

1920

SALARIES OF JUSTICES

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props

Recommended Citation

SALARIES OF JUSTICES California Proposition 3 (1920).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/132

This Proposition is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact marcusc@uchastings.edu.

Let it be explained further that this act would foist on this state a bone-dry prohibition law from which the people of California could get no relief even if congress in its judgment later on saw fit to modify the Volstead Act by permitting the use of light wines and beers in the home. If Proposition No. 2 becomes the law in our state, we would find ourselves under rigid radical prohibition while other states in the union could enjoy any modifications that might come through congress by amendment of the Volstead Act. This would make a laughing stock of California which produces ninety per cent of all the grapes grown in the United States.

Proposition No. 2, being of premature birth, is unnecessary legislation. If it becomes the

law, it compels those who purchase liquor for nonbeverage purposes to obtain double sets of permits—one from the United States prohibition enforcement department and another from the California State Board of Pharmacy.

I trust the great majority of voters of this state will mark "X" opposite the word "No" on this measure and thereby again defeat prohibition in California and for the fourth time. I repeat that the proposed law is superfluous, would bar light wines and beer in the home, and does not reflect the true sentiment of our glorious hospitable California.

E. M. SHEEHAN,
President California Grape
Growers' Exchange.

SALARIES OF JUSTICES. Initiative measure amending Section 17 of Article VI of Constitution. Increases the salary of each Justice of the Supreme Court from \$8,000 a year to \$10,000 a year, and of each Justice of the District Courts of Appeal from \$7,000 a year to \$9,000 a year.		YES
		NO

Sufficient qualified electors of the State of California present to the secretary of state this petition and request that a proposed measure, as hereinafter set forth, be submitted to the people of the State of California for their approval or rejection, at the next ensuing general election. The proposed measure is as follows:

Section seventeen of article six of the constitution is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT.

(Proposed changes in provisions are printed in black-faced type.)

Section 17. The justices of the supreme court and of the district courts of appeal, and the judges of the superior courts, shall severally, at stated times during their continuance in office, receive for their service such compensation as is or shall be provided by law. The salaries of the judges of the superior court, in all counties having but one judge, and in all counties in which the terms of the judges of the superior court expire at the same time, shall not hereafter be increased or diminished after their election, nor during the term for which they shall have been elected. The salaries of the justices of the supreme court and of the district courts of appeal shall be paid by the state. One-half of the salary of each superior court judge shall be paid by the state; and the other half thereof shall be paid by the county for which he is elected. The salaries of the justices of the supreme court shall be ten thousand dollars a year, each, payable monthly. The salaries of the justices of the district courts of appeal shall be nine thousand dollars a year, each, payable monthly.

EXISTING PROVISIONS.

Section seventeen, article six, proposed to be amended, now reads as follows:

(Provisions proposed to be repealed are printed in italics.)

Section 17. The justices of the supreme court and of the district courts of appeal, and the judges of the superior courts, shall severally, at stated times during their continuance in office, receive for their service such compensation as is or shall be provided by law. The salaries of the judges of the superior court, in all counties having but one judge, and in all counties in which the terms of the judges of the superior court expire at the same time, shall not hereafter be increased or diminished after their election, nor during the term for which they shall have been elected. *Upon the adop-*

tion of this amendment the salaries then established by law shall be paid uniformly to the justices and judges then in office. The salaries of the justices of the supreme court and of the district courts of appeal shall be paid by the state. One half of the salary of each superior court judge shall be paid by the state; and the other half thereof shall be paid by the county for which he is elected. On and after the first day of January, A. D., one thousand nine hundred and seven, the justices of the supreme court shall each receive an annual salary of eight thousand dollars, and the justices of the several district courts of appeal shall each receive an annual salary of seven thousand dollars; the said salaries to be payable monthly.

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF INCREASE OF SALARIES OF JUSTICES.

The present salaries of the Justices of the Supreme Court (\$8,000 per annum) and of the Justices of the District Courts of Appeal (\$7,000 per annum) were fixed in 1906; and since then these salaries have been reduced in purchasing power to less than one-half of their former value. At the time they were fixed, the salaries were regarded as moderate compensation for members of the highest courts of the state; and the primary purpose of the proposed amendment is not to provide any actual increase in compensation, but to offset in part the loss caused by the diminished purchasing power of the present salaries.

The justices affected by the amendment are the Chief Justice and six Associate Justices of the Supreme Court and fifteen Justices of the District Courts of Appeal—six at Los Angeles, six at San Francisco, and three at Sacramento. The adoption of the amendment will increase the salary of each of these justices \$2,000 per annum, making the additional annual cost to the state \$44,000.

The professional attainment and industry necessary to a proper discharge of the duties of an appellate justice would command in private practice a much greater financial return than the proposed increase affords; but the amendment is not designed to measure official salaries by private compensation. Its purpose is to maintain the independence and efficiency of the judiciary by making the compensation of the justices at least approach the values of 1906; and an independent and efficient judiciary is of first importance to the people of the state.

BRADNER W. LEE.