

1949

LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PAY

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

Recommended Citation

LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PAY California Proposition 3 (1949).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/493

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.

VOTE "YES"! Proposition 2 keeps California in the forefront of the states committed to social justice.

Remove pensions from politics—protect the needy from pension politicians—guarantee a more secure future for yourself and your family—
 — payment of \$85 a month to the needy blind
 — \$75 a month to the needy aged, free from promoter politics.

VOTE "YES" ON PROPOSITION 2.

- DR. NEWEL PERRY, President, The California Council for the Blind
- MRS. G. W. LUHR, President, The California Congress of Parents and Teachers
- RAY B. WISER, President, The California Farm Bureau Federation
- BEN C. DUNIWAY, President, The California Association for Social Welfare
- MRS. PAULINE McT. PLOESER, President, The League of Women Voters of California

Argument Against Initiative Proposition No. 2

Proposition No. 2 should be defeated because it takes away from the aged and blind all the benefits voted by the people last November. Therefore, the title of "AGED AND BLIND AID" is a fraud.

It is the first attempt in the State's history to set aside an initiative voted by the people BEFORE IT WAS EVEN GIVEN A FAIR TRIAL. The repeal was started immediately after election, before the new law went into effect.

All bona fide organizations representing the aged and blind are opposed to Proposition 2. It stands to reason that no legitimate aged blind group interested in the needy would participate in a move to deprive them of benefits voted by the people.

The California Council for the Blind, signer of the repeal, is controlled by a few members, NONE OF THEM NEEDY.

Its president, Newell Perry, in a letter written December 7, 1948, admitted the California Council for the Blind is a FALSE FRONT FOR BIG BUSINESS. Here is what he wrote:

"The financiers and business men felt that we should immediately proceed with the initiative petition, repealing Proposition 4. This would prove very expensive, but we were assured that the necessary money was forthcoming, and it would entail no expense to the blind. All that

would be expected from the blind would be to endorse the initiative petition and to have some of them accept membership on a large statewide committee."

In this repeal, the California Council for the Blind and other organizations, are a FALSE FRONT FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

For instance, Mrs. G. W. Luhr, who claims to speak for the California Parent Teachers Association, IS THE WIFE OF AN OFFICIAL OF THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD. The members are unaware that their officers and organization is being used as a front for big business on this issue.

The motive of the California State Chamber of Commerce is to shift more than \$21,000,000 in taxes now paid by the railroads, banks and corporations onto the overtaxed home-owners and farmers.

Under the present law county taxpayers were saved \$21,000,000 when the State assumed the counties' share of old age pension and blind aid costs.

Proposition No. 2 destroys this guarantee and places the amount of pensions at the mercy of a Legislature controlled by lobbyists.

Proposition No. 2 will take away security from the needy in the 63-64 age bracket, and force them on the relief rolls of the counties.

It restores the "responsible relatives" clause, which compels people to deprive their children of necessities to meet the contributions exacted by the State.

Few of us have any assurance today that we will not require aid in our old age or if blindness strikes.

Don't be misled by propaganda in the newspapers into voting against your own interests!

Defeat this fraud against you by protecting the aged and the blind—thereby saving home-owners, farmers and county taxpayers from this scheme of big business to unload the cost.

Vote "NO" on Proposition No. 2.

- GEORGE H. McLAIN, Chairman
Citizens' Committee for Old Age Pensions
- FRANK E. GARDNER, Chairman
Legislative Committee of California Blind
- CHARLES OHLSON, Vice President
California Institute of Social Welfare
- MRS. EVA SCOTT, State President
American War Mothers
- JOHN F. SHELLEY, President
California State Federation of Labor

LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PAY. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 84. Amends Section 2 of Article IV of Constitution Provides that budget sessions of Legislature shall consider only budget bill, revenue acts, charter changes, and provision for session expenses. Limits length of general and budget sessions. Sets salaries of legislators at \$300 per month. Permits legislators per diem expenses not exceeding allowances authorized for other elected state officers. Specifies maximum time limits for which per diem allowances may be paid during regular sessions and during service on legislative investigating committees.		YES	
3			
		NO	

(For full text of measure, see page 5, Part II)

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 84

Here is a proposed constitutional amendment that would do something for the Legislators and

also for the people of California whom they serve.

It would raise the pay of the Legislators to \$300 per month instead of the "token" payment of \$100 per month which they now receive. It

would allow them expenses authorized other state officers. However, this is no ordinary pay increase proposition. This one carries provisions calculated to bring benefits to the voters and taxpayers. It would limit the general sessions of the Legislature to 120 calendar days. It would limit the budget sessions, which come at alternate years to the general sessions, to enactment of the budget and to revenue and tax measures necessary therefor, and to consideration of city and county charter amendments. Budget sessions would be limited to 30 days. Interim committee work would be tightened up also.

This amendment would not prevent the Governor from submitting to the Legislature at the budget sessions urgency matters to be handled at special sessions that could run concurrently with or immediately following the budget sessions.

The objectives of the amendment are to give the lawmakers a little more money to compensate them for the time and expenses of attending sessions of the Legislature and serving on interim committees, to improve the general conduct of the sessions and to tighten up on interim committee work.

By limiting the length of the sessions the lawmakers would be expected to get down to the brass tacks work of the session sooner than they do now, and people would get more earnest consideration of their bills earlier in the session. The proposed pay increase is not such as to induce men to make a career out of sitting in Sacramento. The proposed limitations on interim committees through cutting down on the money a member could draw for such work, would stop the undesirable practice of making a veritable racket of investigating people and things from one end of the State to the other.

Many who have in the past opposed straight pay increases for the lawmakers without any proposed reforms, have joined in to support this one. Some, however, particularly those who seek to make a career of the Legislature and its interim committees as well as those who have a theory that no limitations whatever should be

placed on the Legislature, will even oppose this well considered effort to improve the lot of the lawmaker and give the people a break at the same time.

As the one who wrote the argument against a straight pay increase for the Legislators on the ballot two years ago, I think this proposal moves objectionable aspects of the custom pay increase propositions and adds desirable features which all can support.

DAN W. GREEN
 Publisher, Independent Review
 Los Angeles, California

As author, I have read and concur in the analysis by Mr. Green of Constitutional Amendment No. 84.

SAM L. COLLINS
 Speaker of the Assembly

Argument Against Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 84

In writing the opposition statement to A. C. A. 84, I do so with mingled feelings for I fully realize the need for an increase in the salary of our legislators in order to bring to our Legislature the very highest type individual obtainable; yet, I sincerely believe that the amount of increase called for in this constitutional amendment is not much of an improvement over the existing salary and therefore could do little towards giving the members of the Legislature that degree of financial independence necessary to enable them to devote all of their time to legislative duties.

It is my sincere belief that the salary should be increased to \$6,000 per annum.

I furthermore object to the reduction of legislative days per session. I believe there should increase the number of days for both regular and the budgetary session rather than reduce them.

For the above mentioned reasons, I am opposed to A. C. A. 84.

WILLIAM H. ROSENTHAL
 Assemblyman, 40th Dist.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

4 **Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 66.** Repeals Sections 7½a, 8a and 18½, amends Section 18, of Article XI of Constitution. Eliminates inoperative provisions relating to consolidated city and county charters, the former Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and the indebtedness of various named counties and cities.

YES	
NO	

(For full text of measure, see page 5, Part II)

Argument in Favor of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 66

This amendment proposes to repeal certain obsolete and inoperative provisions from Article XI of the California State Constitution pertaining to local government.

The amendment would repeal Section 7½a of Article XI, a provision applicable only to counties, which according to the census of 1910 had a population of over 200,000 inhabitants and did not have a county charter. At the time this section was adopted only one county (Alameda) was affected by it and that one county has since adopted a charter and thus is removed from its provisions. At the present time this section is not applicable to any county in California and it is

not probable that it ever again will be. For all practical purposes this section is now obsolete.

The remainder of the amendment would repeal provisions relating to the Panama-Pacific Exposition of 1915 and certain enabling acts relating to indebtednesses of several cities and counties of California, all of which indebtednesses have long since been repaid. These provisions have served the purposes for which they were originally enacted and are no longer of any force or effect.

A YES vote on this amendment will remove these obsolete and inoperative provisions from the California State Constitution.

THOMAS W. CALDECOTT
 Assemblyman, 18th Dist.

(f) The net income from real and personal property owned by the applicant.

Income in addition to the above specified shall be computed on the basis of net income.

All laws of this State that are inconsistent with any of the provisions of this Section 4 including all laws re-enacted and revised and declared to be fully and completely effective by this Article are hereby repealed.

All or any Sections of the Welfare and Institutions Code of the State of California hereby amended, may be further amended or may be repealed by the Legislature.

Section 5. If this Article is adopted by the people, it shall take effect five days after the date of the official declaration of the

vote by the Secretary of State and become operative upon the first day of the third month following the last day of the month in which occurs the date of the official declaration of the vote.

Until this Article becomes both effective and operative the provisions of Article XXV of Amendment to this Constitution as in effect prior to the effective date of this Article shall remain operative.

Section 6. If any portion, section or clause of this Article shall for any reason be declared unconstitutional or invalid, such declaration or adjudication shall not affect the remainder of this Article.

3 **LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PAY.** Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 84. Amends Section 2 of Article IV of Constitution. Provides that budget sessions of Legislature shall consider only budget bill, revenue acts, charter changes, and provision for session expenses. Limits length of general and budget sessions. Sets salaries of legislators at \$300 per month. Permits legislators per diem expenses not exceeding allowances authorized for other elected state officers. Specifies maximum time limits for which per diem allowances may be paid during regular sessions and during service on legislative investigating committees.

YES	
NO	

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Sec. 2. (a) The sessions of the Legislature shall be annual, but the Governor may, at any time, convene the Legislature, by proclamation, in extraordinary session.

All regular sessions in odd-numbered years shall be known as general sessions and no general session shall exceed one hundred twenty calendar days, exclusive of the recess required to be taken in pursuance of this section, in duration.

All regular sessions in even-numbered years shall be known as budget sessions, at which the Legislature shall consider only the Budget Bill for the succeeding fiscal year, revenue acts necessary therefor, **urgency measures requiring a two-thirds vote, acts calling elections, proposed Constitutional amendments**, the approval or rejection of charters and charter amendments of cities, counties, and cities and counties, and acts necessary to provide for the expenses of the session.

All general sessions shall commence at 12 o'clock m., on the first Monday after the first day of January, and shall continue for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days thereafter; whereupon a recess of both houses must be taken for not less than thirty calendar days. On the reassembling of the Legislature, no bill shall

be introduced in either house without the consent of three-fourths of the members thereof, nor shall more than two bills be introduced by any one member after such reassembling.

All budget sessions shall commence at 12 m.; on the first Monday in March and no budget session shall exceed thirty calendar days in duration.

(b) Each Member of the Legislature shall receive for his services the sum of three hundred dollars (\$300) for each month of the term for which he is elected.

No Member of the Legislature shall be reimbursed for his expenses, except for expenses incurred (1) while attending a regular, special or extraordinary session of the Legislature (the expense allowances for which may equal but not exceed the expense allowances at the time authorized for other elected state officers), not exceeding one hundred twenty calendar days of any general session or thirty calendar days of any budget session or the duration of a special or extraordinary session or (2) while serving after the Legislature has adjourned or during any recess of the two houses of the Legislature as a member of a joint committee of the two houses or of a committee of either house, when the committee is constituted and acting as an investigating committee to ascertain facts and make recommendations, not exceeding, during any calendar year, forty days as a member of one or more committees of either house, or sixty days as a member of one or more joint committees, but not exceeding sixty days in the aggregate for all such committee work. The limitations in this subsection (b) are not applicable to mileage allowances.

4 **CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT.** Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 66. Repeals Sections 7½a, 8a and 18½, amends Section 18, of Article XI of Constitution. Eliminates inoperative provisions relating to consolidated city and county charters, the former Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and the indebtedness of various named counties and cities.

YES	
NO	

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

First, That Sections 7½a, 8a, and 18½ of Article XI thereof be repealed.

Sec. 4½a. Any county organized under the general law, and having, at the time this section takes effect, a population of two hun-