

1938

OIL LEASES ON STATE-OWNED TIDELANDS AT HUNTINGTON BEACH

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

Recommended Citation

OIL LEASES ON STATE-OWNED TIDELANDS AT HUNTINGTON BEACH California Proposition 10 (1938).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/378

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.

10 OIL LEASES ON STATE-OWNED TIDELANDS AT HUNTINGTON BEACH. Referendum of act of Legislature (Chapter 304, Statutes 1937). Act provides for competitive bidding for leases on eleven parcels of State-owned tide and submerged lands at Huntington Beach for oil drilling from piers, islands or groins; provided that no bid shall be accepted unless it provides for royalty to State of more than 30% of production when average daily production for thirty consecutive days exceeds 200 barrels, and for drilling minimum of ten wells per lease.	YES
	NO

(For full text of measure, see page 1. Part II)

Argument in Favor of Oil Leases on State-Owned Tidelands at Huntington Beach Referendum Measure

This measure is for the protection of the State interest in the huge oil and gas deposits which are known to exist in the Huntington Beach tidelands. It is known as the "Olson Oil Bill," introduced by Senator Olson following an investigation by an interim committee of the Senate, of which he was chairman.

For over ten years oil wells drilled on the privately owned littoral lands along the shore at Huntington Beach have been draining 80 per cent or more of their production from the oil and gas deposits underlying the State's tidelands.

This measure is the first and only step ever taken for the development of this rich resource for the benefit of the State.

It divides the tideland area into eleven parcels and provides for the leasing of these parcels to the highest competitive bidders. It provides for the offsetting of drainage; that no bid shall be accepted and no lease made unless the same provides for payment to the State of more than thirty per cent of the value of production from any wells drilled thereunder, when the average daily production thereof exceeds 200 barrels of oil.

To forestall collusive bidding, the act further provides that if satisfactory bids are not received in accordance with its provisions, the State may proceed immediately with the drilling of wells and with the production, removal, storage and disposal of the oil and gas for the sole benefit of the State.

This act was passed as an urgency measure by two-thirds of the membership of both houses of the Legislature. The urgency clause reads in part as follows:

"That portion of tide and submerged lands of the State described in * * * this act contains oil and gas and other hydrocarbon substances of great value. Many oil wells are now drilled, operating and producing oil and gas upon privately owned lands that are constantly draining said oil, gas and other hydrocarbons from said State lands * * *. This

condition results in the daily depletion of this valuable resource of the State, making it imperative, if the interests of the State are to be preserved and the revenues available to the State therefrom are to be saved, that immediate action be taken to drill for, extract, produce and remove the oil and gas so known to exist in said lands * * *."

As an urgency measure this act should have gone into effect on May 15, 1937. No immediate action was taken under it, however, and petitions calling for its referendum were filed with the Secretary of State. The Supreme Court has held it subject to referendum notwithstanding the urgency clause. Therefore, it must be ratified by the voters before it can become effective.

We earnestly urge the people to vote "YES" on this measure for the protection of their own interests in this great natural resource of the State.

CULBERT L. OLSON,
Senator, Thirty-eighth District,
Los Angeles County.

HARRY C. WESTOVER,
Senator, Thirty-fifth District,
Orange County.

J. C. GARRISON,
Senator, Twenty-second District,
Stanislaus County.

Argument Against Oil Leases on State-Owned Tidelands at Huntington Beach Referendum Measure

Our public beaches are one of our greatest assets and attract hundreds of thousands of visitors annually to all southern California. Our tourist business is the second largest business in the State. It should be obvious to every thinking person that if this bill becomes law it will make possible the ruination of several miles of the finest public beach in the State.

Huntington Beach is not the only beach city facing ruination through this measure. If the proponents secure adoption of this bill and thereby bring about the destruction of the pub-

the beach at Huntington Beach, then it is certain that Long Beach will be next, for the newly discovered Long Beach oil field includes tidelands. If the precedent established by the adoption of this bill should be extended to the Long Beach tidelands one of the finest beaches on the Pacific Coast would be destroyed and hundreds of thousands of people would suffer the loss of the swimming and recreational facilities it now affords. What if the State does receive a few dollars from the oil produced from these tidelands? It will be small compensation, whatever the amount, for the ruination of our public beaches.

Vote against this vicious act and preserve our beaches for all the people. By all means—
VOTE "NO!"

LYNN O. HOSSOM,

Attorney at Law,
Chairman of the Fact Finding
Committee of the Long Beach
Junior Chamber of Commerce,
Harbor Commissioner,
Legal Counsel of Associated
Property Owners of Long
Beach.

**Argument Against Oil Leases on State-
Owned Tidelands at Huntington Beach
Referendum Measure**

Tideland drilling, which causes beach pollution in its most serious form, again presents itself in Proposition Number 10. This measure

asks voters to sanction well drilling in the tidelands of the Huntington Beach area. It is the same sort of proposition that voters have already rejected in five successive elections. In defense of California beaches they must vote "NO" for a sixth time.

Drilling in tidelands, as is well known, pollutes the waters with oil that is carried by littoral currents. As a result, waters are rendered unfit for bathing or fishing, and beaches are so smeared with tar as to be useless for recreation.

Proposition 10 will set a precedent for tideland drilling in the wells that lie along the California coast as far north as the Oregon border, robbing the State of its chief playground, and of a major tourist attraction.

Proposition 10 pretends to justify itself as a revenue measure. It has no such excuse because the oil revenues from State wells are already available through the license of littoral or slant drilling, which does no damage to beaches. Proposition 10 merely substitutes a destructive method of raising revenue for an established method that brings in the same revenue by harmless means. Proposition 10 should be voted "NO."

JAMES S. FARQUHAR,

Editor and Publisher,
Huntington Beach News.

A. C. PETERSON,

Publisher,
South Coast News,
Laguna Beach, California.