

1938

## SAN FRANCISCO BAY EXPOSITION

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca\\_ballot\\_props](http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props)

---

### Recommended Citation

SAN FRANCISCO BAY EXPOSITION California Proposition 12 (1938).  
[http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca\\_ballot\\_props/380](http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/380)

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](mailto:marcusc@uchastings.edu).

<b>12</b>	<b>SAN FRANCISCO BAY EXPOSITION. Assembly Constitutional Amendment 8.</b> Adds section 1.6 to Article XIII of Constitution. Prohibits levy or assessment of tax, license fee or other charge against any property of San Francisco Bay Exposition, a non-profit corporation sponsoring the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939, or against any property while being used or exhibited in connection therewith.	YES	
		NO	

(For full text of measure, see page 26, Part II)

**Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 8**

The San Francisco delegation to the State Legislature respectfully requests the citizens of California to give a favorable vote upon Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 8, which amendment provides that no tax, license fee or charge of any kind or character shall ever be levied or assessed or charged against any property of the San Francisco Bay Exposition, a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California, sponsoring the Golden Gate International Exposition at the City and County of San Francisco in 1939, or against any property used as an exhibit in said exposition while being used or exhibited in connection therewith.

This amendment is most necessary so that the Golden Gate International Exposition can function properly and within the means of the funds allocated to them. The present law provides that no nonprofit organization shall be taxed but there is nothing in the law which exempts expositions.

This constitutional amendment would do for the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939 what the people of this State did for the Panama Pacific International Exposition of 1915. In 1910 in preparation for that exposition a similar constitutional amendment was approved by the vote of the people exempting the 1915 exposition and its exhibitors from taxes and licenses in the same way that the present ballot measure proposes to do for the 1939 exposition and its exhibitors. Such exemptions are usual and customary aids extended to international expositions.

This exposition, nonprofit as it is, is for the benefit of all California. We invite the world to be with us and therefore, to carry on the

construction and operation of this exposition, it is necessary that no taxes or license fees be levied as no profits are expected to be had.

We request you to vote "YES" on this ballot measure.

**P. J. McMURRAY,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-fourth District.

**THOMAS A. MALONEY,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twentieth District.

**RAY WILLIAMSON,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-sixth District.

**WM. B. HORNBLOWER,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-third District.

**EDGAR C. LEVEY,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-eighth District.

**KENNETT B. DAWSON,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-second District.

**MELVYN I. CRONIN,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-fifth District.

**JEFFERSON E. PEYSER,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-seventh District.

**JOSEPH F. SHEEHAN,**  
Member of the Assembly,  
Twenty-first District.

**Argument Against Assembly Constitutional  
Amendment No. 8**

Further tax exemptions, regardless of supposed or claimed merit should be vigorously opposed.

Authorizing the exemption of all property of the San Francisco Bay Exposition, as is done under this measure, will permit the exemption, not only of property used for exhibit purposes on Treasure Island, but any property of the exposition company, regardless of use, value, amount or location in the State.

Further, it is possible under this measure to transfer any valuable property to the exposition company and thereby obtain the tax exemption even though the transfer and use is conditional and the property is to be returned to the real owner later.

While the exposition company is legally a nonprofit company, nevertheless profits are now available to interested parties in the form of high salaries. Hence, why afford one private

corporation a tax exemption not accorded to another of like character?

Normally, tax exemptions of this character are limited to specific property; further, any profits are returned to the State to offset appropriations by the State, county or city, expended for the benefit of the exposition, which is not true in the present case.

Adequate benefits have already been extended to the exposition without creating further tax burdens. A five million dollar State appropriation, a large Federal appropriation, and added police and fire protection requiring employment of many new employees under civil service, who can not be discharged after the Fair is over, but must be absorbed in possible growth and needs, are but a few of the expensive benefits already accorded that must be paid by taxpayers.

Respectfully submitted.

**RALPH S. HUNTINGTON.**