archaic provision of the State Constitution from the right to vote for life because of mistakes they made and paid the price for as juveniles.

These young people are usually individuals from broken or underprivileged homes and social conditions which inevitably produce a higher incidence of law violations.

They paid their penalties under the jurisdiction of state correctional agencies and were discharged as ex-felons. They have rehabilitated themselves as useful members of society cognizant of the wrongs they have committed, willing to accept their duties and responsibilities as constructive members of the community.

Yet they are deprived of the right to vote for life.

Is this fair?

We say no one who neglects to register and vote is a good citizen. Should we deprive these young people of the opportunity to become good citizens?

Proposition Number 8 would rectify this anomalous situation.

It would correct other injustices.

Proposition 8 proposes an amendment to Section 1 of Article II of the State Constitution. This section has a provision that no person convicted of a felony shall ever exercise the privileges of an elector in this State (the term "infamous crime" used in the Constitution has been construed to mean the same as "felony," that is a crime punishable by imprisonment in a state prison or in a federal prison for a sentence of one year or more.) This Proposition would provide instead that no person "while paying the penalties imposed by law, including any period of probation or parole," for conviction of a felony, shall exercise the privileges of an elector. It also adds "treason" to those offenses specifically enumerated for which the right to vote could not be restored except by pardon by the Governor.

The fundamental change proposed is to restore to the individual convicted of a felony (with certain exceptions) the right to vote once he has paid the penalties imposed by law. This franchise would be returned to the individual when his debt to society had been paid.

This perpetual restriction on the right to v
is an outmoded concept and inconsistent
the rehabilitation approach of modern correctio
methods. It is repugnant to democratic concepts of justice.

This proposal would not remove present constitutional and statutory restrictions on collateral rights of electors, such as the right to be a candidate and serve in public office. It would not repeal or limit the certificate of rehabilitation procedure under which ex-felons are able to secure recommendations for pardons from the Governor by the Superior Court. It would not limit powers which the Legislature now possesses. It would delete from the fundamental law of the State an unjust restriction.

This medieval and undemocratic perpetual prohibition should be repealed.

This proposition is endorsed by the State Board of Corrections and California Probation, Parole, and Correctional Association.

We recommend a YES vote on Proposition 8.

EDWARD E. ELLIOTT
Assemblyman, 40th District
Los Angeles

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
Assemblyman, 62nd District
Los Angeles

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 5

This proposed constitutional amendment
vides that a person convicted of a felony is

eligible to vote for the period during which he is paying the penalty which the law prescribes for his offense including the period of probation or parole. This amendment changes the present constitutional provision so that instead of losing the right to vote forever unless he is pardoned or successfully applies for release of disabilities under Sec. 1203.4 of the Penal Code, such a person will automatically regain his right to vote after his punishment has been completed. The proposal further liberalizes the law by changing "infamous crimes" to "felonies" since infamous crimes include felonies and possibly other offenses, depending on which definition of a felony is used—a matter on which there is some dispute.

We should not lessen the penalties for those who commit serious crimes against society at a time when crime is increasing and when there is an unprecedented amount of violence in our large communities.

The present law simply says in effect that voting is a privilege. If you commit an infamous crime, you forfeit that privilege until you successfully carry out certain legal steps to regain your voting privilege.

The law is now clear that a person who is convicted of an infamous crime can regain his voting right in two ways—(1) by a pardon, or (2) by completing the procedure to remove disabilities as set forth in Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code. If a man is unworthy to be pardoned or does not care enough about voting to carry out the procedure set forth in Section 1203.4 of the Penal Code, he does not deserve to receive the right to vote. In short, a man sincerely desirous of regaining his right to vote can already do so under present law.

The proponents of this amendment argue that pardons and the procedure set forth in Section 1203.4 are inadequate because they may involve publicity which will embarrass the party seeking to regain his voting rights. This argument can be answered in two ways:

(1) Embarrassment is part of the price the criminal pays for crime.

(2) If we seek to avoid embarrassment possibly involved in present remedies, there is still no real need for the proposed constitutional amendment. In our eagerness to spare the convicted man embarrassment, it is not necessary to destroy a perfectly understandable constitutional provision that properly emphasizes the importance of voting by saying, if you commit an infamous crime, you shall not automatically receive back your voting rights.

If we desire to spare the convicted person humiliating publicity, why could we not allow a procedure to be authorized by the Constitution in which voting rights could be restored in a proper case by a confidential hearing? Confidential procedures are not unknown. We have them in adoptions, for example. Proper safeguards could be established to protect the interest of the public as well.

This proposed constitutional amendment is unnecessary and undesirable.

VOTE NO
ON THIS MEASURE

HOWARD J. THELIN
Member of Assembly, 43rd District
California Legislature

9	**CLAIMS AGAINST CHARTERED CITIES AND COUNTIES. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 16.** Permits Legislature to prescribe procedures governing claims against chartered counties, cities and counties, and cities, or against officers, agents and employees thereof.	**YES**	
		NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 8, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment would insure the Legislature's power to establish procedures governing the presentation, consideration, and enforcement of claims against chartered governmental bodies and their officers, agents and employees, despite the "home rule" charter provisions of Article XI of the Constitution. It would add Section 10 to that article and would make applicable to chartered counties, chartered cities, and chartered cities and counties, uniform claim procedures enacted by the Legislature at its 1959 General Session. (See, Gov. Code, Secs. 700 to 720; and Report of California Law Revision Commission, "The Presentation of Claims Against Public Entities" (1959).)

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 16

Until last year a person who was owed money by a city, county, school district or other local governmental agency often could not collect because of failure to comply with legal technicalities in filing his claim. These technicalities were contained in over 174 different laws concerning the filing of claims! It was difficult even for a lawyer to know exactly which law applied in any particular case.

In 1959 the Legislature repealed all these confusing laws and substituted a simple, uniform claim filing procedure which any citizen can follow to collect what is owing to him by a local governmental agency. However, the new law does not have state-wide application because a few cities and counties are not governed by state law, but by local charters.

Proposition 9 extends the benefits of the new, simple procedures to persons who have legitimate claims against these chartered cities and counties. By adopting Proposition 9, the new law regarding claims will be applicable everywhere in California including chartered cities and counties. No longer,

for example, would a person seriously injured be denied payment due him because of his failure in filing his claim to comply with some obscure provision in a city charter.

Proposition 9 was placed on this ballot by the unanimous vote of the Senators and Assemblymen present in the Legislature when the vote was taken. Vote YES on Proposition 9.

CLARK BRADLEY
Member of the Assembly
WILLIAM BIDDICK, Jr.
Member of the Assembly

10 ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 14. Provides that membership of Judicial Council besides judges shall include members of State Bar and two legislators; permits appointment of administrative director. Creates Commission on Judicial Qualifications consisting of judges, members of State Bar and citizens; provides procedure for removal of judges for misconduct or to compel retirement for disability. Declares State Bar of California is a public corporation. Changes name of Commission on Qualifications to Commission on Judicial Appointments.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 8, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Section 1a of Article VI provides for a Judicial Council consisting of the Chief Justice and 10 judges appointed by him. This measure would amend that section to add four members of the State Bar appointed by its Board of Governors, one member selected by each house of the Legislature, and one additional municipal court judge. The Clerk of the Supreme Court would be secretary of the Council, which would be authorized to appoint an administrative director of the courts who would hold office at its pleasure. The administrative director would perform such of the Council's duties, other than making rules of practice and procedure, as may be delegated to him. The measure would allow the Chief Justice to equalize judicial business by assigning a judge, with his consent, to a court of lower jurisdiction and a retired judge, with his consent, to any court.

The constitutional amendment would create a Commission on Judicial Qualifications by adding Section 1b to Article VI. The commission would consist of two justices of district courts of appeal, two judges of superior courts and one judge of a municipal court, selected by the Supreme Court for four year terms. The commission would also include, for four year terms, two members of the State Bar appointed by its Board of Governors and two citizens, appointed by the Governor. The citizen members could not be active or retired judges nor members of the State Bar. An existing "Commission of Qualifications," created by Section 26 of Article VI, would be renamed to be the "Commission on Judicial Appointments."

The constitutional amendment would add Section 10b to Article VI to provide for the removal of judges for willful misconduct in office, or willful and persistent failure to perform their duties, or habitual intemperance. It would also provide for involuntary retirement of judges for permanent disability. The new Commission on Judicial Qualifications may hold a hearing concerning the removal or retirement of a judge or it may request the Supreme Court to appoint three special masters to hold such a hearing on its behalf. If the commission finds good cause therefor, it must recommend the removal or retirement of the judge to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court is required to review the record and may take additional evidence. It may order the judge's removal or retirement, or may wholly reject the commission's recommendation. The amendment would provide other procedural requirements and it constitutes a method of removal which is an alternative to such existing procedures as impeachment, recall, removal by the Legislature and removal for conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude.

The constitutional amendment would add Section 1c to Article VI to provide that the State Bar of California is a public corporation with perpetual existence. Every person admitted and licensed to practice law in this State is required to be a member of the State Bar except while holding office as a judge of a court of record.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 14

This measure is designed to improve the administration of justice. It was formulated by the Joint Judiciary Committee of the California Legislature with the assistance of the Judicial Council, the State Bar and the Conference of California Judges.

It is proposed by the overwhelming vote of both Houses of the Legislature.

First, the measure proposes an effective and expeditious method for the removal of a judge who is unable or unwilling to perform his duties. Impeachment, recall and other existing methods are too cumbersome and expensive to be workable. It is only rarely that cause exists for the removal of a judge. But where such cause does exist, the removal should be fast and sure. The Conference of California Judges, by an overwhelming vote, has endorsed this measure as a protection for the competent, hardworking judges against the rare cases of incompetency and misconduct on the Bench. The People are at least equally entitled to such protection.

A commission of nine members—five judges appointed by the Supreme Court, two lawyers appointed by the Board of Governors of the State Bar, and two citizens appointed by the Governor

will receive complaints, conduct investigations, hold hearings, and make recommendations to the Supreme Court. To avoid the unfairness of publishing complaints of merely disgruntled litigants, proceedings before the commission will not be public, unless and until it recommends to the Supreme Court the removal or retirement of the judge. The record before the commission will then be a public record of the Supreme Court which will determine whether the judge in question shall be removed or retired.

This proposal will assure real protection against incompetency, misconduct or non-performance of duty on the Bench.

The amendment also strengthens the Judicial Council, which makes the rules of court procedure, by enlarging its membership to include two legislators and four lawyers, and authorizes it to appoint a Court Administrator to supervise the administrative work of the courts. Some 18 other States and the Federal Government have learned that such a Court Administrator performs an important function in increasing the efficiency of the courts and equalizing the workload of the judges.

Inasmuch as the measure provides that the State Bar shall appoint the four lawyer members of the Judicial Council and the two lawyer members of the Commission on Judicial Qualifications, both of which are created by the State Constitution, it is thought advisable to include a provision giving the State Bar, which is now a statutory entity, the status of a constitutional body too. The Legislature, however, will continue to have power to regulate the administration of the State Bar by statute as it now does.

Finally, the amendment changes the name of the existing Commission on Qualifications, which is concerned with approving or rejecting the Governor's appointments of appellate judges, and with voluntary retirement of judges, to the more appropriate one of the "Commission on Judicial Appointments." This will prevent confusing it with the proposed new Commission.

This constitutional amendment should have your Yes vote.

EDWIN J. REGAN
Senator, 5th District
Trinity and Shasta Counties

JOSEPH A. RATTIGAN
Senator, 12th District
Sonoma County

---

11 **VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION.** **Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 13.** Provides that residency requirement for veterans' tax exemption of $1,000 means those who were residents at time of entry into armed forces or operative date of this amendment; survivor to be entitled to exemption must be survivor of qualified veteran and also resident at time of application. Extends exemption to widowers as well as widows; exemption denied to survivor owning property of value of $10,000. Permits totally disabled veteran entitled to $5,000 exemption on a home to transfer it to subsequently acquired home.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 10, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment would amend Section 1¼ of Article XIII. It would extend the present coverage of the veterans' tax exemption to include veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States, rather than merely those of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service.

It would restrict the present exemption by making it applicable only to those veterans who were residents of this State at the time of their entry into the Armed Forces or who are residents on November 8, 1960, which will be the effective date of the amendment if it is adopted. Under the present constitutional provision a veteran need only be a resident of California at the time he makes application for the exemption.

In addition, the proposed amendment would use the word "spouse" instead of "wife" or "widow," thus extending the exemption to husbands and widowers. The measure would provide that a surviving spouse, father or mother of a deceased veteran may not own property of the value of $10,000 or more, rather than $5,000 or more, if they are to qualify for the exemption.

It would also restrict the exemption granted to a surviving spouse or parent of a veteran to situations in which such spouse or parent resided in this State and the deceased veteran was eligible for an exemption at the time of his death.

The proposed constitutional amendment also restates the last paragraph of Section 1¼ in the form of a new Section 1¼a. Under the present provisions of that paragraph the Legislature has authority to exempt from property taxes the homes of veterans of this State who are permanently and totally disabled due to the loss, or loss of use, of both lower extremities from specified causes. Present authority is limited, however, to exempting homes acquired with the assistance of the Federal Government. This constitutional amendment would extend the exemption to any home acquired and occupied by such a totally disabled veteran after disposing of the home acquired with Federal assistance, whether or not the new home is acquired with such assistance.

Proposition No. 3 also would amend Section 1¼ of Article XIII and would add a Section 1¼a to that article. The two measures are therefore in conflict and in the event that both are adopted by the voters, the one receiving the higher vote will prevail.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 13

This proposition relates to the Veterans Tax Exemption. There are five changes contained in Proposition 11:

1. Eligibility for exemption is limited to:

A. Residents of California at the time they entered military service; or
B. Veteran residents of California in November, 1960.

One who by action and intent indicates that he will remain in California indefinitely, is a resident. It is not necessary to live here any specified time to establish residence.

About 40% of all veterans in California today entered the service elsewhere. This would not affect these people. But thousands of new veterans are arriving every year. The total annual cost to local governments of this exemption now exceeds $60,000,000, is growing yearly, and is shifted to other taxpayers, including veterans. Additional exemptions reduce the value of the exemption to those now claiming it.

There is ample precedent for this restriction. CALVET Farm and Home Loans are limited to those who entered service from California. And all states which grant veterans bonuses limit them to veterans who entered service from those states.

Yet at present a veteran can collect the bonus in his own state, then move to California and receive our exemption the rest of his life.

It should be emphasized that no veteran who is eligible today will lose the exemption under Proposition 11.

2. Veterans' widows. To be eligible today the veteran cannot own more than $5,000 in property. This means $10,000 in community property for the married veteran.

When the veteran dies, his widow loses community property status, goes back under the $5,000 rule and may lose the exemption from which she has benefited for years at a time when she needs it most.

Proposition 11 changes the property limitation for widows to $10,000.

The reference to widows is broadened to include widowers—in 1911 the voters could not foresee the number of women who would enter military service.

3. "Wife" is changed to "spouse" granting a broader benefit to women veterans.

Specifically, a veteran is now permitted exemption on property worth $1,000, or "lacking such amount of property . . . so much of the property of the wife . . . necessary to equal such amount". Female veterans have been denied a similar benefit on their husband's property. This proposition corrects this situation.

4. Liberalization of benefits for permanently disabled paraplegics, corrects a previous oversight. This provision, and arguments for it, are identical to Proposition 3, and passage will not conflict with Proposition 3.

5. Language changes for clarification only.

Compensation or reward for military service is primarily a national responsibility, since the veteran served the nation, not just one state—this is recognized in the federal veterans' program. State veterans' benefits are a further expression of gratitude to those who entered service from that state.

Other states limit their programs to such veterans. This proposition would make California's exemption conform for those moving here in the future, but no veteran now eligible would lose exemption.

This proposition also liberalizes the provisions for widows, women veterans and paraplegics.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition 11.

LUTHER E. GIBSON
Senator for Solano County

JAMES J. McBRIDE
Senator for Ventura County

Argument Against Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 13

This Constitutional Amendment will permit widowers of female veterans the same exemption as widows of male veterans and will allow veterans permanently disabled in military service who have received a home from the federal government to transfer their exemption if they sell their home and buy a different one. However, it also will cut off any exemption for those veterans who may take up residence in California hereafter, who were not resident in California at the time of their entry into the military service. This will have the effect of setting up two classes of veterans even though their service may have been equal in danger and equal in length. In effect it will greatly reduce the number of veterans eligible in future years.

Restricting the number of veterans eligible for this exemption of a portion of their property will not materially increase the funds of the public school districts because the state provides a specified foundation program and will provide proportionately less state funds to equal the added tax to be paid by veterans.

It should be borne in mind that only property to the assessed valuation of One Thousand Dollars or less is exempted and veterans pay the full tax rate on all assessed valuation over that amount.

Also when the value of property owned by a veteran amounts to five thousand dollars or over, he loses any and all exemption and pays the full tax on the full assessed value of his property. Many veterans lose their exemption in a very few years by reason of savings or the purchase of a home and the assessment of their possessory interest. Many homes are assessed at Five Thousand or over now and bar the veteran from eligibility for any partial exemption whatever.

The world-wide Communist conspiracy is trying to weaken patriotism and the defense of the free countries. Anything that we do to lessen our appreciation of the war time service of our youth in the army, navy, and air force may be made use of by subversives in the cold war.

This proposal should be divided so the separate parts can be voted on separately at a future election. We ask a 'No' vote.

NELSON S. DILWORTH
Senator, Thirty-seventh District
Riverside County

CONSTITUTION: ELIMINATES OBSOLETE AND SUPERSEDED PROVISIONS.

12 **Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 22.** Repeals and amends several provisions of the constitution to eliminate obsolete and superseded provisions without substantive change. Provides any amendment to constitution which is proposed by Legislature solely to eliminate obsolete and superseded provisions shall not affect prior validations and ratifications. Any other measure submitted to the people at the same election which affects the same sections contained in the legislative proposal shall control to the extent of any conflict.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 12, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment would eliminate obsolete or superseded constitutional provisions affecting state officers and agencies. It would repeal constitutional language relating to the original (1879) terms of office for Members of the Legislature, Superintendent of Public Instruction, members of the Board of Equalization and other state officers together with provisions needed to put the 1879 Constitution into effect. It would also repeal obsolete language relating to salaries of members of the Legislature and other state officers and would eliminate references to the nonexistent office of Surveyor General and the nonexistent State Board of Prison Directors.

The constitutional amendment amends and restates Section 22 of Article IV to incorporate provisions of another section of the same number added in 1952, and repeals the latter section.

It would add a new provision to specify that constitutional amendments whose purpose is to eliminate obsolete or superseded constitutional language shall not interfere with other proposals affecting the same sections on the same election ballot and shall not affect previous validations by constitutional provisions which are to be repealed.

This measure conflicts with Proposition 2, which would amend Section 3 of Article IV to establish four-year terms of office for Members of the Assembly. If both measures are adopted by the voters, however, Proposition 2 will prevail in that respect because of the express provision in this measure on that point. (See paragraph numbered "Sixteenth" in this measure.)

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 22

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 22 deletes and consolidates various sections of the California Constitution which have either become obsolete or have been superseded by the adoption of other provisions by the people. At the time of the drafting of the Constitution in 1879 it was necessary to insert a number of temporary provisions. These included provisions relating to the first election, the terms of office of the first legislators and other officers, and the time of taking effect of the Constitution, all of which are now useless and may now be deleted. A provision relating to the 1886 election of members of the State Board of Equalization is also no longer necessary and is taken out.

The office of Surveyor General and the Board of Prison Directors have been abolished by the people at previous elections and references to them are deleted. In addition to dropping these provisions which no longer have any effect, Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 22 eliminates unnecessary duplication of language, combines present provisions relating to the same subject matter, and makes other minor technical changes to conform to recently adopted amendments.

To make absolutely certain that no substantial rights are curtailed by this "clean-up" amendment or other such amendments in the future, a new section would be added to the Constitution, Section 3 of Article XXII. It provides that constitutional amendments whose purpose is to eliminate obsolete or superseded language shall not interfere with other proposals on the same election ballot, and that repeals made by such measures shall not affect previous validations by constitutional provision.

California's Constitution has often been criticized for its excessive length. Adoption of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 22 would be a step in the right direction toward shortening and clarifying our Constitution. Neither the rights of the people nor the operation of the state government would in any way be changed. The amendment would merely eliminate unnecessary and undesirable "deadwood" from the Constitution.

These passages in the constitution are no longer useful or effective and for people untrained in the law, are confusing and misleading. These corrections have been prepared for the Legislature by very capable counsel and no opposition was expressed in legislative consideration.

We urge your "yes" vote on this constitutional amendment.

NELSON S. DILWORTH
Senator from Riverside County
Thirty-seventh Senatorial District

STEPHEN P. TEALE
Senator from Calaveras, Tuolumne & Mariposa Counties
Twenty-sixth Senatorial District

DON MULFORD
Assemblyman, 18th Assembly District
Berkeley-Albany

DISTRICT COURTS OF APPEAL: APPELLATE JURISDICTION. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 11. Provides District Courts of Appeal shall have appellate jurisdiction of municipal and justice court cases as provided by law.

13

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 16, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Generally, under the California Constitution, a district court of appeal has appellate jurisdiction (that is, the power to hear and decide appeals) only over (1) cases tried in a superior court and (2) cases appealed to the Supreme Court which that court transfers to the district court of appeal. A district court of appeal does not generally have appellate jurisdiction over cases tried in a court of lesser jurisdiction than a superior court, that is, a municipal court or justice court. The Legislature cannot expand the jurisdiction of district courts of appeal beyond that conferred by the Constitution.

This measure provides that district courts of appeal shall have appellate jurisdiction in all cases within the original jurisdiction of the municipal and justice courts, to the extent and in the manner provided for by law. Thus, under this measure the Legislature would be empowered to give to district courts of appeal appellate jurisdiction over cases tried in the municipal and justice courts where the district courts of appeal do not now have that appellate jurisdiction.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 11

This constitutional amendment was unanimously approved by the State Legislature and has the active support of both the State Bar of California and the Judicial Council. It deserves your YES vote in order that the Legislature may fill in a present gap in our State laws.

This measure will enable the Legislature to provide for an informal, speedy and inexpensive appeal to the District Courts of Appeal in those cases arising in the Justice or Municipal Courts where such an appeal is plainly merited. At present, appeals in these cases can be taken only to the Superior Court, or to the Appellate Department of the Superior Court in counties having Municipal Courts. Such cases, regardless of their merits, cannot be taken to the appellate courts of this State even though the decision of the Superior Court is in conflict with the decisions of other counties. For example, a Superior Court in one county may interpret a statute entirely differently from the way that very same statute is interpreted in another county.

In both criminal and civil matters it is now possible to have as many different interpretations of the law in Justice and Municipal Court matters as there are counties in this State, namely 58. Very few of the decisions of the Appellate Departments of the Superior Court are written opinions and there is at present no way for the Superior Court, sitting as the Appellate Department, to be familiar with the decisions in other counties. A person may be sent to jail for as much as six months in one jurisdiction and acquitted in another under different interpretations of the same statute.

At the present time, the one instance in which an appeal can be taken from the Superior Court or Appellate Department of the Superior Court, in cases arising in the Justice or Municipal Courts, is that involving an interpretation of a U.S. statute or the U.S. Constitution. In such a case the appeal must be made directly to the U.S. Supreme Court because there is no State appellate court higher than the Superior Court which is authorized to decide the case.

This constitutional amendment will permit the Legislature to provide an expeditious, informal and inexpensive procedure in those cases where an important question of law is construed differently in several counties or in those cases where an important question of Federal Law arises, under which the District Courts of Appeal will be authorized to transfer cases to themselves for hearing and decision.

In those few cases where justice requires, under provisions already existing in the California Constitution, the State Supreme Court in turn could transfer such cases to itself from the District Courts of Appeal to achieve uniformity of decision throughout the State.

J. WILLIAM BEARD
Senator, 39th District
Imperial County

STANLEY ARNOLD
Senator, 1st District
Lassen, Modoc & Plumas Counties

Argument Against Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 11

Of itself, S.C.A. No. 11 is harmless—and useless. It is the doors that it opens by which it is to be judged.

There is now no law whereby an appeal can go to a district court of appeal from a justice or municipal court. So, to be of use, the amendment must be followed by legislation. If legislation opens the doors, now closed, so that an appeal from one of those courts, which now goes to a superior court, where it is decided, is to go either directly or after the decision in the superior court to the higher court, these results will follow—inevitably: (1) the district courts, already loaded with work, will become overloaded; (2) added delays in the administration of justice will result; and (3) an added burden will be placed on the state budget.

These last two results will come about, not because the justices of the district courts of appeal are any less diligent and able than are the judges of the superior courts. But the latter do not have to write opinions in all cases, as section 24 of Art. VI of the constitution requires of the justices. And the preparation and composition of writ opinions just takes time. The result will be there will have to be more justices, and they are

paid at a higher rate than are superior court judges.

A further delay in the final disposition of these ·eals may also follow from the provisions of .tion 4c, Art. VI of the constitution, which pro-..des for hearings in the state Supreme Court, following decisions in the district courts of appeal.

All this can be avoided by a "no" vote on S.C.A. No. 11.

EDWARD T. BISHOP
Judge, Superior Court (Retired)
County of Los Angeles

STREET AND HIGHWAY FUNDS: USE FOR LOCAL GRADE CROSSING BONDS.

14 **Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1.** Includes separation of grade districts to which Legislature may appropriate fuel taxes and motor vehicle registration and license fee moneys. Such moneys allocated to local agencies may be used for paying bonds duly issued for grade crossing separation projects to extent of 50% of sums allocated.

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 16, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would amend Section 3 of Article XXVI of the Constitution. That article requires money collected from motor vehicle fuel taxes and from vehicle registration and license fees to be expended exclusively and directly for highway purposes. This constitutional amendment would add separation of grade districts to the list of governmental bodies to which such funds could be allocated by the Legislature to be expended for highway purposes.

It would also permit counties, cities and counties, cities, and separation of grade districts to use up to 50 percent of the highway funds allocated to them annually for the payment of principal and interest on bonds issued by them to finance grade separation projects involving the intersection of ·lic streets and highways with rapid transit or ·oad rights-of-way. The bonds would have to be approved by two-thirds of the electors and could not exceed 25 years. Such bond financing would not be possible under Article XXVI at the present time since the tax funds would not be used "exclusively and directly" for highway purposes.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1

Railroad grade crossings have been the scene of many bad accidents through the years. But the elimination of these hazards has proven a very difficult problem for local governments because of the normally high costs involved.

Any extensive development of rapid transit could accentuate this problem by creating many new high speed grade crossings, so the problem may grow.

Although the railroads or transit companies are generally required (by the Public Utilities Commission) to pay a good proportion of the costs of grade crossing separations, and the State has stepped in to help, local governments are often financially unable to meet their share of the costs.

Frequently the sums are too great to be furnished from annual operating budgets and taxpayers are understandably reluctant to vote bond issues tied into local property taxes for projects of this nature.

This proposition would permit that portion of Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund (gasoline taxes, ve-..e registration and drivers' license fees) which are allocated to local governments to be used to pay principal or interest on bonds issued to build such grade separations.

This is NOT a bond issue. It doesn't appropriate a nickel of funds and doesn't furnish any added money to anyone. It doesn't impose any new or greater tax of any kind.

It is merely a permissive measure to allow cities and counties a flexibility in meeting their street and road problems, and specifically railroad or rapid transit grade crossing problems, which they are now prohibited under existing law.

There are a number of important restrictions in this proposition as a protection to the taxpayer. Any bond issue to which these funds may be applied must be approved by two-thirds of the voters of the local government involved.

The term of the bonds may not exceed 25 years and not more than 50 percent of the funds allocated in any one year may be used for these purposes.

Supplementary law already enacted by the legislature contingent upon passage of this proposition, spells out in detail the procedures to be used and the protection to be afforded.

There was no opposition expressed to this proposition at legislative hearings.

Many smaller cities in this state have critical deficiencies in their street system at intersections of those streets with railroads. Proposition 14 provides a means by which these deficiencies can be overcome.

Again, this proposition will permit a city or county to use a portion of its own share of the Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund for the payment of principal and interest on bonds for railroad or rapid transit grade crossing separations, but only if two-thirds of their people vote to do so.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition 14.

LUTHER E. GIBSON
Senator for Solano County

HUGO FISHER
Senator for San Diego County

Argument Against Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1

1. It is a proposed amendment of the anti-diversion Article XXVI of the State Constitution, thus establishing a precedent for further amendments and weakening of said Article.

2. The amount of highway user taxes devoted to the payment of interest and expenses incurred in connection with issuance and sale of bonds would represent a diversion of these funds from street and road improvements.
3. Since the enactment of the original gasoline tax in 1923 all State highway financing and a large part of the financing of county roads has been on the pay-as-you-go basis, using current highway user tax revenues. The present proposal would permit mortgaging of motor vehicle fuel revenues by cities and counties and separation of grade districts.
4. Any such mortgaging of future revenues could be extremely detrimental because in most cities and counties there will be need for all current and future revenues for maintenance and additional improvements of roads and streets.
5. Mortgaging of said funds in advance would almost inevitably result in demands for additional contribution by the State of motor vehicle fuel revenues to cities and counties, thereby either depleting amounts available for State highways, or necessitating increase in the rate of motor vehicle fuel taxes.
6. In the event local governmental agencies issue bonds to be repaid from allocations made under present laws, serious question would be presented as to whether the Legislature would be restricted in the extent to which it could reduce or otherwise modify the present allocations.
7. At the present time there is an annual allocation of $5-million from the State Highway Fund specifically marked for aiding local governmental agencies in the construction reconstruction of grade separation projects
8. Large funds are available under recent Federal-aid Highway Acts which help to relieve many of the traffic problems created by grade crossings. Therefore, there is less urgency for a speed-up in local separation of grade projects justifying the mortgaging of highway user revenues.
9. As the Legislature has required in SCR-62, a Senate committee is now engaged in developing a Statewide picture of the problem of the needs of county roads and city streets. This committee will also consider the advisability of legislation for a 1¢ increase in the State gasoline tax and upon what basis such additional revenue should be apportioned to the cities and counties of the State. It is expected the Legislature during the 1961 Legislative Session will take action upon this subject.
10. In view of the above it is untimely and it would be inappropriate for the people to approve Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1, Proposition No. 14 on the November 1960 ballot, to give to local government agencies authority to mortgage future motor vehicle tax revenues.

ALAN G. ANDERSON, Secretary
California Highway Users Conference
1017 Phelan Building
San Francisco 2, California

---

15 **"SENATE REAPPORTIONMENT. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.** Establishes and apportions 40 senatorial districts. Provides for election of all Senators in 1962, one-half of Senators to be elected every two years thereafter. Requires Legislature in 1961 to fix boundaries of districts in counties having more than one district on basis of population, area, and economic affinity, which may be refixed following each decennial federal census. Permits Legislature following 1980 and each subsequent decennial federal census to reapportion senatorial districts on same basis; provided no county shall have more than 7 districts and 20 districts be apportioned to designated counties."

YES	
NO	

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 16, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This initiative measure would provide a new constitutional formula for dividing the State into 40 Senate districts, by amending Sections 5 and 6 of Article IV of the California Constitution.

Section 5 would be amended to provide that the terms of the senators elected from odd-numbered districts in 1960 shall expire at the end of 1962, instead of continuing until the end of 1964. Since the terms of senators elected in 1958 from even-numbered districts will expire at that time, all 40 senatorial seats would be vacated at the end of 1962. This measure would require 40 senators to be elected in November, 1962, from new senatorial districts. The terms of the 20 senators elected from the new odd-numbered districts would expire at the end of 1964, however, and one-half of the Senate would thereafter be elected each two years for four-year terms.

The provisions of Section 6 affecting Assembly districts would be rephrased without any substantive change in the present constitutional requirements. The amendment would delete all reference to Senate districts from the first two paragraphs of Section 6, and would add four paragraphs affecting senatorial districts only.

This measure would eliminate constitutional requirements that no county shall contain more than one senatorial district, that no county or city and county shall be divided to form senatorial districts and that counties of small population shall be grouped in districts with not more than three counties in any one senatorial district. It would create 40 senatorial districts by reference to the counties as they exist on January 1, 1961. Thus, 20 senators, representing District to 20, would be allotted to the 45 counties loc north of the line formed by the northern a

western boundaries of San Luis Obispo, Kern, Tulare, Inyo and Mono Counties. The remaining 20 senators, representing Districts 21 to 40, would allotted to the 13 counties south of that line.

Angeles County would have seven senators; and Orange, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara and Alameda Counties would have two senators. Ten districts would consist of several counties and the combination of Mono, Inyo and San Bernardino Counties would be divided into two senatorial districts.

This amendment would require the Legislature at its 1961 session to fix the boundaries of the two districts in Mono, Inyo and San Bernardino Counties and of the districts in counties having more than one district. If the Legislature failed to fix such boundaries, a Reapportionment Commission provided by the Constitution would fix them. At its 1971 general session the Legislature would be authorized to adjust these boundaries fixed at its 1961 general session.

Legislative adjustment of all senatorial districts would be permitted after the decennial federal census of 1980 and each subsequent decennial census, except that 20 senatorial districts would be required for the 13 southern counties. Twenty senatorial districts would be apportioned in the remaining 45 counties, and no county could have more than seven districts in such future reapportionments.

Argument in Favor of Senate Reapportionment Initiative Constitutional Amendment

In 1926, 40 Senators were apportioned between 58 Counties. No County, regardless of area population, ever could have more than 1 Senator. The 8 Southern Counties (Santa Barbara to Imperial) were given 8 Senators. 50 Northern Counties were given 32 Senators. This apportionment is referred to as a modified Federal plan.

When that plan was adopted, the total population of California was under 5,000,000. The 1960 population is 15,550,000. The 8 Southern Counties now have 8,939,000 and still have 8 Senators. The 50 remaining Counties have 6,560,000 and 32 Senators.

The 5 Counties in the San Francisco Bay Area have 3,085,000 people and 5 Senators. The remaining 45 Northern Counties have 3,575,000 people and 27 Senators.

The following 30 Counties have 14 Senators: Lassen, Modoc, Plumas, Del Norte, Siskiyou, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Shasta, Trinity, Butte, Nevada, Placer, Sierra, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama, Amador, El Dorado, Sutter, Yuba, Napa, Yolo, Solano, Calaveras, Mariposa, Tuolumne, Alpine, Inyo and Mono. (1960 population 945,000).

The Bay Area Counties pay (deducting subventions) net State taxes of $181,250,000. The Southern 8 Counties pay $463,700,000. The 30 Counties pay net but $7,504,000.

The Bay Area and the Southern 8 Counties have ⅘ of the population, pay ⅔ of State taxes and have but 13 Senators. The 30 Counties with 6% of the population and paying but ¾ of 1% of net State taxes have 14.

The above changes in the past 34 years demonstrate we must have reapportionment of the State Senate. The injustice is so glaring it need not be argued.

The Legislature should represent people and not trees. The Bay Area and Southern California provide jobs for millions. These two areas pay the major taxes to support schools, colleges, universities and to operate the State Government. Justice demands that these populous areas have a stronger voice in making laws that levy taxes and spend tax money.

Proposition 15 gives to San Francisco, Alameda, Santa Clara, San Diego, Orange and San Bernardino Counties 2 Senators each. It gives Los Angeles County 7 but prohibits forever 1 County having more than 7. No. 15 is not sectional. It is fair to all the people of California. It recognizes every principle of just representation—geographical area, population, taxes paid, schools, agriculture, business, industry. It retains the best features of the 1926 Federal Plan. The agricultural and other rural areas with but 40% of the population and paying less than 40% of the net State taxes have 27 Senators. This ⅔ majority in the rural areas empowers the Senate to reject the action of the Assembly and to override the Governor's veto.

6,000,000 people in Los Angeles County have but 1 Senator. The same number of people in the remainder of California, excluding the Bay Area, have 34 Senators. 1 Senator cannot adequately represent 6,000,000 people. Each of 42 States has a population less than 6,000,000.

The 1926 law is indefensible. Change it. Vote "YES" on 15.

FRANK G. BONELLI, Chairman,
Board of Supervisors,
Los Angeles County

MRS. LEILAND ATHERTON IRISH,
Civic Leader

JAMES L. BEEBE, Chairman, State
and Local Government Committee,
Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce

Argument Against Senate Reapportionment Initiative Constitutional Amendment

Vote No on Proposition No. 15—one of the most dangerous measures ever presented to California voters.

This reckless State Senate-packing scheme was inspired by political retribution. If it passes it will work untold harm on all California—including Los Angeles County.

Should Proposition No. 15 become law no public issue could ever again be decided by the Legislature of California except on the basis of raw political power. The sectional bitterness that would result—pitting Los Angeles County against the rest of the State—would wreak havoc in our State Government and adversely affect the jobs and prosperity of every California citizen.

Proposition No. 15 grew out of the thirst of certain Los Angeles County Supervisors for higher taxes. The Los Angeles Supervisors tried to wangle a measure through the State Legislature to place a so-called "possessory interest tax" on defense industries. This tax grab was attempted

despite the fact that defense industries provide tens of thousands of jobs and paychecks for Californians—and despite the fact that the proposed tax would have provided all the argument necessary for the Federal Government to heed the wishes of other States trying to lure defense industries away from California.

The State Senate wisely turned thumbs down on this job-destroying, business-curbing scheme.

Then, in retribution, the Chairman of the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors launched this State Senate-packing proposal to destroy the legislators who had protected the State from this dangerous tax scheme he sponsored.

Presently, California—as is the case with most States—elects its Legislature in accordance with the Federal system, whereby the lower house, or Assembly, is chosen on the basis of population, and the upper house, or Senate, on a geographic basis.

Proposition No. 15 would reapportion the State Senate on neither basis, but instead on a completely arbitrary, divisive basis cutting California in two at a permanent, artificial line above and below which 20 State Senators would have to be chosen.

In order to avoid the status of mere satellites of Los Angeles County, surrounding Southland Counties have joined with Northern California Counties—and many thoughtful Los Angeles citizens who have favored other proposals for Senate reapportionment—in emphatic opposition to Proposition No. 15.

The grave problems that California faces r
and in the future—how to solve the despera
urgent problem of bringing water from surp
areas to shortage areas at reasonable cost and with proper guarantees for both—how to provide adequate public schools and roads and other services—can only be solved in an atmosphere of essential harmony and inter-regional trust. They can't be solved by drawing a "Mason-Dixon" line in California.

Proposition No. 15 is opposed by California's Governor Edmund G. Brown.

Proposition No. 15 in fact is opposed by leaders of both political parties and by a host of civic organizations throughout the State.

Smash this politically conceived State Senate-packing scheme.

Vote No on Proposition No. 15.

J. F. SULLIVAN, JR., Chairman
Californians Against Proposition No. 15

GEORGE W. MILIAS
Immediate Past Chairman
Republican State Central Committee

JOSEPH L. WYATT, JR., President
California Democratic Council

Part II—Appendix

1	**FOR THE CALIFORNIA WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BOND ACT.** This act provides for a bond issue of one billion, seven hundred fifty million dollars ($1,750,000,000) to be used by the Department of Water Resources for the development of the water resources of the State.
	AGAINST THE CALIFORNIA WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BOND ACT. This act provides for a bond issue of one billion, seven hundred fifty million dollars ($1,750,000,000) to be used by the Department of Water Resources for the development of the water resources of the State.

This proposed law, by act of the Legislature passed at the 1959 Regular Session, is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article XVI of the Constitution.

(This proposed law does not expressly amend any existing law; therefore the provisions thereof are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE** to indicate that they are **NEW.**)

PROPOSED LAW

An act to add Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 12930) to Part 6 of Division 6 of the Water Code, relating to provision for the development of the water resources of the State by providing the funds necessary therefor through the issuance and sale of bonds of the State of California, and by providing for the handling and disposition of said funds, and providing for the submission of this act to a vote of the people the general election to be held in the month November, 1960.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1. Chapter 8 (commencing at Section 12930) is added to Part 6 of Division 6 of the Water Code, to read:

CHAPTER 8. WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT BONDS

12930. This chapter shall be known and may be cited as the California Water Resources Development Bond Act.

12931. The object of this chapter is to provide funds to assist in the construction of a State Water Resources Development System for the State of California. Said system shall be comprised of the State Water Facilities as defined in Section 12934(d) hereof and such additional facilities as may now or hereafter be authorized by the Legislature as a part of (1) the Central Valley Project or (2) the California Water Plan, and including such other additional facilities as the department deems necessary and desirable to meet local needs, including, but not restricted to, flood control, and to augment the supplies of water in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this chapter. The enactment of this chapter shall not be construed as creating any right to water the use thereof nor as affecting any existing relation with respect to water or water rights, except as expressly provided herein, nor shall anything herein contained affect or be construed as affecting vested water rights. Any facilities heretofore or hereafter authorized as a part of the Central Valley Project or facilities which are acquired or constructed as a part of the State Water Resources Development System with funds made available hereunder shall be acquired, constructed, operated, and maintained pursuant to the provisions of the code governing the Central Valley Project, as said provisions may now or hereafter be amended. For the purposes of this chapter the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta shall be deemed to be within the watershed of the Sacramento River. No facility constructed in whole or in part with funds made available by this chapter shall be used to transport water the right to which was secured through eminent domain by others than the State unless approved by the Legislature by concurrent resolution with a majority of the members elected to each house voting in favor thereof.

12932. Insofar as it is not inconsistent with the express provisions of this chapter, the State General Obligation Bond Law (Chapter 4 (commencing at Section 16720) of Part 3, Division 4, Title 2 of the Government Code), is adopted for the purpose of the issuance, sale, and repayment of, and otherwise providing with respect to, the bonds authorized to be issued by this chapter, and the provisions of that law are included in this chapter as though set out in full in this chapter. All references in this chapter to "herein" shall be deemed to refer both to this chapter and such law.

12933. There is hereby created a California Water Resources Development Finance Committee composed of the Governor, the State Treasurer, the State Controller, Director of Finance and Director of Water Resources, all of whom shall serve without compensation, and the majority of whom shall be empowered to act for said committee. The Director of Finance shall provide such assistance, and the Attorney General shall furnish such legal advice, to the California Water Resources Development Finance Committee as it may require.

12934. As used in this chapter and for the purposes of this chapter as used in the State General Obligation Bond Law, the following words shall have the following meanings:

(a) "Committee" shall mean the California Water Resources Development Finance Committee created by Section 12933.

(b) "Board" or "department" shall mean the Department of Water Resources.

(c) "Fund" shall mean the California Water Resources Development Bond Fund created by Section 12935.

(d) "State Water Facilities" shall mean the following facilities:

(1) A multiple purpose dam and reservoir on the Feather River in the vicinity of Oroville, Butte County, and dams and reservoirs upstream therefrom in Plumas County in the vicinity of Frenchman, Grizzly Valley, Abbey Bridge, Dixie Refuge and Antelope Valley;

(2) An aqueduct system which will provide for the transportation of water from a point or points at or near the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to termini in the Counties of Marin, Alameda, Santa Clara, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles and Riverside, and for delivery of water both at such termini and at canal-side points en route, for service in Solano, Napa, Sonoma, Marin, Alameda, Contra Costa, Santa Clara, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Fresno, Tulare, Kings, Kern, Los Angeles, Ventura, San Bernardino, Riverside, Orange, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Monterey and Santa Barbara Counties.

Said aqueduct system shall consist of intake and diversion works, conduits, tunnels, siphons, pipelines, dams, reservoirs, and pumping facilities, and shall be composed of a North Bay aqueduct extending to a terminal reservoir in Marin County; a South Bay aqueduct extending to terminal reservoirs in the Counties of Alameda and Santa Clara; a reservoir near Los Banos in Merced County; a Pacheco Pass Tunnel aqueduct from a reservoir near Los Banos in Merced County to a terminus in Pacheco Creek in Santa Clara County; a San Joaquin Valley-Southern California aqueduct extending to termini in the vicinity of Newhall, Los Angeles County, and Perris, Riverside County, and having a capacity of not less than 2,500 cubic feet per second at all points north of the northerly boundary of the County of Los Angeles in the Tehachapi Mountains in the vicinity of Quail Lake and a capacity of not less than 10,000 cubic feet per second at all points north of the initial offstream storage reservoir; a coastal aqueduct beginning on the San Joaquin Valley-Southern California aqueduct in the vicinity of Avenal, Kings County, and extending to a terminal at the Santa Maria River;

(3) Master levees, control structures, channel improvements, and appurtenant facilities in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta for water conservation, water supply in the Delta, transfer of water across the Delta, flood and salinity control, and related functions.

(4) Facilities for removal of drainage water from the San Joaquin Valley.

(5) Facilities for the generation and transmission of electrical energy.

(6) Provision for water development facilities for local areas as provided in Chapter 5 (commencing at Section 12880) of Part 6 of Division 6 of the Water Code as the same may now or hereafter be amended.

(7) Including for the foregoing (1 through 5) the relocation of utilities and highways and acquisition of all lands, rights of way, easements, machinery, equipment, apparatus, and all appu nances necessary or convenient therefor.

12935. For the purpose of creating a fund, herein designated the California Water Resources Development Bond Fund, to provide for the acquisition, construction and completion of the State Water Facilities herein specified and, to the extent provided in Section 12938, for additions to the State Water Resources Development System, the committee shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered to create a debt or debts, liability or liabilities of the State of California in the aggregate principal amount of one billion seven hundred fifty million dollars ($1,750,000,000) in the manner and to the extent herein provided, but not otherwise nor in excess thereof.

12936. All bonds herein authorized, which shall have been duly sold and delivered as herein provided, shall constitute valid and legally binding general obligations of the State of California, and the full faith and credit of the State of California is hereby pledged for the punctual payment of both principal and interest thereof. Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision (b) of Section 16731 of the Government Code, the first date or dates of maturity of any series of bonds issued under this chapter shall be not more than 10 years, and the last dates of maturity of any such series of bonds may be fixed at any date or dates to and including 50 years, after the date of that series. The committee may fix different dates the bonds of each series and the bonds of any s may be made to mature and become payable at different times from those of any other series; provided, that the maturity dates of each separate series shall comply with the provisions of this section.

12937. The ways and means for the payment of the interest on and the principal of such bonds shall be as follows:

(a) There shall be collected annually in the same manner and at the same time as other state revenue is collected such a sum, in addition to the ordinary revenues of the State, as shall be required to pay the principal and interest on said bonds as herein provided, and it is hereby made the duty of all officers charged by law with any duty in regard to the collection of said revenue, to do and perform each and every act which shall be necessary to collect such additional sum.

There is hereby appropriated from the General Fund in the State Treasury such sum annually as will be necessary to pay the principal of and the interest on the bonds issued and sold pursuant to the provisions of this chapter, as said principal and interest become due and payable.

On the several dates on which funds are remitted pursuant to Section 16676 of the Government Code for the payment of the then maturing principal and interest on the bonds, to wit, on the several dates of maturity of said principal and interest in each fiscal year there shall be tr ferred into the General Fund in the State T ury from revenues deposited in the fund as pr-

vided in subdivision (b) of this Section 12937, and from any accrued interest and premiums received on any sale, or sales of the bonds, so far as available therein, amounts equal to, but not in excess of all sums so becoming due for principal and interest and in the event such money received from such sources and so returned on said remittance dates is less than the principal and interest then due and payable then the balance remaining unpaid shall be transferred to the General Fund out of moneys in the fund received from such sources as soon thereafter as it shall become available, together with simple interest thereon, from such remittance dates until so returned at the same rate as borne by the bonds.

(b) All revenues derived from the sale, delivery or use of water or power, and all other income or revenue, derived by the State, from the State Water Resources Development System shall be deposited in a special account or accounts in the California Water Resources Development Bond Fund and shall be accounted for and used annually only for the following purposes and in the following order, to wit:

1. The payment of the reasonable costs of the annual maintenance and operation of the State Water Resources Development System and the replacement of any parts thereof.

2. The annual payment of the principal of and interest on the bonds issued pursuant to this chapter.

3. Transfer to the California Water Fund as reimbursement for funds utilized from said fund for construction of the State Water Resources Development System.

4. Any surplus revenues in each year not required for the purpose specified in the foregoing subparagraphs (1), (2) and (3) of this subdivision (b) of Section 12937 and not required to be transferred to the General Fund pursuant to subparagraph (a) of this Section 12937, shall, during the time any of the bonds authorized herein are outstanding, be deposited in a special account in the California Water Resources Development Bond Fund and are hereby appropriated for use and shall be available for expenditure by the department for acquisition and construction of the State Water Resources Development System as described in Section 12931 hereof.

All such revenues shall constitute a trust fund and are hereby pledged for the uses and purposes above set forth and such pledge shall inure to the direct benefit of the owners and holders of all general obligation bonds issued under this chapter. The department, subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Legislature, shall enter into contracts for the sale, delivery or use of water or power, or for other services and facilities, made available by the State Water Resources Development System with public or private corporations, entities, or individuals. Such contracts shall not be impaired by subsequent acts of the Legislature during the time when any of the bonds authorized herein are outstanding and the State may sue and be sued with respect to said contracts. Said contracts shall be for a stated term insofar as practicable and feasible, for the full term of the life of the general obligation bonds issued under this chapter and each such contract shall recite (i) that it is entered into for the direct benefit of the holders and owners of all general obligation bonds issued under this chapter, and (ii) that the income and revenues derived from such contracts are pledged to the purposes and in the priority herein set forth. Such pledge of revenues as herein set forth is hereby declared to be and shall constitute an essential term of this chapter and upon its ratification by the people of the State of California shall be binding upon the State so long as any general obligation bonds authorized hereunder are outstanding and unpaid. Such income and revenues, subject to the priorities herein set forth, shall constitute additional security for all of the bonds authorized and issued hereunder irrespective of the date of their issuance and sale and so long as any of the bonds authorized and issued hereunder, or the interest thereon, are unpaid, such income and revenues shall not be used for any other purpose. The bonds authorized hereunder shall be equally secured by a lien upon all income and revenues derived from the State Water Resources Development System without priority for number, amount, date of bonds, of sale, of execution, or of delivery pursuant to this chapter. Notwithstanding the pledge of revenues herein contained, the State of California shall remain liable for the payment of the principal of and interest upon all of the bonds authorized and issued under this chapter.

12938. All proceeds from the sale of the bonds herein authorized shall be deposited in the fund as provided in Section 16757 of the Government Code and shall be available for the purpose provided in Section 12935, but, except only as to accrued interest and any premiums received on any sale, or sales, of the bonds, shall not be available for transfer to the General Fund. All moneys deposited in the fund are hereby appropriated to the department for expenditure and allocation by the department without regard to fiscal years for the State Water Facilities as herein defined and, to the extent provided in this Section 12938, for additions to the State Water Resources Development System. Of the total amount of the bonds authorized herein, one hundred thirty million dollars ($130,000,000) and no more shall be available exclusively for the provision of water development facilities for local areas as set forth in subdivision (d)(6) of Section 12934. Any money in the California Water Fund, and any surplus revenue as described in Section 12937(b)4, available for expenditure for the State Water Resources Development System shall be used for the construction of the State Water Facilities in lieu of the proceeds of bonds authorized by this chapter. The use of the proceeds of bonds for such construction shall be decreased by an amount equal to that hereafter expended from the California Water Fund for the construction of State Water Facilities. To the extent that money is expended from the California Water Fund for construction of the State Water Facilities, proceeds from the sale of bonds authorized pursuant to this act in an equal amount, is appropriated and shall be expended for the construction of such additional

facilities of the State Water Resources Development System as the department shall determine to be necessary and desirable to meet local needs, including, but not restricted to, flood control, and to augment the supplies of water in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta from multiple purpose dams, reservoirs, aqueducts and appurtenant works in the watersheds of the Sacramento, Eel, Trinity, Mad, Van Duzen and Klamath Rivers for use in the State Water Resources Development System, and the department is authorized to construct any and all facilities for which funds are appropriated to it for expenditure pursuant to this chapter. Such additional facilities for local needs shall include those necessary to conserve or develop water which is tributary to the stream upon which any of the facilities of the State Water Resources Development System are constructed and it shall be the duty of the department to diligently plan such full development and submit plans and reports thereon to the Legislature. All moneys in the California Water Fund and all accruals thereto are hereby appropriated to the department for expenditure and allocation by the department without regard to fiscal years for the State Water Resources Development System as defined in Section 12931 except that in any fiscal year the Legislature may appropriate for any lawful purpose any money in the California Water Fund which is unexpended at the beginning of that fiscal year and any money accruing to that fund during the fiscal year.

12939. Upon the written request of the board, supported by a statement of the expenditures made and to be made for the State Water Resources Development System, the committee shall determine whether or not it is necessary or desirable to issue any bonds authorized under this chapter in order to make such expenditures and, if so, the amount of bonds then to be issued and sold. The committee and the board shall file with the Legislature detailed reports of all expenditures from the California Water Resources Development Bond Fund and the California Water Fund, setting forth descriptions of the purposes of all such expenditures. Such reports shall be filed on or before the fifteenth day of each regular legislative session and shall show schedules of expenditures and the dates on which additional water will be available for sale from principal termini of the State Water Resources Development System and the total amount then available for sale at these termini. Successive issues of bonds may be authorized and sold to make such expenditures progressively and it shall not be necessary that all of the bonds herein authorized to be issued shall be sold at any one time.

12940. If any resolution determining that the sale of all or any part of the bonds herein authorized is necessary or desirable, the committee may in its discretion provide for the interexchange of bonds of different denominations, which may be in any multiple of one thousand dollars ($1,000), the issuance of bonds of different denominations in lieu of or in exchange for bonds of a like aggregate principal amount but of different denominations, the issuance of registered bonds in such denominations as may be specified by the committee and the exchange of such registered bonds for coupon bonds of a like aggregate principal amount but of different denominations. The committee may also provide for the authentication of any bonds by the State Controller or by any duty state controller. If authentication is so required, no bond authorized hereunder shall be valid unless so authenticated in the manner so required.

12941. In computing the net interest cost under Section 16754 of the Government Code, the committee may determine that interest shall be computed either from the date of sale or from the date of the bonds or from the last preceding interest payment date to the respective maturity dates of the bonds then offered for sale at the coupon rate or rates specified in the bid, such computation to be made on a 360-day year basis, and the committee shall make appropriate provision therefor in the form of notice of sale of the bonds.

12942. The committee may authorize the State Treasurer to sell all or any part of the bonds herein authorized at such date or dates as may be fixed by the State Treasurer and no direction of the Governor shall be required. The provisions of Sections 16750 and 16754 of the Government Code respecting the direction of the Governor shall not be applicable to such sale.

Sec. 2. Section 1 of this act shall take effect upon the adoption by the people of the California Water Resources Development Bond Act, as set forth in Section 1 of this act. Sections 2 to [illegible] this act contain provisions relating to and necessary for the submission of the California Water Resources Development Bond Act to the people, and for returning, canvassing, and proclaiming the votes thereon, and shall take effect immediately.

Sec. 3. The California Water Resources Development Bond Act, as set forth in Section 1 of this act, shall be submitted to the people of the State of California for their ratification at the next general election, to be held in the month of November, 1960, and all ballots at said election shall have printed thereon and in a square thereof, the words: "For the California Water Resources Development Bond Act," and the same square under said words the following in 8-point type: "This act provides for a bond issue of one billion seven hundred fifty million dollars ($1,750,000,000) to be used by the Department of Water Resources for the development of the water resources of the State." In the square immediately below the square containing such words, there shall be printed on said ballot the words, "Against the California Water Resources Development Bond Act," and in the same square immediately below said words, in 8-point type shall be printed "This act provides for a bond issue of one billion seven hundred fifty million dollars ($1,750,000,000) to be used by the Department of Water Resources for the development of the water resources of the State." Opposite the words "For the California Water Resources Development Bond Act," "Against the California Water Resources Develop-

ment Bond Act," there shall be left spaces in which the voters may place a cross in the manner required by law to indicate whether they vote for gainst said act, and those voting for said act . .l do so by placing a cross opposite the words, "For the California Water Resources Development Bond Act," and those voting against the said act shall do so by placing a cross opposite the words "Against the California Water Resources Development Bond Act." Provided, that where the voting of said general election is done by means of voting machines used pursuant to law in such manner as to carry out the intent of this section, such use of such voting machines and the expression of the voters' choice by means thereof, shall be deemed to comply with the provisions of this section. The Governor of this State shall include the submission of this act to the people, as aforesaid, in his proclamation calling for said general election.

Sec. 4. The votes cast for or against the California Water Resources Development Bond Act shall be counted, returned and canvassed and declared in the same manner and subject to the same rules as votes cast for state officers; and if it appears that said act shall have received a majority of all the votes cast for and against it at said election as aforesaid, then the same shall have effect as hereinbefore provided, and shall be irrepealable until the principal and interest of the liabilities herein created shall be paid and discharged, and the Governor shall make proclamation thereof; but if a majority of the votes cast as aforesaid are against this act then the same shall be and become void.

2 **TERMS OF ASSEMBLYMEN.** Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 15. Provides that terms of members of Assembly elected in 1960 and thereafter shall be four years; one-half of members elected in 1960 shall vacate office at expiration of second year, so that half of the members of the Assembly shall be elected every two years.

YES ☐

NO ☐

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~, and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE IV

Sec. 3. Members of the Assembly ~~shall be~~ elected ...e year ~~eighteen hundred and seventy-nine, at the time and in the manner now provided by law. The second election of members of the Assembly after the adoption of this Constitution shall be on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, eighteen hundred and eighty. Thereafter, members of the Assembly shall be chosen biennially, and their term of office shall be two years,~~ **1960, and thereafter, shall be chosen for a term of four years**; and each election shall be on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, unless otherwise ordered by the Legislature. **The seats of 40 Members of the Assembly elected in the year 1960 from the odd-numbered districts shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, so that half of the Members of the Assembly shall be elected every two years.**

3 **DISABLED VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION.** Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 21. Permits totally disabled veteran entitled to $5,000 exemption on a home to transfer it to subsequently acquired home.

YES ☐

NO ☐

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution and adds a new section thereto; therefore **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~, and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **ADDED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE XIII

First—That Section 1¼ of Article XIII be amended to read:

SEC. 1¼. The property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of every resident of this State who has served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service of the United States (1) in time of war, or (2) in time of peace, in a campaign or expedition for service in which a medal has been issued by the Congress of the United States, and in either has received an honorable discharge therefrom, who after such service of the United States under such conditions has continued in such service, or who in time of war is in such service, or who has been released from active duty because of disability resulting from such service in time of peace or under other honorable conditions, or lacking such amount of property in his own name, so much of the property of the wife of any such person as shall be necessary to equal said amount; and the property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of the widow resident in this State, or if there be no such widow, of the widowed mother resident in this State, of every person who has so served and has died either during his term of service or after receiving an honorable discharge from said service, or who has been released from active duty because of disability resulting from such service in time of peace or under other honorable conditions, and the property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of pensioned widows, fathers, and mothers, resident in this State, of soldiers, sailors and marines who served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service of the United States shall be exempt from taxation; provided, this exemption shall not apply

to any person named herein owning property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more, or where the wife of such soldier or sailor owns property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more. No exemption shall be made under the provisions of this section of the property of a person who is not legal resident of the State; provided, however, all real property owned by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic and all property owned by the California Soldiers Widows Home Association shall be exempt from taxation.

~~The Legislature may exempt from taxation, in whole or in part, the property, constituting a home, of every resident of this State who, by reason of his military or naval service, is qualified for the exemption provided in the first paragraph of this section, without regard to any limitation contained therein on the value of property owned by such person or his wife, and who, by reason of a permanent and total service-connected disability incurred in such military or naval service due to the loss, or loss of use, as the result of amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, has received assistance from the Government of the United States in the acquisition of such property; except that such exemption shall not extend to more than one home nor exceed five thousand dollars ($5,000) for any person or for any person and his spouse. This exemption shall be in lieu of the exemption provided in the first paragraph of this section.~~

Second—That Section 1¼a be added to Article XIII, to read:

Sec. 1¼a. The Legislature may exempt f taxation, in whole or in part, the property, constituting a home, of every resident of this State who, by reason of his military or naval service, is qualified for the exemption provided in Section 1¼ of this article, without regard to any limitation contained therein on the value of property owned by such person or his wife, and who, by reason of a permanent and total service-connected disability incurred in such military or naval service due to the loss, or loss of use, as the result of amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, has received assistance from the Government of the United States in the acquisition of such property; except that such exemption shall not extend to more than one home nor exceed five thousand dollars ($5,000) for any person or for any person and his spouse. This exemption shall be in lieu of the exemption provided in Section 1¼ of this article.

Where such totally disabled person sells or otherwise disposes of such property and thereafter acquires, with or without the assistance of the Government of the United States, any other property which such totally disabled person occupies habitually as a home, the exemption allowed pursuant to the first paragraph of this section shall be allowed to such other property.

---

4 TERMS OF OFFICE. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1 (1960 First Extraordinary Session). Permits Legislature to provide terms of office not to exceed eight years for members of any state agency created by it to administer the State College System of California.

YES ☐

NO ☐

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XX

SEC. 16. When the term of any officer or commissioner is not provided for in this Constitution, the term of such officer or commissioner may be declared by law; and, if not so declared, such officer or commissioner shall hold his position as such officer or commissioner during the pleasure of the authority making the appointment; but in no case shall such term exceed four years; provided, however, that in the case of any officer or employee of any municipality governed under a legally adopted charter, the provisions of such charter with reference to the tenure of office or the dismissal from office of any such officer or employee shall control; and provided further, that the term of office of any person heretofore or hereafter appointed to hold office or employment during good behavior under civil service laws of the State or of any political division thereof shall not be limited by this section.

The Legislature may provide terms of office for not to exceed eight years for the members of any state agency created by it in the field of public higher education which is charged with the management, administration, and control of the State College System of California.

---

5 COMPENSATION OF LEGISLATORS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 31. Sets salary of members of the State Legislature at $750 per month. Provides that increased compensation provided by this amendment shall not increase retirement benefits for those legislators already retired.

YES ☐

NO ☐

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~, and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE IV

That the first paragraph of subdivision (b) of Section 2 of Article IV be amended to read:

(b) Each Member of the Legislature shall ceive for his services the sum of ~~five hundred dol-~~

~~lars ($500)~~ seven hundred fifty dollars ($750) for each month of the term for which he is elected.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this ~~constitution~~ or of law, the increased compensa- ~~tion~~ for Members of the Legislature resulting from ~~the~~ amendment to this subdivision as proposed by the Legislature at its 1959 Regular Session shall not be considered in computing the retirement benefits under the Legislators' Retirement System of any person who has retired under that system prior to the operative date of said amendment and the retirement benefits payable to such retired members shall not be increased as the result of such increased compensation.

ASSESSMENT OF GOLF COURSES. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29.

6 Establishes manner in which non-profit golf courses should be assessed for purposes of taxation.

YES	
NO	

(This proposed amendment does not expressly amend any existing section of the Constitution, but adds a new section thereto; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE** to indicate that they are **NEW**.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XIII

Sec. 2.6. In assessing real property consisting of one parcel of 10 acres or more and used exclusively for nonprofit golf course purposes for at least two successive years prior to the assessment, the assessor shall consider no factors other than those relative to such use. He may, however, take into consideration the existence of any mines, minerals and quarries in the property, including, but not limited to oil, gas and other hydrocarbon substances.

CHIROPRACTORS. Amendment To Chiropractic Initiative Act, Submitted By Legislature.

7 Permits two, rather than one, board members from same chiropractic school or college to be members of board at same time. Provides that Legislature may fix fees of applicants and licensees and per diem compensation payable to board members.

YES	
NO	

(This proposed law expressly amends an existing law and adds new provisions to the law; therefore **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~; and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **ADDED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED LAW

An act to amend an initiative act entitled "An act prescribing the terms upon which licenses may be issued to practitioners of chiropractic, creating the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners and declaring its powers and duties, prescribing penalties for violation hereof, and repealing all acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith," approved by electors November 7, 1922, by amending Section 1 thereof and adding Section 12.5 thereto, relating to practice of chiropractic, said amendment to take effect upon the approval thereof by the electors, and providing for the submission thereof to the electors pursuant to Section 1b of Article IV of the State Constitution.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1. Section 1 of the act cited in the title is amended to read:

Section 1. A board is hereby created to be known as the "State Board of Chiropractic Examiners," hereinafter referred to as the board, which shall consist of five members, citizens of the State of California, appointed by the Governor. Each member must have pursued a resident course in a regularly incorporated chiropractic school or college, and must be a graduate thereof and hold a diploma therefrom.

~~Each~~ member of the board first appointed hereunder shall have practiced chiropractic in the State of California for a period of three years next preceding the date upon which this act takes effect, thereafter appointees shall be licentiates hereunder. ~~No~~ **Not more than** two persons shall serve simultaneously as members of said board, whose first diplomas were issued by the same school or college of chiropractic, nor shall more than two members be residents of any one county of the State. And no person connected with any chiropractic school or college shall be eligible to appointment as a member of the board. Each member of the board, except the secretary, shall receive a per diem of ten dollars ($10) for each day during which he is actually engaged in the discharge of his duties, together with his actual and necessary traveling expenses incurred in connection with the performance of the duties of his office, such per diem traveling expenses and other incidental expenses of the board or of its members to be paid out of the funds of the board hereinafter defined and not from the State's taxes.

Sec. 2. Section 12.5 is added to said act, to read:

Sec. 12.5. The Legislature may by law fix the amounts of the fees payable by applicants and licensees and the amount of the per diem compensation payable to members of the board.

Sec. 3. Sections 1 and 2 of this act shall become effective only when submitted to and approved by the electors, pursuant to Section 1b of Article IV of the Constitution of the State.

Sec. 4. Sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be submitted to the electors for their approval or rejection at the next succeeding general election occurring at any time subsequent to 130 days after this section takes effect, or at any state-wide special election which may be called by the Gov-

ernor, in his discretion, prior to such general election, in the same manner that a constitutional amendment proposed by the Legislature would be submitted, and all of the provisions of law relative to submission of such constitutional amendments to the electors and to matters incidental thereto shall apply to the submission of Sections 1 and 2 of this act, except as otherwise provided in this section or as such provisions may be clearly inapplicable for the submission of amendment to an initiative measure pursuan Section 1b of Article IV of the State Constituti...

8 **ELIGIBILITY TO VOTE. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 5.** Changes prohibitions of eligibility to vote from those convicted of infamous crime to those convicted of felony during punishment therefor and those convicted of treason.

YES	
NO	

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~; and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE II

SECTION 1. Every native citizen of the United States of America, every person who shall have acquired the rights of citizenship under and by virtue of the Treaty of Querétaro, and every naturalized citizen thereof, who shall have become such 90 days prior to any election, of the age of 21 years, who shall have been a resident of the State one year next preceding the day of the election, and of the county in which he or she claims his or her vote 90 days, and in the election precinct 54 days, shall be entitled to vote at all elections which are now or may hereafter be authorized by law; provided, any person duly registered as an elector in one precinct and removing therefrom to another precinct in the same county within 54 days, or any person duly registered as an elector in any county in California and removing therefrom to another county in California within 90 days prior to an election, shall for the purpose of such election be deemed to be a resident and qualified elector of the precinct or county from which he so removed until after such election; provided, further, no alien ineligible to citizenship, no idiot, no insane person, no person convicted of any ~~infamous crime, no person hereafter convicted of~~ felony, while paying the penalties imposed by law therefor, including any period of probation or parole, no person convicted of treason, the embezzlement or misappropriation of public money, and no person who shall not be able to read the Constitution in the English language and write his or her name, shall ever exercise the privileges of an elector in this State; provided, that the provisions of this amendment relative to an educational qualification shall not apply to any person prevented by a physical disability from complying with its requisitions, nor to any person who had the right to vote on October 10, 1911, nor to any person who was 60 years of age and upwards on October 10, 1911; provided, further, that the Legislature may, by general law, provide for the casting of votes by duly registered voters who expect to be absent from t... respective precincts or unable to vote therein reason of physical disability, on the day on w... any election is held.

9 **CLAIMS AGAINST CHARTERED CITIES AND COUNTIES. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 16.** Permits Legislature to prescribe procedures governing claims against chartered counties, cities and counties, and cities, or against officers, agents and employees thereof.

YES	
NO	

(This proposed amendment does not expressly amend any existing section of the Constitution, but adds a new section thereto; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE** to indicate that they are **NEW.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XI

Sec. 10. No provision of this article shall limit the power of the Legislature to prescribe procedures governing the presentation, consideration and enforcement of claims against chartered counties, chartered cities and counties, and chartered cities, or against officers, agents and employees thereof.

10 **ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 14.** Provides that membership of Judicial Council besides judges shall include members of State Bar and two legislators; permits appointment of administrative director. Creates Commission on Judicial Qualifications consisting of judges, members of State Bar and citizens; provides procedure for removal of judges for misconduct or to compel retirement for disability. Declares State Bar of California is a public corporation. Changes name of Commission on Qualifications to Commission on Judicial Appointments.

YES	
NO	

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, and adds new sections thereto; therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~, and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** or **ADDED** are pri...d in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE VI

First—That Section 1a of Article VI is amended to read:

SEC. 1a. There shall be a Judicial Council. It shall consist of: (i) the Chief Justice or Acting Chief Justice ~~, and of~~ ; (ii) one associate justice of the Supreme Court, three justices of district courts of appeal, four judges of superior courts, ~~one judge~~ two judges of a ~~police or~~ municipal ~~court~~ courts, and one judge of ~~an inferior~~ a justice court, ~~assigned~~ designated by the Chief Justice ~~to sit there on~~ for terms of two years; (iii) four members of the State Bar of California appointed by the Board of Governors of the State Bar for terms of two years, two of the first such appointees to be appointed for one year and two for two years; and (iv) one member of each house of the Legislature designated as provided by the respective house. ~~provided, that if~~ If any judge so ~~assigned~~ designated shall cease to be a judge of the court from which he is ~~assigned~~ selected, his ~~term~~ designation shall forthwith terminate. If any member of the State Bar so appointed shall cease to be a member of the State Bar, his appointment shall forthwith terminate, and the Board of Governors of the State Bar shall fill the vacancy in his unexpired term. If any member of the Legislature so designated shall cease to be a member of the house from which designated, his designation shall forthwith terminate, and a new designation shall be made in the manner provided by the respective house. The Chief Justice or Acting Chief Justice shall be chairman and the Clerk of the Supreme Court shall serve as secretary. The council may appoint an administrative director of the courts, who shall hold office at its pleasure and shall perform such of the duties of the council and of its chairman, other than to adopt or amend rules of practice and procedure, as may be delegated to him. No act of the council shall be valid unless concurred in by ~~six~~ a majority of its members.

The Judicial Council shall from time to time:

(1) Meet at the call of the chairman or as otherwise provided by it.

(2) Survey the condition of business in the several courts with a view to simplifying and improving the administration of justice.

(3) Submit such suggestions to the several courts as may seem in the interest of uniformity and the expedition of business.

(4) Report to the Governor and Legislature at the commencement of each regular session with such recommendations as it may deem proper.

(5) Submit to the Legislature, at each general session thereof, its recommendations with reference to amendments of, or changes in, existing laws relating to practice and procedure.

~~(5)~~ (6) Adopt or amend rules of practice and procedure for the several courts not inconsistent with laws that are now or that may hereafter be in force ~~; and the council shall submit to the Legislature, at each regular session thereof, its recommendations with reference to amendments of, or changes in, existing laws relating to practice and procedure~~.

~~(6)~~ (7) Exercise such other functions as may be provided by law.

The chairman shall seek to expedite judicial business and to equalize the work of the judges, and shall provide for the assignment of any judge to another court of a like or higher jurisdiction to assist a court or judge whose calendar is congested, to act for a judge who is disqualified or unable to act, or to sit and hold court where a vacancy in the office of judge has occurred. A judge may likewise be assigned with his consent to a court of lower jurisdiction, and a retired judge may similarly be assigned with his consent to any court.

~~The clerk of the supreme court shall act as secretary of the council.~~

The ~~several~~ judges shall co-operate with the council, shall sit and hold court as assigned, and shall report to the chairman at such times and in such manner as he shall request respecting the condition, and manner of disposal, of judicial business in their respective courts.

No member of the council shall receive any compensation for his services as such, but shall be allowed his necessary expenses for travel, board and lodging incurred in the performance of his duties as such. Any judge assigned to a court wherein a judge's compensation is greater than his own shall receive while sitting therein the compensation of a judge thereof. The extra compensation shall be paid in such manner as may be provided by law. Any judge assigned to a court in a county other than that in which he regularly sits shall be allowed his necessary expenses for travel, board and lodging incurred in the discharge of the assignment.

Second—That Section 1b is added to Article VI, to read:

SEC. 1b. There shall be a Commission on Judicial Qualifications. It shall consist of: (i) Two justices of district courts of appeal, two judges of superior courts, and one judge of a municipal court, each selected by the Supreme Court for a four-year term; (ii) two members of the State Bar, who shall have practiced law in this State for at least 10 years and who shall be appointed by the Board of Governors of the State Bar for a four-year term; and (iii) two citizens, neither of whom shall be a justice or judge of any court, active or retired, nor a member of the State Bar, and who shall be appointed by the Governor for a four-year term. Every appointment made by the Governor to the commission shall be subject to the advice and consent of a majority of members elected to the Senate, except that if a vacancy occurs when the Legislature is not in session, the Governor may issue an interim commission which shall expire on the last day of the next regular or special session of the Legislature. Whenever a member selected under subdivision (i) ceases to be a member of the commission or a justice or judge of the court from which he was selected, his membership shall forthwith terminate and the Supreme Court shall select a successor for a four-year term; and whenever a member appointed under subdivision (ii) ceases to be a member of the commission or of the State Bar, his membership shall forthwith terminate and the Board of Governors of the State Bar shall appoint a successor for a four-year term; and whenever a member appointed under

subdivision (iii) ceases to be a member of the commission or becomes a justice or judge of any court or a member of the State Bar, his membership shall forthwith terminate and the Governor shall appoint a successor for a four-year term. No member of the commission shall receive any compensation for his services as such, but shall be allowed his necessary expenses for travel, board and lodging incurred in the performance of his duties as such.

No act of the commission shall be valid unless concurred in by a majority of its members. The commission shall select one of its members to serve as chairman.

Third—That Section 1c is added to Article VI, to read:

Sec. 1c. The State Bar of California is a public corporation with perpetual existence and succession. Every person admitted and licensed to practice law in this State is and shall be a member of the State Bar except while holding office as a justice or judge of a court of record.

Fourth—That Section 10b is added to Article VI, to read:

Sec. 10b. A justice or judge of any court of this State, in accordance with the procedure prescribed in this section, may be removed for willful misconduct in office or willful and persistent failure to perform his duties or habitual intemperance, or he may be retired for disability seriously interfering with the performance of his duties, which is, or is likely to become, of a permanent character. The Commission on Judicial Qualifications may, after such investigation as the commission deems necessary, order a hearing to be held before it concerning the removal or retirement of a justice or a judge, or the commission may in its discretion request the Supreme Court to appoint three special masters, who shall be justices or judges of courts of record, to hear and take evidence in any such matter, and to report thereon to the commission. If, after hearing, or after considering the record and report of the masters, the commission finds good cause therefor, it shall recommend to the Supreme Court the removal or retirement, as the case may be, of the justice or judge.

The Supreme Court shall review the record of the proceedings on the law and facts and in its discretion may permit the introduction of additional evidence and shall order removal or retirement, as it finds just and proper, or wholly reject the recommendation. Upon an order for retirement, the justice or judge shall thereby be retired with the same rights and privileges as if he retired pursuant to statute. Upon an order for removal, the justice or judge shall thereby be removed from office, and his salary shall cease from the date of such order.

All papers filed with and proceedings before the Commission on Judicial Qualifications or masters appointed by the Supreme Court, pursuant to this section, shall be confidential, and the filing of papers with and the giving of testimony before the commission or the masters shall be privileged; but no other publication of such papers or proceedings shall be privileged in any action for defamation except that (a) the record filed by the commission in the Supreme Court continues privileged and upon such filing loses its confidential character and (b) a writing which was privileged prior to its filing with the commission or the masters does not lose such privilege by such filing. The Judicial Council shall by rule provide for procedure under this section before the Commission on Judicial Qualifications, the masters, and the Supreme Court. A justice or judge who is a member of the commission or Supreme Court shall not participate in any proceedings involving his own removal or retirement.

This section is alternative to, and cumulative with, the methods of removal of justices and judges provided in Sections 10 and 10a of this article, Sections 17 and 18 of Article IV, and Article XXIII, of this Constitution.

Fifth—That Section 26a is added to Article VI, to read:

Sec. 26a. The "Commission on Qualifications" created by Section 26 of this article is renamed and henceforth shall be known as the "Commission on Judicial Appointments."

---

11 **VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION.** **Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 13.** Provides that residency requirement for veterans' tax exemption of $1,000 means those who were residents at time of entry into armed forces or operative date of this amendment; survivor to be entitled to exemption must be survivor of qualified veteran and also resident at time of application. Extends exemption to widowers as well as widows; exemption denied to survivor owning property of value of $10,000. Permits totally disabled veteran entitled to $5,000 exemption on a home to transfer it to subsequently acquired home.

YES	
NO	

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, and adds a new section thereto; therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~, and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** or **ADDED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE**.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE XIII

First—That Section 1¼ of Article XIII be amended to read:

Sec. 1¼. **(a)** The property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of every resident of this State who has served in the ~~Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service~~ **Armed Forces** of the United States (1) in time of war, or (2) in time of peace, in a campaign or expedition for service in which a medal has been issued by, **or under the authority of,** the Congress of the United S' and in either case has received an honorable charge therefrom, or who after such service of the

United States under such conditions has continued in such service, or who in time of war is in such service, or (3) who has been released from active
because of disability resulting from such
ce in time of peace or under other honorable conditions ; ; or lacking such amount of property in his own name, so much of the property of the ~~wife~~ **spouse** of any such person as shall be necessary to equal said amount, **shall be exempt from taxation; provided, this exemption shall not apply to any person described herein owning property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more, or where the spouse of such person owns property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more.** ~~, and the~~

(b) The property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of the ~~widow~~ **surviving** resident **spouse** in this State, or if there be no such ~~widow~~ **surviving spouse**, of the widowed mother resident in this State, of every person who has so served and has died ~~either during his term of service or after receiving an honorable discharge from said service, or who has been released from active duty because of disability resulting from such service in time of peace or under other honorable conditions~~, and the property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of pensioned ~~widows~~ **surviving spouses**, fathers, and mothers, resident in this State, of ~~soldiers, sailors and marines who served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service of the United States~~ **persons described herein who have so served in the Armed Forces of the United States**, shall **be** exempt from taxation; provided, t' xemption **shall** not apply to ~~any person named i owning property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more, or where the wife of such soldier or sailor owns property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more.~~ any **surviving spouse**, father or mother described in **this subdivision owning property of the value of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) or more.** ~~No exemption shall be made under the provisions of this section of the property of a person who is not legal resident of the State; provided, however, all~~

(c) All real property owned by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic and all property owned by the California Soldiers Widows Home Association **shall** be exempt from taxation.

~~The Legislature may exempt from taxation, in whole or in part, the property, constituting a home, of every resident of this State who, by reason of his military or naval service, is qualified for the exemption provided in the first paragraph of this section, without regard to any limitation contained therein on the value of property owned by such person or his wife, and who, by reason of a permanent and total service-connected disability incurred in such military or naval service due to the loss, or loss of use, as the result of amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, has received assistance from the Government of the United States in the acquisition of such property; except that such exemption shall not extend to more than one home nor exceed five thousand dollars ($5,000) for any person or for any person and his spouse. This exemption shall be in lieu of the exemption provided in the first paragraph of this section.~~

No person described herein who has served in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be eligible for such exemption unless he was a resident of California at the time of his entry into such Armed Forces, or unless he was a resident of California at the effective date of the amendment of this section as proposed at the 1959 Regular Session of the Legislature.

No surviving spouse, father or mother of such person described herein who has served in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be eligible for such exemption unless such described person was eligible for such exemption at the time of his death, and unless such surviving spouse, father or mother of such described person was a resident at the time of the application for such exemption.

Second—That Section 1¼a be added to Article XIII, to read:

Sec. 1¼a. The Legislature may exempt from taxation, in whole or in part, the property, constituting a home, of every resident of this State who, by reason of his military or naval service, is qualified for the exemption provided in subdivision (a) of Section 1¼ of this article, without regard to any limitation contained therein on the value of property owned by such person or his spouse, and who, by reason of a permanent and total service-connected disability incurred in such military or naval service due to the loss, or loss of use, as the result of amputation, ankylosis, progressive musular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, has received assistance from the Government of the United States in the acquisition of such property; except that such exemption shall not extend to more than one home nor exceed five thousand dollars ($5,000) for any person or for any person and his spouse. This exemption shall be in lieu of the exemption provided in subdivision (a) of Section 1¼ of this article.

Where such totally disabled person sells or otherwise disposes of such property and thereafter acquires, with or without the assistance of the Government of the United States, any other property which such totally disabled person occupies habitually as a home, the exemption allowed pursuant to the first paragraph of this section shall be allowed to such other property.

CONSTITUTION: ELIMINATES OBSOLETE AND SUPERSEDED PROVISIONS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 22. Repeals and amends several provisions of the constitution to eliminate obsolete and superseded provisions without substantive change. Provides any amendment to constitution which is proposed by Legislature solely to eliminate obsolete and superseded provisions shall not affect prior validations and ratifications. Any other measure submitted to the people at the same election which affects the same sections contained in the legislative proposal shall control to the extent of any conflict.

12

YES	
NO	

(This proposed amendment expressly amends existing sections of the Constitution, repeals existing sections thereof, and adds a new section thereto; therefore **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** or **REPEALED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~; and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** or **ADDED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES IV, V, IX, X, XIII, XX, and XXII

First, that Section 3 of Article IV be amended to read:

SEC. 3. Members of the Assembly shall be elected ~~in the year eighteen hundred and seventy-nine, at the time and in the manner now provided by law. The second election of members of the Assembly after the adoption of this Constitution shall be on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, eighteen hundred and eighty. Thereafter, members of the Assembly shall be chosen~~ biennially, and their term of office shall be two years ~~, and each~~. **Each** election shall be on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, unless otherwise ordered by the Legislature.

Second, that Section 5 of Article IV be amended to read:

SEC. 5. The Senate shall consist of 40 members, and the Assembly of 80 members, to be elected by districts, numbered as hereinafter provided. ~~The seats of the twenty Senators elected in the year eighteen hundred and eighty-two from the odd numbered districts shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, so that one-half~~ **One-half** of the Senators shall be elected every two years ~~, provided, that all the Senators elected at the first election under this Constitution shall hold office for the term of three years.~~, **those from the odd-numbered districts being elected when the number of the year is divisible by four.**

Third, that Section 18 of Article IV be amended to read:

SEC. 18. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, ~~Surveyor General,~~ Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, judges of the district court of appeal, and judges of the superior courts, shall be liable to impeachment for any misdemeanor in office; but judgment in such cases shall extend only to removal from office, and disqualification to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the State; but the party convicted or acquitted shall nevertheless be liable to indictment, trial, and punishment according to law. All other civil officers shall be tried for misdemeanor in office in such manner as the Legislature may provide.

Fourth, That Section 22 of Article IV, as proposed by Resolutions Chapter 184 of the Statutes of 1951, is amended to read:

SEC. 22. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriation made by law, and upon warrants duly drawn thereon by the Controller; and no money shall ever be appropriated or drawn from the State Treasury for the purpose or benefit of any corporation, association, asylum, hospital, or any other institution not under the exclusive management and control of the State as a state institution, nor shall any grant or donation of property ever be made thereto by the state ~~, provided~~, **except** that notwithstanding anything contained in this or any other section of the Constitution ~~, the~~ :

(1) Whenever federal funds are made available for the construction of hospital facilities by public agencies and nonprofit corporations organized to construct and maintain such facilities, nothing in this Constitution shall prevent the Legislature from making state money available for that purpose, or from authorizing the use of such money for the construction of hospital facilities by nonprofit corporations organized to construct and maintain such facilities.

(2) The Legislature shall have the power to grant aid to the institutions conducted for the support and maintenance of minor orphans, or half-orphans, or abandoned children, or children of a father who is incapacitated for gainful work by permanent physical disability or is suffering from tuberculosis in such a stage that he cannot pursue a gainful occupation, or aged persons in indigent circumstances—such aid to be granted by a uniform rule, and proportioned to the number of inmates of such respective institutions ~~, provided, further, that the~~ .

**(3) The Legislature shall have the power to grant aid to needy blind persons not inmates of any institution supported in whole or in part by the State or by any of its political subdivisions, and no person concerned with the administration of aid to needy blind persons shall dictate how any applicant or recipient shall expend such aid granted him, and all money paid to a recipient of such aid shall be intended to help him meet his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person, and such aid when granted shall not be construed as income to any person other than the blind recipient of such aid, and the State Department of Social Welfare shall take all necessary action to enforce the provisions relating to aid to needy blind persons as heretofore stated ~~, provided further the~~ .

(4) The Legislature shall have power to grant aid to needy physically handicapped persons not inmates of any institution under the supervision he Department of Mental Hygiene and sup- ted in whole or in part by the State or by any institution supported in whole or part by any political subdivision of the State ; ~~provided further, that the~~.

(5) The State shall have at any time the right to inquire into the management of such institutions ; ~~provided further, that whenever~~.

(6) Whenever any county, or city and county, or city, or town, shall provide for the support of minor orphans, or half-orphans, or abandoned children, or children of a father who is incapacitated for gainful work by permanent physical disability or is suffering from tuberculosis in such a stage that he cannot pursue a gainful occupation, or aged persons in indigent circumstances, or needy blind persons not inmates of any institution supported in whole or in part by the State or by any of its political subdivisions, or needy physically handicapped persons not inmates of any institution under the supervision of the Department of Mental Hygiene and supported in whole or in part by the State or by any institution supported in whole or part by any political subdivision of the State; such county, city and county, city, or town shall be entitled to receive the same pro rata appropriations as may be granted to such institutions under church, or other control.

An accurate statement of the receipts and expenditures of public moneys shall be attached to s ' published with the laws at every regular ses- of the Legislature.

Fifth, that Section 22 of Article IV, as proposed by Resolutions Chapter 220 of the Statutes of 1951, is hereby repealed.

~~SEC. 22. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriation made by law, and upon warrants duly drawn thereon by the Controller; and no money shall ever be appropriated or drawn from the State Treasury for the purpose or benefit of any corporation, association, asylum, hospital, or any other institution not under the exclusive management and control of the State as a state institution, nor shall any grant or donation of property ever be made thereto by the State; provided, that whenever federal funds are made available for the construction of hospital facilities by public agencies and nonprofit corporations organized to construct and maintain such facilities, nothing in this Constitution shall prevent the Legislature from making state money available for that purpose, or from authorizing the use of such money for the construction of hospital facilities by nonprofit corporations organized to construct and maintain such facilities; provided, further, that notwithstanding anything contained in this or any other section of the Constitution, the Legislature shall have the power to grant aid to the institutions conducted for the support and maintenance of minor orphans, or half-orphans, or abandoned children, or children of a father who is incapacitated for ainful work by permanent physical disability suffering from tuberculosis in such a stage that he cannot pursue a gainful occupation, or aged persons in indigent circumstances—such aid to be granted by a uniform rule, and proportioned to the number of inmates of such respective institutions; provided, further, that the Legislature shall have the power to grant aid to needy blind persons not inmates of any institution supported in whole or in part by the State or by any of its political subdivisions; provided, further, that the Legislature shall have power to grant aid to needy physically handicapped persons not inmates of any institution under the supervision of the Department of Mental Hygiene and supported in whole or in part by the State or by any institution supported in whole or part by any political subdivision of the State; provided, further, that the State shall have at any time the right to inquire into the management of such institutions; provided, further, that whenever any county, or city and county, or city, or town, shall provide for the support of minor orphans, or half-orphans, or abandoned children, or children of a father who is incapacitated for gainful work by permanent physical disability or is suffering from tuberculosis in such a stage that he cannot pursue a gainful occupation, or aged persons in indigent circumstances, or needy blind persons not inmates of any institution supported in whole or in part by the State or by any of its political subdivisions, or needy physically handicapped persons not inmates of any institution under the supervision of the Department of Mental Hygiene and supported in whole or in part by the State or by any institution supported in whole or part by any political subdivision of the State; such county, city and county, city, or town shall be entitled to receive the same pro rata appropriations as may be granted to such institutions under church, or other control. An accurate statement of the receipts and expenditures of public moneys shall be attached to and published with the laws at every regular session of the Legislature.~~

Sixth, that Section 23 of Article IV be amended to read:

SEC. 23. The Members of the Legislature shall receive ~~for their services the sum of one hundred dollars each for each month of the term for which they are elected, to be paid monthly in the even numbered years and to be paid during the regular legislative session in the odd numbered years at such times as may be provided by law and~~ mileage to be fixed by law ; ~~all~~ and paid out of the State Treasury, such mileage not to exceed five cents ($0.05) per mile.

Seventh, that Section 4.5 of Article V be amended to read:

SEC. ~~4.5~~ 4. The Legislature may regulate by law the manner of making returns of elections for Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

~~The legislation enacted at the Fifty-third Session of the Legislature regulating the manner of making returns of elections for Governor and Lieutenant Governor is hereby ratified and validated, and it shall have the same force and effect as if it had been passed after the adoption of this provision of the Constitution.~~

Eighth, that Section 17 of Article V be amended to read:

SEC. 17. A Secretary of State, a Controller, a Treasurer, and an Attorney General ; ~~and a Sur-~~

veyor General shall be elected at the same time and places, and in the same manner as the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, and their terms of office shall be the same as that of the Governor.

Ninth, that Section 19 of Article V be repealed.

SEC. 19. The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, and Surveyor General shall, at stated times during their continuance in office, receive for their services a compensation which shall not be increased or diminished during the term for which they shall have been elected, which compensation is hereby fixed for the following officers, as follows: Governor, ten thousand dollars per annum; Lieutenant Governor, four thousand dollars, the Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, and Surveyor General, five thousand dollars each per annum, and the Attorney General, six thousand dollars per annum, such compensation to be in full for all services by them respectively rendered in any official capacity or employment whatsoever during their respective terms of office; *provided, however,* that the Legislature may, by law, diminish the compensation of any or all of such officers, but in no case shall have the power to increase the same above the sums hereby fixed by this Constitution. No salary shall be authorized by law for clerical service, in any office provided for in this article, exceeding eighteen hundred dollars per annum for each clerk employed. The Legislature may, in its discretion, abolish the office of Surveyor General; and none of the officers hereinbefore named shall receive for their own use any fees or perquisites for the performance of any official duty.

Tenth, that Section 22 of Article V be amended to read:

SEC. 22. Notwithstanding anything contained elsewhere in this Constitution, the **The** compensation for the services of the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the State Controller, Secretary of State, Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Treasurer may be fixed at any time by the Legislature at an amount not less than ten thousand dollars ($10,000) per annum, for the Governor, and not less than five thousand dollars ($5,000) per annum for each of the other state officers named herein. Except by an act passed at the Fifty-seventh Regular Session of the Legislature, the **The** compensation of no state officer named herein shall be increased nor or diminished during his term of office. **Such compensation shall be in full for all services respectively rendered by them in any official capacity or employment whatsoever during their respective terms of office, and none of the officers named in this section, or the Attorney General, shall receive for his own use any fees or perquisites for the performance of any official duty.**

Eleventh, that Section 2 of Article IX be amended to read:

SEC. 2. A Superintendent of Public Instruction shall, at each gubernatorial election after the adoption of this constitution, be elected by the qualified electors of the State at each gubernatorial election. He shall receive a salary equal to that of the Secretary of State, and shall enter upon the duties of his office on the first Monday after the first day of January next succeeding his election.

Twelfth, that Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of Ar X be repealed.

SECTION 1. There shall be a State Board of Prison Directors, to consist of five persons, to be appointed by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall hold office for ten years, except that the first appointed shall, in such manner as the Legislature may direct, be so classified that the term of one person so appointed shall expire at the end of each two years during the first ten years, and vacancies occurring shall be filled in like manner. The appointee to a vacancy, occurring before the expiration of a term, shall hold only for the unexpired term of his predecessor. The Governor shall have the power to remove either of the directors for misconduct, incompetency, or neglect of duty, after an opportunity to be heard upon written charges.

SEC. 2. The Board of Directors shall have the charge and superintendence of the State Prisons, and shall possess such powers, and perform such duties, in respect to other penal and reformatory institutions of the State, as the Legislature may prescribe.

SEC. 3. The Board shall appoint the Warden and Clerk, and determine the other necessary officers of the Prisons. The Board shall have power to remove the Wardens and Clerks for misconduct, incompetency, or neglect of duty. All other officers and employees of the Prisons shall be appointed by the Warden thereof, and be removed at his pleasure.

SEC. 4. The members of the Board shall r no compensation other than reasonable tra... g and other expenses incurred while engaged in the performance of official duties, to be audited as the Legislature may direct.

SEC. 5. The Legislature shall pass such laws as may be necessary to further define and regulate the powers and duties of the Board, Wardens, and Clerks, and to carry into effect the provisions of this article.

SEC. 6. After the first day of January, eighteen hundred and eighty-two, the labor of convicts shall not be let out by contract to any person, copartnership, company, or corporation, and the Legislature shall, by law, provide for the working of convicts for the benefit of the State.

Thirteenth, that Section 7 of Article X be renumbered and amended to read:

SEC. 1. 7. Notwithstanding anything contained elsewhere in this Constitution, the **The** Legislature may provide for the establishment, government, charge and superintendence of all institutions for all persons convicted of felonies. For this purpose, the Legislature may delegate the government, charge and superintendence of such institutions to any public governmental agency or agencies, officers, or board or boards, whether now existing or hereafter created by it. Any of such agencies, officers, or boards shall have such powers, perform such duties and exercise such functions in respect to other reformatory or penal matters, as the Legislature may prescribe.

The Legislature may also provide for p... ...ment, treatment, supervision, custody and care of

females in a manner and under circumstances different from men similarly convicted.

~~All existing statutes and constitutional provi- , purporting to create such institutions or such ies or officers or boards, to so delegate such government, charge and superintendence, to so prescribe such powers, duties, or functions, or to so provide for such punishment, treatment or supervision are hereby ratified, validated and declared to be legally effective until the Legislature provides otherwise.~~

The labor of convicts shall not be let out by contract to any person, copartnership, company or corporation, and the Legislature shall, by law, provide for the working of convicts for the benefit of the State.

Fourteenth, that Section 9 of Article XIII be amended to read:

SEC. 9. A State Board of Equalization, consisting of ~~one member from each Congressional District in this State, as the same existed in 1879,~~ **four members,** shall be elected by the qualified electors of their respective districts, ~~at the general election to be held in the year 1886, and~~ at each gubernatorial election ~~thereafter~~, whose term of office shall be for four years; whose duty it shall be to equalize the valuation of the taxable property in the several counties of the State for the purposes of taxation. The Controller of State shall be ex officio a member of the board. The boards of supervisors of the several counties of the State shall constitute boards of equalization for their respective counties, whose duty it shall be to equalize the valuation of the taxable property in the county for the purpose of taxation; provided, such state and county boards of equalization are hereby authorized and empowered, under such rules of notice as the county boards may prescribe, as to the county assessments, and under such rules of notice as the state board may prescribe as to the action of the state board, to increase or lower the entire assessment roll, or any assessment contained therein, so as to equalize the assessment of the property contained in said assessment roll, and make the assessment conform to the true value in money of the property contained in said roll; provided, that no board of equalization shall raise any mortgage, deed of trust, contract, or other obligation by which a debt is secured, money, or solvent credits, above its face value. The present State Board of Equalization shall continue in office until their successors, as herein provided for, shall be elected and shall qualify. The Legislature shall have power to redistrict the State into four districts as nearly equal in population as practical, and to provide for the elections of members of said Board of Equalization.

Fifteenth, that Section 20 of Article XX be amended to read:

SEC. 20. Elections of the officers provided for by this Constitution; ~~except at the election in the year 1879,~~ shall be held on the even-numbered years next before the expiration of their respective terms. The terms of such officers shall commence on the first Monday after the first day of January next following their election.

Sixteenth, that Sections 3, 10, 11 and 12 of Article XXII be repealed, and that a new Section 3 be added to said article to read:

~~SEC. 3. All Courts now existing, save Justices' and Police Courts, are hereby abolished, and all records, books, papers, and proceedings from such Courts, as are abolished by this Constitution, shall be transferred on the first day of January, eighteen hundred and eighty, to the Courts provided for in this Constitution, and the Courts to which the same are thus transferred shall have the same power and jurisdiction over them as if they had been in the first instance commenced, filed, or lodged therein.~~

SEC. 3. Any amendment to this Constitution which is proposed by the Legislature solely for the purpose of eliminating obsolete or superseded provisions therefrom shall be subject to the following limitations:

(1) Any other measure submitted to the people at the same election which affects a section of the Constitution included in the Legislature's proposal shall, to the extent of any conflict between the two, prevail over such proposal; and

(2) If the Legislature's proposal repeals or eliminates constitutional language which originally validated, ratified, confirmed or gave effect to other governmental action, such proposal shall not be construed so as to alter or invalidate the action previously validated, ratified, confirmed or given effect.

~~SEC. 10. In order that future elections in this State shall conform to the requirements of this Constitution, the terms of all officers elected at the first election under the same shall be, respectively, one year shorter than the terms as fixed by law or by this Constitution, and the successors of all such officers shall be elected at the last election before the expiration of the terms as in this section provided. The first officers chosen after the adoption of this Constitution shall be elected at the time and in the manner now provided by law. Judicial officers and the Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected at the time and in the manner that State officers are elected.~~

~~SEC. 11. All laws relative to the present judicial system of the State shall be applicable to the judicial system created by this Constitution until changed by legislation.~~

~~SEC. 12. This Constitution shall take effect and be in force on and after the fourth day of July, eighteen hundred and seventy-nine, at twelve o'clock meridian, so far as the same relates to the election of all officers, the commencement of their terms of office and the meeting of the Legislature. In all other respects, and for all other purposes, this Constitution shall take effect on the first day of January, eighteen hundred and eighty, at twelve o'clock meridian.~~

13 **DISTRICT COURTS OF APPEAL: APPELLATE JURISDICTION. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 11.** Provides District Courts of Appeal shall have appellate jurisdiction of municipal and justice court cases as provided by law.

YES ☐
NO ☐

(This proposed amendment does not expressly amend any existing section of the Constitution, but adds a new section thereto; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE** to indicate they are **NEW**.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE VI

Sec. 4e. The district courts of appeal shall have appellate jurisdiction on appeal in all cases within the original jurisdiction of the municipal and justice courts, to the extent and in the manner provided for by law.

14 **STREET AND HIGHWAY FUNDS: USE FOR LOCAL GRADE CROSSING BONDS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 1.** Includes separation of grade districts to which Legislature may appropriate fuel taxes and motor vehicle registration and license fee moneys. Such moneys allocated to local agencies may be used for paying bonds duly issued for grade crossing separation projects to extent of 50% of sums allocated.

YES ☐
NO ☐

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~, and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XXVI

SEC. 3. The provisions of this article are self-executing but the Legislature shall have full power to appropriate such moneys and to provide the manner of their expenditure by the State, counties, cities and counties, ~~or~~ cities, **or separation of grade districts** for the purposes specified and to enact legislation not in conflict with this article. This article shall not prevent any part of the moneys referred to in Sections 1 or 2 hereof from being temporarily loaned to the State General Fund upon condition that the amount so loaned shall be repaid therefrom to the funds from which so borrowed to be used for the purposes specified in Sections 1 or 2 hereof. **The moneys referred to in Sections 1 or 2 hereof, allocated for general expenditure in counties, cities and counties, cities, or separation of grade districts, may be used for the payment of the principal and interest of bonds issued by counties, cities, cities and counties, or by separation of grade districts to the extent of 50 percent of sums so allocated in any one year. Such bonds must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the electors and the term thereof shall not exceed 25 y[illegible]. The proceeds from such bonds shall be use[illegible] to finance grade crossing separation projects involving the intersection of public streets and highways with railroad or rapid transit rights-of-way.**

15 **"SENATE REAPPORTIONMENT. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.** Establishes and apportions 40 senatorial districts. Provides for election of all Senators in 1962, one-half of Senators to be elected every two years thereafter. Requires Legislature in 1961 to fix boundaries of districts in counties having more than one district on basis of population, area, and economic affinity, which may be refixed following each decennial federal census. Permits Legislature following 1980 and each subsequent decennial federal census to reapportion senatorial districts on same basis; provided no county shall have more than 7 districts and 20 districts be apportioned to designated counties."

YES ☐
NO ☐

(This proposed amendment expressly amends existing sections of the Constitution; therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in ~~STRIKEOUT TYPE~~ and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE.**)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE IV

Section 5 and Section 6 of Article IV of the Constitution of the State of California is hereby amended to read:

SEC. 5.

The Senate shall consist of 40 members, and the Assembly of 80 members, to be elected by districts, numbered as hereinafter provided. The seats of the ~~twenty~~ Senators elected in the year ~~eighteen hundred and eighty-two~~ **1960 shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, so that in the year 1962 a Senator shall be elected from each senatorial district, as provided in Section 6 of this Article. The seats of the 20 Senators elected in the year 1962** from the odd-numbered districts shall be vacated at the expiration of the second year, so that one-half of the Senators shall be elected every two years. ~~; provided, that all the Senators elected at the first election under this Constitution shall hold office for the term of three years.~~

SEC. 6.

For the purpose of choosing members of the ~~Legislature~~ **Assembly**, the State shall be divided into ~~40 Senatorial and~~ 80 assembly districts ~~to be called Senatorial and Assembly districts~~. Such districts shall be composed of contiguous territory,

and ~~Assembly districts~~ shall be as nearly equal in population as may be. Each ~~Senatorial district shall choose one senator and each~~ assembly district shall choose one member of Assembly. The ~~Senatorial~~ ~~icts shall be numbered from one to 40, inclu~~ ~~in numerical order, and the~~ assembly districts shall be numbered from 1 to 80 in ~~the same~~ **numerical** order, commencing at the northern boundary of the State and ending at the southern boundary thereof. In the formation of assembly districts no county, or city and county, shall be divided, unless it contains sufficient population within itself to form two or more districts, ~~and in the formation of Senatorial districts no county, or city and county, shall be divided,~~ nor shall a part of any county, or of any city and county, be united with any other county, or city and county, in forming any assembly ~~or Senatorial~~ district. The census taken under the direction of the Congress of the United States in the year ~~1920~~ **1960**, and every 10 years thereafter, shall be the basis of fixing and adjusting the ~~legislative~~ **assembly** districts; and the Legislature shall, ~~at its first regular session following the adoption of this section and thereafter~~ at the first ~~regular~~ **general** session following each decennial federal census, adjust such districts, and reapportion the representation so as to preserve the assembly districts as nearly equal in population as may be; ~~but in the formation of Senatorial districts no county or city and county shall contain more than one Senatorial district, and the counties of small population shall be grouped in districts of not to exceed three counties in any one Senatorial district,~~ provided, however, that should the Legislature ~~at the first regular session following the adoption of this~~ ~~, or~~ at the first ~~regular~~ **general** session following any decennial federal census fail to reapportion the assembly ~~and Senatorial~~ districts, a Reapportionment Commission, which is hereby created, consisting of the Lieutenant Governor, who shall be chairman, and the Attorney General, State Controller, Secretary of State and State Superintendent of Public Instruction, shall forthwith apportion such districts in accordance with the provisions of this section and such apportionment of said districts shall be immediately effective the same as if the act of said Reapportionment Commission were an act of the Legislature, subject, however, to the same provisions of referendum as apply to the acts of the Legislature.

Each subsequent reapportionment shall carry out these provisions and shall be based upon the last preceding federal census. But in making such adjustments no persons who are not eligible to become citizens of the United States, under the naturalization laws, shall be counted as forming a part of the population of any district. ~~Until such districting as herein provided for shall be made, Senators and Assemblymen shall be elected by the districts according to the apportionment now provided for by law.~~

For the purpose of choosing members of the Senate, the State shall be divided into 40 senatorial districts. Such districts shall be composed of contiguous territory and shall be numbered from 1 to 40 in numerical order. Each senatorial district shall choose one Senator.

Senatorial districts shall consist of the territory within the counties existing on January 1, 1961, as follows:

District No. 1	**Del Norte, Siskiyou, Humboldt, and Trinity counties.**
District No. 2	**Modoc, Shasta, Lassen and Plumas counties.**
District No. 3	**Mendocino, Lake, Colusa, Glenn, and Tehama counties.**
District No. 4	**Butte, Sutter and Yuba counties.**
District No. 5	**Sierra, Nevada, Placer, El Dorado, Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, Tuolumne, and Mariposa counties.**
District No. 6	**Sonoma and Marin counties.**
District No. 7	**Napa, Yolo and Solano counties.**
District No. 8	**Sacramento county.**
District No. 9	**Contra Costa county.**
District No. 10	**San Joaquin county.**
Districts No. 11 & 12	**San Francisco county.**
Districts No. 13 & 14	**Alameda county.**
District No. 15	**San Mateo county.**
Districts No. 16 & 17	**Santa Clara county.**
District No. 18	**Stanislaus, Merced and Madera counties.**
District No. 19	**Santa Cruz, San Benito and Monterey counties.**
District No. 20	**Fresno and Kings counties.**
District No. 21	**Tulare county.**
Districts No. 22 & 23	**Inyo, Mono and San Bernardino counties.**
District No. 24	**San Luis Obispo county.**
District No. 25	**Kern county.**
District No. 26	**Santa Barbara county.**
District No. 27	**Ventura county.**
Districts No. 28 through 34	**Los Angeles county.**
Districts No. 35 & 36	**Orange county.**
District No. 37	**Riverside county.**
Districts No. 38 & 39	**San Diego county.**
District No. 40	**Imperial county.**

The Legislature, at its 1961 general session, shall fix the boundaries of senatorial districts 22 and 23 within the counties of Inyo, Mono and San Bernardino and of senatorial districts within counties having more than one senatorial district, which said boundaries shall be determined as nearly as may be upon the basis of population, as disclosed by the 1960 federal decennial census, geographic area and economic affinity; provided, that should the Legislature at the 1961 general session fail to fix the boundaries of any one or more of said senatorial districts, a Reapportionment Commission as constituted in this section shall forthwith fix the boundaries thereof in accordance with the provisions of this section and such boundaries as so fixed shall be immediately effective the same as if the act of said Reapportionment Commission were the act of the Legislature, subject, however, to the same provisions of referendum as apply to the acts of the Legisla-

ture. At the first general session following the decennial federal census of 1970, and at the first general session following each decennial federal census thereafter, the Legislature may fix and adjust the boundaries of senatorial districts 22 and 23 and of senatorial districts in counties having more than one senatorial district as hereinabove provided.

At the first general session following the decennial federal census of 1980, and at the first general session following each decennial federal census thereafter, the Legislature may apportion the 40 senatorial districts on a basis of population, as disclosed by the last preceding decennial federal census, geographic area and economic affinity and in doing so shall comply with all of the provisions of this section relating to senatorial districts except that it need not allocate counties to senatorial districts or senatorial districts to counties as hereinbefore provided in this section; provided 20 of such districts shall at all times be apportioned to the counties of Tulare, Inyo, Mono, San Bernardino, San Luis Obispo, Kern, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Diego, and Imperial, and 20 of such districts shall be apportioned to the remaining counties; provided further, that at no time shall any county have more than seven (7) senatorial districts.

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY OF STATE

State of California, Department of State
Sacramento, California

I, Frank M. Jordan, Secretary of State of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing measures will be submitted to the electors of the State of California at the general election to be held throughout the State on the eighth day of November, 1960, and that the foregoing pamphlet is correct.

Witness my hand and the Great Seal of the State, at office in Sacramento, California, the first day of September, A.D. 1960.

Frank M. Jordan
Secretary of State

printed in CALIFORNIA STATE PRINTING OFFICE

22600 7-60 7,500,000