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## Part I—Arguments

### VETERANS FARM AND HOME BONDS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 40. Adds Section 16 to Article XVI of Constitution. Authorizes issue and sale of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) in state bonds to provide funds to be used by State Department of Veterans Affairs in accordance with Veterans Farm and Home Purchase Act of 1943 in assisting California war veterans to acquire farms and homes. Brings into operation and validates Bonds Act of 1951, governing issue, sale and redemption of such bonds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis by the Legislative Counsel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This measure approves and makes effective the issuance and sale of state bonds not exceeding the sum of $150,000,000 and use of the proceeds, as provided by the Veterans Bond Act of 1951 (Sections 996-996.12, inclusive, Military and Veterans Code), to provide a fund as herein provided for farm and home purchase pursuant to the Veterans' Farm and Home Purchase Act of 1943 (Sections 965-967.10, inclusive, Military and Veterans Code).

The Veterans Bond Act of 1951 provides that the bonds are to be general obligations of the State for the payment of which the full faith and credit of the State is pledged, and appropriates from the General Fund the sum necessary to make the payments of principal and interest on the bonds as they become due.

Money received as payments of principal and interest under contracts for the purchase or construction of farms and homes by veterans of World War I, World War II, or the present Korean campaign, under the Veterans' Farm and Home Purchase Act of 1943, is deposited in a special fund known as the Veterans' Farm and Home Building Fund of 1943. The bond act requires the maturity dates of the bonds to be fixed so as to coincide as nearly as possible with the receipt of these payments. It further requires that, on the due dates for payments of the principal and interest on the bonds, there be transferred to the General Fund from this special fund the amount necessary to make the payment of interest and, in event the amount of the amount in the special fund is less than the amount of the payments then due, the balance must be transferred to the General Fund as soon as it becomes available, with interest from such dates of maturity at the same rate as is borne by the bonds.

The amounts of the bonds to be issued from time to time and their maturity dates are to be determined by the Veterans' Finance Committee of 1943, which consists of the Governor, State Treasurer, State Controller, Director of Finance, and Director of Veterans Affairs.

The proceeds of this bond issue will also be used to repay amounts temporarily advanced from the ordinary revenues of the State deposited in the General Fund, pursuant to Chapter 9 of th. 1953 First Extraordinary Session. The Veterans' Farm and Home Building Fund of 1943 was exhausted early in 1953. The Legislature, accordingly, amended the Veterans' Farm and Home Purchase Act of 1943 to authorize advances from the General Fund for the purposes of the act and require repayment of the advances, with 1.74 percent interest, from proceeds of the sale of veterans' bonds, or, if bonds are not authorized, from the Veterans' Farm and Home Building Fund of 1943 within 21 years. The Legislature appropriated $55,000,000 for this purpose, with the proviso that if this bond issue is rejected, the unexpended and unobligated balance of the appropriation ceases to be available and reverts to the General Fund.

### Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 40

In 1921 the people of California put into effect a plan to assist veterans to acquire farms and homes at low financing cost. It was felt that assisting veterans to acquire and own property was far more appropriate and worthwhile than any temporary or less substantial favor. The greatest good that can be done for the veteran is to encourage him or her to acquire his or her "home sweet home." It establishes the veteran, provides family security, and makes each community richer to that extent.

Funds for these low-cost loans have been supplied through bond issues and in the years since the program was started the people have overwhelmingly voted additional bond issues to continue the program. The veterans have been so prompt and faithful in meeting their repayment installments that maturing bonds have been paid without any expenditure of the tax payers' money whatsoever.

Housing still continues as a serious problem in California and the revolving funds of our Veterans Farm and Home Loan Purchase Plan are all in use. There are more than 1,000,000 veterans in California and 254,000 have applied for these loans. The average applicant is 49 years of age and is supporting children in his family, yet thousands are waiting without homes. Therefore the Legislature has asked the people of California to authorize the issuance of another $150,000,000 in bonds. Normal mortgage money may be available from commercial lending agencies but it does not fill the whole need, especially where the veteran is concerned. Typical advantages of the state loan are 1) repayment can be spread over a longer period of years, 2) a lower rate of interest and smaller monthly payments are provided, and 3) no other financing is needed.

This is possible because the state uses its credit in making the money available to the veteran population. However, the present groups of returning veterans and all those now planning home ownership will not have this opportunity unless the funds are replenished.

This veterans' program has been an outstanding success for 30 years. We are sure you will want to vote YES.

---

**SAM L. COLLINS**  
Speaker of the Assembly, Orange County

**RICHARD H. MCCOLLISTER**  
Assemblyman, Chairman of Committee on Military Affairs, Marin and Sonoma Counties

**NELSON S. DILWORTH**  
State Senator, Riverside County


PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDS. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Amends Article IX, Section 6, of the State Constitution. Increases required State support for public schools to One Hundred Eighty Dollars per year for each pupil in average daily attendance, of which each local school district shall receive not less than One Hundred Twenty Dollars per pupil. To become operative July 1, 1953.

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment would make two changes in the amounts required to be provided by the State for the support of the Public School System. It would require the Legislature to increase the total amount in the State School Fund for apportionment from $120 to $180 per pupil in average daily attendance in the schools of the system during the preceding fiscal year.

It would increase the minimum amount required to be apportioned to each school district from $90 to $120 per pupil in average daily attendance in the district during the preceding fiscal year.

The existing constitutional provisions would remain operative until June 30, 1953, the end of the present fiscal year.

Argument in Favor of Initiative Proposition No. 2

For the sake of our school children—and homeowners too—vote "YES" on Proposition 2.

This election year finds Americans sharply divided on many issues.

But one issue on which good Americans never have been divided is the need to provide good educational opportunity for all children.

No State has met its obligations to youth more conscientiously than California. In the years since the War, as population soared and as inflation pushed school operating costs higher and higher, school districts all over California repeatedly have been forced to go to the local taxpayers for greater support.

In the past two years, more than 500 school districts have asked homeowners to raise their taxes so that school budgets could be met.

The twin pressures of inflation and increased population have created a major crisis for California's school children, which only can be resolved by one of the following steps:

1. Continuing to increase taxes—already unfairly high—on homeowners and local property taxpayers.

2. Cutting back school services, increasing classroom sizes, accepting unqualified teachers, closing schools in some areas—an unthinkable "solution."

3. Increasing school revenues from the broad State tax base to realistic levels, thus relieving the pressure on homeowners. This is the sound solution afforded by Proposition 2.

There are two school revenue sources. One is the local property tax. The other source is from State tax collections, including sales, income, bank and corporation taxes.

In former years, the State paid about 55 per cent of school operation costs; local taxpayers 45 per cent. Today the reverse is true; local taxpayers meet nearly 60 per cent! Proposition 2 would re-establish the former less burdensome ratio; and based on the experience of the past few years, there is reason to believe that the increased State support can be financed immediately from existing State revenues.

There is nothing experimental about Proposition 2; it changes just two figures in the Constitution. It sets State school support at $180 a year per pupil (about one dollar per school day per child), and guarantees that of that amount, no school district shall receive less than $120 per pupil.

There is every reason why the amount of school support guaranteed by the State should stay in the Constitution, where it has been for 50 years. Should depression strike, and property taxes be cut to the bone, only the constitutional guarantee can be relied on to keep our schools open.

Proposition 2 has the support of parents, homeowners, educators, veterans, business, church and labor groups. Non-partisan and non-political, it has gained such widespread support because it's a sound and realistic solution to an existing need.

The problems cannot be sidestepped; school costs, like all household and business costs, have increased. Teachers' salaries, though less rapidly than other wages, have increased. Without the solution afforded by Proposition 2, local property taxes would of necessity have to continue their current upward march.

PROTECT YOUR HOME AND CHILDREN TOO! VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION TWO!

MRS. P. D. BEVIL,
President, California Congress of Parents and Teachers

ASSEMBLYMAN FRANCIS DUNN, JR.
Chairman, Assembly Committee on Education, California State Legislature

ARTHUR COREY
Executive Secretary, California Teachers Association

Argument Against Initiative Proposition No. 2

Opposition to Proposition No. 2 is not opposition to good schools, good salaries for teachers, or adequate school financing. A NO vote merely continues the present system until constructive changes can be developed.

Proposition No. 2 would freeze into the State Constitution a dangerously high state appropriation for schools. It could put a stop to the good work the Legislature has been doing to take care of the school problem.

Since 1946, the Legislature has adopted over 15 important new laws which materially improve California schools. This year alone these improvements will cost state over $77,000,000 in excess of any constitutional requirement. The Legislature has also appropriated to offset inflationary trends. The Legislature has been generous and prompt in meeting the problems as they arise.

These remedial measures are now in effect. The Legislature by its actions has shown a determination to meet the school problem. No constitutional amendment is needed for further legislative action along the same line.

Unless Proposition No. 2 is defeated, the State will be committed by constitutional mandate to a program which will require additional State taxes to support it. This is folly. When the program can be met less expensively and more adequately as has been demonstrated in recent years by annual review of the problem by the Legislature.

Freezing the same amount of increase in State support in the Constitution for every kind of school—elementary, high school, and junior college—regardless
of need, is a wasteful way of aiding elementary schools, where the financial problem is presently greatest.

The amendment cannot be expected to reduce property taxes, except in isolated cases, since the increase will be spent primarily to raise teachers' salaries. Teachers' salaries in California are already the highest in the Nation, according to the Federal Security Agency.

If the schools need more state support, it is imperative that the Legislature be free to secure the best possible school program for the money. Already over 40 percent of the State General Fund budget is frozen for constitutionally fixed cost. School apportionment takes practically all of this. Proposition No. 2, by adding to these fixed costs, would reduce still further the Legislature's ability to enact an economical and effective budget. It would also increase the incentive of other groups to assure themselves of a fixed state appropriation by writing their demands into the Constitution.

TAXATION: WELFARE EXEMPTION OF NONPROFIT SCHOOL PROPERTY. Act of Legislature submitted to electors by referendum. Act amends Section 214, Revenue and Taxation Code. Extends property tax exemption, known as welfare exemption, to property used exclusively for schools of less than collegiate grade owned and operated by nonprofit religious, hospital or charitable organizations.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 2, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This referendum measure submits Chapter 242 of the Statutes of 1951 to a vote by which the electors may express their approval or disapproval of that legislation. If approved, Chapter 242 would broaden the exemption from property taxation provided by Section 214 of the Revenue and Taxation Code (the "welfare exemption") by exempting property of private, nonprofit educational institutions of collegiate grade but under certain conditions now exempt from taxation under other provisions of law.

The welfare exemption was authorized by a constitutional amendment adopted in 1944 (Art. XIII, Sec. 10). Pursuant to this amendment the Legislature has by Section 214 of the Revenue and Taxation Code exempted property used exclusively for religious, hospital, scientific or charitable purposes owned and operated by community chests, funds, foundations or corporations organized and operated for religious, hospital, scientific, or charitable purposes, if the property and the owner thereof meet the conditions imposed by the Legislature designed to assure compliance with the constitutional amendment.

As a result, if this measure is approved, and if property of an educational institution of less than collegiate grade qualifies under the conditions prescribed by the existing exemption, that property will be exempt under the measure. If other property used exclusively for religious, hospital, scientific or charitable purposes is now exempt.

Argument in Favor of Referendum Measure No. 3

Your "YES" vote on PROPOSITION 3 will sustain the action of the State Legislature which in 1951 voted almost unanimously (108 to 3) to give non-profit schools tax equality as a matter of justice, and as an aid in solving the alarming shortage of schools in California.

Principally affected are two kinds of schools . . .

1. elementary and high schools maintained by more than a dozen religious denominations; and (2) the many schools for the blind, deaf-mutes, crippled, pa-

sioned and mentally retarded maintained by charitable foundations.

California is the only state in the Union which taxes schools of this character. The principle of giving these schools tax equality with public schools has been recognized in 47 of the 48 states because non-tax-supported schools perform a valuable public service, which otherwise would become a further burden on the taxpayer; also because "Penalty taxation" of church-financed schools is a violation of our traditional separation of church and state.

This principle of tax equality has long been established. In 1914 California granted tax exemption to non-profit colleges and universities. Stanford, University of San Francisco, University of Southern California, College of the Pacific and Pomona, for example, were thus given tax equality with the State Universities.

Non-profit schools educated 182,483 children in California last year, and have helped relieve the badly over-crowded public school system which has been forced to place thousands of our children on half-day sessions. These non-profit schools have saved the taxpayers an estimated $350,000,000 annually. This is a further burden on the taxpayer.

To sustain the State Legislature means that approximately $100,000,000 in taxes must be absorbed. This is insignificant (less than a penny per capita) compared with the $41,000,000 saved to the taxpayers each and every year by these schools. Hence you can see why it is not only just, but also good business, to grant all non-profit schools tax equality.

A "YES" vote on PROPOSITION 3 will continue these savings to the taxpayers, but at the same time will give no taxpayer a "free ride." Parents of children in the non-profit, non-tax-supported schools will continue to pay taxes for public schools, as well as to maintain solely at their own expense the schools operated by religious and charitable groups.

The subject of extending tax equality to non-profit elementary and high schools was before the State Legislature for more than six weeks. After open hearings

It is bad practice to write into the Constitution the amount of money any government activity should have.

Californians are famous for their devotion to good schools. But in Proposition No. 2 enthusiasts have gone too far; they have proposed a very bad method for accomplishing their purposes. It is bound to backfire and cause untold damage to good budgeting, good financing, and the security of the schools themselves.

Don't tie the hands of the Legislature. Trust your elected representatives to carry out the wishes of the public for a good and sound school system.

Vote NO on Proposition No. 2.

VON T. ELLSWORTH, Ph.D.
Director, Research Department,
California Farm Bureau Federation

A. C. HARDISON, LL.D.
President, California Taxpayers Association
and full opportunity for all to be heard, it was passed overwhelmingly (108 to 3) and signed by the Governor. Now it has been referred to the voters for their approval as PROPOSITION 3.

A "YES" vote on PROPOSITION 3 will help our public school system, will benefit the taxpayer, will align California with the other 47 states of the Union who give justice to children attending non-tax-supported elementary and high schools.

FLEET ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ
Regent, University of California
Chair, Committee
Secretary-Treasurer, California State Federation of Labor
ADRIEN J. FALK
Past President, California State Chamber of Commerce

Argument Against Referendum Measure No. 3

There are at least six reasons why the proposed legislation should not be enacted into law; and any one of them is more than sufficient for a NO vote:

1. It would add more millions of dollars to the already too large amount (now estimated at 765 million) of private property exempt from taxation; and thus further narrow the tax base.

This would, of course, further increase the taxes on property not exempt, including small homes and apartments.

2. If the tax base is to be changed, it should be broadened—not narrowed; and that property may have been exempted in the past is no reason for another exemption.

3. There is no limit to the extent of this proposed exemption, as there is to the exemption granted universities and colleges.

4. If, as claimed by the proponents of the measure, the exemption should be granted because the parochial schools keep the children out of the public schools and thus lessen the cost of public education, then the property of all private schools should be exempted; and there is no reason to exempt only schools "owned and operated by religious * * foundations or corporations" i.e. parochial schools which are a component part of the Church which operates them.

5. It would add $1,88 a year to the cost of education of a child at a private school; if he so desires, even though he is maintained primarily to indoctrinate the child with the ideology of a particular religion; but he has no right to expect a taxpayer who is not of that faith to help pay its cost.

The parochial school is not a partner, but a competitor, of our American system of free public schools; and any aid granted to a parochial school must be to the disadvantage of our public schools.

There is no argument in favor of this proposed exemption which could not be as well made (as it has been) for a share of all public money appropriated for our public schools.

5. The proposed measure violates the American principle of the separation of Church and State. It is contrary to the constitution of this state as well as of the United States; and the faith of our American ideals is to help pay.

CHARLES ALBERT ADAMS
Former Member, State Board of Education, Educator, Public Schools Week
HENRY W. COIL
Attorney-at-Law
ALFRED J. LUNDBERG
Past President, California State Chamber of Commerce

PAYMENTS TO NEEDY BLIND. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 23. Amends Section 22 of Article IV of Constitution: Prohibits imposition of administrative restrictions on manner in which blind recipient expends aid payments. Provides that such aid payments are for benefit of the blind recipient alone and shall not be regarded as income to any person other than the recipient. Requires State Department of Social Welfare to enforce such provisions.

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure forbids any person concerned with the administration of aid to needy blind persons to dictate how any applicant or recipient shall spend such aid granted to him.

It also declares that all money paid to a recipient of needy blind aid shall be intended to help him meet his individual needs and is not for the benefit of any other person and that such aid when granted is not to be construed as income to any person other than the blind recipient of the aid. The State Department of Social Welfare is required to take all necessary action to enforce these provisions.

This section of the Constitution (Art. IV, Sec. 22) would also be amended by Proposition No. 20 submitted to the voters at this election. The recommendations are not conflicting, however, and if both are approved by the voters, both can be given effect.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 23

The present law does a great injustice to the aged blind in certain cases. For example—suppose an aged blind couple are getting county aid of $45.00 each, a total of $90.00. Then suppose the husband reaches 65 years of age, becomes eligible for the State Blind Aid of $85.00, and says to his aged blind wife, "Well, we haven't many years left and we can never regain our sight, but we will have $40.00 a month more now and we can at least have a few little things that we couldn't have before."

But then the County Welfare Department steps in and says, "Under our rules, as allowed by law, we
deduct any family income. You now have $85.00 income and we must deduct that, reducing the County grant from $90.00 to $5.00 and leaving the total $90.00 as before." The husband would go off the County rolls anyway, relieving the County of $45.00, but under present practice the County takes the entire $85.00 and the aged blind couple gets no part of it. Certainly that was not the intention of either the Legislature or the people when the blind aid was provided. Only a very few cases are involved and the difference to any county would be negligible. Practically all sighted people have had their salaries and wages increased. The blind person’s pension has not been increased.

In simple justice to the aged blind, vote YES.

H. B. DILLINGER
Author and Chairman Senate Social Welfare Committee

KATHRYN T. NIEHOUSE
Member of the Assembly and Chairman of Assembly Social Welfare Committee

ERNEST C. CROWLEY
Member of the Assembly

 Argument Against Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 23

California makes substantial monthly aid payments to the aged, blind, and needy children upon the basis of need. If the individual or the family has an income that will meet part of the needs, the amount of aid given is less than if there is no income. This is the only fair way to assure that the needy receive necessary aid and, at the same time, protect the public from excessive costs.

California’s counties give general relief to persons who do not qualify for state aid, and, here again, the basis is need. If the family has an income, the county relief is less if it doesn’t. If a member of the family receives old age or blind aid from the State, the counties rightly count this as family income just the same as income from private pensions, investments, employment, contributions from relatives, or any other source. This is reasonable and sensible because it is all money and where it comes from should have no bearing on whether it meets family needs or what it will buy.

Proposition No. 4 proposes to prohibit counties from considering aid to the blind as family income in determining family needs for county relief. It does not exempt aid to the aged but, if it passes, there will undoubtedly be another amendment at a future election extending this to aged. It will be argued that what is fair for one group is fair for the other.

That is the real problem. There are only 11,500 blind aid recipients in California and less than one-third are married and living with their spouses. Accordingly, the number of county relief cases among families of the blind would be relatively small, and additional county costs relatively small too. But it is a different matter with the aged. There are more than 273,000 old age recipients, and in some 32,000 family cases only the husband or wife receives state aid. Undoubtedly a number of these would ask for and receive additional county relief. Obviously, counties would incur substantial costs if forbidden to consider aged aid grants as family income in determining the family’s needs.

We ask you to vote NO on PROPOSITION NO. 4 because:

1. It is a "foot-in-the-door" proposition that puts public assistance on the basis of "how much you can get" instead of "how much do you need."

2. It will discriminate against aid recipients who have small private pensions or other income which they have earned.

3. It will give special privileges to special groups among aid recipients.

4. It writes into the Constitution details that, if they are determined to be desirable and necessary, should be handled by the Legislature through statutes.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION NO. 4!

DUDLEY M. STEELE
Chairman, Los Angeles Citizens’ Budget Committee

SUBVERSIVE PERSONS AND GROUPS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1 (Third Ex. Sess., 1950). Adds Section 19 to Article XX of Constitution. Provides that public office or employment shall not be held by, and no tax exemption shall be extended to, any person or organization advocating overthrow of Federal or State Government by force or unlawful means or advocating support of foreign government against United States in event of hostilities. Authorizes legislation to enforce this provision.

YES

NO

5

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 3, Part III)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment, if adopted, would prohibit any person or organization which advocates the overthrow of the Federal or State Government by force, violence or other unlawful means, or who advocates the support of a foreign government against the United States in the event of hostilities, from holding any office or employment under this State, including any office or employment with the University of California, or with any city, county, or other political subdivision or public agency of this State.

It would also prohibit such person or organization from receiving any exemption from any tax imposed by the State or any of the other public agencies mentioned above.

It would require the Legislature to enact such laws as may be necessary to enforce the provisions of the amendment.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1

This amendment applies separate and apart from any controversy there may be about the taking of oaths. It provides that no person or organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of the State of California by force or violence or other unlawful means, or who advocates the support of a foreign government against the United States in the event of hostilities shall

1. Hold any office or employment under the State of California or in any public body within the State, or

2. Receive any exemption from any tax imposed by the State or any public body within the State.

(This means that no organization advocating the overthrow of the United States or the State could operate as a charity and avoid paying taxes. It
also means that any such person or organization would not be entitled to certain business and income tax exemptions. This will have the effect of hitting such persons or organizations in the pocketbook.

The effect of this amendment is not, therefore, limited to people who work for the State or some public agency within the State, but also to any person or organization engaging in such activities by preventing them from having many tax exemptions now permitted by law.

This proposed amendment has been carefully and thoughtfully prepared. The use of the phrase "or other unlawful means" used in the proposed amendment has been approved by the Supreme Court of the United States in deciding on the validity of the 1948 Los Angeles City Ordinance dealing with this subject.

There are no several requirements such as veteran status and financial status, that must be met before one is entitled to certain personal and real property exemptions. There is no valid reason why such exemptions should be allowed communists and the like. No right thinking person should object to making a declaration that he is not a communist before receiving such exemptions from the State.

This measure was approved by the Legislature without a dissenting vote.

Vote yes.

JOHN D. BABBAGE
Member of Assembly, 76th Assembly District, Riverside County

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1

The chief purpose of this proposal is to permit the Legislature to adopt a scheme to eliminate subversives from local and State governments. That is a laudable purpose, but what subversives are there to eliminate, and how will it be done?

We have tens of thousands of State and local employees. They are your neighbors. Do you know any of them to be disloyal? Of course, not! Our public employees are singularly loyal, and there is no necessity for this kind of legislation.

But, think of the price YOU as a taxpayer would have to pay if an agency to hunt subversives were set up! Think of the cost of investigating not just the few public employees in your community but the tens of thousands throughout the State and, it is hoped, giving them some kind of a hearing! Why, such an investigatory and hearing system could not be operated without the annual expenditure of millions of dollars which would come out of YOUR pockets. If you want to prevent waste in government, don't allow such an unnecessary and costly agency to get started.

And, pity the poor public employee if secret police start snooping and prying into his private life. Think too, what a fine target he would make for malicious and misguided people. If someone fancies he has a grievance against a public employee and wants to get even, all he has to do is to accuse him of having said or done something that is subversive. Informers can get away with false charges, because such reports are always kept confidential and the accuser never has to confront the accused.

That isn't the way we do things in this country. In fact, that's the sort of thing the Communists and Fascists do to take away freedom from their public servants. If they get out of line; if they fail to conform, they may sacrifice their jobs. Consequently, if this proposition is adopted, government employees will have to be extremely cautious about what they say and with whom they associate.

Moreover, this proposal is an entering wedge for the politicians to tamper with the operation of the University of California. The Constitution has wisely placed its control out of the reach of the politicians and in the hands of the Regents. That's the place to leave it. If you want to maintain the high teaching standards of the University of California, don't let the politicians have a hand in deciding who may teach there.

Finally, a lesser purpose of this proposal is to deny tax exemption to subversive individuals and groups. For example, YOU might suddenly be denied your veteran's exemption of $1,000. Think how difficult it would be to defend yourself against secret subversive charges. If any serious effort were made to enforce this section of the proposal, by setting up an expensive investigatory system, it would cost many times what would be saved in canceled tax exemptions.

Vote NO on Proposition No. 5.

ERNEST BESSIG
Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Northern California

OATHS OF OFFICE. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 9.

Amends Constitution, Article XX, Section 3. Requires each public officer and employee (except inferior officers and employees exempted by law) to take oath that he neither advocates nor is member of any group advocating overthrow of government by force, that during preceding five years he has not been member of such group except as indicated, that he will neither engage in such advocacy nor become member of such group while holding office. Applies to officers and employees of State, including University of California, and of all political subdivisions and agencies thereof.

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The existing provision of the Constitution, which this measure would amend, requires "Members of the Legislature and all officers, executive and judicial except such inferior officers as may be by law exempted" to take a prescribed oath. There is a distinction between "public officers" and "public employees" and the existing provision does not require "public employees" to take the oath.

This measure, if approved by the voters, would require the oath to be taken not only by Members of the Legislature and executive and judicial officers but also by all public officers and employees, including those employed by the State, the University of California, every county, city, city and county, district and authority, or by any department, division, bureau, board, commission, agency or instrumentality thereof, except such inferior officers and employees as may be specifically exempted by law.

The oath prescribed by the existing provision, which this measure would amend, reads: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm, as the case may be,) that I will sup-
port the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of

This measure, if adopted by the people, would expose the State to the fear of requiring each public officer and employee mentioned above to swear or affirm that he will not only support, but also defend, the Federal and State Constitutions against all enemies foreign and domestic; that he will bear true faith and allegiance to the Federal and State Constitutions; and that he takes the oath freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion.

In addition, each such public officer or employee would be required to swear or affirm that he does not advocate, and is not a member of any party or organization that now advocates, the overthrow of the Federal or State Government by force, violence or other unlawful means; that within the five years immediately preceding the taking of the oath or affirmation he has not been a member of any such party or organization except those which he specifically mentions at the time the oath or affirmation is taken; and that, during such time as he holds the public office or employment he will not advocate, nor become a member of any party or organization which advocates, the overthrow of the Federal or State Government by force, violence or other unlawful means.

**Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 9**

This amendment will broaden the constitutional oath of office now required of members of the Legislature and all officers, executive and judicial, except inferior officers exempted by law.

The constitutional oath of office will be broadened to include an oath or affirmation that the officer does not advocate nor belong to any party or organization that now advocates the overthrow of the state or federal government by force or violence or other unlawful means. He will also be required to swear or affirm that he has not been a member of such a party or organization within the five years prior to taking the oath, or, if so, to list the names of such parties or organizations.

In addition to broadening the form of the oath the amendment requires that it be taken by all "public officers and employees" and defines this phrase as including every employee of the State, the University of California and of every city, county, district, authority, and of any agency or instrumentality thereof.

The effect of this amendment will be to require all public servants to take an oath or affirmation that they do not advocate, nor belong to any organization or party which advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of the State of California by force or violence or other unlawful means. This oath is now required by statute of most state and local governmental employees in this state.

Those who act as public servants have a duty to support the form of government lawfully chosen by the people whom they are employed to represent. They should not be allowed to represent the people and be supported by them, and at the same time retain any right to advocate the forceful or violent overthrow of the very government by which they are employed and supported. The public is entitled to a guaranty of the good faith and loyalty of its servants and representatives.

This amendment will require that such a guaranty be given.

**Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 9**

Vote NO on Proposition No. 6. This proposed amendment to the state constitution would drastically modify the oath of allegiance that has been used by the government of the United States from its founding and by the State of California from its admission into the Union in 1850. It has served well for these many years. Now certain individuals who have no faith in the American people would put into the state constitution an expurgatory oath, although the fundamental law of the State since 1849 has expressly provided that "no other oath, declaration or test shall be required..." than the oath of allegiance.

This proposal is a serious threat to your democratic freedoms. Its passage would be a mandate to the Legislature to establish an authority to investigate and snoop into the lives of all the people, even on irrelevant matters. It contains language which is so broad and loose as to admit of almost any interpretation a bureaucratic agency might choose to place on it in order to subject a group or individual it disliked to persecution. It subjects persons taking the required oath in good faith to the possibility of prosecution for perjury or other criminal prosecution punishable by from one to fourteen years in a state penitentiary. It would transform our oath of allegiance into a subservience to whatever political group happens to be in power, instead of an adherence to our democratic principles.

This proposition would create a great welter of fear, suspicion, and distrust among the people. It would bypass our regularly constituted law enforcement agencies through this mandate to the Legislature to create an expurgatory policing authority. It would hamper and eventually terminate freedoms Americans have long treasured.

The author of the Declaration of Independence, the great Thomas Jefferson, said that governments are divided into two groups: "1. Those that fear and distrust the people... 2. Those that identify themselves with the people and have confidence in them..." The totalitarian nations exemplify the first group. The United States is an example of group number two. If you vote for this proposal, you vote to place the United States in a class with totalitarian countries. No good American wants to do that.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the famous case of Cummings v Missouri declared a law imposing expurgatory oaths similar to this proposal to be void and unconstitutional. In its decision the Court stated: "Under this form of legislation, the most flagrant invasion of private rights, in periods of excitement, may be enacted, and individuals, and even whole classes, may be deprived of political rights. The subject was regarded as so important... such a violation of the fundamental principles of civil liberty, and the rights of citizens, that it engaged the attention of eminent lawyers and distinguished statesmen, and among others Alexander Hamilton." In opposing this type of proposal Hamilton described it as an "inquisition... into the consciences of men" and "one that is unknown to the Constitution and repugnant to the genius of our law."

Let us heed the sage advice of Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton by overwhelmingly defeating this proposal. Preserve our American heritage. Vote NO on Proposition No. 6.

**HAROLD K. LEVERING**

60th Assembly District

**GEORGE D. COLLINS, Jr.**

Assemblyman, 22nd District

**EDWARD E. ELLIOTT**

Assemblyman, 44th District
ELECTIONS: BALLOT DESIGNATION OF PARTY AFFILIATIONS. Submitted by the Legislature as alternative to Proposition No. 13. Provides that at regular primary and special elections, the ballot shall show political party affiliation of each candidate for partisan office, as shown by candidate's registration affidavit.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure will require that the political party affiliation of each candidate for a partisan political office be printed following his name on the direct primary ballots of all parties the nomination of which he seeks. It applies to candidates for the offices of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of the State Board of Equalization, United States Senator, Representative in Congress, State Senator, and Member of the Assembly. It does not apply to candidates for judicial, school, county, township, and municipal offices, since those are nonpartisan.

Therefore, if this measure is approved, the name of a candidate affiliated, for example, with the Republican Party, who has "cross-filed" so as to run on the Democratic ballot as well, would be followed on the ballots of both parties by the abbreviation "Rep." to indicate that he is affiliated with the Republican Party.

This measure would also require the party affiliation of candidates for election to a partisan political office at a special election to be similarly shown.

It makes a technical change in the ballot forms set forth in Section 3946 of the Elections Code to insert a statement at the top of such ballot forms that absentee ballots may be marked with a pen or pencil rather than with a rubber stamp. This portion of the measure makes no change in the law, since Section 3944 of the Elections Code already provides that such a statement must be printed on the ballots.

This measure was proposed as an alternative to Proposition No. 13 by the Legislature under paragraph 3 of Section 1 of Article IV of the Constitution, following the Legislature's rejection of that measure (the anti-cross-filing initiative). To the extent to which a court may hold these measures to be in conflict, the measure receiving the highest affirmative vote will prevail if both are approved.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 7

Proposition No. 7 would remove any uncertainty concerning the party affiliation of a candidate who cross-files in a primary election. It requires a candidate to state in abbreviated form the party with which he is affiliated, and thus removes any valid objection to retention of the cross-filing system which has for 40 years protected California voters regardless of partisan affiliation, from machine politics and boss rule.

Elsewhere on the ballot appears an initiative measure which, if adopted, would abolish the cross-filing act and thus deprive the voter of the opportunity to use his own judgment in voting for a candidate of his preference in primary elections.

Proposition No. 7 accomplishes any desirable objective of the anti-cross-filing initiative and involves none of its objectionable features.

For your own protection as a voter and in the interests of a strong two-party system unhampered by political machine exploitation, vote "YES" on Proposition No. 7.

SAM L. COLLINS
Speaker of the Assembly

Argument Against Proposition No. 7

This measure makes an improvement in our election laws if cross-filing of candidates is to continue. At least it indicates to the voting public the party affiliation of partisan candidates in the Primary Election.

It does not abolish the cross-filing of candidates. Elsewhere on the ballot (Proposition No. 13) you can vote "Yes" to eliminate cross-filing. That is the real answer to the problem.

JULIAN BECK
Assemblyman, 41st Assembly District

TAXATION: CHURCH BUILDINGS UNDER CONSTRUCTION.

Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29. Amends Section 11/2 of Article XIII of Constitution. Extends to church building during course of construction, as well as land on which building is situated, the same tax exemption as is now provided for buildings and land in actual use as places of religious worship.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment would extend an existing tax exemption of property used solely and exclusively for purposes of religious worship, to a building in the course of construction intended for such use.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29

This amendment would further the purpose of the present constitutional provision exempting from taxation buildings used solely and exclusively for religious worship, by including within the exemption buildings in the course of erection which are intended to be used for religious worship.

The California Supreme Court has ruled as to similar constitutional provisions that, because of the language used in such provisions, the buildings must actually be in use for the purpose of religious worship before the exemption attaches. The result of this ruling has been that a church under construction on the date the tax attaches is not exempt, even though the church may be virtually completed, whereas a church that has been completed on such date and used for religious worship is exempt.
The purpose of the exemption of churches from taxation is to encourage the establishment and development of churches in this State. In view of this purpose, a discrimination between churches in the course of construction and those completed and being used for religious worship has no reasonable basis. Such a discrimination discourages rather than encourages the establishment and development of churches.

A "yes" vote on this proposed amendment is recommended to eliminate this unfair discrimination.

HAROLD K. LEVERING
Assemblyman, 60th Assembly District

| TAXATION: COLLEGE BUILDINGS UNDER CONSTRUCTION. | YES | NO |
| Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 26. Amends Section 1a of Article XIII of Constitution. Extends nonprofit college property tax exemption, now applied to buildings in actual use for educational purposes, to include buildings during course of construction if intended to be used exclusively for educational purposes. Applies to buildings in course of construction in March, 1950, and thereafter. | | |

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel
This constitutional amendment would extend an existing tax exemption of property of a nonprofit educational institution of collegiate grade, to a building of such an institution in the course of construction on or after the first Monday in March, 1950, and intended on completion to be used exclusively for the purposes of education.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 26
The adoption of this amendment would further the purpose of the present constitutional amendment exempting from taxation buildings which are used exclusively for the purposes of education, by expressly including within the exemption buildings in the course of construction. For many years, prior to 1950, college buildings, regardless of whether completed or in the process of construction, were exempt from taxation. As a result of certain language in a decision of the California Supreme Court (in a case construing the hospital exemption) certain tax officials, commencing in 1950, have taxed college buildings which were not completed on tax day (that is, the first Monday of March of each year)

In other words, because of this Supreme Court decision tax officials have ruled that to be entitled to the exemption a building must actually be in use on tax day and thus must be completed. The result has been that college buildings under construction on tax day have been taxed, although the buildings may be substantially completed and even though when completed and used for education the same buildings are exempt.

The purpose of the exemption of college buildings from taxation is to encourage the establishment and development of educational institutions of collegiate grade in this State. In view of this purpose the discrimination between buildings in the course of construction and those completed and being used for education has no reasonable basis. This discrimination discourages rather than encourages the establishment and development of educational institutions of collegiate grade. A "yes" vote on this proposed amendment is recommended in order to clarify the exemption and to assure the elimination of this illogical and unfair discrimination.

JACK B. TENNEY
Senator, 38th District

| PUBLIC FUNDS: CERTAIN EXPENDITURES PROHIBITED. | YES | NO |
| Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Adds Section 31½ to Article IV of Constitution. Prohibits (and provides that Constitution has always prohibited) appropriation or expenditure of public money to California State Chamber of Commerce, any local chamber of commerce, County Supervisors Association, or any other private organization which attempts to influence legislation. Directs Attorney General to recover all public money hitherto or hereafter expended in violation of such prohibition. Provides that future operation of this prohibition shall not be affected if retroactive application is held invalid. | | |

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel
This initiative constitutional amendment declares that the Constitution now prohibits, and has always prohibited, the paying of any public money to the California State Chamber of Commerce, any local chamber of commerce, the County Supervisors Association, or any other private corporation, association, or organization which attempts in any manner to influence federal, state, or local legislation.

The measure states that any public money which has been paid to the above-mentioned organizations in the past has been unlawfully paid and directs the Attorney General of California to take action to recover for the people all such money as well as any public money which might hereafter be paid to such organizations.
It provides that in the event a court should hold that the Attorney General may not lawfully recover public money which has been paid to such organizations in the past, such a decision shall not prevent action to recover money paid in the future in violation of the provisions of the measure.

Argument in Favor of Initiative Proposition No. 10

VOTE YES on Proposition No. 10.

One of the biggest steals put over on an unsuspecting public is that of the diversion of millions of dollars of tax funds each year to the support of the state and local chambers of commerce.

About $3,000,000.00 a year is turned over by your County Boards of Supervisors and City Councils into the pockets of the promoters of the chambers of commerce and other privately controlled organizations which use much of it to influence legislation and cause public officials to do their bidding.

The original Chambers of Commerce outlived their usefulness after their purpose was accomplished years ago. However, self-perpetuating promoters moved in and took over believing that in the Chambers they had a new political gimmick with which they could usurp power.

SOME YEARS AGO THEY SENT WELL-PAID LOBBYISTS TO SACRAMENTO WHO SECRETLY PUT OVER A BILL ALLOWING 4¢ OUT OF EVERY $100 ASSESSED VALUATION ON ALL REAL PROPERTY TO BE SET ASIDE AND GIVEN TO CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE. IF THIS SPECIAL TAX DOES NOT RAISE SUFFICIENT MONEY TO SATISFY THESE PROMOTERS, OTHER THOUSANDS OF YOUR TAX DOLLARS ARE TURNED OVER TO THEM.

No other State permits such misuse of public funds by privately controlled organizations over which the electorate has no control whatsoever.

OVER $40,000,000.00 DURING THE PAST YEARS HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM MUCH NEEDED PUBLIC HOSPITALS, PLAYGROUNDS, SCHOOLS AND RELIEF OF THE POOR AND GIVEN TO THE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE WHO HAVE BUILT A POLITICAL ORGANIZATION WHICH MAKES THE OLD PENDERGAST AND TAMPANY POLITICAL MACHINES LOOK LIKE GARDEN PARTIES.

The policies of many newspapers are dictated by these political bosses—whose control reaches into every phase of public life in California.

Not even the rank and file membership of the Chambers of Commerce know the extent of the Chambers' influence over public, private and civic groups, much less how much of their tax money plus their membership money is used for entertainment and politicking instead of the civic purpose for which they are proclaimed.

The officials of the Chambers of Commerce are not responsible to the people—therefore they have no right to the people's money. History shows that similar diversions of public money have brought about communism and dictatorship.

This measure stops the grab of public monies by privately controlled organizations who use it to lobby against labor, veterans, the aged and blind, public employees, schools, homeowners and other county taxpayers.

Reading the simple one paragraph of this proposed amendment in the back of this pamphlet proves that it does not prohibit the counties or cities from advertising their resources. Nor does it prohibit the Chambers of Commerce from doing anything they please. BUT IT DOES PROHIBIT THEM AND OTHER PRIVATELY CONTROLLED ORGANIZATIONS FROM PLAYING POLITICS WITH OUR TAX MONEY.

VOTE YES on Proposition No. 10.

RICHARD RICHARDS
Chairman, L. A. Democratic County Central Committee

JOHN S. BARCOME
Member and former Chairman, L. A. Republican County Central Committee

GEORGE McLAIN
Chairman, California Institute of Social Welfare

Argument Against Initiative Proposition No. 10

Every Californian who believes in common sense will vote "NO" on Proposition No. 10.

Proposition No. 10 would bring no benefits to people on the pension rolls or to anyone else. It is a retaliatory measure, pure and simple, conceived by pension promoter George H. McLain as a political blackjack to punish civic groups and organizations that have had the courage to stand up against him and his political clique.

Proposition No. 10 would deny the use of tax funds to semi-public organizations which testify before legislative bodies. It specifically names the California State Chamber of Commerce, all local Chambers of Commerce and the County Supervisors Association, and it would affect many other semi-public, privately managed groups and organizations.

If Proposition No. 10 became law, many worthwhile projects and programs which these organizations have carried on for years in the public interest would have to be abandoned or drastically curtailed.

The tremendously successful Chamber of Commerce efforts to bring new industry, jobs and payrolls to California communities would be seriously hampered.

The splendid 4-H Club youth-building program jointly sponsored by the California Farm Bureau Federation and the University of California Extension Service would be placed in jeopardy.

Matching State funds now provided the Rehabilitation Programs of the major Veterans organizations would be denied.

Promotion of California's multi-million dollar tourism industry would be imperiled.

Because the provisions of Proposition No. 10 are so sweeping, competent legal opinion believes that court tests would be necessary to determine whether teachers and other public employees would be prohibited from belonging to PTA or other organizations which occasionally endorse or oppose legislative proposals.

California needs its Chambers of Commerce, its tourist promotion bodies and other semi-public organizations. Without them, State and local governments would have to set up and maintain, at far greater expense, entirely new departments to attempt to provide the same vitally necessary services.

Common sense and common decency demand the overwhelming defeat of the McLain blackjack initiative. VOTE "NO" on PROPOSITION NO. 10.

RALPH TAYLOR
Executive Secretary, Agricultural Council of California

JOHN HOME
Past Commander, American Legion, Department of California

WALTER SWANSON
Vice-President and General Manager, San Francisco Convention and Tourist Bureau
PAYMENTS TO AGED PERSONS. Initiative to the Legislature.

Places old age security program under state administration; terminates county administration, eliminates county share of costs. Repeals relatives' responsibility requirements. Increases $75 maximum monthly payments according to cost-of-living increases since March, 1950, within specified limits. Provides state payment (up to $25 monthly, plus any federal payments) for health services for old age recipients, and up to $150 funeral expenses. Changes property qualifications of recipients, subject to federal requirements. Entitles recipients to medical and hospital care from county of residence.

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This initiative measure declares that adequate uniform provision for the needs of the aged is a matter of state-wide concern, and that it is the duty of the State to administer the Old Age Security Law directly and to pay the costs from state, rather than local, funds. It declares that the purpose of the Old Age Security Law is to make security available to the needy aged to meet all of their needs without discrimination between those whose resources are insufficient and those who have no resources, in conformity with the requirements of the State Constitution and the Federal Social Security Act. Benefits to individuals under the Old Age Security Law are designated as "old age security."

This initiative measure provides for direct state administration of old age security through the State Department of Social Welfare, rather than county administration under state supervision, and for federal payment of the present state and county shares of cost. It appropriates monthly from the General Fund the sum necessary to pay the full amount of all benefits, after deducting any federal assistance received therefor. It entitles the State to the possession of county administration records and to a portion of the property interest in any real property which is subject to the State and federal interests in such property.

The measure eliminates relatives' responsibility under the Old Age Security Law to contribute to the support of applicants or recipients or to reimburse the State or any public agency for security paid to a recipient, preserving the right of the applicant or recipient to use support under other laws.

It continues the maximum grant at $75 monthly, subject to semiannual cost-of-living increases or decreases of 50 cents for each point of change in the consumer price index from March 15, 1950, between a $75 minimum and a $100 maximum. This grant is subject also to increases or decreases by the amount of the changes in federal assistance from the amount paid on January 1, 1950, but not below $75 monthly.

The measure provides necessary health services and supplies to recipients without exempt income who are not on an excess need budget including such services and supplies up to a maximum of $25 monthly, plus any federal assistance available therefor, payment to be made directly to the seller. It provides also for payment by the State Department of Social Welfare of the funeral expenses of a security recipient, to a maximum of $150, where such expenses are provided for by insurance or contract rights and where the estate does not include sufficient cash or marketable securities to pay them, safeguarding freedom of selection of a funeral director and manner of disposal of the remains.

This initiative measure increases the personal property holdings allowable without loss of eligibility from $1,200 for an individual to $1,500 for each person, less encumbrances of record. The measure eliminates the $2,000 personal property allowance for a married person living with a spouse who is also an applicant or recipient. It excludes, in addition to present exclusions, the value of a motor vehicle of moderate value used for essential transportation of an applicant or recipient. It eliminates any maximum (now $3,500, less encumbrances of record) on the value of real property holdings if the property is occupied as a home or is otherwise being used to meet the current or future identifiable needs of the applicant or recipient.

This measure entitles every recipient to necessary medical and hospital care from the county in which he is living, chargeable to the county, if any, in which he has one year's residence.

It declares the separability of any provision of the Old Age Security Law held unconstitutional, and suspends the operation of any provision found to be in conflict with the Federal Social Security Act or with the rules and regulations of the Federal Security Agency, specifying a procedure for determining the existence of such a conflict.

If adopted, this initiative measure will be subject to amendment or repeal by the Legislature (that is, without a popular vote) only as the initiative itself provides. It permits the Legislature to amend or repeal any Welfare and Institutions Code provision which it amends or adds; but prohibits reduction of benefits, administrative provisions by any agency other than the State Department of Social Welfare or a similar state agency, requiring payment of costs from any funds but state funds, and the reinstatement of relatives’ responsibility.

Argument in Favor of Initiative Proposition No. 11

Vote YES—on Proposition No. 11.

For the past four years we old folks have petitioned our State Legislature again and again to return a few of the benefits you voters gave us in 1948 but which later were taken away by fraud.

We have each time been turned down because the big lobby groups opposed us.

After years of struggle we again come to you praying for relief from our misery and suffering. Hundreds and thousands of us, over 70 years of age, trudged the streets securing signatures to put this measure before you.

Later the Governor's statewide conference on problems of the aged went on record for the main provisions of this old age assistance proposition.

The laws of man have been patterned after the laws of God in most cases. Especially has this been true in regard to the Ten Commandments. One of these commandments is: "HONOR THY FATHER AND THY MOTHER THAT THY DAYS BE LONG UPON THE LAND WHICH THE LORD THY GOD GIVETH THEE"—is a law! But it is violated today by an antiquated program in California which
doesn’t honor the old or comfort them. This can be modernized and corrected by a “yes” vote on OLD AGE ASSISTANCE.

We are not so bold as to ask for a pension as a matter of right. We are only asking for a decent sustenance based on need, in conformity with Federal laws so the State will continue to receive federal funds for this program.

Please grant us freedom of parentage and don’t penalize some of us because we have children.

The people of California voted twice for $75 a month. We are not asking for more, but only that this amount be increased according to the cost of living. And just because we are old we ask for a small amount to take care of our medicines and health needs as well as a decent burial.

Since old age is a statewide problem, not a local one, we ask that the administration be returned to the State so that we can be treated alike in every county and that the costly duplication of 58 county welfare administrations be eliminated.

State administration under the Governor will save the overburdened county taxpayer $22 million dollars a year by shifting the entire cost to the state taxpayer and the State Treasury where there are already many millions of surplus dollars to pay the required $65 million a year of this very modest welfare program.

Contrary to the propaganda of those interests which detest the old because they are poor, only 1½ of the present state tax dollar goes to support California’s aged and blind.

We don’t believe you would begrudge less than a half-cent more out of the state tax dollar to give us forgotten old people the right to some semblance of human dignity in this harsh materialistic world of today.

May God guide you to vote “YES” on OLD AGE ASSISTANCE!

MRS. AMELIA MAYBERRY
Pioneer Organizer of Calif. P. T. A.;
Age 88

MRS. EVA WARING
A 79-year old God Star Mother
GEORGE MCLAIN
Chairman California Institute of Social Welfare

Argument Against Initiative Proposition No. 11

VOTE NO! on Proposition No. 11! This new pension scheme sponsored by promoter George McLain (and his California Institute of Social Welfare) is far more dangerous than the 1948 plan which he put over on the people of California, only to have it repudiated a year later when an enlightened electorate decisively repealed it.

VOTE NO! This thoroughly unsound scheme would increase monthly assistance payments on the basis of the consumers’ price index, lower property qualifications, and add new, expensive health and funeral benefits. INCREASING CALIFORNIA’S OLD AGE ASSISTANCE COSTS MORE THAN $103,000,000 ANNUALLY, according to the Legislative Auditor—

AN ADDED BURDEN WHICH WOULD REQUIRE HIGHER TAXES.

VOTE NO! California now has the most liberal old age assistance laws of any major State. California now pays more for aged aid than New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois combined.

VOTE NO! This measure would transfer administration of old age pensions from counties to the State. Californians had a sour taste of State administration under the discredited “Myrtle Williams Regime” with all its excesses, and know that LOCAL ADMINISTRATION, CLOSE TO THE PEOPLE, IS BETTER AND MORE ECONOMICAL THAN STATE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.

VOTE NO! Most normal American children consider it an honor to assist their aging parents. The McLain scheme removes the responsibility of financially-able children for their parents and foists it on the State. This alone would add more than $50,000,000 to annual costs. The present law requires adult sons and unmarried daughters, in a position to do so, to help support an aged parent. The maximum amount required is reasonable. For example, a married son with one child, receiving “take home” pay of $420 per month, contributes only $15. It is immoral for financially-able relatives to require others to pay costs which they, themselves, can bear.

VOTE NO! Attracted by California’s generosity, many elderly people have migrated to this State for pensions. Over the last five years, the number of old age assistance recipients in California increased more than 64%. Compare this with New York’s 8.9% increase and Michigan’s 2% increase, while Pennsylvania’s costs actually decreased 15%, Illinois dropped 10%, and Ohio decreased 1.2%. This new McLain scheme, with its added costs, would encourage thousands more to come to California to live out their days at the expense of this State’s productive citizens. IT IS NEITHER FAIR NOR EQUITABLE THAT CALIFORNIA’S PRODUCTIVE CITIZENS SHOULD BE CALLED UPON TO SUPPORT AN INCREASINGLY DISPROPORTIONATE NUMBER OF THE NATION’S NEEDY AGED POPULATION.

VOTE NO! California must conserve its finances for needed education and classrooms for the rapidly increasing enrollment of children in our schools. It is unthinkable to add unneeded millions to California’s welfare load to pad an already liberal relief program beyond our ability to pay for it.

VOTE NO on No. 11! A vote against this Proposition will be a vote against professional pension agitators who sow dissension among the elderly by wheeling contributions from their limited cash resources.

L. A. ALESEN, M.D.
President California Medical Association

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

FRANCIS V. KEESLING, SR.
### MILITARY SERVICE BY PUBLIC OFFICERS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 2 (First Ex. Sess., 1962)

Amends Section 20 of Article IV of Constitution. Narrows prohibition against simultaneous holding of state and federal offices, so as not to apply to active military service of less than 30 days per year by public officers belonging to United States armed forces reserves. Provides that such military service shall not affect or suspend tenure of public officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

At present the Constitution provides that no person holding an office under the United States Government for which he receives pay is eligible for any paid civil office of the State. An exception is made for local federal officers, postmasters whose annual pay does not exceed $500, or officers in the militia who receive no annual salary.

It is not certain whether this provision permits a paid state civil officer to be a member of the reserve military forces of the United States.

This amendment to the Constitution provides that a person holding a paid civil office in the state service may also be a member of any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States so long as he is not on active federal duty for more than 30 days in any year, and may receive compensation for both his state and federal service.

The amendment also deletes the restriction on service in the militia so that a person holding a paid civil office in the State may also serve as an officer in the militia on an annual salary.

It is further provided in the amendment that the holding of any paid civil office under the State shall not be affected or suspended by military service as described above.

#### Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 2

The law presently provides for and encourages public officers and employees—State, county, city and local—to participate in the defense preparedness program as members of the National Guard, militia, and reserve components of the armed forces. However, because of a technicality in the law some public officers, particularly elective ones, are unable to effectively participate even though well qualified by their military experience in World War II. At present, active federal military duty, even for a week-end as part of a training program, results in a temporary vacancy of the State or local office held by the National Guard member or reservist. In many instances this prevents participation.

This amendment would merely correct this technicality and enable them, like all other public officers and employees, to participate as members of the National Guard, militia, or reserve components of the armed forces, including brief periods of active federal duty (not over 30 days in any year) without disqualifying occupancy of office under this State.

This measure passed both houses of the Legislature without a dissenting vote or opposition from any source.

GEORGE J. HATFIELD
State Senator, 24th District

### ELECTIONS: PROHIBITING CROSS FILING. Initiative to the Legislature. Provides that no person shall be a candidate or nominee of a political party for any office unless he has been registered as affiliated with such party for at least three months prior to filing nomination papers. Invalidates conflicting laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Under the present election laws of California, any qualified candidate for a partisan political office may seek the nomination of more than one political party by causing his name to appear as a candidate for nomination on the primary election ballots of one or more political parties in addition to the party with which he is registered. This is commonly known as "cross-filing." It applies to candidates for the offices of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Controller, Treasurer, Attorney General, Member of the State Board of Equalization, United States Senator, Representative in Congress, State Senator, and Member of the Assembly. It does not apply to candidates for judicial, school, county, township, and municipal offices, since these are nonpartisan.

This initiative measure (the anti-cross-filing initiative) will abolish "cross-filing" by prohibiting any person from becoming a candidate for the nomination of any political party unless he has been continuously registered as a member of that party for at least three months immediately prior to the filing of nomination papers for the partisan office he seeks, so that no candidate can run on the primary ballot of any party other than the one with which he is registered.

This measure was submitted to the Legislature for approval or rejection and was rejected. See Proposition No. 7, which is a measure proposed by the Legislature as an alternative to this measure under Paragraph 3 of Section 1 of Article IV of the Constitution. To the extent to which a court may hold these measures to be in conflict, the measure receiving the highest affirmative vote will prevail if both are approved.

#### Argument in Favor of Initiative Proposition No. 13

Cross-Filing is a Double Cross. Politicians against the People. The legislature has refused to correct this evil, so the people have to bring it direct to a vote through this initiative. How can a politician simultaneously be both Democratic and Republican? He can't. But, he can pretend! He can Cross-File on both tickets and confuse the voters.
Cross-Filing is NOT non-partisanship. IT'S POLITICAL HYPOCRISY. Causing candidates to claim they are BOTH Republican and Democrat. On opposing platforms, facing both ways. Cross-Filing unfairly places incumbent's name first on ballot.

Cross-Filing has created at Sacramento the most vicious private lobby that exists anywhere. Governor Earl Warren said publicly, (Collier's), of the chief California lobbyist, "On matters that affect his clients, Artie (Samish) unquestionably has more power than the Governor."

Lobbyists dominate legislation. Through Cross-Filing, powerful SPECIAL INTERESTS control California. They take millions from taxpayers and put it in private pockets.

QUOTES:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA, MRS. WINSTON CROUCH, President; “Cross-Filing has so weakened political parties in California they are unable to serve their proper function. True democracy demands political parties be responsive not to machines, bosses, or special interest groups, but to the members of the parties—the voters, you and me.”

LOS ANGELES TIMES; Nov. 7, 1944—“Cross-Filing in Primaries should be discarded. There seems no good reason why a Republican should be allowed to file in Democratic Primary or vice-versa when the candidate would not be allowed to vote in a primary other than that of his own party.”

DWIGHT EISENHOWER: “Essential to America’s political health today is a genuine two-party system.”

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT: “...Without parties, popular government would be absolutely impossible.”

WOODROW WILSON: “... The discipline and zest of parties, has held us together, and made it possible for us to form and carry out programs.”

HERBERT HOOVER: “We cannot weaken or destroy United States political parties without weakening or destroying rule of the people.”

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT: “I believe party organizations—the existence of at least two effectively opposing parties—are a sound and necessary part of our American System.”

CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT decision: “The obvious purpose of primary law is to preserve integrity of parties... If indiscriminate right to vote with any party at a primary were given to electors, whether they were in accord with principles of the party or not, it would soon tend to destroy all party organization. So, to permit persons to become INDISCRIMINATELY THE CANDIDATES OF ANY OR ALL PARTIES AT A PRIMARY ELECTION WOULD TEND TO HAVE THE SAME EFFECT. The existence of such parties... lies at the foundation of our government and it is not expressing it too strongly to say that such parties are essential to its very existence.”

Kill this powerful, vicious Cross-Filing System NOW! Throw it out! Restore a People’s government!

VOTE YES ON NO. 13

JOHN B. ELLIOTT
Chairman, Abolish Cross Filing in California

EDWARD H. TICKLE
Chairman, Californians for Responsible Party Government

Argument Against Initiative Proposition No. 13

Vote “NO” on Proposition No. 13 regardless of your political party affiliation if you, as a voter, desire to retain your RIGHT to vote according to your own conviction and judgment in a primary election.

Proposition No. 13—a radical change in California’s form of government—is a denial of this RIGHT, which has been your right and privilege for 40 years.

Cross-filing in California primary elections eliminated political boss control in this State and for almost four decades has successfully prevented the development of corrupt State and municipal political machines such as yield their sinister influences in so many Eastern and Midwestern States and cities.

Repeal of cross-filing would inevitably lead to a return of the political boss, whether in the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, or any other official party organization.

Boss control of elections means corruption, graft, special favors, special immunities and backroom decisions in which the voter is neither considered nor consulted.

Why is it so important to the promoters of Proposition No. 13 that restrictions be placed on your voting rights?

It is a strange spectacle to find certain so-called “good government” advocates promoting this unfortunate proposal. For the most part, these normally well-meaning people are being used as a “front” by embittered political “outs” of both parties who refuse to accept like good Americans the decisions of the people at the polls.

One argument used by those who would change California’s form of government is that repeal of cross-filing “would strengthen the two-party system.”

Thinking people will immediately recognize the absurdity of that contention.

Cross-filing in California has not weakened the two-party system, but on the contrary has strengthened and cleansed it by discouraging its abuses.

Another strained argument used by those fronting for the behind-the-scenes influences backing Proposition No. 13 is that “cross-filing is the cause of lobbying.” That argument is false. If lobbying by pressure groups resulted from cross-filing, then in Washington, D. C. where cross-filing isn’t a factor, lobbying shouldn’t exist. Yet, as everyone knows, Washington, D. C. is full of lobbyists.

Though cynically promoted as a “do-good” measure, Proposition No. 13 would accomplish nothing but harm. California has benefited and prospered by cross-filing. We have been remarkably free of any threat of hoodlum control of our government through racket-ridden machines such as the Pendergast, Tammany, and others, both Democratic and Republican.

In all the United States, our cross-filing system is the most responsive to the will of the people. Several states have adopted or are considering adoption of similar systems. Cross-filing was the first system to give the people a real voice, really free of any threat of hoodlum control of our government through racket-ridden machines such as the Pendergast. Tammany, and others, both Democratic and Republican.

The malcontents and impractical theorists must not be allowed to sabotage it.

Don’t bring back “The Boss”! Vote “NO” on Proposition No. 13.

JAMES J. McBRIEDE
State Senator, Ventura County

MRS. MILDRED PRINCE
Past President, Pro America of California

JOSEPH SCOTT
Attorney
### REPEALING CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON CHINESE.

Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 59. Repeals Article XIX of Constitution, as adopted in 1879, which directs Legislature to prescribe laws imposing conditions on residence of certain aliens and to provide for their removal from the State; which prohibits Chinese employment by corporations and on public works; which directs passage of laws providing for removal of Chinese from cities or their restriction to certain portions of cities, and adoption of laws to prohibit Chinese from entering State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would repeal Article XIX of the State Constitution as adopted in 1879, consisting of four sections.

Section 1 directs the Legislature to prescribe all necessary regulations for the protection of the State and its political subdivisions from the burdens and evils arising from the presence of aliens dangerous or detrimental to the well-being or peace of the State, to impose conditions upon which such persons may reside in the State and to provide for their removal from the State upon failure or refusal to comply with such conditions.

Section 2 prohibits the employment of Chinese or Mongolians by corporations. This section was held to be invalid under the provisions of the treaty between the United States and China and the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States by *In re Parrott* (1880), 1 Fed. 481.

Section 3 prohibits the employment of Chinese on any public work except in punishment for crime.

Section 4 declares the presence of foreigners ineligible to become citizens of the United States to be dangerous to the well-being of the State and directs the Legislature to discourage their immigration by all means within its power. Asiatic coolieism is prohibited and all contracts for coolie labor are declared to be void. All companies or corporations for the importation of such labor are declared to be subject to such penalties as the Legislature may prescribe. The Legislature is directed to delegate all necessary power to the incorporated cities and towns of the State for the removal of Chinese without the limits of such cities and towns and their location within prescribed portions of those limits, and is also directed to provide the necessary legislation to prohibit the introduction into this State of Chinese after the adoption of the Constitution of 1879.

The Constitution of this State operates as a limitation upon the powers of the Legislature and not as a grant of power. The provisions of Article XIX that direct the Legislature to enact specified regulatory measures did not operate to enlarge the powers of the Legislature, except insofar as that power may have been restricted by other provisions of the State Constitution. The repeal of Article XIX will not deprive the Legislature of its present power to enact legislation on the subject of that article in the exercise of the police power of the State, subject to the limitations on that power imposed by other provisions of the Constitution of this State or by the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

The repeal will not affect the validity of any existing statutory restrictions, such as the provisions in the Labor Code restricting or prohibiting the employment of aliens upon public work or by public agencies.

### Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 59

The Constitution of the State of California was adopted in 1879. Article 19, entitled "Chinese," is subdivided into four different sections.

Section 1 declares that it is the responsibility of the State Legislature to protect the state from the burdens and evils arising from the presence of aliens who are or may become vagrants, mendicants, criminals or invalids with contagious or infectious diseases. This section is very unfair to a great number of Chinese aliens who were most law-abiding and led quiet and peaceful lives at all times. This section is certainly misleading and is of no benefit whatsoever to the people of the State of California other than to create a false impression of the majority of Chinese residents here in California.

Section 2 prohibits California corporations from employing, directly or indirectly, any Chinese or Mongolians. This provision is void because it violates a treaty between the United States and China.

Section 3 prohibits the employment of Chinese on state, county or city public works except as punishment for crimes. This section is now outdated and antiquated and therefore should be abolished from the State's Constitution.

Section 4 provides that the immigration of foreigners into the State should be discouraged. It further provides that the Legislature should delegate the necessary authority to cities and towns of this State for the removal of Chinese without the limits of such cities and towns. Again, this section accomplishes nothing except that of promoting ill feelings between distinctive racial groups.

The growth and progress of the State of California could be traced directly or indirectly, to an appreciable extent, to the help and cooperation of the Chinese people. To allow Article 19 to stand in the Constitution of the great state of California is to allow an antiquated and outmoded piece of legislation to adversely affect the dignity and prestige of our state.

To those without sufficient understanding as to the legal effect of these outdated provisions it may even serve to bring about certain amount of racial hatred and discrimination.

At this time when the peace of the world is still hanging in an uneasy balance, we can ill afford to permit any legislation to stand either in our statute books or in our state constitution which might foster misunderstanding and mutual distrust between people of different racial groups.

THOMAS A. MALONEY
Speaker Pro Tempore of the Assembly
TAXATION: INSURANCE COMPANIES AND BANKS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 5. Amends Sections 14 1/2 and 16 of Article XIII of Constitution. Places State Compensation Insurance Fund in same position as private insurance companies with regard to tax liabilities and exemptions. Provides that insurance companies shall not be exempt from payment of motor vehicle registration, license and operation fees. Requires banks to pay motor vehicle fees whenever federal law permits imposition thereof upon national banks.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 19, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment relates to the taxation of insurance companies and banks and property owned by them.

It would include the State Compensation Insurance Fund within the definition of "insurer," with the consequence that the provisions of the Constitution regarding the taxation of insurers will be extended to the fund.

It would permit the imposition of state taxes and fees upon motor vehicles owned by insurers or upon the operation of such vehicles.

It would also permit the imposition of state taxes and fees upon motor vehicles owned by banks or upon the operation of such vehicles, when the State is permitted by Congress to impose such taxes and fees upon or with respect to the vehicles of national banks.

Argument in Favor of Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 5

Proposition No. 15 passed both houses of the Legislature unanimously without opposition. It amends provisions of the Constitution pertaining to taxation on insurance companies and banks. The only important change is that insurance companies and banks will also pay fees and taxes on their automobiles, which are now tax exempt. Fewer than 5,000 motor vehicles, those now carrying "P.S." plates, will be affected.

Proposition No. 15 should be passed because:
1. Banks and insurance companies should pay motor vehicle taxes and are willing to do so.
2. Additional revenue will be obtained for badly needed state highway construction.
3. Additional revenue will be obtained for major city streets and primary county roads.
4. The expense of issuing special "P.S." plates will be eliminated.

To prevent discrimination against state banks, the amendment provides that their vehicles will not be taxed until it is possible under Federal law to tax vehicles of national banks in the same manner.

Because of their particular nature, banks and insurance companies are taxed under special provisions of law. This takes the form of a direct levy on business transacted and is in lieu of most other state taxes. This proposition merely removes motor vehicles from this "in lieu" exemption.

The amendment also includes the State Compensation Insurance Fund in the definition of "insurer" for tax purposes. This change in language places the Fund on an equal basis with private insurers—a sound principle supported by the fund itself.

There is no known opposition. I urge a "Yes" vote.

RANDOLPH COLLIER
Senator, 2nd District

BOROUGH FORM OF CITY GOVERNMENT. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1. Amends Section 8 of Article XI of Constitution. Gives any chartered city or city and county alternative of establishing borough form of government either for entire territory or any part thereof, any such borough to exercise such municipal powers and to be administered as the charter prescribes.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 20, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Section 8 of Article XI of the Constitution now permits the charter of any city to provide for the division of the city into territorial units (boroughs) with general or special municipal governmental powers relating to matters of local concern. This is known as the borough system of city government.

The Constitution does not at present permit the charter of a city to create such a local governmental unit (borough) in any part of the city unless the entire city is divided into such units (boroughs).

This amendment to the Constitution will permit the charter of a city to provide for the establishment of a borough system of government for either the entire city or for one or more parts of the city.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1

This constitutional amendment must be adopted in order to remove obstructions that prevent home rule cities from setting up portions of their municipalities as boroughs.

The amendment is permissive only. Charter cities will decide for themselves whether or not they wish to have boroughs. Los Angeles is the only city which now has charter provision for boroughs.

At the time Wilmington and San Pedro were annexed to the City of Los Angeles, promises of "borough status" were made, and, in 1909, the Charter was amended to authorize the formation of boroughs. Wilmington citizens attempted to form a borough but
a ruling of the State Supreme Court in 1917 declared the charter provision for boroughs in conflict with the State Constitution. The present amendment will resolve that conflict by changing the Constitution to permit portions of cities to organize into boroughs.

The basic argument for this amendment is that home rule cities should be allowed to adopt internal organization of their own choosing.

The case for dividing a particular city into boroughs will have to be made by those who understand the local situation. Some of our larger cities might choose to set up boroughs in order to help (1) Restore to the citizen a sense of belonging that has been lost in large cities with remote governments; (2) Permit the people of a community to develop and pay for services especially suited to their outlook and needs; (3) Combine the efficiency of unity in the general city-wide services with the beneficial effects of local home rule; and (4) Provide a laboratory for civic training in a unit small enough for the citizen to know.

The establishment of borough governments exercising jurisdiction over purely local matters would extend adequate representation to all. Many activities, important to only one district within the city, could be effectively administered by the boroughs. Local improvements might be easier to secure if the only alternatives were not so frequently either payment of all costs by special assessment of abutting property owners or the Shouldering of the cost of the entire project by the city.

Another important advantage of such a two-layer arrangement would be the relief of the central body from the consideration of multitudinous petty matters that do not concern the city as a whole. More time would be available to city councilmen for the consideration of problems of metropolitan importance. Community interest in civic affairs would greatly increase with the responsibility of local affairs centered within easy reach of the average citizen. Local autonomy and community concern go hand in hand, and both are integral parts of a democratic system. Many complaints which would have to be taken downtown under the present system could be dealt with promptly at the borough level to the increased satisfaction of the individuals concerned.

Before these advantages can be made available to any city, constitutional restrictions must be removed.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION NO. 16.

VINCENT THOMAS
Assemblyman, 68th District

CHIROPRACTORS. Amendment of Chiropractic Initiative Act, Submitted by Legislature. Increases Board of Chiropractic Examiners from five members to seven. Increases per diem of board members. Authorizes suspension or revocation of chiropractic licenses for described types of unprofessional conduct, such as employment of unlicensed or suspended practitioner in treating the sick, procurement of abortions, untrue or misleading advertising, payment for procuring patients, wilful neglect of patients. Requires chiropractors annually to take 16 hours of postgraduate study as condition of license renewal. Exempts chiropractors in armed forces from payment of license renewal fees.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 22, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure submits to the voters for approval or rejection amendments made by Chapter 1650 of the Statutes of 1951 to the Chiropractic Initiative Act of 1922, providing for the organization of the Board of Chiropractic Examiners and for educational and licensing requirements for the practice of chiropractic in this State, which amendments may be summarized as follows:

The measure increases membership of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners from five to seven members, and increases the vote necessary to carry motions or resolutions, to adopt rules, or to issue licenses from affirmative vote by three members to affirmative vote by four members.

It eliminates the provision precluding any two persons whose first diplomas were issued by the same chiropractic school from being members of the board at the same time. It also increases per diem for members of the board while engaged in official duties from $10 to $30.

It repeals the provision providing for the granting of licenses to graduates of chiropractic schools practicing chiropractic at the effective date of the Chiropractic Act, and those graduates who meet prescribed educational requirements prior to January 1, 1922, if application for the license is made within six months of the effective date of the Chiropractic Act, which is December 21, 1922.

The measure adds as a ground for suspension or revocation of a license or for refusal to grant a license any act which constitutes unprofessional conduct. Unprofessional conduct is defined as the procuring, aiding or abetting in the procuring, of criminal abortion; paying for steering patients into one’s office; obtaining a fee on assurance that a manifestly incurable disease can be made entirely well; wilful betrayal of professional secrets of a patient to his detriment; chiropractic advertising which is untrue or misleading; conviction of an offense involving moral turpitude; or wilful neglect of a patient in a critical condition.

The measure further defines as unprofessional conduct the employing, directly or indirectly, of a suspended or unlicensed practitioner in the practice of any system or mode of treating the sick or afflicted, or aiding or abetting any unlicensed person to practice any system or mode of treating the sick or afflicted.

It requires that licenses be renewed annually, the issuance of such renewal licenses to be contingent upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the board that the applicant has completed at least 16 hours of postgraduate studies within the previous year.

It increases the fee required of a licentiate who fails, refuses, or neglects to pay the annual renewal fee for 60 days after January 1 of each year from $10 to $25, but exempts any licentiate serving in the United States armed forces from payment of the renewal fee during his period of service and for one year thereafter.
It increases the fine for certain acts declared to be a misdemeanor by the Chiropractic Act from not less than $50 nor more than $200 to not less than $200 nor more than $600.

Argument in Favor of Amendment of Initiative Act

This proposed amendment to the act creating the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners and regulating the practice of chiropractic will make the desired changes set forth in the preceding analysis by the Legislative Counsel. These changes are necessary to meet problems which have developed with the growth of the State and the profession since the original enactment of the Chiropractic Act.

This proposed amendment will in no way involve additional cost to the general taxpayer in that the administration of the Act is self-supporting from within the profession.

This proposed amendment has the whole-hearted support of members of the profession. It is an amendment proposed by the Legislature without a dissenting vote or other opposition and has been approved by the Governor.

Vote “YES”!

DONALD L. GRUNSKY
Assemblyman, Santa Cruz and San Benito Counties

Argument Against Amendment of Initiative Act

The proposed amendment to the chiropractic act is a “featherbedding” act to create a seven-man Board instead of the present five-man Board. The two extra positions do not in any way provide the Board with a more efficient executive capacity. It merely increases the expense of the Board personnel. Also a 200% increase in the per diem expense of the Board is asked. Proposely the act would allow that all members of the Board could be selected from any ONE school, instead of the wise provision in our present act, that prevents discrimination against ANY college by allowing only ONE to be appointed from any given college. Designedly, the proposition provides for 16 hours of post graduate studies “upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the Board.” No legal or professional standard whatever is provided. What a patronage “plum” would be provided the Board, especially if a majority were from ONE school. With approximately 6,000 licentiates in this State at $20.00 per post graduate course contingent “upon evidence satisfactory to the Board,” that would mean a $120,000 “plum” to go to the “approved” school yearly. It would be childish to think such a proposal would be in good faith. Compulsory post graduate courses have been tried before and have been discarded in other States as well as ours. The Osteopathic Board required a 30 hour educational course to renew their licenses from January 1, 1942. This was repealed as of August 4, 1943. The Chiropractors had the 30 hour educational requirement effective September 13, 1945. This was repealed September 19, 1947.

Why repeat failure methods? Purportedly the proposition seems to exempt the man serving his country in the armed forces from his renewal fee , , , , but it does not exempt him from the 16 hours of an “approved” course. He loses his license to practice because the 16 hour course is mandatory.

The State of California now grants to ALL health professionals the right to practice their profession upon recognized qualification. This amendment would jeopardize his license to practice every year unless he submitted to compulsory directed thought imposed by the Board. This inadvertent act would imply that a doctor learns nothing by experience but must have compulsory directed education every year, especially for a financial consideration. This incredible act provides for suspension or revocation in such a way that the Board may deem any statement made by a chiropractor as “unprofessional conduct” and any of these actions of the Board may be committed without provision in the proposed amendment for any recourse in a Court of Law for review of the Board’s action. One section has it that “any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.”

Failure to go back to an “approved” school is certainly a violation of the act. Our present Board is an executive Board, let us not turn it into a dictatorial one.

VOTE NO on No. 16.

HOMER YORK, D.C.
President Chiropractic Institute of California, California State Representative
International Chiropractors Assn.

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 55. Adds Section 19 to Article XIII of Constitution. Authorizes financing cost of redevelopment project from portion of revenue derived from taxes on taxable property within project. Provides that taxing agencies shall continue to receive tax revenues based on assessed value of such property at time of approval of redevelopment plan. Authorizes and validates laws permitting use of additional tax revenue, based on later increases in assessed value, for payment of bonds or other obligations of the redevelopment agency and permitting the agency to pledge such income as security for its obligations.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 24, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This constitutional amendment declares subject to taxation all property in a community redevelopment project established under the Community Redevelopment Law (Section 33000 and following, Health and Safety Code), except that exempt from taxation by reason of public ownership.

It would authorize the Legislature to provide for the inclusion in a redevelopment plan of a provision for the division of taxes collected on property in a project as follows: to each public agency levying taxes, an amount equal to that which would be produced on an application of the agency’s tax rate to the assessed value of the property prior to the redevelopment; the excess to a special fund of the redevelopment agency to pay the interest and principal on any debts incurred by the agency in financing or refinancing the project. It would empower the Legislature to provide for the
irrevocable pledging of such excess for the payment of such principal and interest.

In addition, the measure would validate all provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law consistent with the foregoing relating to the use or pledge of taxes.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 55

This Constitutional Amendment provides a method of financing community redevelopment projects by relieving general taxpayers. Community redevelopment must be distinguished from public housing. The purpose is to eliminate blighted areas. Under the law, redevelopment, including the construction of streets, curbs, sidewalks and buildings, must be financed by private capital. However, a city or county must first acquire the property, if necessary by condemnation, because an individual, syndicate or corporation does not have the right of eminent domain and one property owner might refuse to sell and block the development.

The difference between the expense of acquisition and clearing off the old, dilapidated buildings may be greater than what may be realized from the sale of the property for redevelopment in accordance with an officially approved plan. Without this constitutional amendment, the expense would come out of the general funds of the city or county or from Federal subsidy. This constitutional amendment makes it possible for the entire amount advanced out of public funds to be returned out of taxes on the increased valuation of the property after improvement. In other words, the property will carry itself, and the expenses will be paid out over a term of years.

This constitutional amendment is a good provision and has been carefully drafted. It is in effect an enabling act to give the Legislature authority to enact legislation which will provide for the handling of the proceeds of taxes levied upon property in a redevelop-

ment project. It is permissive in character and can become effective in practice only by acts of the Legislature and the local governing body, the City Council or Board of Supervisors. It will make possible the passage of laws providing that tax revenues derived from any increase in the assessed value of property within a redevelopment area because of new improvements, shall be placed in a fund to defray all or part of the cost of the redevelopment project that would otherwise have been advanced from public funds.

The constitutional amendment makes possible what is called permissive legislation. In other words, no city or county having a redevelopment agency need take advantage of its provisions unless they so desire. The procedure provided for adjusting tax revenues derived from increased valuation of redeveloped areas that were previously blighted areas are fair and equitable to the taxpayers of the community.

If adopted, this constitutional amendment will readily facilitate the redevelopment of blighted areas in cities and counties as now authorized by the Community Redevelopment Act of the State of California. Blighted areas are an economic and social drag upon the community and it is good public business to eliminate them. By the adoption of this constitutional amendment, it will be made possible for the property to pay its own way and finance the cost of redevelopment without an additional levy upon already overburdened taxpayers.

Vote "Yes" on Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 55.

A. I. STEWART
Member of the Assembly,
47th District
GERALD J. O'GARA
Attorney and State Senator for
San Francisco
FLETCHER ROWRON
Mayor of Los Angeles

GRAND JURIES. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 2.
Amends Section 8 of Article I of Constitution. Requires that grand juries shall consist of 19 jurors, including three to nine members of the preceding year's grand jury. Provides that no grand juror shall serve more than two consecutive years, nor serve as chairman for more than one year.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 25, Part III)

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 2

This proposed amendment will enable our Grand Juries to be better able to follow through with their important investigations. Grand Juries now function for a period of only one year. After a Grand Jury is discharged, the new Grand Jury must be appointed entirely of new members. It has a very difficult time picking up where the preceding Grand Jury left off. Thus, many investigations, the results of which are vital to good government, are left incomplete and no effective action results.

This proposed amendment would cause from 3 to 9 members of the previous Grand Jury to serve on the following Grand Jury. With these previous jurors present, a new Grand Jury would have little difficulty carrying on important investigations that the former grand jury had not been able to complete.

The Grand Jury system is fundamental in our form of government. This proposed amendment would give the Grand Jury the strength it needs to root out corruption and prevent inefficient government on the City and County level.
The proposed amendment has been carefully prepared and does not permit any juror to serve more than two consecutive years. It also provides that no juror can serve more than one year as foreman. This measure was overwhelmingly approved by the State Legislature. Vote yes.

JOHN D. BARRAGE
Member of Assembly,
76th Assembly District,
Riverside County

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 2

This amendment seeks to change the Constitution by providing that each successive Grand Jury shall have no less than three nor more than nine members from the previous year's jury. Anticipating that this amendment would be voted upon by the people, the legislature passed a bill designed to amend the law relating to the selection of Grand Jurors. Governor Warren's veto message of this bill severely criticized this attempt to alter the historical characteristics of grand juries and criticized the bill as tending toward the creation of professional grand jurors.

Americans, above everything else, demand impartiality from their Grand Juries. This necessity for impartiality was well stated by Chief Justice Shaw of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts as follows: "In a free and popular government it is of the utmost importance to the peace and harmony of society not only that the administration of justice and the punishment of crime should, in fact, be impartial, but that it should be so conducted as to inspire a general confidence. To accomplish this, nothing could be better conceived than a selection of a body, considerably numerous, by lot, from among those who previously, and without regard to time, person or occasion, have been selected from amongst their fellow citizens as persons deemed worthy of this high trust by their moral worth, and general respectability of character. The Grand Jury by its mode of selection, by its number and character and the temporary exercise of its power is placed beyond the reach of suspicion of fear or favor of being overawed by power or seduced by persuasion."

Federal Grand Juries have no provision relating to carryover jurors. To the writers' knowledge, no other state has sought to rig the membership of its juries by any such provision.

Often senior citizens serve upon these bodies and it is doubtful if they would be willing to serve if they knew they might have to serve for two continuous years.

It is argued that carryover jurors insure efficiency and knowledge of the works of the previous jury. However, continuation of membership does not insure continuity of inquiry. If Grand Jurors wish knowledge of actions taken by past Grand Juries, reports and records of these Juries are available in the files.

This amendment permits nine members of the old Jury to sit with the new Jury. Instead, as there are only nineteen members on a Grand Jury, there is a definite possibility that the nine holdovers would dominate the entire Jury and dangerous clumps or an impasse might result.

Human characteristics often make it difficult for a person to serve for one year as a GrandJuror without developing or maintaining a personal connection with his work. Under the proposed system, these prejudices would be perpetuated in the succeeding Jury. Further, this scheme to perpetuate jury service is a desirable device for those few jurors who, while on Grand Jury service, may seek to further their political ambitions. Vote NO on this proposal.

L. NATHANIEL FITTS
Foreman, 1951 L.A. County Grand Jury

HAYDEN JONES
Foreman Pro Tem, 1951 L.A. County Grand Jury

STATE FUNDS: HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 58. Amends Section 22 of Article IV of Constitution. Permits Legislature to make state funds available to public agencies and nonprofit corporations for construction of hospital facilities and to authorize use of state funds for that purpose by nonprofit corporations, whenever federal money is made available for such construction.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 26, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The Legislature would be specifically authorized by this measure to make state money available for the construction of hospital facilities by public agencies and nonprofit corporations organized to construct and maintain such facilities whenever federal funds are made available for such construction.

Congress is now making federal funds available for a portion of the cost of the construction of public and other nonprofit hospitals, but there is serious doubt whether this section of the Constitution now permits the use of state money for the construction of hospital facilities by nonprofit corporations. The amendment made by this measure will give the Legislature that power whenever the Federal Government makes funds available for such purposes.

This section of the Constitution (Art. IV, Sec. 22) would also be amended by Proposition No. 4 submitted to the voters at this election. The amendments are not conflicting, however, and if both are approved by the voters, both can be given effect.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 58

Adoption of this amendment would permit nonprofit community hospitals to participate in the State grants for necessary hospital construction expansion on the same basis as tax-supported hospitals. These funds would be available only for construction and not for operating expenses or budgetary deficits. The adoption of this amendment will not in any way increase the taxes upon real and personal property.

It has been the intention of the Hospital Survey and Construction Program that in order to solve the problems arising from the acute shortage of hospital beds in California, funds for building new hospitals or expanding existing institutions be furnished on a joint basis, in part through federal grants, in part through state funds and the remainder, in the case of voluntary hospitals, by the group sponsoring the hospital. Due to constitutional restrictions state funds cannot be made available for the nonprofit voluntary hospitals and of necessity must go entirely to tax-supported institutions.
The supporters of this amendment believe that it is to the advantage of the public to have a portion of facilities included in hospital expansion in the form of voluntary hospitals, particularly in view of the fact that operational costs would not be tax-supported. Furthermore, the record shows that the need for financial assistance in the voluntary hospital field is now exceeding that for tax-supported institutions. In the past, all state construction funds have been allocated to tax-supported institutions and the number of tax-supported hospital beds has, as a result, increased out of proportion to voluntary hospital beds.

It is not the purpose of this amendment to increase the amount of tax money used for hospital construction, but only to eliminate the technical constitutional prohibition which tends to prevent local communities from making a determination on the merits without being influenced by the availability or nonavailability of state funds as to whether or not they would prefer to fill their hospital needs through additional tax-supported institutions or through voluntary hospitals. The elimination of both state and federal funds will continue to be made on the basis of need and the proposed amendment will bring about a more equitable distribution of hospital facilities of every kind.

The amendment will place California in a similar position enjoyed by a substantial number of other states and permit its nonprofit voluntary hospitals to share public funds available for construction purposes with tax-supported hospitals.

ARGUMENT AGAINST ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NO. 58

Under the HOSPITAL SURVEY AND CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM, California receives a federal grant to assist in the construction of new hospitals and the expansion of existing institutions to relieve the critical shortage of hospital facilities. The federal assistance is available to both governmental or public hospitals and nonprofit voluntary institutions. The state, in recognition of the need for expanded facilities, has established its own hospital construction fund to supplement the federal grant. Participation in the state fund is limited to the public hospitals under the State Constitution which restricts the expenditure of state funds to governmental agencies and institutions. Only county and district hospitals may receive this state aid.

The purpose of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 58 is to permit nonprofit voluntary hospitals to participate in the state hospital construction fund. This would allow the state to grant financial assistance to hospitals which are not owned, controlled or operated by it or through any of its subdivisions. It would amount to subsidizing of private interests in the construction of hospital facilities. This is contrary to the philosophy of government, which restricts the use of state funds for the creation and support of tax-supported agencies and institutions.

Although no additional funds are required or necessarily contemplated, the amount available for the tax-supported institutions would obviously be reduced by enlarging the group eligible for participation. County and district hospitals are entirely dependent upon tax money for their construction and do not receive financial assistance through public subscription. Such amounts may be authorized for the state construction fund should continue to be reserved entirely for their use and benefit. It is sufficient that the voluntary community hospitals are permitted to participate in such federal aid as is made available. Their additional financial requirements may be supplemented as in the past by private gifts and endowments.

More county and district hospitals are required to meet the demands of the state's increasing population. Their location, size and facilities are subject to a planned program related to need based upon population, area to be served and accessibility. Their operation has been proven satisfactory and represents an immediate solution to the state's health and hospital requirements. The adoption of this amendment would result in a reduction of the state funds now available to the public hospitals and consequently retard their growth and expansion.

ARTHUR J. BREED, JR.
Senator, Sixteenth District

BEN HUSE
Senator, Thirty-ninth District

SUPERIOR JUDGES, VACANCIES. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 16. Amends Section 8 of Article VI of Constitution. Provides that where superior court vacancy occurs during general election year preceding end of the incumbent judge's term, election of a full-term successor shall be held at same election as if no vacancy had occurred.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 26, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Council

Under the present constitutional provisions, judges of the superior court are elected for a term of six years. Section 8 of Article VI of the Constitution now provides that a vacancy in the office of judge of the superior court shall be filled at the state general election next succeeding the first day of January following the occurrence of the vacancy. The Governor is authorized to fill any vacancy until an election can be held.

The existing constitutional provisions have been construed by the courts to mean that, when the vacancy occurs in the last year of the incumbent judge's term, the election normally held in that year shall be postponed for a period of two years until the next state general election. This amendment would require the election which normally would be held to proceed, when the vacancy occurs during the last year of the incumbent's regular term of office.
vacancy occurs even though a general state election is held in that year. The Governor is empowered to appoint a judge to hold the office until the term of the judge elected by the people commences, which would be the first Monday after the first day of January following the date of the election.

During the last year of an incumbent’s term, the people elect a successor to the office for a full 6 year term commencing the following year. However, if a vacancy occurs in the office during the incumbent’s last year, the election for the successor cannot be held during that year, and can be held only at the next general state election after the close of that year, which would normally be 2 years later. Thus under the constitutional provision as now worded the people are denied the right to vote for a superior court judge every 6 years if a vacancy occurs during the last year of an incumbent’s term. This amendment would provide that in those cases where the vacancy occurs in the last year of an incumbent’s term of office, the office shall be filled by the election of a judge for a full term in the same year that the vacancy occurred in the same manner and to the same effect as if the vacancy had not occurred. This will avoid the situation outlined above where, by reason of a vacancy occurring during the last year of the incumbent’s term, the people are deprived of the right which they would otherwise have to vote for such office at the general state election in that year. The Governor would be required to appoint a judge to serve the unexpired portion of the incumbent’s term and until the term of the elected successor to the office commenced in the following January. This is consistent with the present policy of filling the office of superior court judge by means of the election process every six years and insures a greater degree of local control over public officials serving within a locality.

Vote Yes.

GEORGE J. HATFIELD
State Senator, 24th District

GREGORY P. MAUSHEART
Judge of the Superior Court
of the State of California
in and for the County of Madera

PROPERTY TAX STATEMENTS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 19. Amends Section 8 of Article XIII of Constitution. Authorizes Legislature to permit annual property tax statements to be verified by taxpayer’s written declaration under penalty of perjury, as alternative to verification by oath of taxpayer.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 27, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The constitutional provision which would be amended by this measure directs the Legislature to require each property taxpayer to deliver to the county assessor a statement showing the real and personal property owned by or under the control of the taxpayer as of noon on the first Monday of March. The amendment which this measure makes would permit the use of a written declaration under penalties of perjury as an alternative to the oath which is now required on the filing of the statement.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 19

By adopting this Amendment to the California Constitution, voters will eliminate the burdensome requirement that all property tax statements filed with assessors must be made under oath.

Now, a property owner cannot complete a statement in the same way that he would make an income or sales tax return. Instead, he must appear personally at the assessor’s office to take an oath that the statement is correct.

If the crowds and delays at the Court House make such procedure difficult, there are two alternatives, but they are both inconvenient. The taxpayer may take the oath in his own home if he happens to be there when an assessor visits the home or he may appear before a notary public for the purpose of being sworn.

For several years, taxpayers have been spared such inconvenience in connection with their sales and income tax returns. These may simply be signed and mailed without the necessity of taking an oath. To safeguard the public interest, the law provides the same penalties for false returns as would apply if the reports were made under oath.

After this amendment is adopted, property taxpayers may make their returns to assessors under the same modern method. No other change in the law will result. Under another constitutional provision (Section 14, Article XII), since 1933 special methods to verify personal property have been authorized. This proposal has no bearing on the subject and is confined exclusively to simplifying the method by which a property tax return may be made as to all property, both real and personal.

You are urged to vote YES on this proposition. In so doing, you will serve your own convenience as a taxpayer and will promote the efficiency of the assessor.

RALPH M. BROWN
Member of the Assembly, 30th District

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 19

Present practices in assessment of property place the burden of making the assessment on the assessor. Deputy assessors call at the home or place of business and place a value on the taxpayer’s holdings. Under the plan contemplated, the property tax statements would be mailed to the taxpayer with instructions to list his property, sign the statement “under the penalties of perjury” and return it to the assessor. Thus, the burden of making the assessment would, in a sense, be shifted from the assessor to the taxpayer.

There is no assurance that taxpayers with similar holdings would file similar voluntary property statements. For example, some taxpayers might include clothing and other personal effects which, as a matter of practice, are not now assessed, while other taxpayers might not. There would not be the same assurance of uniform, equitable assessment as exists under present practices.

At present, when property tax statements are made under oath to the assessor, accepted, and valued by the assessor, the assessment is final when the rolls are closed, and the taxpayer is relieved of further uncertainties. Under the proposed change, the enabling legislation could provide that assessing officers could re-open the assessment at some later period and question the items previously returned, thus extending the period of uncertainty. Extension of the period of uncertainty with respect to final determination of secure personal prop-
It is appropriate to be almost over-cautious in approving changes in assessment procedures and precedents established over a long period of years. If assessors should decide to enforce stringently and literally the provisions of the proposed amendment, all taxpayers would be required to itemize every article of personal property owned including, for example, wearing apparel; otherwise they would, in effect, commit perjury, and be subject to prosecution on felony charges. Furthermore, the enlargement of the scope of governmental authority in such a vague manner, if enforced literally, could conceivably be used as a political weapon against citizens incurring the displeasure of persons in public office.

HAYDEN F. JONES
3061 Viewfield Ave.
Rt. 2, Puente, Calif.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY FOR ASSESSMENT. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 20. Amends Section 3 of Article XIII of Constitution. Eliminates requirement that federally sectionized land containing more than 640 acres shall be assessed by sections or fractions of sections.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 27, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel
This constitutional amendment will eliminate an existing requirement that every tract of land containing more than 640 acres which has been sectionized by the Federal Government shall be assessed for property tax purposes by sections or fractions of sections. It will also delete a direction to the Legislature that it provide for the assessment in small tracts, of land which has not been sectionized by the United States Government.

The effect will be to invest the Legislature with general authority to provide by law for the description of land for tax assessment purposes.

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No 20
This Constitutional Amendment will simplify and improve the method of describing large tracts of land for tax purposes in California. It makes no other change in the power of the Legislature to prescribe how property shall be taxed.

Under an 1879 provision, whenever a tract contains more than 640 acres, it must be divided for assessment purposes into parcels not exceeding that acreage. The requirement is absolute if the land has been sectionized, that is, mapped into sections of 640 acres each by Government survey.

Conditions that prompted inclusion of this provision in the Constitution 75 years ago no longer exist today. Then, much valuable land capable of intensive development was held in large tracts. Now, most of the remaining large holdings are comprised of land of relatively low value devoted mainly to livestock grazing and like purposes.

Dividing these large tracts into smaller units for taxation is an unnecessary and expensive process. It requires additional work of county officials who must prepare and handle several tax records for what is actually a single piece of property. This proposal would permit the Legislature to provide for the description of these holdings for tax purposes free of restriction as to the size of parcels assessed. It does nothing more.

This is confirmed by the California Attorney General, who has ruled that legislative history indicates clearly that the amendment has no effect beyond the removal from the Constitution of the acreage restriction with respect to the assessment of land parcels. Vote YES on this proposition. It will improve property tax description methods without otherwise changing the legislative authority in such matters in any way.

RALPH M. BROWN
Member of the Assembly, 30th District

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 20
This Constitutional Amendment was proposed for the purpose of removing the restriction, which has until now, limited parcels of land for assessment purposes to 640 acres. This has been considered by some to promote more efficient assessing practices, particularly in the several counties in the State in which there are large ranchos which substantially exceed 640 acres in size.

While the proposed amendment would appear adequate to correct this particular problem, it seems that consideration may not have been given to its effect as to other duties of assessing officers generally.

Since the proposal of this amendment by the Assembly, it has developed that there is considerable doubt as to what the amendment actually means and some fear as to the manner in which it might be interpreted by the courts.

In providing this change, the words "for the purpose of taxation," which previously appeared in Section 3, Article XIII of the Constitution, have been eliminated completely from the references to assessment, which may raise the question as to whether assessment is to be made for the purpose of valuation or for the purpose of taxation.

Without intending to do so, this amendment, if adopted, might in the future be interpreted by the courts to change the traditional concept of "value" in assessing practices. If this should occur, many years might elapse before assessing officials and county boards of equalization would again have a reasonable concept as to the correct procedure to follow.

Since this doubt has been raised, it would appear to be practical to vote "no" on the amendment at this time, and to allow the question to be resolved further by a future session of the Legislature, particularly as there is no urgency involved.

JOHN COTTON
San Diego, California

END OF ARGUMENTS
### Part II—Appendix

#### VETERANS FARM AND HOME BONDS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 40.

Amends Section 16 to Article XVI of Constitution. Authorizes issue and sale of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) in state bonds to provide funds to be used by State Department of Veterans Affairs in accordance with Veterans Farm and Home Purchase Act of 1943 in assisting California war veterans to acquire farms and homes. Brings into operation and validates Veterans Bond Act of 1951, governing issue, sale and redemption of such bonds.

(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 THE CONSTITUTION**

Sec. 16. The issuance and sale of bonds of the State of California, not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000), and the use and disposition of the proceeds of the sale of said bonds, all as provided in the Veterans Bond Act of 1951 (Article 50 added to Chapter 6 of Division 4 of the Military and Veterans Code by Chapter 985 of the Statutes of 1951) authorizing the issuance and sale of state bonds in the sum of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) for the purpose of providing a fund to be used and disbursed to provide farm and home aid for veterans in accordance with the provisions of the Veterans Farm and Home Purchase Act of 1943, and of all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto are hereby authorized and directed and said Veterans Bond Act of 1951 is hereby approved, adopted, legalized, ratified, validated, and made fully and completely effective upon the effective date of this amendment to the Constitution. All provisions of this section shall be self-executing and shall not require any legislative action in furtherance thereof, but this shall not prevent such legislative action. Nothing in this Constitution contained shall be a limitation upon the provisions of this section.

#### PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDS. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.

Amends Article IX, Section 6, of the State Constitution. Increases required State support for public schools to One Hundred Eighty Dollars per year for each pupil in average daily attendance, of which each local school district shall receive not less than One Hundred Twenty Dollars per pupil. To become operative July 1, 1953.

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

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION**

Section 6. Each person, other than a substitute employee, employed by a school district as a teacher or in any other position requiring certification qualifications shall be paid a salary which shall be at the rate of an annual salary of not less than twenty-four hundred dollars ($2400) for a person serving full time, as defined by law.

The Public School System shall include all kindergarten schools, elementary schools, secondary schools, technical schools, and State colleges, established in accordance with law and, in addition, the school districts and the other agencies authorized to maintain them. No school or college or any other part of the Public School System shall be, directly or indirectly, transferred from the Public School System or placed under the jurisdiction of any authority other than one included within the Public School System.

The Legislature shall add to the State School Fund such other means from the revenues of the State as shall provide in said fund for apportionment in each fiscal year, an amount not less than one hundred and twenty dollars ($120) per pupil in average daily attendance in the kindergarten schools, elementary schools, secondary schools, and technical schools in the Public School System during the next preceding fiscal year.

The entire State School Fund shall be apportioned in each fiscal year in such manner as the Legislature may provide, through the school districts and other agencies maintaining such schools, for the support of, and aid to, kindergarten schools, elementary schools, secondary schools, and technical schools except that there shall be apportioned to each school district in each fiscal year not less than thirty dollars ($30) per pupil in average daily attendance in the district during the next preceding fiscal year and except that...
the amount apportioned to each school district in each fiscal year shall be not less than twenty-four hundred dollars ($2400).

Soley with respect to any retirement system provided for in the charter of any county or city and county pursuant to the provisions of which the contributions of, and benefits to, certificated employees of a school district who are members of such system are based upon the proportion of the salaries of such certificated employees contributed by said county or city and county, all amounts apportioned to said county or city and county, or to school districts therein, pursuant to the provisions of this section shall be considered as though derived from county or city and county school taxes for the support of county and city and county government and not money provided by the State within the meaning of this section.

The Legislature shall provide for the levying annually by the governing body of each county, and city and county, of such school district taxes, at rates not in excess of the maximum rates of school district tax fixed or authorized by the Legislature, as will produce in each fiscal year such revenue for each school district as the governing board thereof shall determine is required in such fiscal year for the support of all schools and functions of said district authorized or required by law.

The provisions of this section as they read on April 1, 1946-1958, shall remain operative to and including June 30, 1947-1953, and no longer, notwithstanding any provision of this Constitution to the contrary.

| TAXATION: WELFARE EXEMPTION OF NONPROFIT SCHOOL PROPERTY. Act of Legislature submitted to electors by referendum. Act amends Section 214, Revenue and Taxation Code. Extends property tax exemption, known as welfare exemption, to property used exclusively for schools of less than collegiate grade owned and operated by nonprofit religious, hospital or charitable organizations. |
|---|---|
| 3 | YES
| NO |

(5) The property is not used by the owner or members thereof for fraternal or lodge purposes, or for social club purposes except where such use is clearly incidental to a primary religious, hospital, scientific, or charitable purpose;

(6) The property is irrevocably dedicated to religious, charitable, scientific, or hospital purposes and upon the liquidation, dissolution or abandonment of the owner will not inure to the benefit of any private person except a fund, foundation or corporation organized and operated for religious, hospital, scientific, or charitable purposes;

(7) The property, if used exclusively for scientific purposes, is used by a foundation or institution which, in addition to or in compliance with the foregoing requirements for the exemption of charitable organizations in general, has been chartered by the Congress of the United States, and whose objects are the encouragement or conduct of scientific investigation, research and discovery for the benefit of the community at large.

The exemption provided for herein shall be known as the “welfare exemption.” This exemption shall be in addition to any other exemption now provided by law. This section shall not be construed to enlarge the college exemption or to extend an exemption to property held by or used as an educational institution of less than collegiate grade. Property used exclusively for school purposes of less than collegiate grade and owned and operated by religious, hospital or charitable funds, foundations or corporations, which property and funds, foundations or corporations meet all of the requirements of this section, shall be deemed to be within the exemption provided for in Section 1c of Article XIII of the Constitution of the State of California and this section.
PAYMENTS TO NEEDY BLIND. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 28. Amends Section 22 of Article IV of Constitution. Prohibits imposition of administrative restrictions on manner in which blind recipient expends aid payments. Provides that such aid payments are for benefit of the blind recipient alone and shall not be regarded as income to any person other than the recipient. Requires State Department of Social Welfare to enforce such provisions.

Proposed Amendment to the Constitution
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 therefor by the State; provided, 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 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 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, 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 in 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 in 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.

SUBVERSIVE PERSONS AND GROUPS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1 (Third Ex. Sess., 1950). Adds Section 19 to Article XX of Constitution. Provides that public office or employment shall not be held by, and no tax exemption shall be extended to, any person or organization advocating overthrow of Federal or State Government by force or unlawful means or advocating support of foreign government against United States in event of hostilities. Authorizes legislation to enforce this provision.

Proposed Amendment to the Constitution
Sec. 19. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, no person or organization which advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States in event of hostilities shall receive any preferential treatment in the manner of any other person or organization including public employment, or any other public office, or any other tax exemption.
United States or the State by force or violence or other unlawful means or who advocates the support of a foreign government against the United States in the event of hostilities shall:

(a) Hold any office or employment under this State, including but not limited to the University of California, or with any county, city or county, city, district, political subdivision, authority, board, bureau, commission or other public agency of this State; or

(b) Receive any exemption from any tax imposed by this State or any county, city or county, city, district, political subdivision, authority, board, bureau, commission or other public agency of this State.

The Legislature shall enact such laws as may be necessary to enforce the provisions of this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OATHS OF OFFICE. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 9.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amends Constitution, Article XX, Section 3. Requires each public officer and employee (except inferior officers and employees exempted by law) to take oath that he neither advocates nor is member of any group advocating overthrow of government by force, that during preceding five years he has not been member of such group except as indicated, that he will neither engage in such advocacy nor become member of such group while holding office. Applies to officers and employees of State, including University of California, and of all political subdivisions and agencies thereof.</td>
<td>(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE, and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 3. Members of the Legislature, and all public officers and employees, executive, legislative, and judicial, except such inferior officers and employees as may be by law exempted, shall, before they enter upon the duties of their respective offices, take and subscribe the following oath or affirmation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I ... do solemnly swear (or affirm: as the case may be) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California against all enemies, foreign and domestic; and that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office of . . . according to the best of my ability upon which I am about to enter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And I do further swear (or affirm) that I do not advocate, nor am I a member of any party or organization, political or otherwise, that now advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of the State of California by force or violence or other unlawful means; that within the five years immediately preceding the taking of this oath (or affirmation) I have not been a member of any party or organization, political or otherwise, that advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of the State of California by force or violence or other unlawful means except as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If no affiliations, write in the words &quot;No Exceptions&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and that during such time as I hold the office of . . . I will not advocate nor become a member of any party or organization, political or otherwise, that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States or of the State of California by force or violence or other unlawful means.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And no other oath, declaration, or test, shall be required as a qualification for any public office or public trust employment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Public officer and employee&quot; include every officer and employee of the State, including the University of California, every county, city, city and county, district, and authority, including any department, division, bureau, board, commission, agency, or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ELECTIONS: BALLOT DESIGNATION OF PARTY AFFILIATIONS. Submitted by the Legislature as alternative to Proposition No. 13. Provides that at direct primary and special elections, the ballot shall show political party affiliation of each candidate for partisan office, as shown by candidate’s registration affidavit.

(This proposed law expressly amends an existing section of and adds new sections to the Elections Code, therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE, and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE.)

PROPOSED LAW

An act to add Sections 53 and 3928.1 to, and to amend Section 3946 of, the Elections Code, relating to designation of party affiliation of candidates on ballots; and providing for the submission thereof to the electors for approval or rejection pursuant to paragraph 3 of Section 1 of Article IV of the California Constitution.

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

Section 1. Section 53 is added to the Elections Code, to read:

53. On the ballots for any special election at which a partisan office is to be filled there shall be printed in the manner prescribed by Section 3928.1 after the name of each partisan candidate the designation of the party with which such candidate is affiliated.

Sec. 2. Section 3928.1 is added to said code, to read:

3928.1. On the direct primary ballots of each political party, in the same line in which the name of a candidate for any partisan office is printed and at the right of the name, or immediately below the name if there is not sufficient space to the right thereof, shall be printed the name of the political party with which the candidate is affiliated as shown in the affidavit of registration of the candidate. The name of such political party may be abbreviated by printing not less than the first three letters of the name of such political party. If the names of two or more political parties qualified to participate in the primary commence with the same first three letters sufficient additional letters of each such names shall be printed so that each party will be clearly identified.

Sec. 2. Section 3946 of said code is amended to read:

3946. Except as to the order of the names of candidates the ballot shall be printed in substantially the following form:

(See Ballot Reproductions on pages 6, 7, 8, 9)
OFFICIAL PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT
REPUBLICAN PARTY

8TH CONGRESSIONAL, 17TH SENATORIAL, 48TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

To vote for a person whose name appears on the ballot, stamp a cross (+) in the square at the RIGHT of the name of the person for whom you desire to vote.
To vote for a person whose name is not printed on the ballot, write his name in the blank space provided for that purpose. If you wrongly stamp, tear or deface this ballot, return it to the Inspector of Election and obtain another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>CONGRESSIONAL</th>
<th>LEGISLATIVE</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>JUSTICE OF THE PEACE</th>
<th>TREASURER</th>
<th>ASSessor</th>
<th>TAX Collector</th>
<th>RECORDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>United States Senator</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>THOMAS SULLIVAN</td>
<td>FRED T. DU BOIS</td>
<td>E. C. NEWLANDS</td>
<td>KNUTE NELSON</td>
<td>C. M. DE PEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>CHARLES N. HART</td>
<td>United States Representative</td>
<td>WALTER BROWNLOW</td>
<td>PETER HEPBURN</td>
<td>Bank Cashier</td>
<td>Loan Agent</td>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor of Napa</td>
<td>(Rep.)</td>
<td>(Incumbent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Incumbent)</td>
<td>AUGUSTUS O. BACON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN DOE, Prodi.</td>
<td>(State Senator)</td>
<td>CASSIUS N. CLAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLAUDE SWANSON</td>
<td>JAMES H. BERRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Representative in Congress</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>(Incumbent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>8th District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS GREEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORACE JONES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of State</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>(Incumbent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHN TOURTILLOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor of Marin County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALBERT BERG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER E. HONSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Member of Assembly</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>TIMOTHY HEALEY</td>
<td>FRED T. DU BOIS</td>
<td>E. C. NEWLANDS</td>
<td>KNUTE NELSON</td>
<td>C. M. DE PEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS THOMPSON</td>
<td>48th District</td>
<td>48th District</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Teacher</td>
<td>Bank Cashier</td>
<td>Loan Agent</td>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMUEL ALDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM DUNN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prodi.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREW ANDERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGE GAUGHEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETER PETERSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. W. REYNOLDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES CARSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLES W. FULTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of Title Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THOMAS H. CARTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of State Board of Equalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM ADAMS, Rep. Accountant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY ALGER, Dem. Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| County Clerk                          |
| Vote for One                          |
| S. R. MALLORY, Bookkeeper             |
| JAMES B. McCREARY, Filing Clerk       |
| ASBURY C. LATTIMER, Incumbent         |

| Auditor                              |
| Vote for One                         |
| JOHN W. DANIEL, Accountant           |
| M. J. FOSTER, Certified Public Accountant |
| JOHN M. PATTERSON, Bookkeeper        |
| J. F. ALLEE, Incumbent               |
| CLARENCE D. CLARK, Deputy County Auditor |

| County and Township                   |
| Vote for One                          |
| Sheriff                               |
| J. P. DOLLIVER, Deputy Sheriff        |
| CHESTER I. LONG, Incumbent            |
| R. A. ALGER, Private Detective        |

| Public Administrator                  |
| Vote for One                          |
| H. M. TELLER, Attorney                |
| J. W. BAILEY, Incumbent               |
| James B. Fraizer, Undertaker          |
| H. C. LODGE, Undertaker               |
| W. P. DILLINGHAM, Incumbent           |
| E. B. YOUNG, Engineer                 |
| J. B. FORAKER, Incumbent              |
| C. B. PATTERSON, Farmer               |
| THOMAS SPIGHIT, Merchant              |
| JAMES E. WATSON, Incumbent            |
| R. W. PARKER, Incumbent               |
| JOHN A. STEERLING, Collector          |
| JOHN A. STEERLING, Collector          |
| R. W. PARKER, Incumbent               |
OFFICIAL PRIMARY ELECTION BALLOT
NON-PARTISAN BALLOT

8TH CONGRESSIONAL, 17TH SENATORIAL, 48TH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

To vote for a person whose name appears on the ballot, stamp a cross (+) in the square at the RIGHT of the name of the person for whom you desire to vote. To vote for a person whose name is not printed on the ballot, write his name in the blank space provided for that purpose. If you wrongly stamp, tear or deface this ballot, return it to the Inspector of Election and obtain another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JUDICIAL</th>
<th>COUNTY AND TOWNSHIP</th>
<th>Treasurer</th>
<th>Coroner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge of the Superior Court</td>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. J. RYAN</td>
<td>M. E. TEHAN</td>
<td>M. D. HALEY</td>
<td>WARREN E. REED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. F. RYAN</td>
<td>HARRY VALE</td>
<td>T. J. HODGSON</td>
<td>J. E. RUGGLES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Deputy Sheriff</td>
<td>Bricklayer</td>
<td>Undertaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. R. SHIRLEY</td>
<td>G. D. BEARDSLEE</td>
<td>RICHARD HEN</td>
<td>FRED W. SMITH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>HENY</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. STAFFORD</td>
<td>District Attorney</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Police Judge</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. J. WINSLOW</td>
<td>JAMES M. BYRNE</td>
<td>H. G. JACKSON</td>
<td>H. F. SOFGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. C. COOK</td>
<td>H. C. JILLSON</td>
<td>JUSTUS STAIGER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CARLETON H. JOHNSON</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice of the Peace</td>
<td>Tax Collector</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
<td>Vote for One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote for Two</td>
<td>ALEXANDER CROSSAN</td>
<td>R. L. MERRITT</td>
<td>J. R. SPANN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>Merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEE G. DAGGETT</td>
<td>M. M. McCONNELL</td>
<td>EDWARD O. STRONG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L. NEHRBAISS</td>
<td>R. L. TAYLOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendent of Public Instruction</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEO. ELLIOTT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. HARLOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. J. TORRES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. W. TURNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS BURNS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLIAM R. McGEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. N. DOTY</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. F. DRACKERT</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. M. DUCHOW</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. L. DUNNING</td>
<td>C. P. A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. G. FALL</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recorder</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. G. NEWBERT</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. R. O'BRIEN</td>
<td>Statistician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. P. OLWELL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constable</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JAMES E. THOMPSON</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. G. WARNER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Administrator</th>
<th>Vote for One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. K. ORMAN</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. A. PAGNELLO</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sec. 2. This act shall be presented to the electors for approval or rejection on the ballot at the same election at which is presented an initiative measure titled "An act to prohibit cross filing and to prevent any person from becoming a candidate or nominee of any political party unless he has been continuously registered as a member of that party for at least three months immediately prior to filing of nomination papers for the office he seeks and to invalidate any law in conflict with this act," as an alternative to such measure, pursuant to paragraph 3 of Section 1 of Article IV of the California Constitution.
**TAXATION: CHURCH BUILDINGS UNDER CONSTRUCTION.**
Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29. Amends Section 1 1/2 of Article XIII of Constitution. Extends to church building during course of construction, as well as land on which building is situated, the same tax exemption as is now provided for buildings and land in actual use as places of religious worship.

(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 THE CONSTITUTION
Sec. 1. All buildings, and so much of the real property on which they are situated as may be required for the convenient use and occupation of said buildings, when the same are used solely and exclusively for religious worship, or, in the case of a building in the course of erection, the same is intended to be used solely and exclusively for religious worship, shall be free from taxation; provided, that no building so used or, if in the course of erection, intended to be so used which may be rented for religious purposes and rent received by the owner therefor, shall be exempt from taxation.

---

**TAXATION: COLLEGE BUILDINGS UNDER CONSTRUCTION.**
Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 26. Amends Section 1a of Article XIII of Constitution. Extends nonprofit college property tax exemption, now applied to buildings in actual use for educational purposes, to include buildings during course of construction if intended to be used exclusively for educational purposes. Applies to buildings in course of construction in March, 1950, and thereafter.

(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 THE CONSTITUTION
Sec. 1a. Any educational institution of collegiate grade, within the State of California, not contracted for profit, shall be exempt from taxation its buildings, when the same are used solely and exclusively for educational purposes, and includes a building in the course of erection, the same is intended when completed to be used exclusively for educational purposes.

The exemption granted by this section applies to and includes a building in the course of construction on or after the first Monday of March, 1950, if the same is intended when completed to be used exclusively for the purposes of education.

---

**PUBLIC FUNDS: CERTAIN EXPENDITURES PROHIBITED.**
Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Adds Section 31 1/2 to Article IV of Constitution. Prohibits (and provides that Constitution has always prohibited) appropriation or expenditure of public money to California State Chamber of Commerce, any local chamber of commerce, County Supervisors Association, or any other private organization which attempts to influence legislation. Directs Attorney General to recover all public money hitherto or hereafter expended in violation of such prohibition. Provides that future operation of this prohibition shall not be affected if retroactive application is held invalid.

(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 THE CONSTITUTION
Section 31 1/2. Section 31 of this article prohibits, and has at all times prohibited, the appropriation or expenditure of any public money to or for the California State Chamber of Commerce, any local chamber of commerce, the County Supervisors Association of California, Incorporated, or any other private corporation, association, or organization which attempts in any manner to influence federal, state, or local legislation. The Attorney General shall take action to recover for the people all public money hitherto or hereafter appropriated or expended in violation of Section 31 of this article.

If the retroactive application of this section is held invalid, the prospective application shall not be affected thereby.

---
PAYMENTS TO AGED PERSONS. Initiative to the Legislature.
Places old age security program under state administration; terminates county administration, eliminates county share of costs. Repeals relatives' responsibility requirements. Increases $75 maximum monthly payments according to cost-of-living increases since March, 1950, within specified limits. Provides state payment (up to $25 monthly, plus any federal payments) for health services for old age recipients, and up to $150 funeral expenses. Changes property qualifications of recipients, subject to federal requirements. Entitles recipients to medical and hospital care from county of residence.

(This proposed law expressly repeals and amends existing sections of the law, and adds new sections thereto; therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE; and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED or ADDED are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE.)

PROPOSED LAW

An act to amend Sections 2011, 2020, 2025, 2141, 2163, and 2180 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, to repeal Sections 2021, 2164, 2165, 2165a, 2181, 2181.01, 2185, 2186, 2186.1, 2187, 2188, 2200, 2201, and 2224 thereof, and to add Sections 2000.3, 2000.5, 2004.5, 2020.03, 2020.04, 2021, 2163.8, 2164, 2181, 2185, 2200, 2201, 2221, and 2232 thereto, all relating to old age security, providing for direct State administration and financing thereof, the disposition of property used in the administration thereof, increases in the amount thereof, and health and funeral expense benefits for recipients thereof, modifying the property qualifications for eligibility thereof, abolishing relatives' responsibility, and making an appropriation.

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

Section 1. Section 2000.3 is added to the Welfare and Institutions Code, to read:

2000.3. Adequate and uniform provision for the needs of the aged of California is a matter of statewide concern. It is therefore the duty and just obligation of the State to administer the provisions of the Old Age Security Law directly, and to pay the costs of old age security from State rather than local funds.

It is the purpose of this chapter to make old age security available to the needy aged of the State in such manner that all needs of each eligible applicant and recipient shall be met, without discrimination between those who have income or resources insufficient to meet their full needs and those who are without any other income or resources whatever, in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution of the State of California and of the Federal Social Security Act.

Section 2. Section 2000.5 is added to said code, to read:

2000.5. All benefits paid or payable to individuals under this chapter shall be known and referred to as "old age security." Wherever in this chapter reference is made to "aid" to individuals, such reference shall be construed to refer to old age security under this chapter.

Section 3. Section 2004.5 is added to said code, to read:

2004.5. Notwithstanding any other provision of this code, old age security under this chapter shall be administered by the State Department of Social Welfare, and the full cost of such security, including the cost of administration and disbursement thereof, shall be paid by the State.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, and unless the context otherwise requires, wherever in any provision of this chapter which vests any power or function in grants any right to, or imposes any duty upon, any county or any county board of supervisors, except Sections 2024, 2160.7, 2201, 2227, 2228, and 2230, reference is made to the county, or to the county board of supervisors, such reference shall be deemed and construed to refer to the State, acting through the State Department of Social Welfare, and wherever in any such provision reference is made to any other county officer or agency, such reference shall be deemed and construed to refer to the State officer or State agency authorized to exercise powers and functions and to perform duties substantially corresponding to those of the county officer or agency to which reference is made, as the case may be.

Wherever in this chapter any person is permitted to make application to the county board of supervisors, such application may be made to the State Department of Social Welfare at the local office of the department nearest to the residence of the applicant. Wherever in this chapter notice is required to be given or information disclosed to the county board of supervisors, such notice shall be given or such information disclosed to the State Department of Social Welfare at the local office of the department nearest to the residence of the person required to give the notice or to disclose the information.

Section 4. If it is impossible for the State to assume the full administration of old age security in any county by the time Section 2004.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, as added thereto by this act, becomes both effective and operative, the State may contract with any county, and any county may contract with the State, for the exercise of any power or function or the performance of any duty granted to or imposed on the State or any state officer or agency by the Old Age Security Law until such time as the State is able to exercise the power or function or to perform the duty but not longer than six months after Section 2004.5 of the Welfare and Institutions Code becomes operative. Any such contract may be made by the State, through the Director of the State Department of Social Welfare or through the State
Controller, with the approval of the State Department of Finance, and any county, through the county board of supervisors. Every such contract shall include provision for full reimbursement of the county by the State for all expenses incurred under the contract by the county in the administration of old age security, whether for the direct cost of old age security or for the cost of administration thereof, including the cost of disbursement. The State Department of Finance shall by rule establish procedures for such reimbursements, and may authorize payments to be advanced to the contracting counties, upon the basis of estimates submitted by the counties to the State Department of Social Welfare or to the State Controller, and approved by the State Department of Finance. Section 5. Section 2011 of said code is amended to read: 2011. No officer or employee of any county the State shall make any demand upon any person, either as a ministerial officer, or as a legally responsible relative, of any applicant for or recipient of aid under this chapter, to contribute a stated amount to the support of the any applicant for or recipient each month, of old age security or to agree so to contribute, or shall threaten any such relative or person with any legal action against him by or on behalf of the county or with any penalty whatsoever, unless he agrees so to contribute. Nothing in this chapter imposes any responsibility or liability upon any relative of any applicant for or recipient of old age security to contribute to the support of the applicant or recipient, or to reimburse the State or any public agency for old age security paid to any recipient. Nothing in this chapter shall prevent any applicant or recipient from exercising any right to sue for support which he may have under any other provision of law, but security shall not be withheld unless he exercises such right. Section 6. Section 2020 of said code is amended to read: 2020. Amount of aid allowed. (a) Subject to the provisions of Subdivision (b) of this section the amount of aid to which any applicant shall be entitled shall be, when added to the income (including the value of currently used resources, but excepting casual income and inconsequential resources) of the applicant from all other sources, seventy-five dollars ($75) per month. If, however, in any case it is found the actual need of an applicant exceeds seventy-five dollars ($75) per month, such applicant shall be entitled to receive old age security in an amount, not to exceed seventy-five dollars ($75) per month, which when added to his income (including the value of currently used resources, but excepting casual income and inconsequential resources) from all other sources, shall equal his actual need. The State Department of Social Welfare may provide by rule that any change in grant for an amount of two dollars ($2) or less may be delayed for not more than two months beyond the month in which the recipient reported the change in circumstances. (b) Within thirty (30) days after this subdivision becomes operative, the State Department of Social Welfare shall determine the average of the latest “Consumers’ Price Index for Moderate Income Families in San Francisco—All Items” issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor and the comparable Index of the same date for Los Angeles. If this average of the two index numbers exceeds the average of the comparable index numbers for San Francisco and Los Angeles for March 15, 1950, by one full point or more, then the monthly old age security allowance to each recipient shall be increased in the amount of fifty cents ($0.50) for each full point by which the latest average index exceeds the average index for March 15, 1950. Such adjustment allowances shall become effective on the first of the month following the determination. During each January and July thereafter, the State Department of Social Welfare shall similarly determine the average of the latest index for San Francisco and the comparable index of the same date for Los Angeles. The monthly old age security allowance to each recipient shall then be adjusted upward or downward in the amount of fifty cents ($0.50) for each full point of change upward or downward occurring subsequent to the last determination of the average index. In any such periodic adjustment there shall be taken into account the unapplied portion of the change in the average index which occurred in the preceding adjustment, of less than one full point, which was not used in the calculation of the amount of such preceding change in the monthly payment as provided in this subdivision. If at any such adjustment date, the variation in such average price Index, taking into account the unapplied portion of the change which occurred in the average Index in the preceding adjustment, is less than one full point from the average Index figure used in making the adjustment for the period immediately next preceding the period in question, then the amount of security payable shall remain at the amount established at such preceding date. In any such periodic adjustment any increase in the said average Index greater than 50 points above the average Index figure determined for March 15, 1950, and any decrease therein which would bring the monthly old age security allowance to less than seventy-five dollars ($75) shall be ignored. Each such adjustment shall become effective as of the first day of the second calendar month next succeeding the month of adjustment. If the Bureau of Labor Statistics ceases to issue Consumers’ Price Index from the base Index figure of 100, as established from average consumers’ statistics for the years 1926 through 1939 inclusive, as determined by such Bureau, and the same or a substantially similar index reflecting the same base is issued by any other bureau, department, or agency of the Federal Government, then the latter index shall thereafter be used by the State Department of Social Welfare in making the periodic adjustments in security as provided in this subdivision. In the event that such a cost of living index is not compiled by any bureau, department, or agency of the United States Government for a period in excess of six months, then the State Department of Social Welfare shall compile and publish a similar index semiannually, and the cost of living so determined shall be the basis for computing increases and decreases in the cost of living for the purposes of this section, in lieu of the cost of living index prepared by the United States Department of Labor or other Federal bureau, department, or agency. Section 7. Section 2020.03 is added to said code, to read: 2020.03. In addition to security granted under Section 2020, each recipient of old age security shall
be entitled to receive any or all of the following services and items necessary to preserve or restore his health or his normal physical functions:

(a) Medical or dental care by practitioners of any of the healing arts licensed or recognized by this State, from practitioners selected by the recipient.

(b) Nursing care in the recipient's home, ambulance service, and hospital care, all as prescribed by the practitioner of the healing arts attending the recipient.

(c) Medicine, drugs, medical and pharmaceutical supplies; eyeglasses, optical supplies, hearing aids; artificial limbs and other prosthetic devices and appliances; all as prescribed by the practitioner of the healing arts attending the recipient.

Payment for such services and items shall be made by the State Department of Social Welfare directly to the person rendering the service or supplying the items.

Until such time as Federal assistance is made available to this State for such necessary health services and other items, the amount of services and other items provided to any recipient under this section shall not exceed twenty-five dollars ($25) a month. When and if Federal assistance is made available to the States for such health services and other items, or any of them, it shall be the duty of this State to accept such Federal assistance. During such time as Federal assistance therefor is available to and received by this State, the maximum amount of services and items to which any recipient in need thereof shall be entitled under this section shall be increased by the maximum amount of Federal assistance received by this State in respect to such services and items for each recipient.

This section shall not apply to any health services or other items necessary for a recipient who has earnings or income not taken into account in determining the amount of his grant of security under Section 2020, nor to any health services or other items included in the monthly budget of a recipient whose needs exceed the maximum amount of security to which he is entitled under Section 2020 and whose grant of security is determined on the basis of his excess need.

Section 8. Section 2020.04 is added to said code, to read:

2020.04. Upon the death of a person who was receiving old age security at the time of his death, the State Department of Social Welfare shall pay his actual and necessary funeral expenses, including the expenses of final disposition of his remains whether by burial or otherwise, to a maximum of one hundred fifty dollars ($150). Such funeral expenses shall be paid by the State Department of Social Welfare only in the event and to the extent that specific provision for them has not been made by burial or other insurance or contract rights of the decedent and that his estate does not include sufficient cash or marketable securities to pay them. Nothing in this section limits the freedom of any person authorized by law to make arrangements for the funeral of any such decedent in the selection of a funeral director or in the selection of any lawful mode of disposition of the remains of the decedent, nor shall the freedom of any such person to make any such selection be limited by rule or regulation of the State Department of Social Welfare.

Section 9. Section 2021 of said code is repealed.

2021. There is hereby appropriated out of any money in the State Treasury not otherwise appropriated to every county within this State for maintaining or supporting aged persons who come within the provisions of this chapter and who have county residence as provided in this chapter and not in excess of a sum equal to six-sevenths of the grant made pursuant to this chapter to every such aged person; after deducting therefrom the amount of any sum received from the United States Government as old-age assistance in respect to each such aged person; each month for each such aged person maintained or supported by such county.

There is hereby further appropriated to every county within this State for the purpose of maintaining or supporting aged persons who come within the provisions of this chapter and who have county residence as provided in this chapter, and not in excess of a sum equal to the full amount of the grant made pursuant to this chapter to each such aged person who has no county residence; after deducting therefrom the amount of any sum received from the United States Government as old-age assistance in respect to each such aged person; each month for each such aged person.

Payments of aid shall be made in the manner provided in Sections 2147 to 2149, inclusive, of this code.

Section 10. Section 2021 is added to said code, to read:

2021. Out of any money in the General Fund there is hereby appropriated each month such sum as is necessary to pay the full amount of old age security, as provided in Sections 2020, 2020.03, 2020.04, and 2025, in respect to each aged person eligible therefor under this chapter, after deducting therefrom the amount of any sum received from the United States Government as old-age assistance in respect to such aged person.

Section 11. Section 2025 of said code is amended to read:

2025. Increase or decrease of federal contributions: Change in amount of aid: Maximum and minimum: Legislative intent: If, when, and during such times as the United States Government increases or decreases its contributions in assistance of the aged in this State above or below the amount being paid on January 1, 1947 January 1, 1950, or above or below the amount payable as a result of any such increase or decrease, the amount of the grant of aid security provided for in this article shall be increased or decreased by an amount equal to such increase or decrease by the United States Government, but in no event shall the total aid security granted under this chapter be less than seventy-five dollars ($75) nor more than sixty-five dollars ($65) per month. It is the intent of the Legislature that any change in contributions by the United States Government, whether increase or decrease, shall result in a corresponding change in the amount of this grant, within the limits established by this section.

Section 12. Section 2141 of said code is amended to read:

2141. The State Department of Social Welfare shall supervise and pass upon the measures taken by the county boards of supervisors to administer old age security under this chapter and provide for the care of needy aged citizens, to the end that they shall receive suitable care and that there shall be throughout the State a uniform standard of records and method of treatment of aged persons based upon their individual needs and circumstances.
Section 13. Section 2163 of said code is amended to read:

2163. No aid under this chapter old age security shall be granted or paid to any person who owns personal property, the value of which, less all encumbrances of record, exceeds one hundred two hundred dollars ($1,200). No aid under this chapter shall be granted or paid to any married person living with a spouse who is also an applicant or recipient of aid under this chapter, if the combined value of the personal property of both spouses, less all encumbrances of record, exceeds two thousand dollars ($2,000).

For the purpose of this section no life insurance policy shall be valued at more than its present surrender value to the applicant or recipient. Premiums paid on life insurance policies shall not be deemed income or resources of the applicant or recipient, whether or not the person by whom the premiums are paid is a responsible relative of the applicant or recipient, and no deduction therefor shall be made from the amount of aid security granted to the recipient.

Section 14. Section 2163.8 is added to said code, to read:

2163.8. For the purposes of this chapter the value of a motor vehicle of moderate value used for essential transportation of an applicant or recipient shall be excluded in determining the amount of personal property as provided in Section 2163.

Section 15. Sections 2164, 2165, and 2165a of said code are repealed.

2164. No aid under this chapter shall be granted or paid to any person who owns real property in the assessor’s value of which, as assessed by the county assessed, less all encumbrances of record, exceeds three thousand five hundred dollars ($3,500). Real property owned but not occupied as a home by an applicant or recipient shall be utilized to provide for the needs of the applicant or recipient.

2165. No aid under this chapter shall be granted or paid to any married person if the assessed value of the combined real property of the husband and wife, as assessed by the county assessor, less all encumbrances of record, exceeds three thousand five hundred dollars ($3,500).

2165a. In computing value of property under Section 2164, ownership of separate property by a spouse with whom the applicant or recipient is not living shall not preclude the applicant or recipient from receiving the aid provided in this chapter.

Section 16. Section 2164 is added to said code, to read:

2164. Ownership of real property shall not render any person ineligible to receive old age security if the real property is occupied as a home by the applicant or recipient or is otherwise being used to meet the current or future identifiable needs of the applicant or recipient.

If the Federal Security Administrator requires this State to specify a maximum amount of real property which may be owned by an applicant for or recipient of old age security without loss of eligibility therefor, in order that the State plan for old age security shall conform to the requirements of the Federal Social Security Act, the State Social Welfare Board shall by rule prescribe the maximum amount of real property which may be so owned; and in so doing the State Social Welfare Board shall specify the largest amount recognized by the Federal Security Admin-

The Board of Supervisors Directs:

1. Section 20.20.020 is added to read as follows:

"Section 20.20.020. In adopting this section, the Board of Supervisors directs that the provisions of Section 20.20.020 be interpreted as follows:

(a) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted to mean that the provisions of Section 20.20.020 shall be interpreted as follows:

(b) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(c) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(d) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(e) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(f) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(g) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(h) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(i) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(j) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(k) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(l) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(m) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(n) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(o) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(p) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(q) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(r) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(s) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(t) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(u) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(v) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(w) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(x) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(y) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(z) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

Section 20.20.020. In adopting this section, the Board of Supervisors directs that the provisions of Section 20.20.020 be interpreted as follows:

(a) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(b) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(c) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(d) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(e) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(f) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(g) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(h) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(i) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(j) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(k) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(l) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(m) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(n) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(o) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(p) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(q) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(r) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(s) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(t) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(u) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(v) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(w) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(x) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(y) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(z) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

Section 20.20.020. In adopting this section, the Board of Supervisors directs that the provisions of Section 20.20.020 be interpreted as follows:

(a) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(b) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(c) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(d) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(e) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(f) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(g) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(h) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(i) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(j) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(k) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(l) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(m) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(n) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(o) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(p) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(q) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(r) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(s) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(t) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(u) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(v) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(w) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(x) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(y) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:

(z) The provisions of this section shall be interpreted as follows:
costs of administration incurred under this chapter, the State Treasurer shall pay to each county an amount equal to such county's proportionate share of the sum so granted for the cost of administration which amount shall be used exclusively for paying such administration costs. The State Department of Social Welfare shall determine the portion of the amount so granted or made available for administration costs to be paid to the counties, which portion shall be not less than one-half of the amount so granted or made available. The State Department of Social Welfare shall adopt rules and regulations which shall be of uniform application for determining the proportionate shares of the respective counties of the portion so determined to be paid to such counties.

This section shall become operative and shall supersede Part 2 of Section 2116 during such times as grants by the United States Government, provided or made available to defray any portion of administration costs incurred under this chapter, are not computed as a proportion of such costs of administration. Whenever this section is in effect, all other sections referring to Section 2116 shall also be deemed to refer to Section 2116.1.

2116. From the sums appropriated therefor by the State of California; the State Treasurer shall pay to each county an additional amount which shall be used exclusively for aid to needy aged equal to six-sevenths of the remainder of the sums expended by the county as aid to the needy aged under this chapter; after deducting from the sum so expended the amount paid to the county under subdivision (4) of Section 2116 of this code, except that the State shall pay the county the full amount of aid granted any person otherwise qualified who has resided in the State for the required period and who has no county residence, after deducting the amount paid with respect to such person under subdivision (4) of Section 2116 of this code.

2116. The method of computing and paying the amounts provided for in sections 2116 and 2117 for each quarter shall be as follows:

(a) The State Department of Social Welfare shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, estimate the amount to be paid for such quarter to each county under the provisions of sections 2116 and 2117; such estimate to be based on a report filed by each county containing (4) an estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of this chapter, and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the county for such expenditures in such quarter; and if such amount is less than that portion of the total sum of such estimated expenditures which is required under this chapter to be paid by each county; the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived; (2) records showing the number of aged individuals receiving aid under the authority of this chapter in the county; and (3) such other information and investigation as the State Department of Social Welfare may find necessary.

(b) The State Department of Social Welfare shall then certify to the State Controller the amounts so estimated by it for each county, reduced or increased as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the county under this chapter for such quarter, except to the extent that such sum has been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the State Department of Social Welfare for such prior quarter.

(c) The State Controller shall then draw the necessary warrants and prior to such settlement by the State Department of Social Welfare and the State Controller, the State Treasurer shall pay to the treasurer of each county the amount so certified.

Upon the order of the Department of Social Welfare, the amount approved for the quarter may be paid in monthly installments and, if paid in monthly installments all necessary adjustments for the prior quarters shall be made by additions or deductions from the allowances for the first month of each new quarter or in the manner prescribed by the State Department of Social Welfare.

Section 21. Section 2116 is added to said code, to read:

2116. Old age security allowances under this chapter shall be paid by Controller's warrants against the Social Welfare Disbursement Fund.

The State Department of Social Welfare shall, prior to the beginning of each month, certify to the State Controller the names and addresses of persons who will be entitled to receive old age security allowances under Section 2020 for that month or who are entitled to receive and have not been paid such allowances for any prior period of time together with the amount of the grant each such person will be or is entitled to receive. The State Controller shall draw and issue the necessary warrants to the persons and in the amounts so certified, and the warrants shall be paid by the State Treasurer.

Old age security benefits payable under Section 2020.03 and 2020.04 shall be paid by the State Department of Social Welfare in the same manner that other expenses of the department are paid.

Section 22. Sections 2200 and 2201 of said code are repealed.

2200. Any recipient of aid under this chapter who removes from one county to another county in this State shall be entitled to aid; upon the first day of the first month beginning after the date upon which he attained residence of one year in the county to which he has so removed, unless the day upon which he attained one year of residence in the first day of the month; in which event the transfer of the county in which the person was residing prior to the time of removal to the county to which the person is moved shall be effective upon the date of such removal.

2201. For the purposes of this section, it is presumed that the period of time for the acquisition of one year's residence in the county to which the person has removed shall start to run upon the date of removal from the county in which he has previously acquired a residence; any residence once acquired is presumed to continue until terminated by a subsequent act of the recipient. The county to which such person has removed shall provide the necessary medical or hospital; or both care if needed during the one-year period of establishment of residence under this section. The county providing such medical or hospital, or both care may demand payment of the county granting the aid in an amount not in excess of the cost thereof and it shall be a proper charge and the duty of the county granting the aid under the provisions of this section to pay such medical or hospital charges, or both.

2202. Notwithstanding any provision of Section 2200, any recipient of aid under this chapter who re-
moved from one county to another county in this State prior to March 3, 1940, but has not attained one year's residence in the county to which he has removed shall, for the purposes of this chapter, be deemed to be a person who has no county residence as provided in this chapter until he has attained one year's residence in the county to which he has removed.

Section 23. Section 2200 is added to said code, to read:

2200. If a recipient of old age security changes his home from one place to another place within the State, such change shall not cause any forfeiture or interruption of the old age security previously awarded him. If the place to which the recipient has moved is nearer to a different local office of the State Department of Social Welfare than it is to the local office of the department in which his application was filed, within 90 days after the department receives notice of the change of home, it shall transfer the case, together with the application for security and all documents and records pertaining to the eligibility of the recipient, to the local office of the department nearest to the new home of the recipient.

Section 24. Section 2201 is added to said code, to read:

2201. Every recipient of old age security shall be entitled to necessary medical and hospital care from the county in which he is living. If the recipient has not resided for at least one year in the county in which he is living, but does have one year's residence in another county, the county providing the necessary medical or hospital care, or both, may demand payment of the county in which the recipient has one year's residence in an amount not in excess of the cost thereof, and it shall be a proper charge and the duty of the county in which the recipient has one year's residence to pay such medical or hospital charges, or both.

For the purposes of this section, it is presumed that the period of time for the acquisition of one year's residence in the county in which a recipient is living started to run upon the date of his removal from the county in which he previously had one year's residence. Any county residence once acquired is presumed to continue until terminated by a subsequent act of the recipient. If a recipient returns to a county in which he had one year's residence, after an absence of less than one year, he shall not be deemed to have lost his residence therein.

Section 25. Section 2231 is added to said code, to read:

2231. To insure the continued receipt of Federal assistance to this State for old age security, any provision of this chapter which is found to be in conflict with any requirement of the Federal Social Security Act or of the rules and regulations of the Federal Security Agency for the approval of the state plan for old-age assistance shall, to the extent of such conflict, cease to be operative so long as such conflict exists.

Any provision of this chapter shall be deemed to have been found in conflict with a requirement of the Federal Social Security Act or of the rules and regulations of the Federal Security Agency for the approval of the state plan for old-age assistance, within the meaning of this section, whenever the Social Welfare Board certifies to the Governor that the State Department of Social Welfare has received written notice from the Federal Security Agency, or any authorized representative thereof, that the continued operation of such provision will render the plan of this State for old age security out of conformity with such federal requirements, so that further payment of Federal assistance to this State for old age security will not be made, or that the State plan will not be approved. The Governor shall thereupon issue a proclamation declaring that the provision has become inoperative as of the date of the proclamation.

If any provision of this chapter is declared inoperative under this section, such declaration shall not affect the operation or validity of any other provision of this chapter.

Section 26. Section 2232 is added to said code, to read:

2232. If any provision of this chapter, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held unconstitutional, the remainder of the chapter, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

Section 27. The Legislature shall have power to amend or repeal any section of the Welfare and Institutions Code added or amended by this act, and to increase the benefits provided to recipients of old age security, or to reduce the terms and conditions of eligibility therefor, or otherwise to vary the provisions of the Old Age Security Law; except that the Legislature shall not have power to reduce the benefits provided to recipients of old age security, nor to provide for the administration of old age security other than by the State Department of Social Welfare or a similar State agency, nor to require the payment of the administrative costs of old age security from any funds other than State funds, nor to impose on any relative of any recipient of old age security any responsibility or liability to reimburse the State for old age security granted to the recipient in accordance with the provisions of the Old Age Security Law.

Section 28. Thirty days prior to the date on which Section 3 of this act becomes operative, the State Department of Social Welfare shall succeed and be entitled to the possession of all county records, books, and papers pertaining to the administration of the Old Age Security Law. At the same time, the State Department of Social Welfare shall succeed and be entitled to the possession of so much of the furniture, equipment, and other personal property used by each county exclusively or primarily for the administration of the Old Age Security Law on the date this act takes effect as does not exceed in value the aggregate of the respective Federal and State interests in such property due to financial contributions by the United States Government and by the State toward the administrative costs of old age security in the county prior to the effective date of this act, or due to the expenditure of State funds for the acquisition of such property prior to transfer of the property to the county by the State.

The Legislature shall have power to supplement or amend this section, and to provide for such allocation between the State and each county of the furniture, equipment, and other personal property heretofore used by the county for the administration of the Old Age Security Law as the Legislature deems just.

Section 29. If this act is enacted by the Legislature without the necessity of approval by the people, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 of this act shall become operative on the date this act takes effect, and the remaining sections of this act shall become operative on the first day of the
second calendar month following the calendar month in which this act takes effect.
If this act is submitted to and approved by the people, Sections 2, 4, 11, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29 of this act shall become operative on the date this act takes effect, and the remaining sections of this act shall become operative on the first day of the third calendar month following the calendar month in which this act takes effect.
Each section of the Welfare and Institutions Code amended or repealed by this act shall remain operative, as in effect and operation on the effective date of this act, until the section of this act by which it is amended or repealed becomes operative.

### MILITARY SERVICE BY PUBLIC OFFICERS

**Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 2. (First Ex. Sess., 1952).** Amends Section 20 of Article IV of Constitution. Narrows prohibition against simultaneous holding of state and federal offices, so as not to apply to active military service of less than 30 days per year by public officers belonging to United States armed forces reserves. Provides that such military service shall not affect or suspend tenure of public officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment to the Constitution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 20. No person holding any lucrative office under the United States, or any other power, shall be eligible to any civil office of profit under this State; provided, that officers in the militia who receive no annual salary, local officers; or postmasters whose compensation does not exceed five hundred dollars ($500) per annum, or officers in the militia or members of any reserve component of the armed forces of the United States except where on active federal duty for more than 30 days in any year, shall not be deemed to hold lucrative offices; provided further, that the holding of any civil office of profit under this State shall not be affected or suspended by such military service as above described.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELECTIONS: PROHIBITING CROSS-FILING

**Initiative to the Legislature.** Provides that no person shall be a candidate or nominee of a political party for any office unless he has been registered as affiliated with such party for at least three months prior to filing nomination papers. Invalidates conflicting laws.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The people of the State of California do enact as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross filing is hereby prohibited. No person shall become a candidate or nominee of any political party for any office unless he has been continuously registered as a member of that party for at least three months immediately prior to filing of nomination papers for the office he seeks. Any law in conflict with this act is hereby invalidated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REPEALING CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON CHINESE

**Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 59.** Repeals Article XIX of Constitution, as adopted in 1879, which directs Legislature to prescribe laws imposing conditions on residence of certain aliens and to provide for their removal from the State; which prohibits Chinese employment by corporations and on public works; which directs passage of laws providing for removal of Chinese from cities or their restriction to certain portions of cities, and adoption of laws to prohibit Chinese from entering State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment to the Constitution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This proposed amendment expressly repeals an existing article of the Constitution, therefore, the existing article proposed to be repealed is printed in <strong>strike-out type</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Article XIX**

Section 1: The legislature shall prescribe all necessary regulations for the protection of the State, and the counties, cities, and towns thereof, from the burdens
and evils arising from the presence of aliens, who are, or may become, vagrants, paupers, mendicants, criminals, or invalids afflicted with contagious or infectious diseases; and from aliens otherwise dangerous or detrimental to the well-being or peace of the State; and to impose conditions upon which such persons may reside in the State, and to provide the means and mode of their removal from the State, upon failure or refusal to comply with such conditions; provided, that nothing contained in this section shall be construed to impair or limit the power of the Legislature to pass such police laws or other regulations as it may deem necessary.

Sec. 2. No corporation now existing or hereafter formed under the laws of this State, shall, after the adoption of this Constitution, employ, directly or indirectly, in any capacity, any Chinese or Mongolian. The Legislature shall pass such laws as may be necessary to enforce this provision.

Sec. 3. No Chinese shall be employed on any State, county, municipal, or other public work, except in punishment for crime.

TAXATION: INSURANCE COMPANIES AND BANKS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 5. Amends Sections 14 and 16 of Article XIII of Constitution. Places State Compensation Insurance Fund in same position as private insurance companies with regard to tax liabilities and exemptions. Provides that insurance companies shall not be exempt from payment of motor vehicle registration fees and operation fees. Requires banks to pay motor vehicle fees whenever federal law permits imposition thereof upon national banks.

This proposed amendment expressly repeals and amends existing provisions of the Constitution, therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED or REPEALED are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 141. (a) "Insurer," as used in this section, includes insurance companies or associations and reciprocal or interinsurance exchanges and the State Compensation Insurance Fund. As used in this paragraph, "companies" includes persons, partnerships, joint stock associations, companies and corporations.

(b) An annual tax is hereby imposed on each insurer doing business in this State on the basis of the annual premium rates, and subject to the deductions from the tax hereinafter specified.

(c) In the case of an insurer not transacting title insurance in this State, the "basis of the annual tax" is, in respect to each year, the amount of gross premiums, less return premiums, received in such year by such insurer upon its business done in this State, other than premiums received for reinsurance and for ocean marine insurance.

In the case of an insurer transacting title insurance in this State, the "basis of the annual tax" is, in respect to each year, all income upon business done in this State, except:

1. Interest and dividends.
2. Rents from real property.
3. Profits from the sale or other disposition of investments.
4. Income from investments.

"Investments" as used in this subdivision (d) includes property acquired by such insurer in the settlement or adjustment of claims against it but excludes investments in title plants and title records. Income derived directly or indirectly from the use of title plants and title records is included in the basis of the annual tax.

In the case of an insurer transacting title insurance in this State which has a trust department and does a trust business under the banking laws of this State, there shall be excluded from the basis of the annual tax imposed by this section, the income of, and from the assets of, such trust department and such trust business, if such income is taxed by this State or included in the measure of any tax imposed by this State.

(d) The rate of the tax to be applied to the basis of the annual tax in respect to each year is 2.35 percent.

(e) Each insurer shall have the right to deduct from the annual tax imposed by this section upon such insurer in respect to a particular year the amount of real estate taxes paid by it, in that year, before, or within 30 days after, becoming delinquent, on real property owned by it at the time of payment, and in which it was located, in that year, its home office or principal office in this State. Such real property may consist of one building or of two or more adjacent buildings in which such an office is located, the land on which they stand, and so much of the adjacent land as may be required for the convenient use and occupation thereof.

Where as a result of merger, consolidation, or other method of acquisition of substantially all of the assets of one or more insurers by another insurer, effected
prior to January 1, 1939, an insurer owns more than one parcel of real property in this State in which was located a home office or principal office of an insurer immediately prior to such acquisition, the owner shall designate one of such properties as its home or principal office. Real estate taxes paid by it in any of the years 1943 to 1952, inclusive, before, or within 30 days after, becoming delinquent, on such property owned by it at the time of payment and not so designated may also be deducted from the annual tax imposed by this section in respect to such year and are included within the deduction provided for in this subdivision.

(f) The tax imposed on insurers by this section is in lieu of all other taxes and licenses, state, county, and municipal, upon such insurers and their property, except:

(1) Taxes upon their real estate.

(2) That an insurer transacting title insurance in this State which has a trust department or does a trust business under the banking laws of this State is subject to taxation with respect to such trust department or trust business to the same extent and in the same manner as trust companies and the trust departments of banks doing business in this State.

(3) When by the laws of any other state or country any taxes, fines, penalties, licenses, fees, deposits of money or securities or other obligations or prohibitions are imposed on insurers of this State doing business in such state or country, or upon their agents therein, in excess of those imposed upon insurers of such other state or country or upon their agents therein, so long as such laws continue in force, the same obligations and prohibitions of whatsoever kind may be imposed by the Legislature upon insurers of such other state or country doing business in this State, or upon their agents herein.

(4) The tax on ocean marine insurance.

(5) Motor vehicle and other vehicle registration license fees and any other tax or license fee imposed by the State upon vehicles, motor vehicles or the operation thereof.

(g) Every insurer transacting the business of ocean marine insurance in this State shall annually pay to the State a tax measured by that proportion of the underwriting profit of such insurer from such insurance written in the United States, which the gross premiums of the insurer from such insurance written in this State bear to the gross premiums of the insurer from such insurance written within the United States, at the rate of 5 percentum, which tax shall be in lieu of all other taxes and licenses, state, county and municipal, upon such insurer, except taxes upon real estate, and such other taxes as may be assessed or levied against such insurer on account of any other class of insurance written by it. Deductions from the annual tax pursuant to subdivision (e) cannot be made from the ocean marine tax. The Legislature shall define the terms “ocean marine insurance” and “underwriting profit,” and shall provide for the assessment, levy, collection and enforcement of the ocean marine tax.

(h) The taxes provided for by this section shall be assessed by the State Board of Equalization.

(i) The Legislature, two-thirds of all the members elected to each of the two houses voting in favor thereof, may by law change the rate or rates of taxes herein imposed upon insurers.

(j) This section is not intended to and does not change the law as it has previously existed with respect to the meaning of the words "gross premiums, less return premiums, received" as used in this section or as used in Section 14 or 144 of this article.

Sec. 16. 1. (a) Banks, including national banking associations, located within the limits of this State, shall annually pay to the State a tax, at the rate to be provided by law according to or measured by their net income, which shall be in lieu of all other taxes and licenses, state, county and municipal, upon such banks, or the shares thereof, except taxes upon their real property; at the rate to be provided by law and, when permitted by the Congress of the United States with respect to national banking associations, motor vehicle and other vehicle registration license fees and any other tax or license fee imposed by the State upon vehicles, motor vehicles or the operation thereof.

(b) The Legislature may provide by law for any other form of taxation now or hereafter permitted by the Congress of the United States respecting national banking associations; provided, that such form of taxation shall apply to all banks located within the limits of this State.

2. The Legislature may provide by law for the taxation of corporations, their franchises, or any other franchises, by any method not prohibited by this Constitution or the Constitution or laws of the United States.

3. Any tax imposed pursuant to this section must be under an act passed by not less than two-thirds vote of all the members elected to each of the two houses of the Legislature.

Borough Form of City Government. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1. Amends Section 8 of Article XI of Constitution. Gives any chartered city or city and county alternative of establishing borough form of government either for entire territory or any part thereof, any such borough to exercise such municipal powers and to be administered as the charter prescribes.

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS PROPOSED TO BE DELETED are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE, and NEW PROVISIONS PROPOSED TO BE INSERTED are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 8. (a) Any city or city and county containing a population of more than 3,500 inhabitants, as ascertained by the last preceding census taken under the provisions of this Constitution, or of the Legislature of California, may frame a charter for its own government, consistent with and subject to this Constitution; and any city or city and county
having adopted a charter may adopt a new one. Any such charter may be framed by a board of 15 freeholders chosen by the electors of such city or city and county, at any general or special election, but no person shall be eligible as a candidate for such board unless he shall have been, for the five years next preceding, an elector of said city or city and county. An election for choosing freeholders may be called by a two-thirds vote of the legislative body of such city or city and county, and on presentation of a petition signed by not less than 15 percent of the registered electors of such city or city and county, the legislative body shall call such election at any time not less than 30 nor more than 60 days from date of the filing of the petition. Any such petition shall be verified by the authority having charge of the registration records of such city or city and county and the expenses of such verification shall be provided by the legislative body thereof.

(b) Candidates for the office of freeholders shall be nominated either in such manner as may be provided for the nomination of officers of the municipal or city government or by petition, substantially in the same manner as may be provided by general laws for the nomination by petition of candidates for public offices to be voted for at general elections.

(c) At such election the electors shall vote first on the question "Shall a board of freeholders be elected to frame a proposed new charter?" and secondly for the candidates of the office of freeholder. If the first question receives a majority of votes of the qualified voters voting thereon at such election, the 15 candidates for the office of freeholder receiving the highest number of votes shall forthwith organize as a board of freeholders, but if the first question receives less than a majority of the votes of the qualified voters voting thereon at such election no board of freeholders shall be deemed to have been elected.

(d) The board of freeholders shall, within one year after the result of the election is declared, prepare and propose a charter for the government of such city or city and county. The charter so prepared shall be signed by a majority of the board of freeholders and filed in the office of the clerk of the legislative body of said city or city and county. The legislative body of said city or city and county shall, within 15 days after such filing, cause such charter to be published once in the official newspaper of said city or city and county and each edition thereof, during the day of publication (or in case there be no such official newspaper, in a newspaper of general circulation within such city or city and county and all the editions thereof issued during the day of publication) and in any city or city and county with over 50,000 population shall cause copies of such charter to be printed in convenient pamphlet form and in type of not less than 10-point and shall cause copies thereof to be mailed to each of the qualified electors of such city or city and county, and shall, until the day fixed for the election upon such charter, advertise in one or more newspapers of general circulation in said city or city and county a notice that copies thereof may be had upon application therefor.

(e) Such charter shall be submitted to the electors of such city or city and county at a date to be fixed by the board of freeholders, before such filing and designated on such charter, either at a special election held not less than 60 days from the completion of the publication of such charter as above provided, or at the general election next following the expiration of said 60 days.

(f) As an alternative, the legislative body of any such city or city and county, on its own motion may frame or cause to be framed, a proposed charter and submit the proposal for the adoption thereof to the electors at either a special election called for that purpose or at any general or special election. Any charter so submitted shall be advertised in the same manner as herein provided for the advertisement of a charter proposed by a board of freeholders, and the election thereon held at a date to be fixed by the legislative body of such city or city and county, not less than 40 nor more than 60 days after the completion of the advertising in the official paper.

(g) If a majority of the qualified voters voting thereon at such general or special election shall vote in favor of such proposed charter, it shall be deemed to be ratified, and shall be submitted to the Legislature, if then in session, or at the next regular or special session of the Legislature. The Legislature shall by concurrent resolution approve or reject such charter as a whole, without power of alteration or amendment, and if approved by a majority of the members voting and not less than a quorum of the members voting, it shall become the organic law of such city or city and county and supersed any existing charter and all laws inconsistent therewith. One copy of the charter so ratified and approved shall be filed with the Secretary of State, one with the recorder in the county in which such city is located, and one in the archives of the city, and in the case of a city and county one copy shall be filed with the recorder thereof, and one in the archives of such city and county; and thereafter the courts shall take judicial notice of the provisions of such charter.

(h) The charter of any city or city and county may be amended by proposals therefore submitted by the legislative body thereof on its own motion or on petition signed by 15 percent of the registered electors, or both. Such proposals shall be submitted to the electors at either a special election called for that purpose or at any general or special election. Petitions for the submission of any amendment shall be filed with the legislative body of the city or city and county not less than 60 days prior to the general election next preceding a regular session of the Legislature. The signatures on such petitions shall be verified by the authority having charge of the registration records of such city or city and county, and the expenses of such verification shall be provided by the legislative body thereof. If such petitions have a sufficient number of signatures the legislative body of the city or city and county shall so submit the amendment or amendments so proposed to the electors. Amendments proposed by the legislative body and amendments proposed by petition of the electors may be submitted at the same election. The amendments so submitted shall be advertised in the same manner as herein provided for the advertisement of a proposed charter, and the election thereon, held at a date to be fixed by the legislative body of such city or city and county, not less than 40, and not more than 60, days after the completion of the advertising in the official paper.

(i) If a majority of the qualified voters voting on any such amendment vote in favor thereof, it shall be deemed ratified, and shall be submitted to the Legislature if then in session, or at the regular or special session next following such election; and ap-
proposed or rejected without power of alteration in the same manner as herein provided for the approval or rejection of a charter.

(j) In submitting any such charter or amendment separate propositions, whether alternative or conflicting, or one included within the other, may be submitted at the same time to be voted on by the electors separately, and, as between those so related, if more than one receive a majority of the votes, the proposition receiving the largest number of votes shall control as to all matters in conflict. It shall be competent in any charter framed under the authority of this section to provide that the municipality governed thereunder may make and enforce all laws and regulations in respect to municipal affairs, subject only to the restrictions and limitations provided in their several charters and in respect to other matters they shall be subject to general laws. It shall be competent in any charter to provide for the division of the city or city and county governed thereby, into boroughs or districts, and to provide that each such

establishment of a borough system of government for the whole or any part of the territory of the city or city and county governed thereby, by which one or more boroughs or districts may be created therein and to provide that each borough or district may exercise such general or special municipal powers, and to be administered in such manner, as may be provided for each such borough or district by the charter of the city or city and county.

(k) The percentages of the registered electors herein required for the election of freeholders or the submission of amendments to charters shall be calculated upon the total vote cast in the city or city and county at the last preceding general state election; and the qualified electors shall be those whose names appear upon the registration records of the same or preceding year. The election laws of such city, or city and county shall, so far as applicable, govern all elections held under the authority of this section.

### CHIROPRACTORS. Amendment of Chiropractic Initiative Act, Submitted by Legislature.

Increases Board of Chiropractic Examiners from five members to seven. Increases per diem of board members. Authorizes suspension or revocation of chiropractic licenses for described types of unprofessional conduct, such as employment of unlicensed or suspended practitioner in treating the sick, procurement of abortions, untruth or misleading advertising, payment for procuring patients, willful neglect of patients. Requires chiropractors annually to take 16 hours of postgraduate study as condition of license renewal. Exempts chiropractors in armed forces from payment of license renewal fees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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(This proposed law expressly amends provisions of existing law; therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED** are printed in **STRIKE-OUT TYPE**, and **NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK-FACED TYPE**.)

PROPOSED LAW

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 seven 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 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 who are 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 thirty dollars ($30) 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. Within 60 days of the date upon which this amendment to this section takes effect, the Governor shall appoint the two additional members of the board. Of the members first so appointed, one shall be appointed for a term of two years, two for two years, and two for three years, expiring February 10, 1954, and the other for a term expiring February 10, 1955. The terms with respect to members of the board, which terms are in existence on the date the latest amendment to this section takes effect, shall expire as if this section had not been amended, that is, two on February 10, 1953, one on February 10, 1954, and two on February 10, 1955. Thereafter, each appointment shall be for the term of three years, except that an appointment to fill a vacancy shall be for the unexpired term only. Each member shall serve until his successor has been appointed and qualified. The Governor may remove a member from the board after receiving sufficient proof of the inability or misconduct of said member.

Sec. 3. The board shall convene within 90 days after the appointment of its members, and shall organize by the election of a president, and a vice presi-
dent to be chosen from the members of the board, and a secretary, who may, but need not be a member of the board. The board shall fix the salary of the secretary, with the approval of the Director of Finance. Thereafter elections of officers shall occur annually at the January meeting of the board. A majority of the board shall constitute a quorum.

It shall require the affirmative vote of three-fourths of the members of the board to carry any motion or resolution, to adopt any rule, or to authorize the issuance of any license provided for in this act. The secretary shall receive a salary to be fixed by the board, together with his attendees, for traveling expenses in connection with the performance of the duties of his office, and shall give bond to the State in such sum with such sureties as the board may deem proper. He shall keep a record of the proceedings of the board, which shall at times during business hours be open to the public for inspection. He shall keep a true and accurate account of all funds received and of all expenditures incurred or authorized by the board, and on the first day of December of each year he shall file with the Governor a report of all receipts and disbursements and of the proceedings of the board for the preceding fiscal year.

Sec. 8. Any person who shall have practiced chiropractic for two years after graduation from a chiropractic school or college, one year of which shall have been in this state preceding the date upon which this act takes effect, or any person who graduated from a chiropractic school or college prior to January 1, 1943, and who shall present to the board satisfactory evidence of good moral character and having practiced in a rural community of not less than two thousand people in a locally incorporated chiropractic school or college, shall be given a practical and clinical examination in chiropractic philosophy and practice; and if he or she make a grade of seventy-five per cent in such examination the board shall grant a license to said applicant to practice chiropractic in this state under the provisions of this act; provided, however, that such application for said license is made within six months of the date upon which this act takes effect and that each applicant shall pay to the secretary of the board the sum of twenty-five dollars.

Sec. 10. (a) The board shall refuse to grant, or may suspend or revoke, a license to practice chiropractic in this State upon any of the following grounds, to wit: the employment of fraud or deception in applying for a license or in passing an examination as provided in this act; the practice of chiropractic under a false or assumed name; or the personation of another practitioner of like or different name; the conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude; habitual intemperance in the use of ardent spirits, narcotics or stimulants to such an extent as to incapacitate him for the performance of his professional duties; the advertising of any means whereby the monthly periods of women can be regulated or the means re-established if suppressed; or the advertising, directly, indirectly or in substance, upon any card, sign, newspaper advertisement, or other written or printed sign or advertisement, that the holder of such license or any other person, company or association by which he or she is employed, or in whose services he or she is, will treat, cure, or attempt to treat or cure, any venereal disease, or will treat or cure, or attempt to treat or cure, any person afflicted with any sexual disease, for lost manhood, sexual weakness or sexual disorder or any disease of the sexual organs; or being employed by, or being in the service of any person, company or association so advertising; or any other act which constitutes unprofessional conduct. The proceedings for the refusal to grant, suspension or revocation of suspend or revoke a license upon any of the foregoing grounds shall be conducted in accordance with Chapter 5 of Part I of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code as it now reads or as it may be hereafter amended by the Legislature, and the board shall have all the powers granted therein. The secretary on all cases of revocation shall enter on his register the fact of such revocation, and shall certify the fact of such revocation under the seal of the board to the county clerk of the counties in which the certificates of the person whose certificate has been revoked is recorded; and said clerk must thereupon write upon the margin or across the face of his register of the certificate of such person the following: "This certificate was revoked on the _______ day of _________," giving the day, month and year of such revocation in accordance with said certificate to him by said secretary. The record of such revocation so made by said county clerk shall be prima facie evidence of the fact thereof, and of the regularity of all proceedings of said board in the matter of said revocation.

(b) At any time after two years following the revocation or cancellation of a license or registration under this section, the board may, by a majority vote, rescind said license to the person affected, restoring him to, or conferring on him all the rights and privileges granted by his original license or certificate. Any person to whom such rights have been restored shall pay to the secretary the sum of twenty-five dollars ($25) upon the issuance of a new license.

(c) All licenses granted under this act shall be renewed annually. The issuance of such renewal licenses shall be contingent upon submission of evidence satisfactory to the board, of the applicant having completed at least 15 hours of postgraduate studies within the previous year.

Sec. 10.5. The employing directly or indirectly of any suspended or unlicensed practitioner in the practice of any system or mode of treating the sick or afflicted, or the aiding or abetting of any unlicensed person to practice any system or mode of treating the sick or afflicted, constitutes unprofessional conduct within the meaning of this chapter.

Unprofessional conduct as used in this act is defined as follows:

(a) The procuring, aiding or abetting in the procuring of criminal abortion; the paying for steering patients into one's office; obtaining a fee on the assurance that a manifestly incurable disease can be made entirely well; the wilful betrayal of professional secrets of a patient to the detriment of such patient; chiropractic advertising which is untrue or misleading; conviction of any offense involving moral turpitude; wilful neglect of a patient in a critical condition.

Sec. 12. Each person practicing chiropractic within this State shall, on or before the first day of January of each year, after a license is issued to him as herein provided, pay to the Board of Chiropractic Examiners a renewal fee of not less than two dollars ($2) nor more than ten dollars ($10) as may be set by the board. The secretary shall, on or before November 1st of each year, mail to all licensed chiropractors in this State a notice that the renewal fee will be due on or before the first day of January next following. Nothing in this act shall be construed to
require the receipts to be recorded in like manner as original licenses. The failure, neglect or refusal of any person holding a license or certificate to practice under this act in the State of California to pay said annual fee during the time his or her license remains in force shall, after a period of 60 days from the first day of January of each year, ipso facto, work a forfeiture of his or her license or certificate, and it shall not be restored except upon the written application therefor and the payment to the said board of a fee of ten dollars ($10) twenty-five dollars ($25), except that such licentiate who fails, refuses or neglects to pay such annual tax within a period of 60 days after the first day of January of each year shall not be required to submit to an examination for the reissuance of such certificate.

Any licentiate serving in the armed forces of the United States shall be exempt from payment of the renewal fee during such period of service and for one year thereafter.

Sec. 15. Any person who shall practice or attempt to practice chiropractic, or any person who shall buy, sell or fraudulently obtain a license to practice chiropractic, whether recorded or not, or who shall use the title "chiropractor" or "D.C." or any word or title to induce, or tending to induce belief that he is engaged in the practice of chiropractic, without first complying with the provisions of this act; or any licensee under this act who uses the word "doctor" or the prefix "Dr." without the word "chiropractor," or "D.C." immediately following his name, or the use of the letters "M.D." or the words "doctor of medicine," or the term "surgeon," or the term "physician," or the words "osteopath," or the letters "D.O." or any other letters, prefixes or suffixes, the use of which would indicate that he or she was practicing a profession for which he held no license from the State of California, or any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than five hundred dollars ($500) and not more than ten thousand dollars ($10,000), or by imprisonment in the county jail for not less than 30 days nor more than 90 days, or both.

COMMUNITY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 55. Adds Section 19 to Article XIII of Constitution. Authorizes financing of redevelopment project from portion of revenue derived from taxes on taxable property within project. Provides that taxing agencies shall continue to receive tax revenues based on assessed value of such property at time of approval of redevelopment plan. Authorizes and validates laws permitting use of additional tax revenue, based on later increases in assessed value, for payment of bonds or other obligations of the redevelopment agency and permitting the agency to pledge such income as security for its obligations.
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(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 THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 19. All property in a redevelopment project established under the Community Redevelopment Law Act as now existing or hereafter amended, except publicly owned property not subject to taxation by reason of such ownership, shall be taxed in proportion to its value as provided in Section 1 of this article, and such taxes (the word "taxes" as used herein shall include, but shall not be limited to, all levies on an ad valorem basis upon land or real property) shall be levied and collected as other taxes are levied and collected by the respective taxing agencies.

The Legislature may provide that any redevelopment plan may contain a provision that the taxes, if any, so levied upon such taxable property in a redevelopment project each year by or for the benefit of the State of California, any city, county, city and county, district, or other public corporation (hereinafter sometimes called "taxing agencies") after the effective date of the ordinance approving the redevelopment plan, shall be divided as follows:

(a) That portion of the taxes which would be produced by the rate upon which the tax is levied each year by or for each of said taxing agencies upon the total sum of the assessed value of the taxable property in the redevelopment project as shown upon the assessment roll used in connection with the taxation of such property by such taxing agency, last equalized prior to the effective date of such ordinance, shall be allocated to, and when collected shall be paid into, the funds of the respective taxing agencies as taxes by or for said taxing agencies on all other property are paid (for the purpose of allocating taxes levied by or for any taxing agency or agencies which did not include the territory in a redevelopment project on the effective date of such ordinance but to which such territory has been annexed or otherwise included after such effective date, the assessment roll of the county last equalized on the effective date of said ordinance shall be used in determining the assessed valuation of the taxable property in the project on said effective date); and

(b) That portion of said levied taxes each year in excess of such amount shall be allocated to and when collected shall be paid into a special fund of the redevelopment agency to pay the principal of and interest on loans, money advanced to, or indebtedness (whether funded, refunded, assumed or otherwise) incurred by such redevelopment agency to finance or refinance, in whole or in part, such redevelopment project. Unless and until the total assessed valuation of the taxable property in a redevelopment project
GRAND JURIES. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 2.

Amends Section 8 of Article I of Constitution. Requires that grand juries shall consist of 19 jurors, including three to nine members of the preceding year's grand jury. Provides that no grand juror shall serve more than two consecutive years, nor serve as chairman for more than one year.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 8. Offenses heretofore required to be prosecuted by indictment shall be prosecuted by information, after examination and commitment by a magistrate, or by indictment, with or without such examination and commitment, as may be prescribed by law. When a defendant is charged with the commission of a felony, by a written complaint subscribed under oath and on file in a court within the county in which the felony is triable, he shall, without unnecessary delay, be taken before a magistrate of such court. The magistrate shall immediately deliver to him a copy of the complaint, inform him of his right to the aid of counsel, ask him if he desires the aid of counsel, and allow him a reasonable time to send for counsel; and the magistrate must, upon the request of the defendant, require a peace officer to take a message to any counsel whom the defendant may name, in the city or township in which the court is situated. If the felony charged is not punishable with death, the magistrate shall immediately upon the appearance of counsel for the defendant read the complaint to the defendant and ask him whether he pleads guilty or not guilty to the offense charged therein; thereafter, or at any time thereafter while the charge remains pending before the magistrate and when his counsel is present, the defendant may, with the consent of the magistrate and the district attorney or other counsel for the people, plead guilty to the offense charged or to any other offense the commission of which is necessarily included in that with which he is charged, or to an attempt to commit the offense charged; and upon such plea of guilty, the magistrate shall immediately commit the defendant to the sheriff and certify the case, including a copy of all proceedings therein and such testimony as in his discretion he may require to be taken, to the superior court, and thereupon such proceedings shall be had as if such defendant had pleaded guilty in such court.

The foregoing provisions of this section shall be self-executing. The Legislature may prescribe such procedure in cases herein provided for as is not inconsistent herewith. In cases not hereinabove provided for, such proceedings shall be had as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law, not inconsistent herewith.

A grand jury consisting of 19 jurors shall be drawn and summoned at least once a year in each county for the year following the adoption of this amendment and for each year thereafter which shall consist of not less than three nor more than nine members of the immediately preceding grand jury who shall serve for that year only and such additional members as are required to provide the total membership. No grand juror shall serve for more than two consecutive years, nor serve as foreman of a grand jury for more than one year. The provisions of this paragraph are self-executing but legislation not in conflict herewith may be enacted to facilitate its operation.

It is intended by this section to empower any redevelopment agency, city, county, or city and county under any law authorized by this section to exercise the provisions hereof separately or in combination with powers granted by the same or any other law relative to redevelopment agencies. This section shall not affect any other law or laws relating to the same or a similar subject but is intended to authorize an alternative method of procedure governing the subject to which it refers.

All of the provisions of the Community Redevelopment Law, as amended in 1951, which relate to the use or pledge of taxes or portions thereof as herein provided, or which, if effective, would carry out the provisions of this section or any part thereof, are hereby approved, legalized, ratified and validated and made fully and completely effective and operative upon the effective date of this amendment.

The Legislature shall enact such laws as may be necessary to enforce the provisions of this section.

---

YES

NO
STATE FUNDS: HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 58. Amends Section 22 of Article IV of Constitution. Permits Legislature to make state funds available to public agencies and nonprofit corporations for construction of hospital facilities and to authorize use of state funds for that purpose by nonprofit corporations, whenever federal money is made available for such construction.

(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 THE CONSTITUTION

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 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; 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, city, and county, 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.

SUPERIOR JUDGES, VACANCIES. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 16. Amends Section 8 of Article VI of Constitution. Provides that where superior court vacancy occurs during general election year preceding end of the incumbent judge's term, election of a full-term successor shall be held at same election as if no vacancy had occurred.

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 8. The term of office of judges of the superior courts shall be six years from and after the first Monday of January after the first day of January next succeeding their election. A vacancy in such office shall be filled by the election of a judge for a full term at the next succeeding general election after the first day of January next succeeding the accrual of such the vacancy by the election of a judge for a full term to commence on the first Monday of January after the first day of January next succeeding his election; except that if the term of an incumbent,
elective or appointive, is expiring at the close of the year of a general state election and a vacancy accrues after the commencement of that year and prior to the commencement of the ensuing term, the election to fill the office for the ensuing full term shall be held in the closing year of the expiring term in the same manner and with the same effect as though such vacancy had not accrued. In the event of any vacancy, the Governor shall appoint a person to hold such the vacant office until the commencement of the term of the judge elected to the office as herein provided.

### PROPERTY TAX STATEMENTS

**Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 19.** Amends Section 8 of Article XIII of Constitution. Authorizes Legislature to permit annual property tax statements to be verified by taxpayer’s written declaration under penalty of perjury, as alternative to verification by oath of taxpayer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Revised amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in **STRIKE OUT TYPE**., and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BLACK FACED TYPE**.)

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION**

Sec. 8. The Legislature shall by law require each taxpayer in this State to make and deliver to the county assessor, annually, a statement, under oath, either by oath or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, setting forth specifically all the real and personal property owned by such taxpayer, or in his possession, or under his control, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the first Monday of March.

### DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY FOR ASSESSMENT

**Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 20.** Amends Section 3 of Article XIII of Constitution. Eliminates requirement that federally sectionized land containing more than 640 acres shall be assessed by sections or fractions of sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Revised amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in **STRIKE OUT TYPE**.)

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION**

Sec. 3. Every tract of land containing more than six hundred and forty acres and which has been sectioned by the United States Government, shall be assessed, for the purposes of taxation, by sections or fractions of sections. The Legislature shall provide by law for the assessment of small tracts of all lands not sectioned by the United States Government.

END
elective or appointive, is expiring at the close of the year of a general state election and a vacancy accrues after the commencement of that year and prior to the commencement of the ensuing term, the election to fill the office for the ensuing full term shall be held in the closing year of the expiring term in the same manner and with the same effect as though such vacancy had not accrued. In the event of any vacancy, the Governor shall appoint a person to hold such the vacant office until the commencement of such the term of the judge elected to the office as herein provided.
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PROPOSED AMPENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
Sec. 8. The Legislature shall by law require each taxpayer in this State to make and deliver to the county assessor, annually, a statement, under oath either by oath or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury, setting forth specifically all the real and personal property owned by such taxpayer, or in his possession, or under his control, at 12 o’clock meridian, on the first Monday of March.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY FOR ASSESSMENT. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 20. Amends Section 3 of Article XIII of Constitution. Eliminates requirement that federally sectionized land containing more than 640 acres shall be assessed by sections or fractions of sections.

(This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMPENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION
Sec. 3. Every tract of land containing more than six hundred and forty acres and which has been sectionized by the United States Government; shall be assessed for the purposes of taxation, by sections or fractions of sections. The Legislature shall provide by law for the assessment; in small tracts of all lands not sectionized by the United States Government.
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**Arguments**

**SCHOOL BONDS. ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NO. 3.** Adds Section 16.5 to Article XVI of Constitution. Directs issuance and sale of $185,000,000 of State bonds for purpose of providing loans and grants to school districts of State. Authorizes Legislature to provide for issuance and sale of bonds. Makes bond proceeds available for expenses of bond issuance, for administration of loans and grants, and for repayment of money appropriated from General Fund. Provides that allocation of funds to school districts and their obligation to repay commensurate with ability be regulated by Legislature. Declares State policy regarding public school sites and buildings.

![YES](image1)

![NO](image2)

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

**Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

This constitutional amendment would authorize a $185,000,000 bond issue for loans and grants to school districts and for repayment of the money appropriated for state school building aid from the General Fund by Chapter 26 of the 1952 Second Extraordinary Session.

It would authorize the Legislature to provide the procedure for issuing and redeeming the bonds, and to pass any laws, general or special, necessary or convenient for carrying out the provisions of the amendment. The amendment would authorize the enactment of laws by the Legislature to carry out its provisions and to provide for the allocation of funds by the State Allocation Board or a similar agency. If provision is made for allocation by such agency, it would grant Members of the Legislature required to meet with the board equal rights and duties with the nonlegislative members to vote and act upon matters pending before the board.

The amendment provides that the Legislature shall require districts receiving an allocation of money from the bonds to repay it to the State on such terms and in such amounts as may be within the ability of the district.

The Legislature at the 1952 Second Extraordinary Session adopted Chapter 27 prescribing a formula for the allocation of state aid money and for the determination of the ability to repay and the amounts of repayment.

At the same session it also adopted Chapter 28, providing for the issuing of state school building bonds in such sums as to make $20,000,000 available for school building construction on May 5, 1953, and $5,000,000 each month thereafter, but not to exceed $165,000,000 in all. This chapter also provides for the issuance of not more than $20,000,000 of bonds to repay the General Fund so much of the amount appropriated from that fund by Chapter 26 as may be needed to provide a surplus of $5,000,000 in the General Fund on June 30, 1953.

**Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 3**

The California Legislature, without a single dissenting vote, presents here for a YES vote by the electorate as Proposition 24, Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 3, proposing a bond issue of $185,000,000 to provide for school house construction.

The Senate and Assembly of California, called into Special Session by the Governor in August 1952 to consider the school housing crisis, were faced with certain starting conditions indicating that continued State aid in meeting the school housing shortage was a compelling educational necessity.

California's school and pre-school age population has continued to increase at record rates since the last State school bond issue was voted by the people in 1949. Rising costs of construction have added to the problem of relieving the shortage of needed school buildings. Based on an attendance of 35 pupils per room, the shortage that this amendment would correct amounts to $13,511 classrooms.

During this school term, more than one-third of all the school children in California are being denied the right of equal educational opportunities because of overcrowded and makeshift classrooms.

A comprehensive study by the State Department of Education revealed that $198,000,000 above and beyond the legal ability of the local school districts to provide would be needed by October 1952, a date which will have passed when this measure is voted on by the electorate. Approximately 1,000, or nearly half the school districts in the State cannot provide enough school buildings to meet their October 1952 needs even though they vote local bonds: to the capacity of their resources, unless they can secure help from the State. This does not take into consideration the certain growth in school population which is sure to continue for several years. A bond issue of $185,000,000 is therefore extremely conservative.

The Legislature has already enacted certain laws governing the allocation of State aid for school buildings, including the following provisions:

1. To qualify for a loan from the State a school district must have voted local bonds to 95 percent of its bonding ability.

2. Borrowing districts financially able to do so must repay the money to the State. Terms of thirty or forty years for repayment are provided.

3. No money can be borrowed by a local school board unless the proposed loan is approved by a two-thirds vote of the electors of the district, voting in an election held for that purpose.

4. School construction, financed in any part by State loans will be subjected to cost controls to be established by the Allocations Board. Restrictions on the number of square feet of construction allowed per pupil are continued.

California has never failed to respond to the educational needs of its children. Overcrowded, makeshift classrooms, half day sessions are forcing a lamentable "watering-down" of educational opportunity at a time when we need to develop to the utmost those precious human resources which have made America great. We have every confidence that the people of California will...
join its Legislature's call to action, and will VOTE YES on Proposition 24.

HUGH P. DONNELLY
Senator 22nd District
Chairman, Senate Committee on Education

ROBERT C. KIRKWOOD
Assemblyman, 28th District
Chairman, Subcommittee on Public School Finance, Assembly Ways and Means Committee

FRANCIS DUNN, JR.
Assemblyman, 13th District
Chairman, Assembly Committee on Education

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 3

PROPOSITION NO. 24 increases the bonded indebtedness of California by One Hundred and Eighty Five Million Dollars. The State now has a bonded debt of Three Hundred Forty-four Million and Three Hundred Thousand Dollars. In order to care for the minimum needs of the State of California, the most conservative estimates reveal it would require a bond issue of Two Hundred Fifty Million Dollars. Certainly the State of California would do no less than provide the minimum requirements. Piecemeal legislation is bad at best. Writing into the Constitution extraneous subjects has been a pastime of Californians for years and this ballot is no exception.

PROPOSITION NO. 24, however, is a warranted exception because it is a loaning of the credit of the State of California. The many arguments that could be presented against writing into the Constitution legislation that should be handled by the Legislature in this instance would not be entirely applicable, but certainly if we are to authorize an additional bonded indebtedness, it should be in an amount sufficient to take care of the minimum needs and One Hundred Eighty Five Million is not sufficient for that purpose.

For this reason and this reason alone, it merits a NO vote.

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION NO. 24.

SAM L. COLLINS
## SCHOOL BONDS. ASSEMBLY CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT NO. 3

Adds Section 16.5 to Article XVI of Constitution. Directs issuance and sale of $185,000,000 of State bonds for purpose of providing loans and grants to school districts of State. Authorizes Legislature to provide for issuance and sale of bonds. Makes bond proceeds available for expenses of bond issuance, for administration of loans and grants, and for repayment of money appropriated from General Fund. Provides that allocation of funds to school districts and their obligation to repay commensurate with ability be regulated by Legislature. Declares State policy regarding public school sites and buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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 THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 16.5. Bonds of the State of California shall be prepared, issued, and sold in the amount of one hundred eighty-five million dollars ($185,000,000), in such denominations, to be numbered, to bear such dates, and to bear such rate of interest as shall be determined by the Legislature.

The proceeds of such bonds shall be used:

(a) To provide loans and grants to the several school districts of the State, subject to such legislation, rules, or regulations as the Legislature may, from time to time determine.

(b) To pay the expenses that may be incurred in preparing, advertising, issuing, and selling the bonds, and in administering and directing the expenditure of the moneys realized from the sale of such bonds.

(c) To repay, as provided by law, the money appropriated from the General Fund at the 1962 Second Extraordinary Session for state school building aid.

The issuance, signing, countersigning, endorsing, and selling of the bonds herein provided for, and the interest coupons thereon, the place and method of payment of principal and interest thereon, the procedure for initiating, advertising and holding sales thereof, and the performance by the several state boards and state officers of their respective duties in connection therewith; and all other provisions, terms, and conditions relating to the bonds, shall be as provided by the Legislature.

The Legislature shall pass all laws, general or special, necessary or convenient to carry into effect the provisions of this section. Such laws may provide for the allocation of funds to school districts pursuant to this section by the State Allocations Board or a similar agency, and in that event, notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, Members of the Legislature who are required to meet with such board shall have equal rights and duties with the nonlegislative members to vote and act upon matters pending before such board.

The Legislature shall require each district receiving an allocation of money from the sale of bonds pursuant to this section to repay such money to the State on such terms and in such amounts as may be within the ability of the district to repay.

The people of the State of California in adopting this section hereby declare that it is in the interests of the State and of the people thereof for the State to aid school districts of the State in providing necessary and adequate school sites and buildings for the pupils of the Public School System, such system being a matter of general concern inasmuch as the education of the children of the State is an obligation and function of the State.)

---

END