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PART I—ARGUMENTS

FOR THE CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1970. This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) to provide funds for water pollution control.

AGAINST THE CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1970. This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) to provide funds for water pollution control.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 1, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel*

A "Yes" vote (a vote FOR THE CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1970) is a vote to authorize the issuance and sale of state bonds in the total amount of $250,000,000 to provide aid to local agencies for water reclamation, the construction of facilities and eligible works for the treatment of water, exportation of waste, and for related planning, research, and development.

A "No" vote (a vote AGAINST THE CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1970) is a vote to refuse to authorize the issuance and sale of state bonds to provide such aid.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel*

This act, the Clean Water Bond Law of 1970, would authorize the issuance and sale of state bonds in the total amount of $250,000,000.

Bond proceeds would be used (1) for state grants made under contract for water reclamation and for the construction of eligible sewage and industrial liquid waste treatment works; (2) for state grants for planning, research, and development necessary or desirable to effectuate the purposes of the act; (3) for loans for facilities for waste collection, treatment, and exportation of waste and for water reclamation facilities; and (4) not to exceed $10,000,000 as additional security for the payment of revenue bonds sold by the state to provide funds to local agencies for needed sewage facilities.

The act provides that the Clean Water Finance Committee, consisting of the Governor or his designated representative, the State Controller, the State Treasurer, the Director of Finance, and the Chairman of the State Water Resources Control Board, shall, upon request of the State Water Resources Con-
(Continued on page 3, column 1)

*Section 3566 of the Elections Code requires the Legislative Counsel to prepare an impartial analysis of each measure appearing on the ballot.

Cost Analysis by the Legislative Analyst*

This $250 million bond issue would allow the state acting through the State Water Resources Control Board to participate fully in the Federal Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 by providing grants to assist in financing state and local waste facility construction contracts let after July 1, 1970. Grants are also available for area-wide planning of facilities. The board may also use up to $10 million of bond proceeds as additional security for payment of principal and interest on any future state revenue bonds which finance local waste treatment construction. Such revenue bonds can be authorized by the Legislature and would not require voter approval. Final unspecified amount of bond proceeds is available for loans to public agencies to construct facilities for the collection, treatment, or export of waste when necessary to prevent water pollution or for facilities to reclaim wastewaters.

The State Water Resources Control Board has reported after a review of facility deficiencies throughout the state that $888 million is needed over the next five years to accelerate construction of wastewater treatment, sewage and wastewater reclamation facilities. If the state grants $22 million from the bond issue to local government, the federal government could legally increase its share of local construction costs from $296 million to $488 million, and local government's share would decrease from $392 million to $188 million.

This would reduce the local share of the construction costs from 70 to 20 percent and finance most treatment and disposal facilities through federal and state grants rather than by user fees or local bonds.

The Treasurer will determine the maximum bond interest rates, but his decision must be approved by the Clean Water Finance Committee composed of the Governor or his design-
(Continued on page 3, column 2)

*Section 3566.3 of the Elections Code requires the Legislative Analyst to prepare an impartial analysis of each measure appearing on the ballot which in his opinion involves additional cost.
Cost Analysis by the Legislative Counsel
(Continued from page 2, column 2)

The state’s existing general obligation bond debt on June 30, 1970, was $4,601 million or $298.21 per capita. On this same basis, $122.40 per capita would be added to the state debt by this proposal.

The payment of principal and interest on bonds issued under this act is appropriated from the General Fund in the State Treasury without regard to fiscal year and without the necessity of further legislative action. Except for the return on the unspecified amount of loans, the General Fund will bear all costs.

Passage of Proposition 1 will for the first time provide the State’s fair share in funding the construction of needed waste treatment and disposal facilities and will make additional funds available to local agencies from the federal government to control pollution.

The money made available by the passage of Proposition 1 will provide the State share of a federal-state-local program to construct new or improved wastewater treatment and disposal facilities to solve California’s water pollution problems over the next five years. This program will also provide funding for wastewater reclamation projects, for developing areawide wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal plans, and for research and development of new technology for the treatment of wastes.

Vote YES on Proposition 1 to enable California to cooperate with our cities, counties, and other local agencies in the construction of vital water pollution control facilities.

Vote YES to prevent water pollution and to assure clean water.

Vote YES to preserve the environment in which you live and upon which you are dependent.

FRANK LANTERMAN, Chairman
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means

CARLEY V. PORTER, Chairman
Assembly Committee on Water

MRS. EDWARD RUBIN, President
League of Women Voters of California

---

Argument in Favor of Proposition 1

YES vote on Proposition 1 is a vote for CLEAN WATER.

The Clean Water Bond Law of 1970 is essential to saving California’s water environment which is in crisis by threatened by pollution.

A YES vote on Proposition 1 will help California achieve the protection, preservation, and enhancement of the quality of our water resources which is the goal of California’s tough new Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

The chief cause of water pollution is the discharge of inadequately treated sewage and other wastes from homes and industries to our rivers and streams. Cities, counties, and other local agencies throughout the State must build new or improved waste treatment and disposal facilities if we are to meet the challenge and effectively control water pollution. While the federal government funds 30% of the cost of constructing waste treatment facilities, local governmental agencies, which have property taxes as their primary source of income, find it nearly impossible to fund their 70% share of the construction cost.

Your YES vote on Proposition 1 will prevent water pollution in California and at the same time provide assistance in relieving the burden the property taxpayer must carry by reducing the local share of construction costs to 20%.

---
VACANCIES IN SPECIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICES. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Provides Supreme Court has exclusive jurisdiction to determine questions of vacancy in offices of Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, Treasurer, and Superintendent of Public Instruction and authority to raise such questions vested in body provided by statute.

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

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to give the State Supreme Court exclusive jurisdiction to determine all questions of vacancy in the office of Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, Treasurer, or Superintendent of Public Instruction, and to provide that the authority to raise questions of vacancy in those offices is vested exclusively in a body to be provided for by statute.

A "No" vote is a vote to reject this measure.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would amend Section 11 of Article V of the State Constitution, which provides for the manner of selection and terms of office of the Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, and Treasurer, and Section 2 of Article IX of the Constitution, which provides for the manner of selection and term of office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. It would provide that the authority to resolve all questions concerning a vacancy in any of those offices is vested exclusively in the State Supreme Court and would provide that the authority to raise any questions concerning such a vacancy is vested in a body to be provided for by statute.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 2

Proposition 2 closes a long-standing gap in the California law regarding the disability of statewide elected officers. The present law fails to provide for replacing these officers if they are temporarily disabled by illness or accident. Proposition 2 solves this problem by providing the constitutional authority necessary for a systematic court procedure through which the disabled officer can be temporarily replaced. In addition, companion statutes, already passed by the Legislature, will enact the required procedures if this measure is approved by the people.

This measure covers six important statewide offices: Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Controller and Superintendent of Public Instruction.

If one of these officers is so disabled by illness or accident that he has failed to perform the duties of his office, Proposition 2 authorizes a special Commission on Constitutional Officers to petition the Supreme Court for a decision to that effect. Should the Supreme Court decide that the person is so disabled, then the Governor would be able to appoint an "acting" officer to temporarily perform the duties of the office. When, and if, the disabled person recovers, he may use the same procedure of petition to the Supreme Court to be reinstated in his office.

In order to protect the disabled officer from abuse of these provisions, the Commission and court are required to act if the officer requests reinstatement. In addition, the Commission and Supreme Court are given exclusive authority over the case in order to prevent elected officers from harassment suits.

This orderly court procedure follows traditional provisions already found in the Constitution. The Commission, for example, is modeled after an existing Commission on the Governorship and has the same members: the Senate President pro Temp, Speaker of the Assembly, President of the University of California, Chancellor of the State Colleges and the Director of Finance. Similarly, the Supreme Court's authority in this measure parallels an existing constitutional provision relating to the Governorship.

Furthermore, the provisions for court review and reinstatement provide a double check on arbitrary action by a governor while, at the same time, allowing temporary replacement of disabled officers in order to guarantee that public responsibilities are fulfilled.

I urge a "YES" vote on Proposition 2 to close an unnecessary and dangerous loophole in our present law.

PAUL PRIOLO,
Assemblyman,
60th Assembly District

STEPHEN TEALE,
State Senator, 3rd District

Argument Against Proposition 2

Proposition 2 could facilitate unwarranted harassment of constitutional officers or
result in unjustified removal from office popularly elected constitutional officers.

The functions of constitutional officers, other than the Governor, are largely ministerial in nature. They seldom require policy decisions. Civil Service and appointive deputies have for this reason in the past been able to keep their offices functioning in the absence of an elected official. Proposition 2 therefore purports to fill a non-existent need.

Because the broad language is subject to implementation by the Legislature, it opens wide the door to irresponsible and undemocratic attempts to dislodge as "inespaci- tated", elected officials who have the strength and integrity to advocate the unpopular or to challenge tradition. Only the people should be allowed to remove from office a candidate whom they have elected.

The failure of the Constitution Revision Commission to endorse Proposition 2, or to offer a similar proposal may be interpreted as validating my belief that this proposal constitutes unnecessary and dangerous tampering with a viable and democratic Constitution which serves the people well. I, therefore, urge a "No" vote on Proposition 2.

DAVID A. ROBERTI
Member of the Assembly,
48th District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE BUDGET. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Commencing in 1972, requires Governor to submit budget to Legislature within first ten days, rather than first thirty days, of each regular session and requires Legislature to pass budget by June 15th of each year.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to require the Governor to submit the state budget to the Legislature within the first 10 days, rather than the first 30 days, of each regular session, commencing with the 1972 Session; and to require the Legislature to pass the Budget Bill by June 15 of each year.

A "No" vote is a vote against such requirements.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The State Constitution now provides that within the first 30 days of each regular session, the Governor shall submit to the Legislature, with an explanatory message, a budget for the ensuing fiscal year containing itemized statements of recommended state expenditures and estimated state revenues. This measure would change the 30-day period to 10 days.

This measure would, in addition, require the Legislature to pass the budget bill by June 15 of each year.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 3

This past year, as in 1969, saw the government of this state teeter on the edge of fiscal chaos, occasioned solely by the failure of the Legislature to enact the budget for the fiscal year by the start of that year.

The state has been fortunate that there was not a fiscal catastrophe on either occasion; there is no guarantee that the events of the past two years will not be repeated again and again, until at some time in the future there is such a catastrophe.

The budgetary process is essentially a race against time, against the deadline of the start of the fiscal year. Although the time limit never changes, the processes of government, the problems to be solved, and programs to solve these problems become more complex and the sums appropriated to fund the multitude of necessary programs increase. Faced with such restrictions, the only alternatives the Legislature has is to give either less attention to individual items of the budget or go past the deadline for enacting the budget, or both. Whether the Legislature is forced to gloss over the budget, thereby necessarily delegating a vast responsibility to state officers and employees not directly responsible to the voters, or run past the deadline for enactment of the budget, the people are the ultimate losers, either in higher taxes, or uneconomical government, or both.

It is a basic economic fact that in times of high taxes, when there are numerous competing demands for each available tax dollar, more time, more effort, and more attention to the fiscal affairs of government is needed, not less.

This measure would give that time to the Legislature, the time to evaluate and control the money spent by state government and at the same time, require the budget to be enacted before the start of the fiscal year.

By requiring the budget to be submitted within the first 10 days of the legislative session instead of the first 30 days, the Legislature would gain almost three weeks time in which to better evaluate the budget.
By requiring the budget to be enacted by June 15 of each year, instead of July 1, the state could stop flirting with the possibility of chaos which could result from the starting of a new fiscal year without a budget.

The Legislative Analyst, the chief fiscal advisor to the Legislature, has stated that there is no practical reason why the budget process cannot be accelerated.

The Legislature can function in the best interests of the people and effectively exercise control over the expenditure of taxes only by having the time to consider carefully and weigh each proposed expenditure to insure that the people receive a full dollar of service for each tax dollar.

Recent history has demonstrated that under existing constitutional requirements, the Legislature does not have the necessary time. As this measure would grant that time, reason, sound fiscal practice and good government indicate that you give this measure a “Yes” vote.

ROBERT W. CROWN, Assemblyman, 14th Assembly District Vice Chairman, Ways and Means Committee

STEPHEN P. TEALE, 3rd Senatorial District Chairman, Joint Legislative Budget Committee

Argument Against Proposition 3

Although earlier adoption of a state budget is desirable, Proposition 3 is not the answer because it would be impossible to administer.

First it would be impossible for an incoming governor to present a budget within the proposed deadline of 10 days after the Legislature convenes. Thus he would have to accept the budget of the outgoing governor. An incoming governor should be given some time to review the budget which had to be prepared by his predecessor before presenting it to the Legislature.

A second major difficulty arises because of the full-time Legislature which meets until August or later and after July 1 passes many supplemental appropriation measures. Because these measures do not become law until about December it would be almost impossible for any governor to include these in a budget which had to be presented to the Legislature by January 10.

At best a governor could submit an incomplete budget and meaningful budget hearings by the Legislature could not begin until more information could be obtained. On both estimated revenues and estimated expenditures, figures could only be tentative and unreliable by January 10. Often these figures do not solidify until after June 15, the date Proposition 3 sets as the deadline for adopting a new budget.

Proposition 3 does not go far enough if its goals of early adoption of a state budget are to be achieved. To be successful there must also be a cut-off date for supplemental appropriation measures to become law. There should be a procedure for submitting the traditional budget in segments so the Legislature can receive reliable information as rapidly as possible. Without reliable information on revenues and actual expenditures, the budget review responsibilities of the Legislature will be weakened and have less meaning.

Vote NO on Proposition 3. If the legislators still believe changes as proposed in Proposition 3 are necessary, they can resubmit them to the voters with more safeguards to see that the budget process is strengthened.

CHARLES J. CONRAD
Speaker pro Tempore of the Assembly

APPROPRIATION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Authorizes Legislature to make appropriation for public schools prior to passage of budget bill if delayed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 5, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A “Yes” vote on this measure is a vote to authorize the Legislature, if the Budget Bill is not enacted within 130 days after introduction, to pass by a two-thirds vote and without prior recommendation by the Governor, a Senate bill or an Assembly bill, or both, appropriating money to the State School Fund and providing for its disbursement.

A “No” vote on this measure is a vote to continue to prohibit any such bill from being passed prior to enactment of the Budget Bill, unless recommended as an emergency bill by the Governor.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The Constitution now provides that if the Budget Bill introduced at a regular session has been enacted, neither house of the
lature may pass any other appropriation bill except emergency bills recommended by the Governor or appropriations for salaries and expenses of the Legislature.

This measure would authorize the chairman of the committee of each house charged with the responsibility of considering the subject of education to introduce within the first 30 days of each regular session a bill containing the recommendations of the committee, to appropriate money to the State School Fund and providing for the disbursement of such appropriation. If the Budget Bill is not passed within 130 days after its introduction, the Legislature could pass by a two-thirds vote in each house, either or both of such bills without the prior approval of the Governor.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 4

Vote ‘‘YES’’ on Proposition 4 to provide for the timely enactment of the annual state school finance measure. Spare your local school officials the agony and inefficiency of setting budgets in June and then learning in August or September how much the State has appropriated.

Currently, state school aid bills must await the passage of the general Budget Bill and compete with hundreds of other measures for attention. Consequently, the school assistance bill is not enacted until long after the fiscal year begins, making it impossible for school districts to plan with assurance.

Proposition 4 presents a solution. It provides for the early introduction of a school finance measure by the Chairmen of the Senate and Assembly Education Committees at each session of the Legislature. The bills may be passed ahead of the Budget Bill in late June by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and the Assembly.

In practice, Proposition 4 would put the school finance bill into the two-house conference process simultaneously with the Budget Bill. This would permit the principal school finance bill to receive approval along with the Budget Bill before July 1.

This measure provides adequate safeguards to protect the ‘‘Executive Budget’’ system we have in California in that the approval for early passage would apply only to the two bills and would require a two-thirds vote, near-final revenue and expenditure data would be available, and the Governor would maintain veto power on the measures.

Help the school districts plan ahead. Give us the authority to enact a school bill in time for districts to plan for its use.

We urge a ‘‘YES’’ vote.

VICTOR V. VERRY, Chairman
Assembly Education Committee
Assemblyman, 75th District

MARCH K. FONG, Member
Assembly Education Committee
Assemblywoman, 15th District

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 4

Contrary to the innuendos by the proponents of this Proposition, the budget bill, which the Constitution requires to be approved before June 30 of each year, contains the appropriation for school finance. The school assistance bill contains only additional money to supplement that amount already authorized by the budget.

Local school officials could easily spare the agony of finding efficient means to plan uses for the additional money appropriated by the school assistance bill without this Proposition. The Legislature may now, without constitutional change, approve the school assistance bill as late as September and make it effective the following June, giving school officials 10 months lead time for planning.

Proposition 4 could open the door to deficit financing. The proponents have shown no valid need for this change. It will do nothing to provide a better education for our children. Vote ‘‘NO’’ on Proposition 4.

ROBERT H. BURKE, Member
Assembly Education Committee
Assemblyman, 70th District

Argument Against Proposition 4

Proposition 4 is simply the attempt of certain interests to circumvent the budget process for their own self-benefit. It will do nothing to provide a better education for our children. Vote ‘‘NO’’ on Proposition 4.

Proposition 4 will prevent equal consideration of all budgetary needs of the State. It could result in future irresponsible fiscal planning and budget deficits. It would give two select members of the Legislature power to override the budgetary control now constitutionally held by the Governor.

The desire for this constitutional change has been caused by the excessive eagerness of
education interests for more and more additional money at an earlier and earlier date. These interests have demanded that increased funds for education be made available immediately as they become known. The Legislature has complied with this demand in the past. But now these same interests are complaining they must know earlier how much additional money will be available for their use.

Proposition 4 will allow the Legislature to appropriate additional money for schools prior to the enactment of the budget and without regard for the Governor's budget, without regard for other State needs, and without regard for the source of the funds. The premature fiscal decision authorized by this Proposition could result in complete loss of the State's fiscal integrity. It will do nothing to provide a better education for our children. Vote "NO" on Proposition 4.

ROBERT H. BURKE, Member of the Assembly, 70th District

Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 4

The statements that Proposition 4 "will prevent equal consideration of all budgetary needs ... could result in future irresponsible fiscal planning and ... would give two select members of the Legislature power to override the budgetary control now constitutionally held by the Governor" are not true.

Proposition 4 simply permits a school finance measure to be considered at the same time and on the same basis as other budget needs are considered. Current constitutional provisions actually prevent school finance legislation from being considered on an equal basis with other budgetary needs because school finance is normally considered after all other proposed state expenditures are agreed upon.

Proposition 4 would allow a school finance measure to precede under certain circumstances the state budget by a maximum of 30 days and cannot logically be construed as leading to "future irresponsible fiscal planning."

The proposition would in no way alter the traditional relationship between the Executive and Legislative branches. The allusion of the opponents to two select members of the Legislature having power to override the Governor's budgetary control is misleading.

Proposition 4 simply authorizes the Chairman of the Education Committee in each house to author a bill which may be passed to the Governor prior to the enactment of the budget only in the event that a budget bill has not been enacted 130 days after its introduction and only with the concurrence of two-thirds of the membership of each house. The Governor still may exercise his veto power.

ASSEMBLYMAN VICTOR V. VEE: Chairman, Assembly Education Committee

MARCH K. FONG, Assemblywoman, 15th District

REGENTS UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: PUBLIC MEETINGS. YES NO

Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Requires meetings of the Regents to be public, with exceptions and notice requirements as Legislature may provide.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 6, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to require in the Constitution that all meetings of the Regents of the University of California be public, subject to such exceptions and notice requirements as may be provided by statute.

A "No" vote on this measure is a vote against including in the Constitution a requirement that meetings of the Regents of the University of California be public.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Section 9 of Article IX of the Constitution now vests the administration of the University of California in the Regents of the University of California subject only to such legislative control as may be necessary to ensure compliance with the terms of the endowments of the university and the security of its funds. This measure amends the Constitution to require that all meetings of the Regents be open to the public, subject to such exceptions and notice requirements as are provided by the Legislature by statute.

Statutes Contingent Upon Adoption of Above Measure

The text of Chapter 1224 of the Statutes of 1969, which was enacted to become operative if and when the above revision is approved, is on record in the office of the Secretary of State in Sacramento and is contained in the 1969 published statutes. A digest that chapter is as follows:

Requires meetings of Regents of University of California to be open to the public. Authorizes the holding of special meetings so
as public is notified in specified manner of the time and place of meetings.

Except meetings to consider matters relating to national security, the conferring of honorary degrees or other honors, matters involving gifts, devises and bequests, matters involving purchase and sale of investments for endowment and pension funds, matters involving expenditures where open discussion could adversely affect public interest, matters involving acquisition and disposition of property, matters relating to complaints or charges against employees of university unless employee requests public hearing, and matters relating to appointment, employment, performance, compensation, or dismissal of officers and employees.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 5

Proposition 5 requires that the Board of Regents of the University of California hold open meetings, unless the subject to be discussed at the meetings has been specifically exempted by statute, as outlined below.

There are two reasons for this proposal. First, all other public, tax-supported agencies in the State are required to hold open meetings, either through the Brown Act, which applies to local agencies, or the State Open Meetings (Bagley) Act, which includes the College Board of Trustees and all other State agencies. Proposition 5 conforms the law governing the activities of the Board of Regents to that governing all other State and local governmental bodies.

The second, and most important argument for this Constitutional Amendment is that the University of California is supported by the people of California. We, the people, have a right to know how the decisions affecting our tax money, and our sons and daughters, are made; who is making them and why. By requiring open meetings we help guarantee that all decisions will be made in an open, logical, and democratic manner with all facts present and all viewpoints noted. We also eliminate the chance for “backroom politics” to play a role in the decisions.

As is true of all other agencies now required to hold their meetings open to the public, the Board of Regents would have the continuing right to establish reasonable regulations governing the time, place, scope, and conduct of its meetings, including the size of the meeting hall. Open meetings are not invitations for riot, and can still be controlled.

Education is one of the most important services provided by the State and for its citizens. Certainly, any actions taken by our educational institutions, and any decisions by them, should have the protection of the establishment of openess. The exception to this rule, as provided by existing statute, only occurs when there is definite proof that an open meeting is not in the public interest, as in cases related to the national security, cases affecting personnel problems, or cases that could adversely affect the legal position of the University. In all other situations, open meetings are essential and Proposition 5 which accomplishes this, should be passed.

WILLIAM T. BAGLEY, Chairman
Committee on Statewide Information
Policy, California Legislature

WILLIAM T. BAGLEY, Chairman
Committee on Statewide Information
Policy, California Legislature

Argument Against in Favor
of Proposition 5

I urge a “NO” vote on Proposition 5. Perhaps no challenge facing the state today is as complicated as the governance of the University of California. The efforts of militant revolutionaries and irresponsible elements on the campus have caused widespread unrest, destruction of property, and even death.

There has been no evidence presented to show that Proposition 5 will cure any abuse now being perpetrated by the Regents to the injury of the people. There is significant evidence that the passage of Proposition 5 will further complicate and hamper the Regents in their responsibility.

One of the favorite tactics of the militants has been the intentional disruption of regental meetings. There are occasions when especially sensitive matters are being discussed that the Regents need to be free of highly charged and emotional harassment. Decisions which are affected by the disruptive presence of partisans in the audience are not consistent with the California electorate’s desire to separate as completely as possible the Regents of the University from political pressure.

With no purpose to be served and no demonstrated need for the amendment, I suggest we stop cluttering our Constitution with extraneous trivia. I urge a “NO” vote on Proposition 5.

JOHN L. HARMER,
State Senator

Argument Against Proposition 5

I cannot support this proposed Constitutional Amendment in principle nor practical grounds. The accompanying legislation which would become effective with the passage of this Amendment does not significantly change present Regents policy as to what can be discussed in Executive Session. Therefore, persons expecting more public information will be disappointed, and this action will be a futile one.

I am convinced, moreover, that the Regents’ power to meet behind closed doors at certain critical times is in the best interest of the state. This is an era of rapid, elec-
In response, I must again point out that Proposition 5 does not grant license to the Regents to conduct their business. Current law, and the statute dependent upon this amendment, not only authorizes the Regents to prevent disorderly meetings but also guarantees that any subject matter relating to national security, personnel, or University litigation may be exempted from the open meeting requirements.

Moreover, the Board of Regents is a branch of the state government. As with all other state agencies, there is no good reason why the decisions made by the Board should not be debated and voted upon in the public view. In fact, there is every reason to guarantee that the public trust assigned to the Regents will be administered openly, not privately or secretly. If the people are to understand and support their University, if they are to have faith not only in the University but in all operations of government, they must have legal guarantees that no action will be taken "behind their back." Proposition 5 will help provide that guarantee, will protect the public interest and will provide the University with an added measure of public confidence.

WILLIAM T. BAGLEY, Chairman
Committee on Statewide Information Policy, California Legislature

ROBERT MORETTI, Chairman
Assembly Committee on Governmental Organization, California Legislature

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHERS' RETIREMENT FUND: INVESTMENTS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Deletes exclusion of Teachers' Retirement Fund from provision authorizing investment of portion of public retirement funds in specific securities.</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 6, Part II)

**General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to authorize the Legislature to permit the investment of a portion of the Teachers' Retirement Fund in specific types of common and preferred stock and shares in certain diversified management investment companies.

A "No" vote is a vote against authorizing the Legislature to permit the investment of a portion of the Teachers' Retirement Fund in specific types of common and preferred stock and shares in certain diversified management investment companies.

For further details, see below.

**Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

The Constitution now generally prohibits the state or any of its political subdivisions from subscribing for stock or becoming a stockholder in any corporation whatever. However, it permits the Legislature to authorize the investment of portions of any public pension or retirement fund, other than the Teachers' Retirement Fund, in specific types of common and preferred stock and shares in certain diversified management investment companies.

This measure would DELETE the specific exclusion of the Teachers' Retirement Fund, thereby permitting the Legislature to authorize the investment of portions of this fund in the specified types of stock and shares in those diversified management investment companies.

**Argument in Favor of Proposition 6**

The California State Teachers' Retirement System is the only public retirement system in California which is not authorized under
to make common stock investments. As a matter of fact, public pension or retirement funds are presently permitted to make these selective stock investments.

This proposal was placed on the ballot with the unanimous approval of the California Legislature and is strongly supported by a wide range of groups and individuals. These endorsements include the California Teachers’ Association, California Retired Teachers’ Association, labor unions, chambers of commerce, newspapers, taxpayers associations, financial and political leaders and many others.

The amendment will permit selective investment of teachers’ retirement funds in common stocks on a restricted basis. These funds come from three sources—contributions from teachers, contributions from school districts and income from investments. Increased investment earnings obviously will benefit both taxpayers and teachers.

The country’s leading financial authorities such as First National City Bank of New York, Chase Manhattan Bank, and Moody’s Investors Service have strongly recommended investing in corporate stocks to reduce retirement system costs. Moody’s said, "... a systematic program of periodic purchases of diversified, professionally selected stocks is the soundest way to achieve the lowest cost and greatest retirement benefits."

Common stocks have been used for years by hundreds of organizations seeking to increase investment earnings. They include:

1. Retirement systems of more than 30 states, the Federal Reserve System, most private companies and many labor unions.
2. Sixty-seven colleges and universities which have invested 60 percent of their endowments, totaling $6 billion, in common stocks. The conservative "Big Four", Columbia, Harvard, Princeton and Yale, have invested more than $1 billion in common stocks with great success.

The State Teachers’ Retirement System, which manages the retirement funds of more than 300,000 members employed in the public schools of the state, has an investment portfolio at the present time of over $1 1/2 billion. With an increase of only one percent in investment earnings on the current investment portfolio, State Teachers’ Retirement System income would grow by an additional $15 million a year, again benefiting both teachers and the public.

This amendment strictly safeguards public retirement funds. Major restrictions include limitation of common stock investments to 25% of the fund’s investment portfolio, with no more than 5% of the stock of any company and no more than 2% of the fund’s assets in a single common stock. Purchases would be limited to domestic corporations listed on a national exchange that have a capitalization of $100 million with a history of dividend payments in eight of the past ten years, including the last three years. Banks and insurance companies with capital funds of $50 million or more would qualify.

This proposal warrants a "Yes" vote. It can be of significant benefit to every Californian.

ASSEMBLYMAN E. RICHARD BARNES, Chairman, Joint Legislative Retirement Committee, California State Legislature

ASSEMBLYMAN JACK R. FENTON, 51st District, California Legislature

STATE COLLEGES: SPEAKER MEMBER OF GOVERNING BODY. Yes

Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Provides Speaker of the Assembly shall be an ex officio member of any agency charged with administration of State College System.

YES

NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 7, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to make the Speaker of the Assembly an ex officio member of any state agency created by the Legislature which is charged with the management, administration, and control of the state college system of California.

A "No" vote is a vote to reject this proposal.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Under existing statutory and constitutional provisions, while the Speaker of the Assembly meets and participates with the trustees in their work to the extent that such participation is not incompatible with his position as a Member of the Legislature, he cannot vote or otherwise participate in the formal proceedings of the trustees.

This measure amends the California Constitution to permit the Speaker of the Assembly to be an ex officio member of the Trustees of the California State Colleges, or any successor to this state agency, with equal rights and duties with the other nonlegislative members of the board, including the right to vote and otherwise participate in the formal proceedings of the trustees.
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Argument in Favor of Proposition 7

The Speaker of the California Assembly currently has the status on the State College Board of Trustees of a "legislative interim committee on the subject of the California State Colleges." In plain terms, this means the Speaker is expected to attend Trustees meetings and take an active role in the affairs of the state colleges yet without being given the power to vote in its proceedings, make or second motions, or take any formal action whatever.

The Speaker is currently an ex-officio member of the University of California Regents and has similar responsibilities toward the University of California as he does toward the California State Colleges but on the Board of Regents he is given the necessary voting privileges to carry out his responsibilities.

The Speaker, who is the ranking member of the State Assembly, holds the same position in his Legislative House as the Lieutenant Governor who is the President and ranking member of the State Senate. Therefore, while the Lieutenant Governor has principal duties in his official capacity as a constitutional officer, he and the Speaker, in effect, represent the California Legislature on the Board of Regents and the Board of Trustees. However, the Lieutenant Governor has voting powers on both Boards while the Speaker has voting power only on the Board of Regents.

The Speaker's present inequitable status therefore is an archaic provision of the State Constitution and that provision should be revised to grant to the Speaker ex-officio membership and the power to vote on the State College Board of Trustees.

I therefore urge a "Yes" vote on Proposition 7.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL, Assemblyman, 50th District

ALBERT S. RODDA, Senator, 5th District

Argument Against Proposition 7

I urge a "No" vote on this Constitutional Amendment which would place the Speaker of the Assembly on the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges.

Instead of adding another politician to the governing board of our state colleges, we should be removing politicians from the Board of Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges. Too often elected officials have exploited the University and State Colleges for their own political purposes.

The presence of political figures on these governing boards tends to focus the attention of the press upon the University and State Colleges as an area of public controversy. It also tends to polarize public opinion and to prevent the constructive resolution of the serious problems facing higher education in California.

I agree with the Constitution Revision Commission study published in January 1969 which stated as follows:

"The most important objection to the membership of elected State officials on the Board of Regents is the danger of political interference. Although Section 9 specifically forbids political interference in the affairs of the University, Regents' meetings offer a forum for political activity that is easily abused by candidates seeking public favor. Since the official members will sometimes represent opposing political parties, Regents' meetings can become the scene of diverse political clashes. Lay Regents may feel compelled to take sides, and University issues may be resolved in terms of political power rather than the best interests of the University."

The Board of Regents of the University now includes the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Except for the Speaker, these politicians also sit on the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges.

Our efforts ought to be to remove these politicians from the governing boards and to take the University and State Colleges out of the arena of partisan politics. This Constitutional Amendment, by adding another elected official to the board, goes in the wrong direction. For this reason, I urge a "No" vote.

ALAN SHEROTY, Member of the Assembly, Fifty-Ninth District
General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to provide for the appointment of two Deputy Superintendents of Public Instruction, rather than one, exempt from state civil service provisions.

A "No" vote is a vote against permitting this additional appointment exempt from civil service.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The Constitution now requires the State Board of Education, on nomination of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to appoint one Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction and three Associate Superintendents of Public Instruction, who are exempt from state civil service and whose terms of office are four years.

Under this measure, the State Board of Education, on nomination of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, would be permitted, rather than required, to appoint up to two Deputy Superintendents of Public Instruction and three Associate Superintendents of Public Instruction, who are exempt from state civil service provisions. Their terms of office would run concurrently with the term of the Superintendent of Public Instruction who nominated them, but could not exceed four years.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 8

We support Proposition 8 because it is a necessary step in aligning California's educational structure to the increasing growth and needs of the state. This proposition would permit the State Board of Education, on nomination of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to appoint one additional Deputy Superintendent for program supervision within the Department and one new Associate Superintendent to be assigned to administration. Both appointments would be exempt from civil service.

The last additions on this administrative level in the Department of Education were in 1947, and since that time, state school appointments have increased from $173 million to $1.2 billion; elementary and secondary pupils have increased from 1.4 million average daily attendance to 7.8 million; full time teaching personnel have increased from 69,000 to 180,000. It is obvious that these additional appointments are needed to further the reorganization of the department as already approved by the legislature and the State Board of Education.

A further reason for supporting this proposition is that it will make the terms of all appointees concurrent with the term of Superintendent of Public Instruction. Thus, each Superintendent of Public Instruction will have the essential flexibility of working with personnel he has selected and recommended who would be clearly sympathetic to his goals. This would eliminate the terms of appointees extending into the administration of a new Superintendent of Public Instruction, as present law permits.

Based on the above, we strongly recommend a yes vote approving this proposition.

LEO RYAN,
Assemblyman, 27th District

JOHN STULL,
Assemblyman, 80th District

Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 8

We oppose ACA 79 because it would by power of appointment tend to provide educational leadership on a political basis rather than a professional basis. This measure would allow the State Board of Education, on nomination of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to appoint one additional Deputy Superintendent and one new Associate Superintendent. Both appointments would be exempt from civil service.

In that the Board of Education is an appointed Board, it should not be empowered to make appointments. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is an elective office responsible for the State Department of Education all of whom are civil service personnel. The only control the State Superintendent has is over his deputy and associate superintendents since all others are on civil service status.

It is an untenable role to cast in expanding the number of personnel in leadership responsibilities charged with the responsibility of carrying out Board Policies, Rules and Regulations without the power of controlling subordinate personnel.

In general this proposition amplifies a bad situation and does not get at the source of the problem. If any reorganization is in order, it should deal with the existing conflicts of
elective and appointive positions, not with adding more appointive personnel.
Based on the above, we urge a no vote on this proposition.

L. E. TOWNSEND, Assemblyman, 67th District

Argument Against Proposition 8

I oppose this proposition number 8, because it does not offer or maintain a continuity of excellence in our state educational system, nor does it reduce state expenditures by adding new high level positions to the state payroll and it lacks control over the qualifications of appointed officials.

In summary the provisions of this amendment would allow:
A. State Board of Education to authorize rather than required to make appointees.
B. Two deputy superintendents of Public Instruction may be appointed rather than one.
C. Appointees terms to run concurrently with the superintendent who nominates him to a maximum of four years rather than a simple four year term.
My arguments against the bill are as follows:

ARGUMENT 1: The provisions that the State Board of Education authorized rather than required to make appointments would not strengthen the present provisions of the Constitution but would rather weaken same by not requiring the appointments of deputies.

ARGUMENT 2: Increasing the number of Deputy Superintendents to two, and making said appointees exempt from civil service is not desirable, and any substantive change in staffing should be identified as a part of a master plan, which will clearly and decidedly produce an improved department.

ARGUMENT 3: There is no advantage in having appointees' terms running concurrent with the superintendent rather than a simple four-year term. This seems to be treating a symptom of a problem and not the problem itself. Numerous studies on the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and State Department of Education point out the head-on conflict of having appointed State Board of Education and an elective State Superintendent wherein the latter is directly responsible to the electorate rather than to the board which he serves. This amendment if approved will compound the problems by increasing the number of duties, each of which would be exempt from service, and at the same time directly responsible to the State Superintendent.

Resolution Chapter 361 also contains a provision incorporating the revision to Article XXIV proposed by Resolution Chapter 340 (A.C.A. 28) in the event that Resolution Chapter 340 is likewise approved by the voters. The provision has the single substantive effect upon current law of permitting the appointment of four, rather than three, Associate Superintendents of Public Instruction.

L. E. TOWNSEND, Assemblyman, 67th District

Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 8

The arguments against ACA 79 (1969) fail to recognize the leadership crisis in the Department of Education. While quality education must be our objective, this cannot be achieved through the present Department.

The elements of this proposal are part of a comprehensive plan developed over three years of study by management consulting specialists, the Governor’s Task Force on Efficiency, the State Board of Education, and both houses of the Legislature.

Opponents point out the conflict between the State Board of Education and a state elected Superintendent of Public Instruction, and state the amendment will compound these problems. The opposite is true.

This proposal will improve the existing structure, since the State Board of Education will not simply validate the nominations of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, but will have power of review over his appointments in the Department.

Emphatically, we do not propose to compound the bureaucracy of the State Department of Education. On the contrary, the implementation of this plan will mean that the department, for the first time in history will be administered by top appointees with authority to act.

ACA 79 will force the State Department of Education to account for its actions. Year after year, the Legislature has written increasingly more rigid language to try to force such accountability, with little success— as evidenced by the enormous cost increases in the Department of Education.

LEO RYAN, Assemblyman, 27th District
General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to permit a non-charter county to provide by an ordinance, adopted by the board of supervisors and approved by the voters, for appointment by the county board of education of a county superintendent of schools; and to permit the Legislature to authorize two or more counties to unite for the purpose of providing by ordinance for the appointment of one county superintendent of schools to serve the counties so uniting.

A "No" vote is a vote to retain the present requirement that the superintendent of schools of a non-charter county be elected.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Section 3 of Article IX of the State Constitution now provides that the superintendent of schools of a non-charter county must be elected to that office by the voters of the county at each gubernatorial election. The Legislature may authorize two or more non-charter counties to unite and elect one superintendent of schools to serve the counties uniting.

This measure would permit the board of supervisors of a non-charter county to adopt an ordinance providing for appointment by the county board of education of the county superintendent of schools. The ordinance would take effect only if approved by the voters of the county, and once approved could not be repealed except with the approval of the voters. The measure provides that the first such appointment would be made upon the expiration of the term of the county superintendent of schools in office upon the effective date of the ordinance authorizing such appointment, or upon the occurrence of an earlier vacancy in the office after the effective date of such ordinance.

The measure would also permit the Legislature to authorize two or more non-charter counties to unite for the purpose of providing by identical ordinances adopted by the boards of supervisors of the uniting counties for the appointment by the combined action of the boards of education of the uniting counties of a superintendent of schools to serve all of the counties. The ordinances would take effect only if approved by the voters of the uniting counties, and once adopted could not be repealed except with the approval of the voters.

Proposition 9 is needed to give the 47 non-charter counties the right to determine whether their county superintendent of schools shall be elected or appointed. The 11 charter counties already have this local control. This proposition will give all of the counties the same right and bring county government another step closer to the people.

Under existing law, a non-charter county is forced to have an elected superintendent, even though the voters in the county may prefer to have the superintendent appointed by the elected county board of education.

The principal reasons all counties should have the right to have an appointed superintendent of schools if they so desire are:

1. The county superintendent of schools should be the best qualified person for the job rather than a politician. Competent professional educators and school administrators can rarely be induced to run for elected public office, not wishing to be exposed to the expense and hardship of political campaigning for election. On the other hand, an elected board of education with authority to appoint the county superintendent of schools can seek out and employ the most qualified applicant available.

2. An appointed superintendent eliminates disruptive conflicts and inefficiency. Under existing law, the county superintendent of schools being elected is not under the jurisdiction and responsive to the direction of the elected school board which represents the voters in the county. Therefore, when major education policy differences between them occur, the resultant controversies and unsolved problems are destructive of the educational programs and the students suffer. With the passage of this proposition, such situations can be avoided in the future.

If this proposition is enacted, the superintendent in the non-charter counties would continue to be elected unless the voters ap-
prove an ordinance adopted by the county board of supervisors authorizing the appointment of the superintendent by the elected board of education. The proposed new procedure, which is already enjoyed by the charter counties, would let the people in non-charter counties decide how they want their local school system to operate. It has been very successful in the charter counties, and we should extend this option to the non-charter counties. The voters in each county would be able to choose the system that works best for them. Local school policy should be left to the local people.

This proposition is in accordance with the principles of home rule and local autonomy enabling the electorate in a non-charter county to decide the way in which their county superintendent of schools will be selected, just as it is now done in charter counties. The voters in each county should be permitted to choose the system that works best for them.

Proposition 9 has been endorsed by education groups throughout California, including various school administrators’ associations, the California League of Women Voters, the California School Boards Association, and many other organizations and individuals concerned about the quality of education in California.

Vote YES on Proposition 9.

BOB WOOD, Assemblyman, Monterey County
MARCH K. FONG, Assemblywoman, 15th District
DONALD L. GRUNSKY, State Senator, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo and San Benito Counties

Argument Against Proposition 9

Proposition 9 provides that in the 47 non-charter counties the county superintendent of schools may be appointed by the board of education to a four-year term if the supervisors and the voters authorize it. At the present time the county superintendent is elected.

The impetus for Proposition 9 was the performance in office of a particular county superintendent and his refusal to resign his office when asked to do so.

That there is no need to amend the Constitution to solve such a problem is crystal clear: the county superintendent involved was overwhelmingly voted out of office at the primary election in June of this year. In

ation, should a county superintendent be guilty of malfeasance in office, serious crime, or other act indicating he should no longer be in office, he can be recalled.

Far too many decisions affecting public education are made by faceless nobodies responsible only to boards, commissions, agencies and the like. California has been well served by county superintendents who are independent of bureaucratic pressures and who must account for their stewardship every four years to the citizens who pay the bills—you and 1: the voters.

Let us not respond emotionally to a rare, isolated incident; let us retain the right of the voter to have his say in public education.

FRANK MURPHY, JR., Assemblyman, 31st District

Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 9

It has been stated that Proposition 9 is a result of an isolated incident; this is simply not true. The conflict which results from these two elected bodies has caused serious problems with destructive effects on numerous occasions during the last few years. Even the Constitution Revision Commission has recognized the need for state-wide action and has recommended an immediate change.

The taxpayers will be better served by appointed superintendent, as he is more responsive to the community will. If he disregards the voters, the citizens may call on their elected board of education. It has the power to dismiss the superintendent at once instead of waiting four years for an election. This is too long to wait in education. The board may then select a new superintendent, insuring that he will maintain high educational standards and be held accountable to see that the county office is run efficiently—using the taxpayers’ dollars wisely. Proposition 9 does not force counties to make this change, it only allows them this option.

Modern education and administrative procedures call for a new system in place of the archaic method that non-charter counties are forced to use. The over 1,000 school districts in California have already adopted the elected board, appointed superintendent system.

Proposition 9 is needed to insure local control of the most efficient educational system possible and to give non-charter counties the same rights and local control already enjoyed by the charter counties.

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 9

MARCH K. FONG, Assemblywoman, 15th District
**General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to exempt from the 10 percent yearly limit on interest or other forms of compensation for the loan of money, any loan of $100,000 or more to a corporation or partnership which is now subject to such limitation, but to authorize the Legislature to limit these charges on such loans.

A "No" vote is a vote to retain the present 10 percent per year limit on interest and other forms of compensation for the loan of money, now applicable to a loan of $100,000 or more to a corporation or partnership.

For further details, see below.

**Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

Section 22 of Article XX of the State Constitution which was adopted on November 6, 1934, now limits to 10 percent per year the imum rate of the interest, fees, bonuses, commissions, discounts or other compensation that may be charged on a loan of money which is made under a written contract by a lender who is not one of a class that is expressly exempted from the limitation in the section. Exempted from the limitation in the section are loans made by building and loan associations (now known as savings and loan associations), industrial loan companies, credit unions, banks, pawnbrokers, personal property brokers, and certain agricultural nonprofit cooperatives, although the Legislature is authorized to provide, by statute, maximum rates of interest and other compensation charges on loans made by these exempt organizations.

This measure would renumber Section 22 as Section 24 and amend its provisions to exempt from the 10 percent maximum, any loan in the amount of $100,000 or more presently subject to such limitation that is made either to a corporation or a partnership, unless the Legislature, by statute, limits these charges on such class of loans.

**Argument in Favor of Proposition 10**

Permitting corporations and partnerships to negotiate for loans in the national money market at prevailing rates, this amendment repeals loans over $100,000 to corporations and partnerships from existing interest-rate limitations. It concerns private transactions only, does not authorize government credit and will not raise taxes a penny. In fact, it will relieve pressure upon property taxes by generating new sources of tax revenue.

Urgency of bringing new capital into California to prevent a serious slowdown or complete collapse of the construction industry led both houses of the State Legislature to pass this constitutional amendment unanimously. It now requires a vote of the people to become effective.

The constitutional limitation on interest rates was adopted in 1934 to protect the needy individual from unscrupulous lenders. Preserving this protection, the amendment makes no change in the constitutional restrictions on interest rates to individuals nor in any of the so-called "small-loan statutes."

This amendment protects Californians by authorizing the Legislature to establish justifiable rate restrictions at any time as indicated by future money-market conditions.

In 45 of the 50 states corporations are permitted to borrow at higher rates than allowed in California. Thirty of the states impose no restrictions at all. If California is to be competitive in attracting investment money for real estate development, passage of this measure is imperative.

Major construction (apartment houses, office buildings, stores, supermarkets, etc.) is financed largely by mortgage loans from institutional investors such as life insurance companies, pension funds, investment trusts, and savings and loans.

Banks usually will not supply short-term construction financing unless the long-term financing is assured from these sources. Today these investors can lend more advantageously in nearly every other state than they can in California. As a result the springs which have nourished California’s dynamic development are drying up—and fast.

Inflation, tight money conditions and high interest rates caused most Eastern money lenders to cease altogether making mortgage loans in California. Without mortgage money construction stops, employment drops, and the economy falters. Inflow of mortgage money encourages construction, spurs employment and underwrites general prosperity and well-being.

Unfortunately, California alone cannot regulate money prices. They are determined by national and international monetary forces.
In the commercial and construction fields limiting by law the rate of interest below the going rate does not result in the borrower paying a lower rate. It results in his not being able to borrow at all, forcing him out of business or into unsound financing procedures.

Mortgage money is the life blood of the construction industry and a foundation of the State's economy. Passage of this amendment is absolutely necessary if construction is to revive. Collapse of the construction industry would not only result in unemployment in the building trades, but create reverberations throughout California.

Follow the unanimous advice of both houses of a concerned Legislature—vote YES to keep California competitive with the great majority of other states.

PAUL PRIOLO, Assemblyman
Chairman, Elections and Constitutional Amendments Committee
JOSEPH KENNICK
State Senator
ART LINKLETTER
Entertainer, and State Chairman for YES on Proposition 10

Argument Against Proposition 10

This measure attempts to change the section in our Constitution which has protected the public against usury since 1934. The same conditions which caused those safeguards to be enacted in 1934 exist today: the economy is placing heavy burdens on borrowers and heavy interest rates are being disguised as charges. Since consumers are still suffering from the same economic stress, this constitutional protection should not be tampered with today. Furthermore, the Legislature has not seen any need to change this section for over thirty-five years. Why should the section now be changed when inflation and high interest rates are hurting everyone?

The present section provides little enough protection for consumers; it places ceilings on interest rates that lenders may charge then exempts all of the banks and savings and loan companies who do business with the consumer. Now this measure proposes to give another exemption—-to corporations which make or borrow loans over $100,000. But it is the consumer who suffers the most from today's high interest rates, not corporations. This measure does not go far enough in re-forming the usury law.

It is time for the voters to demonstrate that our concern should be directed toward strengthening the usury laws to protect the consumer, rather than catering to the needs of big corporations. Vote NO on Proposition 10.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL
Assemblyman, 50th District

Rebuttal to Argument Against
Proposition 10

Contrary to the statements made by the opponent:
(1) Proposition 10 preserves the present constitutional safeguards protecting consumers and home buyers.
(2) Proposition 10 will stimulate economic growth and create new employment.
(3) Proposition 10 relates only to loans made to corporations and partnerships in amounts of $100,000 or more.
(4) Proposition 10 will benefit the consumer by enabling home builders and other business firms to obtain funds with which to produce better and cheaper housing and other products which the consumer wants and needs.

Vote YES on Proposition 10.

PAUL PRIOLO, Assemblyman
60th District

ART LINKLETTER,
Entertainer, and State Chairman for YES on Proposition 10

CHIROPRACTORS: RULES. Amendment of Chiropractic Initiative Act, submitted by Legislature. Authorizes Board of Chiropractic Examiners to adopt specified rules and regulations governing chiropractics and specifies procedure by which rules are to be adopted, amended, repealed, or established.

YES
NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 10, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to amend the Chiropractic Act to authorize the adoption by the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners of specified rules and regulations relating to the practice of chiropractic, and to authorize that board to place persons licensed to engage in such practice on probation or to reprimand them for violations of the act or the board's rules and regulations. A "No" vote is a vote to reject the measure.

For further details, see below.
Filed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The Chiropractic Act, an initiative statutory measure approved by the voters in 1922, provides for the licensing and regulation of the practice of chiropractic. It now authorizes the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners, the agency that administers the act, to adopt from time to time such rules and regulations as the board may deem proper and necessary for the performance of its work.

Also, it now requires the board to refuse to grant, and permits it to suspend or revoke, a license to practice chiropractic in this state upon any of numerous specified causes.

This measure would amend the act to authorize the board also to adopt from time to time such rules and regulations as it may deem proper for the effective enforcement and administration of the act, the establishment of educational requirements for the renewal of licenses, and the protection of the public. In addition, it would permit the board to adopt rules or regulations of professional conduct appropriate to establishing and maintaining a high standard of professional service and for protecting the public. It would also expressly permit the board to amend or repeal its rules and regulations in accordance with uniform statutory rulemaking provisions applicable to state agencies that are contained in the Administrative Procedure Act.

In addition, this measure would also permit the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners to place any licensed person subject to its jurisdiction upon probation or to remand him for a violation of any of its rules or regulations or for any of the specified causes set forth in the act for which the board must refuse to grant, or may suspend or revoke, a license.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 11

The Chiropractic Initiative Act was first adopted November 7, 1922. It has been amended only three times since. During the forty-eight years that have since elapsed, many changes have occurred. New discoveries have been made. The use of x-ray, little known and understood fifty years ago, is now an accepted and indispensable part of diagnosing.

The public is entitled to and will continue to demand intelligent, thorough, and consistent analysis and diagnosis before submitting itself for treatment. The success of the practitioner and the public wellbeing are both tied inseparably to this element in the healing arts.

Trial and error have shown that the use of x-ray by skilled technicians has produced miracles in many ways including diagnosing. New discoveries and techniques in this field alone point to the immediate necessity of assurance for the public that all members of the healing arts are completely aware of the need for continuing preparation and education in this field.

The authority of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners to deal with such problems as professional ethics and continuing education in the interest of the public is limited in the present Act. It is the purpose of this amendment to provide that needed authority. Two opinions of the Attorney General, who by law is the legal counsel for the Board, one in 1964 and one in 1970 verify this lack of authority on the part of the Board and indicate the necessity for this proposed amendment.

The State Legislature also gave its overwhelming approval to this amendment (only one negative vote out of 120 was recorded).

Leighton Hatch, Director of the Department of Professional and Vocational Standards says:

"The Department of Professional and Vocational Standards favors the enactment of Assembly Bill No. 2107.

"We have found that in order to provide for the continuing education of chiropractors, and for rules of professional conduct consistent with a high standard of professional service and protection to the public, it is necessary for the Act to be amended to grant these powers to the Board of Chiropractic Examiners."

Dr. Donald P. Kern, the Director of Palmer Clinic (one of the oldest and best known institutions in the history of Chiropractic) recently stated: 'The doctor who does not attend educational seminars periodically will be listed among the 'also-rans' by his colleagues. Experience with continuing study is the key to developing and maintaining an artistic, skilled practice of Chiropractic. Chiropractors who are concerned with the 'best interests' of their patients regularly attend educational programs sponsored by their alumni, national, state or local organizations.'

George H. Haynes, D.C., Dean, Los Angeles College of Chiropractic states:

"Education does not end with graduation but must continue, for Science does not remain static. This is particularly true in the Health Professions, such as Chiropractic, that deal with Man's most precious possession, Life itself."

William Campbell
Assemblyman 50th District

Larry Townsend
Assemblyman 67th District
Argument Against Proposition 11

The drastic amendments in this Proposition to the Chiropractic Act are deplorable in several areas and should be defeated. The present law, which was endorsed by the voters of California through an initiative ballot measure, provides means to make the changes which the amendment would require. The Proposition duplicates present law and is unnecessary.

The Chiropractors have an excellent program of educating and updating the members of their profession. The requirement in the Proposition unfairly singles out Chiropractic among all the professional groups as the only one with mandatory continuing education. There is no justification to discriminate against Chiropractors in this manner.

Although the Amendment requires continuing education, it proposes no guidelines for establishing license renewal. This could lead to serious administrative problems.

Because the present Chiropractic Act is entirely adequate for dealing with changes in the profession, and because the Chiropractors have themselves displayed admirable interest and ability in self-education and regulation, the Proposition is neither essential nor necessary.

I strongly urge a NO vote on the Proposition.

KENT H. STACEY, Assemblyman, 28th District

COMPENSATION OF COUNTY SUPERVISORS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Provides that county governing body, rather than Legislature, shall prescribe compensation of its members by an ordinance that is subject to referendum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 11, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to require the governing body of each general law county to fix the compensation of its members by an ordinance which would be subject to referendum, rather than by statute enacted by the Legislature, and to provide that if a county charter provides for the Legislature to fix the compensation of the county governing body members, such compensation must be fixed by the governing body.

A "No" vote is a vote to reject this proposal.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Article XI of the State Constitution now requires the Legislature to prescribe the compensation of the governing body of each county not having adopted a charter for its own government. In addition, Article XI now further provides that any county having a charter shall provide in the charter for the compensation of the governing body of the county.

This measure would require that the governing body of each county not having a charter prescribe the compensation of its members and that such compensation be established by ordinance which is subject to referendum. The revision would also require, with respect to any county having a charter which provides for the Legislature to prescribe the compensation of the governing body, that the governing body prescribe its own compensation by ordinance.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 12

DO YOU WANT TO PREVENT COUNTY SUPERVISORS' SALARIES FROM BECOMING TOO HIGH AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE AGAINST UNREALISTIC PAY HIKES BY YOUR SUPERVISORS? If the answer is "Yes", then you should vote "Yes" on this constitutional amendment.

Under our present system, the Legislature sets the salaries of your Board of Supervisors. It does this after receiving a request from the Grand Jury of your county. A legislator from San Diego sets the salaries of a supervisor in Marin County, a legislator from San Francisco sets the salaries of a supervisor in Orange County, and so forth. The salaries which are paid are borne entirely by local taxpayers and yet State legislators tell you how much you should be taxed. This is all done without a hearing in your county and the only way that you could protest would be for you to take the time to come to Sacramento. This is the old system which would be changed by a "Yes" vote on this proposition.

What is proposed is to have local salaries set on the local level. In other words, to restore HOME RULE on salaries rather than have your taxes for purely local services set by centralized government in Sacramento. This constitutional amendment would permit the supervisors to set their salaries and that of other local public officials. Such "local setting" would be done at the local level and at public hearings in your own county, and would be subject to a vote in your community.
PAYERS believe that the salaries are too low, which is a right that you do not now have.

This proposition will restore home rule, and place the responsibility for setting local salaries where it belongs. It will stop a useless waste of the State Legislature's time, which occurs when they "rubber stamp" grand jury requests for supervisors' pay increases.

Compare the two systems:

**PRESENT SYSTEM:**
- No right of citizen to be heard on supervisors' pay increases.
- No right of referendum if pay is too high.
- No responsibility by local officials for pay increases.
- No home rule; salaries of local officials, paid by local taxes, are set by State.

**THIS AMENDMENT PROPOSES A NEW SYSTEM:**
- Gives citizens a voice at public meetings when supervisors' pay increases are proposed.
- Gives local citizens the opportunity to vote against unnecessary salary increases.
- Places responsibility on local public officials for their salaries.
- Takes away the power of out-of-county legislators to increase salaries of local officials and thereby increase local taxes.

The choice is quite clear. The HOME RULE concept proposed by this amendment will help keep salaries at a realistic level, prevent salaries from being set too high, and stop State legislators from voting on measures that increase local taxes for purely local services.

Many groups, like the California Taxpayers' Association who try to keep the tax burden down, support this measure. The Legislature overwhelmingly approved this amendment, and we the undersigned who represent both Republicans and Democrats urge you to vote "YES."

SENATOR MILTON MARKS
ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN T. KNOX,
Chairman, Assembly Local Government Committee
SENATOR JOHN P. McCARTHY

---

**Argument Against Proposition 12**

This proposal would take away from the Legislature the power to set supervisors' salaries. Under the present system, such salaries are now determined by the Legislature after the grand jury of the county in question makes its recommendation.

The present system has worked well for many years and there really is no reason to change it. If the proposed constitutional amendment goes into effect, the salaries of supervisors would be set by the supervisors themselves. While it is true that the supervisors would have to hold hearings before such a raise could go into effect and while it is likewise true that a referendum could be held if the people of the community felt the pay raise was too high, I feel that it would be very expensive to have another election on this issue.

Under our form of government the people elect local, state and national officials; each of them perform a useful function. For almost 100 years the method of setting salaries of local officials has been specified in our constitution. No one has complained about the procedure under which local officials' salaries are set by the State Legislature. The procedure has worked well and has served as a check on the approval of exorbitant salaries.

This proposed constitutional amendment should be defeated. Let's keep the present system, let the Legislature which is not directly involved keep the power and duty to set local salaries, and do not let the supervisors who might seek exorbitant salaries have the power to determine how much money they should receive. The present system gives the people a check and balance system and I believe that the new proposal would serve as too great a temptation to supervisors to set their salaries too high. I believe that the present system should be retained and I urge a "No" vote.

JOHN V. BRIGGS,
Assemblyman,
35th District
TAX EXEMPTION FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND BLIND VETERANS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Increases property tax exemption for totally disabled veteran to $10,000 and extends this exemption to widow until remarriage. Extends blind veteran's exemption to home owned by corporation in which he is shareholder and entitled thereby to possession.

YES

NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 11, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote is a vote to authorize the Legislature to increase the property tax exemption for homes of disabled veterans who have lost the use of both legs from $5,000 to $10,000, to extend this exemption to unmarried widows of such veterans, and to extend the $5,000 property tax exemption for homes of blind veterans to homes in cooperative housing projects.

A "No" vote is a vote to retain the $5,000 exemption for homes of such disabled veterans and not to permit extension of the exemption to their widows or to blind veterans having homes in cooperative housing projects.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Section 11a of Article XIII of the Constitution now authorizes the Legislature to exempt from property taxation up to $5,000 of the assessed value of property constituting a home of a legal resident of this state who has a permanent military or naval service-connected disability resulting in the loss of use of both legs from amputation, ankylosis, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, if such disabilities prevent moving about without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair. The exemption only applies to veterans discharged under honorable conditions who were residents of California at the time they entered the armed forces or who were residents prior to November 3, 1964.

This measure would permit the Legislature to increase the exemption for the homes of these disabled veterans to a maximum of $10,000, rather than $5,000, of assessed value and also to extend the exemption to the widows of such veterans until they remarry.

Section 11b of Article XIII of the Constitution now authorizes the Legislature to exempt from property taxation up to $5,000 of the assessed value of property constituting a home of a blind veteran meeting the same qualifications, except for the nature of the disability, as a disabled veteran who has lost the use of his legs. The exemption for a blind veteran does not now cover living units in a cooperative housing project, since the project is owned by a corporation.

If approved by the voters, this measure would provide that the exemption for a blind veteran shall apply to the home of such a veteran which is owned by a corporation in which the veteran holds shares entitled him to possession of a home owned by the corporation.

Statutes Contingent Upon Adoption of Above Measure

The text of Chapter 1332 of the Statutes of 1963, which was enacted to become operative if and when the above amendments are approved, is on record in the office of the Secretary of State in Sacramento and is also contained in the 1963 published statutes. A digest of that chapter is as follows:

The chapter would raise the exemption on the homes of disabled veterans who have lost the use of both legs from $5,000 to $10,000 of assessed value and extend the exemptive, unmarried widows of such veterans. It would also extend the exemption for blind veterans to homes of such veterans owned by corporations in which the veteran holds shares entitled him to occupy a home owned by the corporation.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 13

This proposed amendment to the California Constitution would have the following effects:

1. It would increase to $10,000 the property tax exemption granted to certain disabled veterans, and would extend this exemption to the widows of such disabled veterans. Presently, they are granted a $5,000 exemption.

2. It would extend the existing blind veterans' property tax exemption to a qualified person whose home is owned by a corporation of which he is a shareholder (i.e., blind veterans who live in an own-your-own apartment, condominium, etc.).

The first effect, the increase in the property tax exemption, represents the principal thrust of the proposed amendment. The veterans who would benefit from the increased exemption are those who are virtually totally disabled; almost all have suffered a severe spinal cord injury. These men are amputees, paraplegics. They have fought their country's battles, and in so doing, they have been crippled for life.
in recognition of the immense sacrifice
of these veterans, the Federal Government
(through Public Law 702) has pro-
vided financial assistance to help them build
homes specially adapted to their needs, with
grab-bars on the walls, wheelchair ramps, etc.

The steady increase in property taxes over
recent years, however, has placed many of
these paralyzed veterans in such a bind that
they may soon be compelled to sell their pres-
cent specially-built homes—unless some relief
is provided. When approved, this constitu-
tional amendment will provide that relief.

There is nothing undue or unusual about
giving our California paralyzed veterans this
consideration and this assistance. States such
as Florida and New Jersey grant complete
property tax exemptions to their service dis-
abled veterans. This amendment does not go
that far; it simply increases the exemption
sufficiently to guarantee that these veterans
will not be immediately threatened with loss
of their homes.

The California State Board of Equalization
estimates that approximately 860 disabled vet-
ers from throughout the State are now
eligible for this property tax exemption. The
Board estimates that increasing the exemp-
tion as provided for in this amendment would
result in a shift in the local property tax
burden of approximately $150,000—State-
wide. The cost, then, is minimal.

The second aspect of this amendment, re-
garding the blind veteran’s exemption, has
no financial implications, according to the
Board of Equalization. It simply insures that
a blind veteran who lives in a condominium
or similar dwelling can receive the same ex-
emption as one who lives in a normal single-
family house.

Men asked to fight in wars by the society
in which they live, and who are maltreated as a
result, deserve the consideration of that so-
ciety. Thus, Proposition 13 deserves a YES
vote.

SENATOR GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN

STATE CIVIL SERVICE. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Con-
tinues existing civil service system, revises language and removes
 certain provisions. Requires additional positions be civil service
 and removes certain positions from civil service.

YES
NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 12, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A “Yes” vote on this measure is a vote to
revise the civil service provisions of the
State Constitution to restate these provisions
and to exempt from civil service employees
of the Lieutenant Governor’s office directly
appointed or employed by the Lieutenant
Governor, to exempt an additional employee
for each member of an elected board or com-
mision, and to authorize the inclusion in
state civil service of certain nonstate em-
ployees in programs taken over by the state.

A “No” vote is a vote to reject this revi-
sion.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Generally, Article XXIV of the Constitu-
tion now provides for (1) a state civil serv-
ces which includes every state officer and
employee, with certain specified exceptions;
(2) permanent appointments and promotions
based upon merit ascertained by competitive
examination; (3) a Personnel Board to en-
force the civil service laws, and an execu-
tive officer to perform and discharge all
ers and functions vested in the board
the Constitution or by law, except for
certain specified duties requiring action
by the board itself; (4) temporary appoint-
ment; and (5) preferences for veterans and
their widows.

The revision would retain the substance
of these provisions with the following ma-
jor changes:
(1) All employees of the Lieutenant Gov-
ernor’s office directly appointed or employed
by the Lieutenant Governor would be ex-
empt from the civil service system.
(2) The number of exemptions for the
Public Utilities Commission would be re-
duced.
(3) The Constitution now provides for
two exempt positions for each elected state
officer but provides that in the case of a
state board composed of elected members
the members each have one exempt position
and the board as a whole has one exempt
position. The revision gives each member of
such a board two, rather than one, exempt
position, and retains the board’s one exempt
position.
(4) The Constitution now provides an ex-
empt position for each board and commission
whose members are appointed by the Gov-
ernor. Under the revision an exempt posi-
tion would also be given to each statutory
state board or commission whose members
are not appointed by the Governor.
(5) The existing constitutional provision
which authorizes the Legislature to transfer
into the civil service system exempt positions except elected officers, Governor's appointees, and employees in the Governor's Office, employees of the University of California, and militiam on active duty, would be deleted. Under the revision, if exempt positions are brought under civil service by constitutional amendment, the State Personnel Board would be authorized to include within the state's civil service system individuals holding exempt positions.

(6) Employees of a county, city, or district or a federal agency in programs taken over by the state would be allowed to qualify for their positions in the state civil service system subject to such minimum standards as the Legislature may establish.

Statutes Contingent Upon Adoption of Above Measure

The text of Chapter 764 of the Statutes of 1970, which was enacted to become operative if and when the above revision is approved, is on record in the office of the Secretary of State in Sacramento and will be contained in the 1970 published statutes. A digest of that chapter is as follows:

It would add one section to the Government Code to provide that the executive officer of the State Personnel Board shall administer the civil service statutes under rules of the board, subject to the right of appeal to the board.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 14

Proposition 14 is a recommendation of California Constitution Revision Commission and both Houses of the Legislature.

Vote YES on Proposition 14. This measure deserves your support because it assures the continued high quality of service by employees of the state government.

A YES vote will retain our excellent civil service system, while eliminating obsolete language and providing new provisions to suit modern needs.

A YES vote on Proposition 14 continues the requirement that permanent appointments and promotion in the state civil service shall be based on merit and competitive examinations. It continues the independent State Personnel Board to enforce civil service statutes and to review disciplinary actions. This proposal has been endorsed by the State Personnel Board and the California State Employees Association.

A YES vote on Proposition 14 promotes efficiency and economy in state government, and prevents appointment of inefficient employees for political reasons.

DAVID A. ROBERTI
Member of the Assembly,
48th District

ED REINECKE
Lieutenant Governor

GEORGE DANIELSON
State Senator
Los Angeles-Alhambra

Argument Against Proposition 14

The people of California gave constitutional protection to the State Civil Service System by an initiative measure in 1934. A new system of employment based on merit replaced the old, corrupt methods of political appointment. Since that time California's system has been a model for the entire country. Now we are told by the Constitution Revision Commission that the system which has served so well must be revised and updated. But in fact this proposition makes additional positions subject to political appointment even though the existing article already contains numerous exemptions from the merit system. The Constitution Revision Commission has once again gone beyond their charge of updating Constitution and has recommended subjective changes. It is time to halt the erosion of constitutional guarantees which have served us so well.

Furthermore, this same proposition has already been on the ballot in the last two statewide elections and the people have twice defeated it. Nevertheless, the Legislature has persistently placed it on the ballot once again. The first defeat in the 1968 General Election was credited to the fact that the issues had been confused by placing all of the constitution revision proposals in one "package" proposition. This problem was supposedly solved by breaking the package down into four propositions on the June 1970 ballot. But, once again, the people rejected the proposal. Is the Legislature relying on the rules of chance to pass this proposal? After two defeats, it should be clear that the people do not want this proposition. Yet the will of the people has been ignored by presenting the same proposal once again.

This time the people must make it very clear that this proposition weakens working constitutional provisions by voting overwhelmingly against it. Vote NO on Proposition 14.

JOHN L. HARME
Senator
FICIAL CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Revises, amends and repeals various miscellaneous provisions of Constitution relating to seat of government, separate property, hours of labor, minimum wages, discrimination based on sex, elections, terms of office, duels, and other matters.

YES

NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 15, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to revise parts of the miscellaneous subjects article of the California Constitution by amending various sections relating to the seat of government, separate property, public works, minimum wages and working conditions, discrimination based on sex, and elections and terms of office, and by repealing various sections relating to duels, reentry to public office after military service, election or appointment to office, fiscal year, marriage contracts, perpetuities, absence from the state, election by plurality, and the State Board of Health.

A "No" vote is a vote to reject this revision.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would revise portions of Article XX of the California Constitution. The revision would restate various provisions, some with, and some without, substantive change. In addition, certain existing provisions would be deleted from the Constitution, thus placing the subject matter of the deleted provisions from then on under legislative control through the enactment of statutes.

1. The revision would amend provisions relating to the following subjects:

Seat of Government

Section 1 of Article XX of the Constitution now provides that the City of Sacramento is the seat of government of the state, and shall so remain until changed by a law submitted to the people by a two-thirds vote of each house of the Legislature and approved by a majority of the electors voting at a general state election.

This measure would amend this section to provide that Sacramento is the Capital of California. An amendment to the Constitution which also requires a two-thirds vote of the Legislature and approval by a majority of electors would thus be required to change the Capital of California.

Separate Property

Section 8 of Article XX of the Constitution now provides that all property, real and personal, owned by either husband or wife before marriage, and that acquired by either of them afterwards by gift, devise, or descent shall be their separate property.

This measure would restate this section without substantive change.

Public Works

Section 17 of Article XX of the Constitution now provides that the time of service of all laborers, workmen or mechanics employed on public works shall be limited to eight hours a day, except in times of war or extraordinary emergency, and requires the Legislature to provide by law that a stipulation to the effect be incorporated in all contracts for public works and prescribe penalties for enforcement.

This measure would restate this section without substantive change.

Minimum Wages and Working Conditions

Section 174 of Article XX of the Constitution now provides that the Legislature may provide for a minimum wage for women and minors and for the comfort, health, safety, and general welfare of all employees, and specifies that nothing in the Constitution shall be construed as a limitation on the authority of the Legislature to empower a commission to carry out such provisions.

This measure would amend this section to provide that the Legislature may provide for minimum wages and for the general welfare of all employees, and may confer legislative, executive and judicial powers upon a commission for such purposes.

Discrimination Based on Sex

Section 18 of Article XX of the Constitution now provides that no person shall, on account of sex, be disqualified from entering upon or pursuing any lawful business, vocation or profession.

This measure would restate this section without substantive change.

Elections and Terms of Office

Section 20 of Article XX of the Constitution now provides that elections of officers provided for by the Constitution shall be held on the even-numbered years next before the expiration of their terms, and the terms of such officers shall commence on the first Monday after the first day of January next following their election.
This measure would restate this section without substantive change.

(2) The revision would repeal the following provisions, thus placing the subject matter of the deleted provisions under legislative control through the enactment of statutes.

(a) Section 2 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that any citizen shall lose the right to vote or hold an office of profit who fights a duel, sends or accepts a challenge to fight a duel, or assists in a duel.

(b) Section 3.5 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that the Legislature may provide for the reentry and reinstatement into public office within the terms for which they were elected, and the reinstatement in public employment, of state and local public officers and employees who resign in order to serve in the armed forces.

(c) Section 4 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that all officers or employees whose election is not provided for in the Constitution shall be elected or appointed, as the Legislature may direct.

(d) Section 5 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that the fiscal year shall commence on the first day of July.

(e) Section 7 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that no contract of marriage, if otherwise duly made, shall be invalidated for want of conformity to the requirements of any religious sect.

(f) Section 9 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that no perpetuities shall be allowed except for elementary [charitable] purposes.

(g) Section 12 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that abscense from the state, on business of the state or the United States, shall not affect the question of the residence of any person.

(h) Section 13 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that a plurality of votes given at any election shall constitute those where not otherwise directed in the Constitution, except where a different manner of election or higher proportion of the vote is prescribed for local officers under city or county charter or by the Legislature for general law cities.

(i) Section 14 of Article XX of the Constitution, which now provides that the Legislature shall provide, by law, for the maintenance and efficiency of a State Board of Health.

---

**Argument in Favor of Proposition 15**

Voters interested in having a clear and concise State Constitution should vote YES on Proposition 15. This measure revises part of Article XX. This Article has been amended so many times that there are 25 unrelated sections. This Article should be revised to bring clarity and consistency back to the Constitution.

Section 1 as revised says in six words "Sacramento is the Capital of California." The existing document says this in 541. A YES vote will eliminate the excess verbiage.

Section 2 deals with dueling, and is obsolete. The same language is already in the Penal Code and will remain there with the deletion of this section from the Constitution. Murder, robbery and dope peddling are not defined in the Constitution now. Deletion of the dueling section from the Constitution will still make it a crime, but leave it in the Penal Code along with other crimes.

Section 3.5 is already covered in the Military and Veterans Code, which protects the rights of returning veterans. The unnecessary constitutional language is deleted.

Section 4 states that the Legislature has power to establish departments of government. This declaration is unnecessary as the Legislature has this power without the Constitutional grant of authority. Section 4 therefore is deleted by Proposition 15.

Sections 5, 7, 9, 12, 13 and 14, are recommended for deletion because they deal with statutory matters or are mere statements of power already inherently under legislative control.

Section 14 is obsolete; it established State Board of Health which has now been superseded by the Health and Welfare Agency. This Section will be deleted from the Constitution by Proposition 15.

Section 17 is amended to give greater flexibility to the Legislature in enforcing the 8 hour work day on public works. The rest of the section restates the existing substance without changing meaning.

Section 17\(1\) is reworded in the proposed section without change in meaning, except that the Legislature's power to extend minimum wage protection to all employees is confirmed.

Section 18 is restated in the proposed section and is a prohibition against discrimination on account of sex without change in meaning and Section 20 is restated in the proposed section. It sets the beginning date of terms of office with change in meaning.

No opposition to the provisions of Proposition 15 was expressed in the Legislature or before the Constitution Revision Commission.

WADIE P. DEDDEH, Assemblyman, 77th District

JUDGE BRUCE W. SUMNER
Chairman, California Constitution Revision Commission

CLAIR W. BURGEMER
State Senator, 38th District
Argument Against Proposition 15

In 1944, the Legislature and the voters of California approved a constitutional provision which guaranteed that veterans who were public officers or employees before going on active military duty would be reinstated in their jobs upon returning home.

This proposition would remove that protection for veterans from our constitution. It would retain this guarantee in statutory form, thus subject to legislative whim, simply in the interest of eliminating excess language.

Constitutional protections for our veterans should not be dealt with so lightly. The purpose of constitutional revision is to eliminate excess verbiage and nothing more. Obviously the constitutional safeguarding of veteran's jobs is not merely excess verbiage.

This proposition actually contains many desirable changes in constitutional language, but unfortunately we as voters cannot separate the good from the bad. We must instead vote simply yes, or no, on the entire package of changes covering thirteen entirely unrelated sections of the constitution.

Constitutional revision is a worthy and much needed project in California. However, many provisions of our current constitution still serve the citizens of California admirably. Protection of the jobs of our returning servicemen should be a basic and irrevocable responsibility of every citizen.

Vote No on Proposition 15, and keep this vital protection in the constitution. We cannot afford to place it solely in the political arena, and leave veteran's protection at the mercy of future legislative action.

VICTOR V. VETLEY
Assemblyman, 75th District

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Authorizes Legislature, by two-thirds vote, to amend or withdraw a proposed constitutional amendment or revision submitted by it. Provides initiatives, referendums, and legislative proposals take effect day after election, unless measure provides otherwise. Revises procedure for constitutional convention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 17, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to revise provisions of the State Constitution concerning (1) procedures for amending and revising the Constitution, and (2) the effective dates of initiative and referendum measures.

A "No" vote is a vote to reject this revision.

For further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would revise portions of Articles IV and XVIII of the California Constitution. The revision would retain some existing provisions without change and would restate other provisions, some with and some without substantive change. In addition, certain existing provisions would be deleted from the Constitution, thus placing the subject matter of the deleted provisions from then on under legislative control through the enactment of statutes.

Amending and Revising the Constitution of Initiative and Referendum Measures

generally, Sections 22 and 24 of Article IV and Article XVIII of the Constitution now provide:

(1) Constitutional amendments may be proposed for submission to the voters (a) by the Legislature and (b) by electors through the initiative process. Revision of the Constitution may be proposed by the Legislature.

(2) If provisions of two or more amendments proposed by initiative or referendum measures approved at the same election conflict, the provisions of the measure receiving the highest affirmative vote prevail. There is no such express provision regarding amendments proposed by the Legislature.

(3) The Legislature by two-thirds vote may submit to the voters the proposition as to whether to call a convention to revise the Constitution. If the proposition is approved by a majority of those voting on it, the Legislature at its next session must provide by law for the calling of a convention consisting of delegates (not to exceed the number of legislators) who are to be chosen in the same manner and to have the same qualifications as legislators. Delegates are required to meet within three months of their election.

The revision would retain the general substance of these provisions with the following major changes:

(1) A new provision would be added specifically authorizing the Legislature, by a two-thirds vote of the membership of each house, to amend or withdraw a constitutional amendment or revision which the Legislature has
proposed where the action is taken before the proposal has been voted on by the electorate.

(2) (a) The general requirement that the Legislature provide for the constitutional convention at the session following the voters' approval of the proposition authorizing the convention would be replaced with a requirement that the Legislature provide for the convention within six months after the voters' approval.

(b) The existing constitutional limitation on the number of elected delegates to a constitutional convention and the requirement that they have the same qualifications and be chosen in the same manner as legislators would be deleted. A requirement would be added that the delegates, each of whom must be a voter, be elected from districts as nearly equal in population as may be practicable.

(c) The existing constitutional requirement that the delegates meet within three months after their election would be deleted.

(3) A provision would be added that if two or more measures amending or revising the Constitution are approved by the voters at the same election and they conflict, the provisions of the measure receiving the highest affirmative vote shall prevail. Thus, no distinction would be made in the Constitution between amendments proposed by the Legislature and by initiative measures.

(4) Provisions prescribing detailed procedures for submitting to the voters, revisions proposed by the constitutional convention and for certifying the results of the election, would be deleted.

Effective Date of Ballot Measures

Section 24 of Article IV of the Constitution now provides that an initiative or referendum measure takes effect five days after the official declaration of vote by the Secretary of State, unless the measure provides otherwise, while the constitutional amendments and revisions submitted by the Legislature take effect upon approval by the voters, unless the measures provide otherwise.

Under the revision the provision for the effective date of all ballot measures would be the same, no matter how the ballot measures originated. Each ballot measure would become effective the day after the election at which it is approved, unless the measure provides otherwise.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 16

This proposition should be approved by the voters because it will improve our Constitution.

Existing Article XVIII contains lengthy arrangements for constitutional conventions even though we have not had a convention since 1879. A YES vote removes this procedural material but requires the Legislature to provide for a convention when requested by a majority of the voters.

A YES vote on Proposition 16 assures that convention delegates will be elected from districts "as nearly equal in population as may be practicable . . . .", which the present Constitution does not do. The revision also specifies the same effective date of constitutional amendments, whether proposed by the Legislature or initiative, which the existing provision fails to do.

A YES vote will allow the Legislature to correct errors found in its proposed amendments, before submitting such proposals to the voters. Existing provisions require that a proposal be presented to the electorate exactly as first adopted by the Legislature, even though it contains errors the Legislature wishes to correct before it goes on the Ballot. A YES vote also requires that a call for a constitutional convention be by a roll call vote.

No opposition to the provisions of this Proposition was expressed before the Legislature or the Constitution Revision Commission.

DAVID A. ROBERTI
Member of the Assembly,
48th District

JUDGE BRUCE W. SUMNER
Chairman, California Constitution Revision Commission

Argument Against Proposition 16

Proposition 16 removes valuable procedural safeguards for constitutional conventions from our Constitution. The present Constitution guarantees that all the delegates to a convention shall be elected "in the same manner" and have the same qualifications as Legislators. In addition, the number of delegates must equal the number of members in the Legislature. These provisions guarantee that the delegates to the convention shall be at least as qualified as Legislators and that their selection shall be by familiar and orderly election, rather than allowing selection of delegates according to the whims of the times. This procedure protects the convention process from possible abuse by delegates who represent a very vocal minority at the time delegates are selected. Furthermore, the limit on number of delegates keeps the convention at a workable size.

Although these procedures take up but a few lines of constitutional language, the proponents of this measure argue that they should be deleted because they have been "unused" since 1879. However, constitutional conventions are very rare events, fact does not justify the elimination of those procedural safeguards which guarantee that
convention shall be initiated in an orderly
manner. Once again the proponents of constitutional
revision have made policy changes in their
recommendations although the purpose of
revision was simply to reduce the length and
wordiness of the Constitution. The voters are
seldom aware of these changes since the re-
vision proposal is billed as a "package" rather
than on an issue by issue basis. This is a
slovenly manner of changing our fundamental
law.

This proposal should be rejected since it
deletes basic constitutional protections. I
urge you to vote "NO".

FLOYD L. WAKEFIELD
Assemblyman, 52nd District

PARTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION.

17 Amendment. Repeals obsolete provisions relating to social
  welfare.

(For Full Text of Measure See Page 18, Part II)

General Analysis by the Legislative Counsel
A "Yes" vote on this measure is a vote to
eliminate from the Constitution an obsolete
 provision that repealed provisions relating to
the administration of the aid to the blind
and aged programs.

A "No" vote on this measure is a vote to
retain in the Constitution the obsolete provi-
sion that repealed provisions relating to the
administration of the aid to the blind and
aged programs.

or further details, see below.

Detailed Analysis by the
Legislative Counsel

Article XXVII of the Constitution re-
pealed former Article XXV of the Constitu-
tion, relating to state administration of the
aged and blind aid programs. Since Article
XXVII has accomplished its purpose by re-
pealing Article XXV, it is now obsolete. This
measure would eliminate this obsolete provi-
sion from the Constitution.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 17

Proposition 17 is a recommendation of both
Houses of the Legislature and the California
Constitution Revision Commission. Proposition
17 deletes Article XXVII from the Cali-
ifornia Constitution. Article XXVII was en-
acted in 1948 solely to repeal Article XXV.
Since its purpose has been accomplished Arti-
 cle XXVII is obsolete and there is no need to
retain it in the Constitution. By deleting Ar-
ticle XXVII, Article XXV is not reinstated.

A "Yes" vote therefore helps to rid our State
vitalization of this obsolete and wholly un-
necessary language.

No opposition to this recommendation for
deletion was expressed before the Legislature

or the California Constitution Revision Com-
mision.

PAUL PRIOLO
Member of the Assembly
60th District

JUDGE BRUCE W. SUMNER
Chairman, California Constitution
Revision Commission

Argument Against Proposition 17

Placing this measure on the ballot as a
separate issue taxes the voter's patience and
tax dollar.

The sole purpose of this measure is to re-
peal a constitutional provision which, itself,
repealed another section of the Constitution.
While it may be desirable to eliminate obso-
lete portions of the Constitution in the revi-
sion process, clean-up measures such as this
one should be included as a part of other
revision proposals. There are already many
complex propositions on the statewide ballot
for the people to read and consider. Making
a separate issue out of an inconsequential
and highly technical measure such as this
could lead to further difficulty and confusion
in interpretation.

In addition, the entire process of placing
measures on the ballot involves considerable
expense. Propositions must first be adopted
through a lengthy and complex legislative
process and then are submitted to the people
as part of a statewide election, involving all
of the costs of ballot composition and print-
ing. Obviously, this procedure consumes con-
siderable time and money. Such expense is
justifiable when the measure makes important
constitutional changes; however, this measure
is purely technical in nature.

The proponents of constitutional revision
should pay closer attention to the interests of
the taxpayer in presenting their proposals
for reform.

LARRY TOWNSSEND
Assemblyman
67th District
PART II—APPENDIX

FOR THE CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1970. This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) to provide funds for water pollution control.

AGAINST THE CLEAN WATER BOND LAW OF 1970. This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000) to provide funds for water pollution control.

This law proposed by AB 1456 (Ch. 508), by act of the Legislature passed at the 1970 Regular Session, is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article XVI of the Constitution.

(This proposed law does not expressly amend any existing law; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in BOLDFACE TYPE to indicate that they are NEW.)

PROPOSED LAW

Section 1. Chapter 13 (commencing with Section 13970) is added to Division 7 of the Water Code, to read:


13970. This chapter may be cited as the Clean Water Bond Law of 1970.

13971. The Legislature hereby finds and declares that clean water, which fosters the health of the people, the beauty of their environment, the expansion of industry and agriculture, the enhancement of fish and wildlife, the improvement of recreational facilities and the provision of pure drinking water at a reasonable cost, is an essential public need. Although the State of California is endowed with abundant lakes and ponds, streams and rivers, and hundreds of miles of shoreline, as well as large quantities of underground water, these vast water resources are threatened by pollution, which, if not checked, will impede the state's economic, community and social growth. The chief cause of pollution is the discharge of inadequately treated waste into the waters of the state. Many public agencies have not met the demands for adequate waste treatment or the control of water pollution because of inadequate financial resources and other responsibilities. Increasing population accompanied by accelerating urbanization, growing demands for water of high quality, rising costs of construction and technological changes mean that unless the state acts now, the needs may soar beyond the means available for public finance. Meeting these needs is a proper purpose of the federal, state and local governments. Local agencies, by reason of their closeness to the problem, should continue to have primary responsibility for construction, operation and maintenance of the facilities necessary to cleanse our waters.

Since water pollution knows no political boundaries and since the cost of eliminating the existing backlog of needed facilities and of providing additional facilities for future needs will be beyond the ability of local agencies to pay, the state, to meet its responsibility to protect and promote the health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants of the state, should assist in the financing. The federal government is contributing to the cost of control of water pollution, and just provision should be made to cooperate with the United States of America. It is the intent of this chapter to provide necessary funds to insure the full participation by the state under the provisions of Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.) and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

13972. The State General Obligation Bond Law is adopted for the purpose of the issuance, sale, and repayment of, and otherwise providing with respect to, the bonds authorized to be issued by this chapter, and the provisions of that law are included in this chapter as though set out in full in this chapter except that notwithstanding anything in the State General Obligation Bond Law, the bonds authorized hereunder shall bear such rates of interest, or maximum rates, as may from time to time be fixed by the State Treasurer, with the approval of the committee, and the maximum maturity of the bonds shall not exceed 50 years from the date of the bonds, or from the date of each respective series. The maturity of each respective series shall be calculated from the date of such series.

13973. As used in this chapter, and for the purposes of this chapter as used in the State General Obligation Bond Law, the following words shall have the following meanings:

(a) "Committee" means the Clean Water Finance Committee, created by Section 13974.

(b) "Board" means the State Water Resources Control Board.
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(c) "Fund" means the State Clean Water Fund.

(d) "Municipality" shall have the same meaning as in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.) and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto and shall also include the State or any agency or department thereof.

(e) "Treatment works" shall have the same meaning as in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.) and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(f) "Construction" shall have the same meaning as in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466 et seq.) and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

(g) "Eligible project" means a project for the construction of treatment works which is all of the following:
   (1) Eligible for federal assistance, whether or not federal funds are then available therefor;
   (2) Necessary to prevent water pollution;
   (3) Certified by the board as entitled to priority over other treatment works, and which complies with applicable water quality standards, policies and plans.

(h) "Federal assistance" means funds available to a municipality either directly or through allocation by the state, from the federal government as grants for construction of treatment works, pursuant to Section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and acts amendatory thereof.

13974. The Clean Water Finance Committee is hereby created. The committee shall consist of the Governor or his designated representative, the State Controller, the State Treasurer, the Director of Finance, and the chairman of the board. The executive officer of the board shall serve as a member of the committee in the absence of the chairman. Said committee shall be the "committee" as that term is used in the State General Obligation Bond Law.

13975. The committee is hereby authorized and empowered to create a debt or debts, liability or liabilities, of the State of California, in the aggregate amount of two hundred fifty million dollars ($250,000,000), in the manner provided in this chapter. Such debt or debts, liability or liabilities, shall be created for the purpose of providing the fund to be used for the object and work specified in Section 13976.

13976. (a) The moneys in the fund shall be used for the purposes set forth in this section.

(b) The board is authorized to enter into contracts with municipalities having authority to construct, operate and maintain treatment works, for grants to such municipalities to aid in the construction of eligible projects and for reclamation of water.

Grants may be made pursuant to this section to reimburse municipalities for construction for which contracts were let subsequent to July 1, 1970, and before the first sale of bonds authorized to be issued by this chapter.

Any contract pursuant to this section may include such provisions as may be agreed upon by the parties thereto, and any such contract concerning an eligible project shall include, in substance, the following provisions:

(1) An estimate of the reasonable cost of the eligible project;

(2) An agreement by the board to pay to the municipality, during the progress of construction or following completion of construction as may be agreed upon by the parties, an amount which equals the minimum amount required by federal law for the project to qualify for the maximum amount of federal assistance available;

(3) An agreement by the municipality, (i) to proceed expeditiously with, and complete, the eligible project, (ii) to commence operation of the treatment works on completion thereof, and to properly operate and maintain such works in accordance with applicable provisions of law, (iii) to apply for and make reasonable efforts to secure federal assistance for the eligible project, (iv) to secure the approval of the board before applying for federal assistance in order to maximize the amounts of such assistance received or to be received for all eligible projects in the state, and (v) to provide for payment of the municipality's share of the cost of the eligible project.

(c) The board may make direct grants to any municipality or by contract or otherwise undertake plans, surveys, research, development and studies necessary, convenient or desirable to the effectuation of the purposes and powers of the board pursuant to this division and to prepare recommendations with regard thereto, including the preparation of comprehensive statewide or area-wide studies and reports on the collection, treatment and disposal of waste under a comprehensive cooperative plan.

The aggregate amount of moneys which may be advanced or granted to or committed to municipalities for the purpose of planning, research and development, whether by the board or under the direction of the board or in the form of direct grants to municipalities for such purpose, shall not exceed in the aggregate such amount as may be fixed from time to time by the committee.

(d) The board may from time to time with the approval of the committee transfer moneys in the fund to the State Water
ty Control Fund to be available for
expenditure to public agencies pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 13440) of this division.

(e) Not more than one-half of 1 percent of the moneys deposited in the fund may be expended by the board for costs incurred in administering the provisions of this chapter.

(f) As much of the moneys in the fund as is necessary shall be used to reimburse the General Obligation Bond Expense Revolving Fund pursuant to Section 16724.5 of the Government Code.

(g) The board may with the approval of the committee transfer not more than ten million dollars ($10,000,000) from the fund to a special reserve fund as additional security for the payment of the principal of and the interest on revenue bonds sold by the state as provided by law to provide funds to municipalities for needed sewage facilities. Such money shall be used for such purpose only after all other securities provided by law have been exhausted. Any money not used for such purpose shall, after retirement of the revenue bonds, be returned to the fund and be available for other purposes provided for in this section.

(h) The board may adopt rules and regulations governing the making and enforcing contracts pursuant to this section.

All bonds herein authorized, which shall have been duly sold and delivered as herein provided, shall constitute valid and legally binding general obligations of the State of California, and the full faith and credit of the State of California is hereby pledged for the punctual payment of both principal and interest thereon.

There shall be collected annually in the same manner and at the same time as other state revenue is collected such a sum, in addition to the ordinary revenues of the state, as shall be required to pay the principal and interest on said bonds as herein provided, and it is hereby made the duty of all officers charged by law with any duty in regard to the collection of said revenue, to do and perform each and every act which shall be necessary to collect said additional sum.

All money deposited in the fund which has been derived from premium and accrued interest on bonds sold shall be available for transfer to the General Fund as a credit to expenditures for bond interest.

13978. All money deposited in the fund pursuant to any provision of law requiring repayments to the state for assistance financed by the proceeds of the bonds authorized by this chapter shall be available for transfer to the General Fund. When transferred to the General Fund such money shall be applied as a reimbursement to the General Fund on account of principal and interest on the bonds which has been paid from the General Fund.

13979. There is hereby appropriated from the General Fund in the State Treasury for the purpose of this chapter such an amount as will equal the following:

(a) Such sum annually as will be necessary to pay the principal of and the interest on the bonds issued and sold pursuant to the provisions of this chapter, as said principal and interest become due and payable.

(b) Such sum as is necessary to carry out the provisions of Section 13980, which sum is appropriated without regard to fiscal years.

13980. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter, the Director of Finance may by executive order authorize the withdrawal from the General Fund of an amount or amounts not to exceed the amount of the unsold bonds which the committee has by resolution authorized to be sold for the purpose of carrying out this chapter. Any amounts withdrawn shall be deposited in the fund and shall be disbursed by the board in accordance with this chapter. Any moneys made available under this section to the General Fund from moneys received from the sale of bonds sold for the purpose of carrying out this chapter.

13981. Upon request of the board, supported by a statement of the proposed arrangements to be made pursuant to Section 13976 for the purposes therein stated, the committee shall determine whether or not it is necessary or desirable to issue any bonds authorized under this chapter in order to make such arrangements, and, if so, the amount of bonds then to be issued and sold. Successive issues of bonds may be authorized and sold to make such arrangements progressively, and it shall not be necessary that all of the bonds herein authorized be issued shall be sold at any one time.

13982. The committee may authorize the State Treasurer to sell all or any part of the bonds herein authorized at such time or times as may be fixed by the State Treasurer.

13983. All proceeds from the sale of bonds, except those derived from premiums and accrued interest, shall be available for the purpose provided in Section 13976, but shall not be available for transfer to the General Fund to pay principal and interest on bonds. The money in the fund may be expended only as herein provided.
VACANCIES IN SPECIFIED CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICES. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Provides Supreme Court has exclusive jurisdiction to determine questions of vacancy in offices of Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, Treasurer, and Superintendent of Public Instruction and authority to raise such questions vested in body provided by statute.

Yes

No

(Proposed amendments by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 43, 1970 Regular Session, expressly amends existing sections of the Constitution; therefore, existing provisions proposed to be deleted are printed in strikethrough type; and new provisions proposed to be inserted are printed in boldface type.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES V AND IX

First—That Section 11 of Article V is amended to read:

Sec. 11. The Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, and Treasurer shall be elected at the same time and places and for the same term as the Governor.

The Supreme Court has exclusive jurisdiction to determine all questions of vacancy in the office of Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, and Treasurer.

Authority to raise questions of vacancy is vested exclusively in a body provided for by statute.

STATE BUDGET. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Commencing in 1973, requires Governor to submit budget to Legislature within first ten days, rather than first thirty days, of each regular session and requires Legislature to pass budget by June 15th of each year.

Yes

No

(Proposed amendments by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 9, 1970 Regular Session, expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore, existing provisions proposed to be deleted are printed in strikethrough type; and new provisions proposed to be inserted are printed in boldface type.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE IV

First—That subdivision (a) of Section 12 of Article IV be amended to read:

Sec. 12. (a) Within the first 10 days of each regular session, commencing with the 1973 Regular Session, the Governor shall submit to the Legislature, with an explanatory message, a budget for the ensuing fiscal year containing itemized statements of recommended state expenditures and estimated state revenues. If recommended expenditures exceed estimated revenues, he shall recommend the sources from which the additional revenues should be provided.*

Second—That subdivision (c) of Section 12 of Article IV be amended to read:

(c) The budget shall be accompanied by a budget bill itemizing recommended expenditures. The bill shall be introduced immediately in each house by the chairmen of the committees that consider appropriations. Commencing in 1973, the Legislature shall pass the budget bill by midnight on June 15 of each year. Until the budget bill has been enacted, neither house may pass any other appropriation bill, except emergency bills recommended by the Governor or appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Legislature.

And be it further resolved, That if Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 6 of the 1969 Regular Session is adopted by the people, as follows:

First—That Section 12.1 be added to Article IV, to read:

Sec. 12.1. Within the first 30 calendar days of each regular session, the chairman of the committee of each house charged with

*Reference to another proposed amendment to subd. (a) of Sec. 12, Art. IV, which was to take effect in the event that Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 2 adopted by the people, has not been included since Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 2 was not submitted to the voters by the Legislature.
Responsibility of considering the subject c...ation may introduce a bill, embodying the recommendations of the committee, making an appropriation to the State School Fund and providing for the disbursement of such appropriation. Neither of the bills may be passed by either house until the budget bill is enacted, or until 130 calendar days after the introduction of the budget bill. Where 130 days have elapsed after the introduction of the budget bill, and the budget bill has not been enacted, notwithstanding Section 12 of this article either or both of such bills may be passed by either or both houses prior to the enactment of the budget bill upon concurrence of two-thirds of the membership of each house. This section shall not affect the power of the Legislature to pass pursuant to the recommendations of the Governor any bill for the support of the public elementary and secondary schools of the state as an emergency bill in accordance with Section 12 of this article.

Second—That if this measure and Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 6 of the 1969 Regular Session are both adopted by the people, the provision of Article IV shall be added in the form shown in this resolved clause and as shown in Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 6 of the 1969 Regular Session of the Legislature.

Third—That Section 12 of Article IV not be amended by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 6 of the 1969 Regular Session of the Legislature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROPRIATION FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.</th>
<th>Legislative Constitutional Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment. Authorizes Legislature to make appropriation for public schools prior to passage of budget bill if delayed.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 6, 1969 Regular Session, expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, and adds a new section thereto; therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED are printed in STRIKEOUT TYPE; and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED or ADDED are printed in BOLD-FACE TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE IV

First—That Section 12 of Article IV be amended to read:

Sec. 12. (a) Within the first 30 days of each regular session, the Governor shall submit to the Legislature, with an explanatory message, a budget for the ensuing fiscal year containing itemized statements of recommended state expenditures and estimated state revenues. If recommended expenditures exceed estimated revenues, he shall recommend the sources from which the additional revenues should be provided.

(b) The Governor and the Governor-elect may require a state agency, officer or employee to furnish him whatever information he deems necessary to prepare the budget.

(c) The budget shall be accompanied by a budget itemizing recommended expenditures. The bill shall be introduced immediately in each house by the chairman of the committee that consider appropriations. Until the budget bill has been enacted, neither house may pass any other appropriation bill, except emergency bills recommended by the Governor, or appropriations for the salaries and expenses of the Legislature, or the appropriation bill provided for by Section 12.1 of this article.

(d) No bill except the budget bill may contain more than one item of appropriation, and that for one certain, expressed purpose. Appropriations from the general fund of the State, except appropriations for the public schools, are void unless passed in each house by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds two-thirds of the membership concurring.

Second—That Section 12.1 be added to Article IV, to read:

Sec. 12.1. Within the first 30 calendar days of each regular session, the chairman of the committee of each house charged with the responsibility of considering the subject of education may introduce a bill, embodying the recommendations of the committee, making an appropriation to the State School Fund and providing for the disbursement of such appropriation. Neither of the bills may be passed by either house until the budget bill is enacted, or until 130 calendar days after the introduction of the budget bill. Where 130 days have elapsed after the introduction of the budget bill, and the budget bill has not been enacted, either or both of such bills may be passed by either or both houses prior to the enactment of the budget bill upon concurrence of two-thirds of the membership of each house. This section shall not affect the power of the Legislature to pass pursuant to the recommendations of the Governor any bill for the support of the public elementary and secondary schools of the State as an emergency bill in accordance with Section 12 of this article.
REGENTS UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: PUBLIC MEETINGS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Requires meetings of the Regents to be public, with exceptions and notice requirements as Legislature may provide.

(This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 12, 1969 Regular Session, 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 BOLDFACE TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE IX

SEC. 9. (a) The University of California shall constitute a public trust, to be administered by the existing corporation known as "The Regents of the University of California," with full powers of organization and government, subject only to such legislative control as may be necessary to insure compliance with the terms of the endowments of the university and the security of its funds. Said corporation shall be in form a board composed of eight ex officio members, to wit: the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the president of the State Board of Agriculture, the president of the Mechanics Institute of San Francisco, the president of the alumni association of the university and the acting president of the university, and sixteen 16 appointive members appointed by the Governor; provided, however, that the present appointive members shall hold office until the expiration of their present terms. The term of the appointive members shall be sixteen 16 years; the terms of two appointive members to expire as heretofore on March first 1st of every even-numbered calendar year, and in case of any vacancy the term of office of the appointee to fill such vacancy, who shall be appointed by the Governor, to be for the balance of the term to which such vacancy exists. Said corporation shall be vested with the legal title and the management and disposition of the property of the university and of property held for its benefit and shall have the power to take and hold, either by purchase or by donation, or gift, testamentary or otherwise, or in any other manner, without restriction, all real and personal property for the benefit of the university or incidentally to its conduct. Said corporation shall also have all the powers necessary or convenient for the effective administration of its trust, including the power to sue and be sued, to use a seal, and to delegate to its committees or to the faculty of the university, or to others, such authority or functions as it may deem wise; provided provided, that all moneys derived from the sale of public lands donated to this State by the several states to Congress shall be invested as provided by said acts of Congress and the income from said moneys shall be inviolably appropriated to the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college of agriculture, where the leading objects shall be (without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military) to teach such branches of learning related to scientific and practical agriculture and mechanical arts, in accordance with the requirements and conditions of said acts of Congress; and the Legislature shall provide that if, through neglect, misappropriation, or any other contingency, any portion of the funds so set apart shall be diminished or lost, the State shall replace such portion so lost or misappropriated, so that the principal thereof shall remain forever undiminished. The university shall be entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its regents and in the administration of its affairs, and no person shall be debarred admission to any department of the university on account of sex.

(b) Meetings of the regents shall be public, with exceptions and notice requirements as may be provided by statute.

TEACHERS' RETIREMENT FUND: INVESTMENTS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Deletes exclusion of Teachers' Retirement Fund from provision authorizing investment of portion of public retirement funds in specific securities.

(This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 15, 1969 Regular Session, 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 BOLDFACE TYPE.)
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
ARTICLE XII

First—That the second and third paragraphs of Section 13 of Article XII are
amended to read:
Notwithstanding provisions to the contrary in this section and Section 24.25 of Article
XIII of this Constitution, the Legislature may authorize the investment of moneys of
any public pension or retirement fund other-

than the fund provided for in Section 12901 of
the Education Code, or any successor thereto,
not to exceed 25 percent of the assets of such
fund determined on the basis of cost in the
common stock or shares and not to exceed 5
percent of assets in preferred stock or shares
of any corporation provided:

a. Such stock is registered on a national se-
curities exchange, as provided in the "Securi-
ties Exchange Act of 1934" as amended, but
such registration shall not be required with
respect to the following stocks:
1) The common stock of a bank which is a
member of the Federal Deposit Insurance Cor-
poration and has capital funds, represented by
capital, surplus, and undivided profits, of at
least fifty million dollars ($50,000,000);
2) The common stock of an insurance com-
pany which has capital funds, represented by
statutory surplus funds, and unassigned
losses, of at least fifty million dollars ($50-
000,000);
3) Any preferred stock
b. Such corporation has total assets of at
least one hundred million dollars ($100,000-
000);
c. Bonds of such corporation, if any are
outstanding, qualify for investment under the
law governing the investment of the retire-
ment fund, and there are no arrears of divi-
dend payments on its preferred stock;
d. Such corporation has paid a cash divi-
dend on its common stock in at least 8 of the
10 years next preceding the date of invest-
ment, and the aggregate net earnings available
for dividends on the common stock of such

corporation for the whole of such period have
been equal to the amount of such dividends
paid, and such corporation has paid an earned
cash dividend in each of the last 3 years;
e. Such investment in any one company
may not exceed 5 percent of the common stock
shares outstanding; and
f. No single common stock investment may
exceed 2 percent of the assets of the fund,
based on cost.

Notwithstanding provisions to the contrary
in this section and Section 24.25 of Article XIV
XIII of this Constitution, the Legislature may
authorize the investment of moneys of any
public pension or retirement fund other than
the fund provided for in Section 12901 of the
Education Code, or any successor thereto, in
stock or shares of a diversified management
investment company registered under the "Inv-
nvestment Company Act of 1940" which has
has total assets of at least fifty million dollars
($50,000,000); provided, however, that the
total investment in such stocks and shares, to-
gether with stocks and shares of all other cor-
porations may not exceed 25 percent of the
assets of such fund determined on the basis of
the cost of the stocks or shares.

STATE COLLEGES: SPEAKER MEMBER OF GOVERNING BODY. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Assembly shall be ex officio member of any agency charged with
administration of State College System.

7 (This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 32, 1970 Regu-
lar Session, expressly amends an existing
article of the Constitution by adding a new
section thereto; therefore, NEW PROVI-
SIONS are printed in BOLDFACE TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
ARTICLE XX

Sec. 23. Notwithstanding any other pro-
vision of this Constitution, the Speaker of
the Assembly shall be an ex officio member,
having equal rights and duties with the non-
legislative members, of any state agency
created by the Legislature in the field of
public higher education which is charged
with the management, administration, and
control of the State College System of Cali-
ifornia.

SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION. Legislative Consti-
tutional Amendment. Authorizes one additional Deputy Superin-
tendent of Public Instruction exempt from civil service.

8 (This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitu-
tutional Amendment No. 79, 1969 Regu-
lar Session, as amended by SB 750 of the
1970 Regular Session, expressly amends an
existing section of the Constitution and re-
peals an existing section thereof; therefore,
EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be
REPEALED are printed in STRIKETHROUGH TYPE; and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be
ADDED are printed in BOLDFACE
TYPE.)
PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES IX AND XXIV

First—That Section 2.1 of Article IX be repealed.

Sec. 2.1. The State Board of Education, on nomination of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, shall appoint one Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction and three Associate Superintendents of Public Instruction who shall be exempt from State civil service and whose terms of office shall be four years. This section shall not be construed as prohibiting the appointment by or under the authority of any county Board of Education of any additional Associate Superintendents of Public Instruction subject to State civil service.

Second—That subdivision (d) be added to Section 4 of Article XXIV, to read:

(d) In addition to positions exempted by other provisions of this section, the State Board of Education, on nomination of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, may appoint not more than two Deputy Superintendents of Public Instruction and not more than three Associate Superintendents of Public Instruction, whose terms of office shall run concurrently with the term of the Superintendent of Public Instruction who nominated them, but shall not exceed four years.

And be it further resolved, That the provisions of the second resolved clause of this measure shall become operative only if Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 36 is adopted by the electors at the November 1970 election, in which case subdivision (d) of Section 4 of Article XXIV as added by the first resolved clause of this measure, and subdivision (m) of Section 4 of Article XXIV as added by the first resolved clause of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 36 of the Regular Session, shall not take effect.

COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Board of Supervisors in each noncharter county, or in those counties uniting for joint supervision, may provide by finance approved by electorate for appointment rather than election of county superintendent of schools.

9

(This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 4, 1970 Regular Session, expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED are printed in STRIKETHROUGH; and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED are printed in BOLDFACE TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE IX

Sec. 3. A Superintendent superintendent of Schools schools for each noncharter county shall be elected by the qualified electors thereof at each gubernatorial election; unless the board of supervisors of the county, by ordinance, provides for the appointment of the superintendent of schools by the county board of education for a term of four years. Neither the enactment of such ordinance nor its repeal shall be effective until assented to by a majority of the qualified electors of the county voting at an election to be held for that purpose.

The first appointment made by a county board of education pursuant to the preceding paragraph shall be made upon the expiration of the term of office of the county superintendent of schools of the county in office on the effective date of the ordinance of the board of supervisors making the position appointive or upon the occurrence of a vacancy in such office after such effective date, whichever occurs first. Any person who holds the office of county superintendent of schools of a county on such effective date shall continue to hold such office until his successor is appointed pursuant to this section.

Provided, however, that the Legislature may authorize two or more noncharter counties to unite and elect for the purpose of electing one Superintendent superintendent for the counties so uniting, by the qualified electors of the counties at each gubernatorial election, or for the purpose of enacting an identical ordinance by the boards of supervisors of the counties providing for the appoint-
of the superintendent of schools by the
c. action of the county boards of ed-
ucation of the counties for a term of four
years. Neither the enactment of such ordi-
nance nor its repeal shall be effective as to
any of such counties until assented to by a
majority of the qualified electors of both or
c. all of the counties voting at an election to
be held for that purpose.

The first appointment made by the com-
bined action of county boards of education
pursuant to the preceding paragraph shall
be made upon the expiration of the terms of

office of the county superintendents of
schools of the counties in office upon the ef-
factive date of the ordinances of the boards
of supervisors making appointive the office
of superintendent of the counties uniting, or
upon the occurrence of vacancies in all such
offices after such effective date, whichever
occurs first. Any person who holds the office
of county superintendent of schools of a
county on such effective date shall continue
to hold such office until his successor is ap-
pointed pursuant to this section.

INTEREST RATE LIMITATION: Amends and renumbers Section 22
of Article XX of the State Constitution to provide, subject to
limitations the Legislature may impose, that loans over one hu-
dred thousand dollars ($100,000) may be made to corporations
or partnerships without regard to restrictions of such section.

(This amendment proposed by Assembly
Constitutional Amendment No. 50, 1970 Reg-
ular Session, expressly amends and renum-
bers an existing section of the Constitution;
therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS pro-
posed to be DELETED are printed in
STRIKEOUT TYPE; and NEW PROVI-
SIONS proposed to be INSERTED are
printed in BOLDFACE TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
ARTICLE XX

That Section 22 of Article XX, adopted
November 6, 1934, be amended and renum-
ered to be Section 24 of Article XX, to
read:

Sec. 24. The rate of interest upon the
loan or forbearance of any money, goods or
things in action, or on accounts after demand
or judgment rendered in any court of the
State, shall be 7 per cent per annum but it
shall be competent for the parties to any
loan or forbearance of any money, goods or
things in action to contract in writing for a
rate of interest not exceeding 10 per cent
per annum.

No person, association, copartnership or
corporation shall by charging any fee, bonus,
commission, discount or other compensation
receive from a borrower more than 10 per
cent per annum upon any loan or forbear-
ance of any money, goods or things in action.

However, none of the above restrictions
shall apply (a) to any loan made to a corpo-
ration or to a partnership if the principal
amount of the loan contracted for is one
hundred thousand dollars ($100,000) or more
or to any forbearance granted to a corpo-
ration or to a partnership in connection with
any such loan, nor (b) to any building and
loan association as defined in and which is
chartered under that certain act known as
the “Building and Loan Association Act,”
approved May 5, 1931, as amended, or to any
corporation incorporated in the manner pre-
scribed in and operating under that certain
act entitled “An act defining industrial loan
companies, providing for their incorporation,
powers and supervision,” approved May 15,
1917, as amended, or any corporation incor-
porated in the manner prescribed in and
operating under that certain act entitled
“An act defining credit unions, providing for
their incorporation, powers, management
and supervision,” approved March 31, 1927,
as amended or any duly licensed pawnbroker
or personal property broker, or any bank as
defined in and operating under that certain
act known as the “Bank Act,” approved
March 1, 1909, as amended, or any bank cre-
ated and operating under and pursuant to
any laws of this State or of the United States
of America or any nonprofit cooperative as-
sociation organized under Chapter 4 of Divi-
sion VI of the Agricultural Code in loaning
or advancing money in connection with any
activity mentioned in said title or any corpo-
ration, association, syndicate, joint stock
company, or partnership engaged exclusively
in the business of marketing agricultural,
horticultural, viticultural, dairy, live stock,
poultry and bee products on a cooperative
nonprofit basis in loaning or advancing
money to the members thereof or in conne-
tion with any such business or any corpora-
tion securing money or credit from any Fed-
eral intermediate credit bank, organized and
existing pursuant to the provisions of an act
of Congress entitled “Agricultural Credits
Act of 1923,” as amended in loaning or ad-
vaning credit so secured, nor shall any such
charge of any said exempted classes of per-
sons be considered in any action or for any
purpose as increasing or affecting or as con-
ected with the rate of interest hereinbefore
fixed. The Legislature may from time to time
prescribe the maximum rate per annum of,
or provide for the supervision, or the filing
of a schedule of, or in any manner fix, regu-
late or limit, the fees, bonus, commissions,
discounts or other compensation which may be charged or received in connection with the exempted classes of loans or which all or any of the said exempted classes of persons may charge or receive from a borrower in connection with any loan or forbearance of any money, goods or things in action.”

The provisions of this section shall supersede all provisions of this Constitution and laws enacted thereunder in conflict therewith.

CHIROPRACTORS: RULES. Amendment of Chiropractic Initiative Act, submitted by Legislature. Authorizes Board of Chiropractic Examiners to adopt specified rules and regulations governing chiropractics and specifies procedure by which rules are to be adopted, amended, repealed, or established.

PROPOSED LAW
An act to amend an initiative act entitled “An Act Prescribing the Terms Upon Which Licenses May Be Issued to Practitioners of Chiropractic . . .” approved by electors November 7, 1922, by amending Sections 4 and 10 thereof relating to the practice of chiropractic, said amendments to take effect upon the approval thereof by the electors.

Section 1. Section 4 of the act cited in the title is amended to read:

Sec. 4. Powers of board. The board shall have power:
(a) To adopt a seal, which shall be affixed to all licenses issued by the board.
(b) To adopt from time to time such rules and regulations as the board may deem proper and necessary for the performance of its work; copies of such rules and regulations to be filed with the Secretary of State for public inspection; the effective enforcement and administration of this act, the establishment of educational requirements for license renewal, and the protection of the public. Such rules and regulations shall be adopted, amended, repealed and established in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 11371) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code as it now reads or as it may be hereafter amended by the Legislature.
(c) To examine applicants and to issue and revoke licenses to practice chiropractic, as herein provided.
(d) To summon witnesses and to take testimony as to matters pertaining to its duties; and each member shall have power to administer oaths and take affidavits.
(e) To do any and all things necessary or incidental to the exercise of the powers and duties herein granted or imposed.
(f) To determine minimum requirements for teachers in chiropractic schools and colleges.

(g) To approve chiropractic schools and colleges whose graduates may apply for licenses in this State. Any school meeting the requirements of Section 5 of this act and the rules and regulations adopted by the board shall be eligible for such approval.

(h) The board may employ such investigators, clerical assistants, and other employees as it may deem necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act, and shall prescribe the duties of such employees.

Sec. 10. (a) The board may by rule or regulation adopt, amend, or repeal rules of professional conduct appropriate to the establishment and maintenance of a high standard of professional service and the protection of the public. Such rules or regulations shall be adopted, amended, or repealed in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 11371) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code as it now reads or as it may be hereafter amended by the Legislature.

(b) The board shall refuse to grant, or may suspend or revoke, a license to practice chiropractic in this State, upon any of the following grounds, to wit: or may place the licensee upon probation or issue a reprimand to him, for violation of the rules and regulations adopted by the board in accordance with this act, or for any cause specified in this act, including, but not limited to:

The employment of fraud or deception in applying for a license or in passing an examination as provided in this act; the practice of chiropractic under a false or assumed name; or the personation of another practitioner of like or different name; the conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude; habitual intemperance in the use of ardent spirits, narcotics or stimulants to such an extent as to incapacitate him for the performance of his professional duties; the advertising of any means whereby the monthly periods of women can be regulated or the means re-established if pressed; or the advertising, directly, indirectly or in substance, upon any card, sign, newspaper advertisement, or other written or printed sign or advertisement, that the
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| COMPENSATION OF COUNTY SUPERVISORS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Provides that county governing body, rather than Legislature, shall prescribe compensation of its members by an ordinance that is subject to referendum. |
|---|---|
| **YES** | **NO** |

This amendment proposed by Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 19, 1970 Regular Session, expressly amends existing sections of the Constitution; therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in **STRIKE-OUT TYPE**; and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED** are printed in **BOLDFACE TYPE**.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XI**

First—That subdivision (b) of Section 1 of Article XI is amended to read:

(b) The Legislature shall provide for county payers and an elected governing body in each county. Except as provided in subdivision (b) of Section 4 of this article, each governing body shall prescribe by ordinance the compensation of its members, but the ordinance prescribing such compensation shall be subject to referendum. The Legislature or the governing body may provide for other officers whose compensation shall be prescribed by the governing body. The governing body shall provide for the number, compensation, tenure, and appointment of employees. Second—That subdivision (b) of Section 4 of Article XI is amended to read:

(b) The compensation, terms, and removal of members of the governing body. If a county charter provides for the Legislature to prescribe the salary of the governing body, such compensation shall be prescribed by the governing body by ordinance.

| TAX EXEMPTION FOR DISABLED VETERANS AND BLIND VETERANS. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Increases property tax exemption for totally disabled veteran to $10,000 and extends this exemption to widow until remarriage. Extends blind veteran's exemption to home which he is shareholder and entitled or **ADDED** are printed in **BOLDFACE TYPE**.) |
|---|---|
| **YES** | **NO** |

(This amendment proposed by Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 29, 1969 Regular Session, expressly amends existing sections of Constitution; therefore, **EXISTING PROVISIONS** proposed to be **DELETED** are printed in **STRIKE-OUT TYPE**; and **NEW PROVISIONS** proposed to be **INSERTED**

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XIII**

First—That Section 14a of Article XIII be amended to read:
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Sec. 14a. The Legislature may exempt from taxation, in whole or in part, the property constituting a home, of (a) every resident of this State who, by reason of his military or naval service, who is qualified for the exemption provided in Section 11 of this article, without regard to any limitation contained therein on the value of property owned by such person or his wife, and who, by reason of a permanent and total service-connected disability incurred in such military or naval service due to the loss, or loss of use, as the result of amputation, amputation, progressive muscular dystrophies, or paralysis, of both lower extremities, such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of braces, crutches, canes, or a wheelchair, has received assistance from the Government of the United States in the acquisition of such property, and; (b) the home of the widow of every such person if the home was acquired as described in subdivision (a); except that such exemption shall not extend to more than one home nor exceed five thousand dollars ($5,000) or ten thousand dollars ($10,000) for any person, or for any person and his spouse, or for his widow. This exemption shall be in lieu of the exemption provided in Section 11 of this article.

Where such totally disabled person, such person and his spouse, or his widow, sells or otherwise disposes of such property and thereafter acquires, with or without the assistance of the Government of the United States, any other property which such totally disabled person, such person and his spouse, or his widow, occupies habitually as a home, the exemption allowed pursuant to the first paragraph of this section shall be allowed to such other property. This section shall not apply to a widow upon her remarriage.

Second.—That Section 14b of Article 11 be amended to read:

Sec. 14b. The Legislature may exempt from taxation, in whole or in part, the property constituting a home, of every resident of this State, who, by reason of his military or naval service, is qualified for the exemption provided in subdivision (a) of Section 14 of this article, without regard to any limitation contained therein on the value of property owned by such person or his spouse, and who, by reason of a permanent and total service-connected disability incurred in such military or naval service is blind in both eyes with visual acuity of 5/200 or less; except that such exemption shall not extend to more than one home nor exceed five thousand dollars ($5,000) for any person or for any person and his spouse. This exemption shall be in lieu of the exemption provided in subdivision (a) of Section 14 of this article.

Where such blind person sells or otherwise disposes of such property and thereafter acquires, with or without the assistance of the Government of the United States, any other property which such totally disabled person occupies habitually as a home, the exemption allowed pursuant to the first paragraph of this section shall be allowed to such other property.

The exemption provided by this section shall apply to the home of such a person which is owned by a corporation of which he is a shareholder, the rights of shareholding in which entitle him to possession of a home owned by the corporation.

This section shall apply to such property for the 1965-1966 fiscal year in the manner provided by law.

STATE CIVIL SERVICE. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Continues existing civil service system, revises language and removes certain provisions. Requires additional positions be civil service and removes certain positions from civil service.

(This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 36 of the 1970 Regular Session, as amended by SB 730 of the 1970 Regular Session, expressly repeals an existing article of the Constitution, and adds a new article thereto; therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be REPEALED are printed in STRIKETHROUGH TYPE; and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be ADDED are printed in BOLDFACE TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO
ARTICLE XXIV
First.—That Article XXIV is repealed.

ARTICLE XXIV
STATE CIVIL SERVICE

Section 1. Permanent appointments and promotion in the State civil service shall be made exclusively under a general system based upon merit, efficiency and fitness as ascertained by competitive examination.

Sec. 2. (a) There shall be a State Personnel Board of five members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. The first term of office shall expire on January 16, 1937; January 16, 1938; January 16, 1941; January 16, 1943; and January 16, 1945. Each subsequent appointee shall hold office for 30 years from the expiration of the term of his predecessor and his successor is appointed and qualifies to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of a term shall be for the remainder of that term. A member may be removed by a vote of two-thirds of
(9) The board shall annually elect one of its members president.

(10) The board shall appoint and fix the compensation of an executive officer who shall be a member of the State civil service but not a member of the board.

Said executive officer shall perform and discharge all of the powers, duties, purposes, functions and jurisdiction hereunder or which hereafter by law may be vested in the board except that the adoption of rules and regulations, the creation and adjustment of classifications and grades, and dismissals, demotions, suspensions and other punitive action for or in the State civil service shall be and remain the duty of the board and a vote of a majority of said board shall be required to make any action with respect thereto effective.

Sec. 3. Said board shall administer and enforce and is vested with all of the powers, duties, purposes, functions and jurisdiction which are now or hereafter may be vested in any other state officer or agency under Chapter 500 of the California Statutes of 1913 as amended or any and all other laws relating to the State civil service or said laws may now exist or may hereafter be enacted, amended or repealed by the Legislature.

Sec. 4. The provisions hereof shall apply to and the term "State civil service" shall include, every officer and employee of this State except:

(1) State officers elected by the people;

(2) State officers directly appointed by the Governor with or without the consent or confirmation of the Senate and the employees of the Governor's office;

(3) State officers and employees directly appointed or employed by the Attorney General or the members of the Judicial Council or by any court of record in this State or any justice, judge or clerk thereof;

(4) State officers and employees directly appointed or employed by the Legislature or either house thereof;

(5) One person holding a confidential position to any officer mentioned in paragraphs (1), (2) or (4) hereof except that there shall be but one such position to any board or commission composed in whole or in part of officers mentioned in said paragraphs, each such person to be selected by the officer, board or commission to be served;

(6) One deputy for the Legislative Counsel for each state officer elected by the people, each such deputy to be selected by the officer to be served;

Persons employed by the University of California;

(12) Persons employed by any state normal school or teachers college;

(13) The teaching staff of all schools under the direction or jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Department of Education or the director thereof or the State Board of Education who otherwise would be members of the State civil service.

(14) Employees of the Federal Government or persons whose selection is subject to rules or requirements of the Federal Government engaged in work done by cooperation between the State and Federal Government or engaged in work financed in whole or in part with federal funds;

(15) Persons appointed or employed by or under the State Board of Prison Directors or any warden of a state prison;

(16) The officers and employees of the Railroad Commission.

(17) Member help in the Veterans' Home of California and inmate help in all state charitable or correctional institutions.

(18) The members of the militia of the State while engaged in military service.

(19) Officers and employees of district agricultural associations employed less than six months in any one calendar year.

(20) Stewards and stewarenesses of the California Horse Racing Board who are not employed on a full-time basis.

(21) The Legislature may provide that the provisions of this article shall apply to, and the term "State civil service" shall include, any person or group of persons hereinafter excepted other than those mentioned in paragraphs (1) or (2) or (12) or (13) of subdivision (a) of this section. Hereafter, no exception shall be revised with respect to any person or group of persons hereinafter or hereafter included in the State civil service under this subdivision. The Legislature may, however, provide that any officer included in the State civil service pursuant to this paragraph may be appointed by the Governor, and in such case the provisions of paragraph (a) shall apply.

(22) Whenever the appointment or employment of new or additional officers or employees of this State is hereinafter authorized by law, such officers or employees shall be subject to the provisions hereof and included within the State civil service unless of a class excepted hereinaf.

Sec. 5. The provisions of this article shall be self-executing but legislation not in conflict herewith may be enacted to facilitate its operation.

Sec. 6. (a) No temporary appointment of a person to any position shall be made unless there is no employment list from which such position can be filled.

(a) No person shall hold a given position under temporary appointment for a longer period than nine months in any consecutive 12 months. The Legislature may pass any law for the purpose of filling or changing existing positions.
months, nor shall any person serve in any board or commission other than the State Civil Service Commission, the University of California, the California State Colleges, the Department of Education, the Department of Mental Hygiene, the State Health Department, the Department of Public Safety, or the Department of Transportation for a longer period than nine months in any consecutive twelve months:

Sec. 7. Nothing herein contained shall prevent or modify the giving of preferences in appointments and promotions and in the State Civil Service to veterans and widows of veterans as in now or hereafter may be authorized by the Legislature.

Second—That Article XXIV is added to read:

**ARTICLE XXIV**

**STATE CIVIL SERVICE**

Sec. 1. (a) The civil service includes every officer and employee of the State except as otherwise provided in this Constitution.

(b) In the civil service permanent appointment and promotion shall be made under a general system based on merit ascertained by competitive examination.

Sec. 2. (a) There is a Personnel Board of five members appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate, a majority of the membership concurring, for 10-year terms, and until their successors are appointed and qualified. Appointment to fill a vacancy is for the unexpired portion of the term. A member may be removed by concurrent resolution adopted by each house, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring.

(b) The board shall annually elect one of its members chairman.

(c) The board shall appoint and prescribe compensation for an executive officer who shall be a member of the civil service but not a member of the board.

Sec. 3. (a) The board shall enforce the civil service statutes and, by majority vote of all its members, shall prescribe probationary periods and classifications, adopt other rules authorized by statute, and review disciplinary actions.

(b) The executive officer shall administer the civil service statutes under rules of the board.

Sec. 4. The following are exempt from civil service:

(a) Officers and employees appointed or employed by the Legislature, either house, or legislative committees.

(b) Officers and employees appointed or employed by councils, commissions or public corporations in the judicial branch or by a court of record or officer thereof.

(c) Officers elected by the people and a deputy and an employee selected by each elected officer.

(d) Members of boards and commissions.

(e) A deputy or employee selected by each board or commission either appointed by the Governor or authorized by statute.

(f) State officers directly appointed by the Governor with or without the consent or confirmation of the Senate and the employees of the Governor’s office, and the employees of the Lieutenant Governor’s office directly appointed or employed by the Lieutenant Governor.

(g) A deputy or employee selected by each officer, except members of boards and commissions, exempted under Section 4(f).

(h) Officers and employees of the University of California and the California State Colleges.

(i) The teaching staff of schools under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education or the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

(j) Member, inmate, and patient help in state homes, charitable or correctional institutions, and state facilities for mentally ill or retarded persons.

(k) Members of the militia while engaged in military service.

(l) Officers and employees of district agricultural associations employed less than six months in a calendar year.

(m) In addition to positions exempted by other provisions of this section, the Attorney General may appoint or employ six deputies or employees, the Public Utilities Commission may appoint or employ one deputy or employee, and the Legislative Counsel may appoint or employ two deputies or employees.

Sec. 5. A temporary appointment may be made to a position for which there is no employment list. No person may serve in one or more positions under temporary appointment longer than six months in 12 consecutive months.

Sec. 6. (a) The Legislature may provide preferences for veterans and their widows.

(b) The board by special rule may permit persons in exempt positions, brought under civil service by constitutional provision, to qualify to continue in their positions in the state civil service subject to such minimum standards as may be established by statute.

And it is further resolved, That it is intended that if both this measure and Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 79 of the 1969 Regular Session of the Legislature are
and approved by the electors at the November 1970 election that both be given effect, and to that end subdivision (m) is added to Section 4 of Article XXIV, to read:

(m) In addition to positions exempted by other provisions of this section, the Attorney General may appoint or employ six deputies or employees, the Public Utilities Commission may appoint or employ one deputy or employee, the Legislative Counsel may appoint or employ two deputies or employees, and the State Board of Education, on nomination of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, may appoint not more than two Deputy Superintendents of Public Instruction and not more than four Associate Superintendents of Public Instruction, whose terms of office shall run concurrently with the term of the Superintendent of Public Instruction who nominated them, but shall not exceed four years.

And be it further resolved, That the provisions of the second resolved clause of this measure shall become operative only if Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 79 is adopted by the electors at the November 1970 election, in which case subdivision (m) of Section 4 of Article XXIV as added by the first resolved clause of this measure, and subdivision (d) of Section 4 of Article XXIV as added by the first resolved clause of Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 79, shall not take effect.

PARTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION. Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Revises, amends and repeals various miscellaneous provisions of Constitution relating to seat of government, separate property, hours of labor, minimum wages, discrimination based on sex, elections, terms of office, duels, and other matters.

This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 65, 1970 Regular Session, expressly amends and repeals existing sections of the Constitution; therefore, existing provisions, proposed to be deleted or repealed are printed in \textit{\underline{\textbf{\textcolor{red}{DELETED}}} \textbf{\underline{\textcolor{red}{PROVISIONS}}}}; and new provisions proposed to be inserted are printed in \textbf{\underline{\textcolor{red}{BOLDFACE TYPE}}}.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE XX

First—That Section 1 of Article XX is amended to read:

\textbf{ARTICLE XX}

\textbf{MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS}

\textbf{SECTION 1.} The city of Sacramento is hereby declared to be the Capital of California. The seat of government of this State; and shall so remain until changed by law; but no law changing the seat of government shall be void or binding, unless the same be approved and ratified by a majority of the qualified electors of the State voting therefor at a general State election; under such regulations and provisions as the Legislature, by a two-thirds vote of each house, may provide, submitting the question of change to the people.

Second—That Section 2 of Article XX is repealed.

\textbf{SECTION 2.} Any citizen of this State who shall, after the adoption of this Constitution, fight a duel with deadly weapons, or send or receive a challenge to fight a duel with deadly weapons, either within this State or out of it; or who shall act as second, or knowingly aid or assist in any manner those than offending, shall not be allowed to hold any office of profit or to enjoy the right of suffrage under this Constitution.

Third—That Section 3.5 of Article XX is repealed.

\textbf{SECTION 3.} Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, the Legislature by general law may provide for the reparation and reentry into public office within the terms for which they were elected, and the reentry into public employment, respectively, of public officers and employees who have resigned or who resign their offices or employments to serve or to continue to serve in the armed forces of the United States or in the armed forces of this State. The Legislature may determine the extent to which such provisions shall be given retrospective effect.

As used in this section, 'public officers and employees' includes all of the following:

\textit{(a) Members of the Senate and of the Assembly.}

\textit{(b) Justices of the Supreme Court and the district courts of appeals; judges of the superior courts and of the municipal courts; and all other judicial officers.}

\textit{(c) All other State officers and employees, whether or not within the State civil service, including all officers for whose selection and term of office provision is made in the Constitution and laws of this State.}

\textit{(d) All officers and employees of any county, city and county; city; township; district; political subdivision; authority; commission; board; or other public agency within this State.}

Every person elected or appointed to any public office or employment within this State holds such office or employment subject to the right of reentry or reinstatement which may be granted to a former holder of the office or employment pursuant to this section.
Fourth—That Section 4 of Article XX is repealed.

Sec. 4. All officers or Commissioners whose election or appointment is not provided for by this Constitution, and all officers or Commissioners whose office or duties may hereafter be created by law, shall be elected by the people, or appointed, as the Legislature may direct.

Fifth—That Section 5 of Article XX is repealed.

Sec. 5. The fiscal year shall commence on the first day of July.

Sixth—That Section 7 of Article XX is repealed.

Sec. 7. No contract of marriage, if otherwise duly made, shall be invalid for want of conformity to the requirements of any religious sect.

Seventh—That Section 8 of Article XX is amended to read:

Sec. 8. All property, Property real and personal, owned by either husband or wife before marriage; and that or acquired during marriage by either of them afterwards by gift, will, or inheritance is devisee or descent, shall be their separate property.

Eighth—That Section 9 of Article XX is repealed.

Sec. 9. No perpetuities shall be allowed except for ecclesiastical purposes.

Ninth—That Section 12 of Article XX is repealed.

Sec. 12. Absence from this State, or from the United States, shall not affect the question of residence of any person.

Tenth—That Section 13 of Article XX is repealed.

Sec. 13. A majority of the votes given at any election shall constitute a choice where not otherwise directed in this Constitution, provided that it shall be competent in all charters of cities, counties or cities and counties, to frame under the authority of this Constitution to provide the manner in which their respective elective officers may be elected and to provide a higher proportion of the vote therefor, and provided also, that it shall be competent for the Legislature by general law to provide the manner in which officers of municipalities organized or incorporated under general laws may be elected and to provide a higher proportion of the vote therefor.

Eleventh—That Section 14 of Article XX is repealed.

Sec. 14. The Legislature shall provide by law for the maintenance and efficiency of a State Board of Health.

Twelfth—That Section 17 of Article XX is amended to read:

Sec. 17. The time Worktime of service of all laborers or workmen or mechanics or workmen on employed upon any of the State of California, or any of the county, city and county, city, town, district, township, or any other political subdivision thereof, whether paid work is done by contract or otherwise, shall be limited and restricted to not to exceed eight hours in any one calendar day; except in wartime or cases of extraordinary emergency emergencies that endanger caused by fire, flood, or danger to life and or property. The Legislature shall provide for enforcement of this section, or except to work upon public, military, or naval work, or defense of in time of war, and the Legislature shall provide by law that a stipulation to this effect shall be incorporated in all contracts for public work and prescribe proper penalties for the speedy and efficient enforcement of said law.

Thirteenth—That Section 17½ of Article XX is amended to read:

Sec. 17½. The Legislature may, by appropriate legislation, provide for minimum wages the establishment of a minimum wage for women and minors and may provide for the comfort, health, safety, and general welfare of any and all employees and for those purposes may, No provision of this Constitution shall be construed as a limitation upon the authority of the Legislature to confer upon any commission, legislative, executive, or judicial, power or authority or the Legislature may deem requisite to carry out the provisions of this section.

Fourteenth—That Section 18 of Article XX is amended to read:

Sec. 18. No person shall, on account of sex, may not be disqualified because of sex, from entering upon or pursuing any law business, vocation, or profession.

Fifteenth—That Section 20 of Article XX is amended to read:

Sec. 20. Elections of the officers, Terms of elective offices, provided for by this Constitution shall be held on the even-numbered years next before the expiration of their respective terms. The terms of such officers shall commence on the first Monday after the first day of January 1st, following their election. The election shall be held in the last even-numbered year before the term expires.

*Reference to another proposed amendment to Sec. 20, Art. XX, which was to take effect in the event that Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 2 was adopted by the people, has not been included in this Assembly Constitutional Amendment 2 was not submitted to the voters by the Legislature.
**ARTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.** Legislative Constitutional Amendment. Authorizes Legislature, by two-thirds vote, to amend or withdraw a proposed constitutional amendment or revision submitted by it. Provides initiatives, referendums, and legislative proposals take effect day after election, unless measure provides otherwise. Revises procedure for constitutional convention.

(This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 67, 1970 Regular Session, expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution, repeals an existing article thereof, and adds a new article thereto; therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be DELETED or REPEALED are printed in STRIKETHROUGH TYPE; and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be INSERTED or ADDED are printed in BOLDFACE TYPE.)

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLES IV AND XVIII**

First—That subdivision (a) of Section 24 of Article IV is amended to read:

Sec. 24. (a) An initiative statute or referendum measure approved by a majority of the voters thereon takes effect 6 days after the date of the official declaration of the vote by the Secretary of State the day after the election unless the measure provides otherwise. A referendum petition is filed against a part of a statute the remainder of the statute shall not be delayed from going into effect.

Second—That Article XVIII is repealed.

**ARTICLE XVIII**

**AMENDING AND REVISION THE CONSTITUTION**

Sec. 1. Any amendment or amendments to, or revision of, this Constitution may be proposed in the Senate or Assembly, and if two-thirds of all the members elected to each of the two houses shall vote in favor thereof, such proposed amendment, amendments, or revision shall be entered in their journals with the year and may be taken thereon; and it shall be the duty of the Legislature to submit such proposed amendment, amendments, or revision to the people in such manner, and at such time, and after such publication as may be deemed expedient. Should more amendments than one be submitted at the same election they shall be so prepared and distinguished by numbers or otherwise that each can be voted on separately. If the people shall approve and ratify such amendment or amendments, or any of them, or such revision, by a majority of the qualified electors voting thereon such amendment or amendments shall become a part of the Constitution; and such revision shall become a part of the Constitution of the State of California on it becomes a part of the Constitution if the measure revises only a part of the Constitution.

**ARTICLE XVIII**

**AMENDING AND REVISION THE CONSTITUTION**

Sec. 1. The Legislature by rolcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, may propose an amendment or revision of the Constitution and in the same manner may amend or withdraw its proposal. Each amendment shall be so prepared and submitted that it can be voted on separately.

Sec. 2. The Legislature by rolcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, may submit at a general election the question whether to call a convention to revise the Constitution. If the majority vote yes on that question, within 6 months the Legislature shall provide for the convention. Dele-
PARTIAL CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION

Amendment. Repeals obsolete provisions relating to social welfare.

(This amendment proposed by Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 66, 1970 Regular Session, expressly repeals an existing article of the Constitution; therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be REPEALED are printed in STRIKEOUT TYPE.)

PROPOSED REPEAL OF
ARTICLE XXVII

ARTICLE XXVII

SECTION 1. Article XXXV of amendment to the Constitution of the State of California is hereby repealed.

SECTION 2. All provisions of this Constitution which were repealed by Article XXXV of amendment to this Constitution because they were in conflict therewith if any, are hereby re-enacted, revised and declared to be fully and completely effective.

SECTION 3. (a) All laws which were repealed by Article XXXV of amendment to this Constitution because they were in conflict therewith are hereby re-enacted, revised and declared to be fully and completely effective.

(b) All of the provisions of Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of Division III of the Welfare and Institutions Code of the State of California relating to Old Age Security and Chapters 1, 2, and 3 of Part I of Division V of the Welfare and Institutions Code of the State of California relating to Aid to Blind as in effect at the time of the passage of Article XXXV of amendment to the Constitution of the State of California are hereby re-enacted, revised and declared to be fully and completely effective.

(c) Nothing contained in paragraph (b) of this section shall be construed to limit in any way the provisions contained in paragraph (a) of this section.

(d) All of the laws re-enacted, revised and declared to be fully and completely effective by this section may, at any time, be amended or repealed by the Legislature.

SECTION 6. If this article is adopted by the people, it shall take effect five days after the date of the official declaration of adoption by the Secretary of State and become effective 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 XXXV 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.

CERTIFICATE OF SECRETARY OF STATE

I, H. P. Sullivan, Secretary of State of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing measures will be submitted to the electors of the State of California at the GENERAL ELECTION to be held throughout the State on November 3, 1970, and that the foregoing pamphlet is correct.

Witness my hand and the Great Seal of the State, at office in Sacramento, California, the seventeenth day of August, 1970.
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