

1952

SUBVERSIVE PERSONS AND GROUP

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

Recommended Citation

SUBVERSIVE PERSONS AND GROUP California Proposition 5 (1952).
http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/524

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.

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. E. 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. 28

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 than 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

5 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

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

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 now 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 and malicious 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 cancelled tax exemptions.

Vote NO on Proposition No. 5.

ERNEST BESIG
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.

YES

NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 4, Part II)

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-