

1990

# LIMITS ON TERMS OF OFFICE, LEGISLATORS' RETIREMENT, LEGISLATIVE OPERATING COSTS.

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

---

## Recommended Citation

LIMITS ON TERMS OF OFFICE, LEGISLATORS' RETIREMENT, LEGISLATIVE OPERATING COSTS. California Proposition 140 (1990).

[http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca\\_ballot\\_props/1045](http://repository.uchastings.edu/ca_ballot_props/1045)

This Proposition is brought to you for free and open access by the California Ballot Propositions and Initiatives at UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Propositions by an authorized administrator of UC Hastings Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [marcusc@uchastings.edu](mailto:marcusc@uchastings.edu).

**Official Title and Summary:****LIMITS ON TERMS OF OFFICE, LEGISLATORS'  
RETIREMENT, LEGISLATIVE OPERATING COSTS.  
INITIATIVE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT**

- Persons elected or appointed after November 5, 1990, holding offices of Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Board of Equalization members, and State Senators, limited to two terms; members of the Assembly limited to three terms.
- Requires legislators elected or serving after November 1, 1990, to participate in federal Social Security program; precludes accrual of other pension and retirement benefits resulting from legislative service, except vested rights.
- Limits expenditures of Legislature for compensation and operating costs and equipment, to specified amount.

**Summary of Legislative Analyst's  
Estimate of Net State and Local Government Fiscal Impact:**

- The limitation on terms will have no fiscal effect.
- The restrictions on the legislative retirement benefits would reduce state costs by approximately \$750,000 a year.
- To the extent that future legislators do not participate in the federal Social Security system, there would be unknown future savings to the state.
- Legislative expenditures in 1991-92 would be reduced by about 38 percent, or \$70 million.
- In subsequent years, the measure would limit growth in these expenditures to the changes in the state's appropriations limit.

## Analysis by the Legislative Analyst

### Background

There are 132 elected state officials in California. This includes 120 legislators and 12 other state officials, including the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Attorney General. Currently, there is no limit on the number of terms that these officials can serve. Proposition 112, passed by the voters in June 1990, requires the annual salaries and benefits (excluding retirement) of these state officials to be set by a commission. Most of these officials participate in the federal Social Security system, and all have the option of participating in the Legislators' Retirement System. The vast majority of the 132 elected state officials participate in this retirement system. The system is supported by contributions from participating officials and the state.

Funding for the Legislature and its employees is included in the annual state budget. Before it becomes law, the budget must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the membership of both houses of the Legislature and must be signed by the Governor.

### Proposal

This initiative makes three major changes to the California Constitution. First, it limits the number of terms that an elected state official can serve in the *same office* (the new office of Insurance Commissioner is not affected by this measure). Second, it prohibits legislators from earning state retirement benefits from their future service in the Legislature. Third, it limits the total amount of expenditures by the Legislature for salaries and operating expenses.

The specific provisions of this measure are:

#### *Limits on the Terms of Elected State Officials*

- The following state elected officials would be limited to no more than two four-year terms in the same office: Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, Superintendent of Public Instruction, Treasurer, members of the Board of Equalization, and State Senators.
- Members of the State Assembly would be limited to no more than three two-year terms in the same office.
- These limits apply to a state official who is elected on or after November 6, 1990. However, State Senators whose offices are *not* on the November 1990 ballot may serve only one additional term.

#### *Restrictions on Legislative Retirement Benefits*

- This measure prohibits current and future legislators from earning state retirement benefits from their service in the Legislature on or after November 7, 1990. This restriction would not eliminate retirement benefits earned prior to that time.
- This measure requires a legislator serving in the Legislature on or after November 7, 1990 to participate in the federal Social Security system. (However, federal law may permit only current legislators who are presently participating in the federal Social Security system to continue to participate in the system. It may also prohibit future legislators from participating in the federal Social Security system.)
- This measure does not change the Social Security coverage or the state retirement benefits of other state elected officials such as the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Attorney General.

#### *Limits on Expenditures by the Legislature*

- This measure limits the total amount of expenditures by the Legislature for salaries and operating expenses, beginning in the 1991-92 fiscal year.
- In 1991-92, these expenditures are limited to the *lower* of two amounts: (1) a total of \$950,000 per Member or (2) 80 percent of the total amount of money expended in the previous year for these purposes. In future years, the measure limits expenditure growth to an amount equal to the percentage change in the state's appropriations limit.

#### Fiscal Effect

*Limits on the Terms of Elected State Officials.* This provision would not have any fiscal effect.

*Restrictions on Legislative Retirement Benefits.* The provision which prohibits current and future Members of the Legislature from earning state retirement benefits from legislative service on and after November 7, 1990 would reduce state costs by about \$750,000 a year.

To the extent that future legislators do not participate in the federal Social Security system, the measure would result in unknown future savings to the state.

*Limits on Expenditures by the Legislature.* In 1991-92, expenditures by the Legislature would be reduced by about 38 percent, or \$70 million. In subsequent years, this measure would limit growth in these expenditures to the change in the state's appropriations limit.

---

For text of Proposition 140 see page 137

---

## Argument in Favor of Proposition 140

Proposition 140 will for the first time ever place a limit on the number of terms a State official may serve in office.

A Yes Vote on Proposition 140 will reform a political system that has created a legislature of career politicians in California. It is a system that has given a tiny elite (only 120 people out of 30 million) almost limitless power over the lives of California's taxpayers and consumers.

Proposition 140, will limit State Senators to two terms (8 years); will limit Assembly members to three terms (6 years); and limit the Governor and other elected constitutional officers to two terms (8 years).

By reducing the amount they can spend on their personal office expenses, Proposition 140, will cut back on the 3,000 political staffers who serve the legislature in Sacramento. In the first year alone, according to the legislative analyst, it will save taxpayers \$60 million.

Proposition 140, will end extravagant pensions for legislators. While most Californians have to depend on Social Security and their own savings, the legislative pension system often pays more than the legislator received while in office. In fact 50 former officials receive \$2,000.00 per month or more from the Legislative retirement fund.

Limiting Terms, will create more competitive elections, so good legislators will always have the opportunity to move up the ladder. Term limitation will end the ingrown, political nature of both houses—to the benefit of every man, woman and child in California.

Proposition 140, will remove the grip that vested interests have over the legislature and remove the huge political slush funds at the disposal of Senate and Assembly leaders.

Proposition 140 will put an end to the life-time legislators, who have developed cozy relationships with special interests.

We all remember the saying, "Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely." But limit the terms of Legislative members, remove the Speaker's cronies, and we will also put an end to the Sacramento web of special favors and patronage.

Proposition 140 will end the reign of the Legislature's powerful officers—the Assembly Speaker (first elected a quarter of a century ago) and the Senate Leader (now into his third decade in the Legislature). Lobbyists and power brokers pay homage to these legislative dictators, for they control the fate of bills, parcel out money to the camp followers and hangers-on, and pull strings behind the scenes to decide election outcomes.

Incumbent legislators seldom lose. In the 1988 election, 100% of incumbent state senators and 96% of incumbent members of the assembly were re-elected. The British House of Lords—even the Soviet Legislature—has a higher turnover rate. Enough is Enough! It's time to put an end to a system that makes incumbents a special class of citizen and pays them a guaranteed annual wage from first election to the grave. Let's restore that form of government envisioned by our Founding Fathers—a government of citizens representing their fellow citizens.

**VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 140 TO LIMIT STATE OFFICIALS TERM OF OFFICE!**

**PETER F. SCHABARUM**

*Chairman, Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors*

**LEWIS K. UHLER**

*President, National Tax-Limitation Committee*

**J. G. FORD, JR.**

*President, Marin United Taxpayers Association*

## Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 140

Proposition 140 is a proposal by a downtown Los Angeles politician to take away your right to choose your legislators. He has a history of taking away voting rights. He and two political cronies voted to spend \$500,000.00 in tax dollars to hire a personal lawyer to defend him against Voting Rights Act violations in Federal Court. Newspapers call it an "outrageous back room deal."

His "Big Bucks" friends, including high-priced lobbyists, have lined his pockets with campaign contributions to help control who *you* can vote for.

- IF 140 PASSES, LOBBYISTS COULD SUBSTITUTE THEIR OWN PAID EMPLOYEES FOR THE INDEPENDENT STAFF RESEARCHERS OF THE LEGISLATURE ELIMINATED BY THIS MEASURE.
- 140 MISLEADS YOU ABOUT THE SO-CALLED "HIGH" COST OF THE LEGISLATURE—THE COST IS LESS THAN ½ PENNY PER TAX DOLLAR.
- THE BIGGEST LIE IS THE FACT THEY DON'T TELL YOU THAT 140 IS A *LIFETIME BAN*.

This is a blatant power grab by Los Angeles contributors and lobbyists who have been wining and dining "Mr. Downtown

Los Angeles" in government for SEVEN TERMS—OVER TWENTY YEARS.

Practice what you preach, "Mr. Downtown Los Angeles," Peter Schabarum. Cut *your own* budget and limit *your own* terms. Don't be piggy and take away people's rights after you have fully eaten at the table.

There is no need for 140. The vast majority of the Legislature *already* serves less than 10 years.

That's *your* choice.

Keep it.

Stop Downtown Los Angeles' power grab.

Vote no on 140!

**ED FOGLIA**

*President, California Teachers Association*

**DAN TERRY**

*President, California Professional Firefighters*

**LINDA M. TANGREN**

*State Chair, California National Women's Political Caucus*

# Limits on Terms of Office, Legislators' Retirement, Legislative Operating Costs. Initiative Constitutional Amendment

140

## Argument Against Proposition 140

Proposition 140 claims to mandate term limits. But in fact, it limits our voting rights.

This measure takes away the cherished constitutional right to freely cast a ballot for candidates of our choice.

We are asked to forfeit *our* right to decide who *our* individual representatives will be.

### PROPOSITION 140'S LIFETIME BAN

140 does *not* limit *consecutive* terms of office. Instead 140 says:

- After serving six years in the Assembly, individuals will be constitutionally *banned for life* from ever serving in the Assembly.
- After serving eight years in the Senate, individuals will be constitutionally *banned for life* from ever serving in the Senate.
- Similar lifetime bans will be imposed on the Superintendent of Public Instruction and other statewide offices.

There are no exceptions—not for merit, not for statewide emergencies, not for the overwhelming will of the people.

Once banned, always banned.

### PROPOSITION 140 IS UNFAIR

It treats everyone—good and bad, competent and incompetent—the same.

No matter how good a job someone does in office, they will be *banned for life*.

No matter what cause they may be fighting for or how badly *we*, the people, want to reelect them, they will be *banned for life*.

You won't even be able to write-in their names on your ballot. If you do, your vote won't count.

That's just not fair.

### LIMITS OUR RIGHT TO CHOOSE

The backers of 140 don't trust us, the people, to choose our elected officials. So instead of promoting thoughtful reforms that help us weed out bad legislators, they impose a lifetime ban that eliminates good legislators and bad ones alike at the expense of our constitutional rights.

No eligible citizen should be *permanently banned* for life from seeking any office in a free society. And we should not be *permanently banned* from voting freely for the candidate of our choice.

Resist the rhetoric. Proposition 140 is not about restricting the powers of incumbency. It's about taking away our powers to choose.

### PHONY PENSION REFORM

Proposition 140's retirement provisions also are misdirected and counterproductive.

140 does not eliminate the real abuses: double and triple dipping—the practice of taking multiple pensions.

Instead it raises new barriers to public office by banning our future representatives from earning *any* retirement except their current social security.

140's retirement ban won't hurt rich candidates. It will hurt qualified, ordinary citizens who are not rich and have to work hard to provide economic security for themselves and their families.

### PROPOSITION 140 GOES TOO FAR

It upsets our system of constitutional checks and balances, forcing our representatives to become even more dependent on entrenched bureaucrats and shrewd lobbyists.

If its proponents were sincere about political reform, they wouldn't have cluttered it with so many unworkable provisions.

### VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION 140

STOP THIS RADICAL AND DANGEROUS SCHEME!  
PROTECT OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. VOTE NO ON  
PROPOSITION 140'S LIFETIME BAN.

DR. REGENE L. MITCHELL

*President, Consumer Federation of California*

LUCY BLAKE

*Executive Director, California League of Conservation Voters*

DAN TERRY

*President, California Professional Firefighters*

## Rebuttal to Argument Against Proposition 140

Proposition 140 restores *true* democracy, gives you *real* choices of candidates, protects *your* rights to be represented by someone who knows and cares about *your* wishes. It opens up the political system so *everyone*—not just the entrenched career politicians—can participate.

Proposition 140 will bring new ideas, workable policies and fresh cleansing air to Sacramento. All are needed badly. A stench of greed, and vote-selling hangs over Sacramento because lifetime-in-office incumbents think it's *their* government, not yours.

Californians polled by the state's largest newspaper say "most politicians are for sale," and "taking bribes is a relatively common practice" among lawmakers. Proposition 140 cuts the ties between corrupting special interest money and long-term legislators.

Why don't more people vote? Because incumbents have rigged the system in their favor so much, elections are meaningless. Even the worst of legislators get reelected 98% of the time. Honest, ethical, *truly* representative people who want to run for office don't stand a chance.

Do career legislators *really* earn their guaranteed salaries, extravagant pensions, limousines, air travel and other luxury benefits? No. They use *your* money and *your* government to buy themselves power and guaranteed reelections.

Who really opposes Proposition 140? It isn't ordinary people who have to work for a living. It's incumbent legislators and their camp followers. Beware of movie stars and celebrities in million-dollar TV ads, attacking proposition 140. They're doing the dirty work for career politicians.

VOTE "YES!" ON PROPOSITION 140. ENOUGH, IS ENOUGH!

W. BRUCE LEE, II

*Executive Director, California Business League*

LEE A. PHELPS

*Chairman, Alliance of California Taxpayers*

ART PAGDAN, M.D.

*National 1st V.P., Filipino-American Political Association*

California, support emerging California industries, or create jobs for a deficient labor market.

2717.6. (a) No contract shall be executed with a joint venture employer that will initiate employment by inmates in the same job classification as non-inmate employees of the same employer who are on strike, as defined in Section 1132.6 of the Labor Code, as it reads on January 1, 1990, or who are subject to lockout, as defined in Section 1132.8 of the Labor Code, as it reads on January 1, 1990.

(b) Total daily hours worked by inmates employed in the same job classification as non-inmate employees of the same joint venture employer who are on strike, as defined in Section 1132.6 of the Labor Code, as it reads on January 1, 1990, or who are subject to lockout, as defined in Section 1132.8 of the Labor Code, as it reads on January 1, 1990, shall not exceed, for the duration of the strike, the average daily hours worked for the preceding six months, or if the program has been in operation for less than six months, the average for the period of operation.

(c) The determination that a condition described in paragraph (b) above shall be made by the Director after notification by the union representing the workers on strike or subject to lockout. The limitation on work hours shall take effect 48 hours after receipt by the Director of written notice of the condition by the union.

2717.7. Notwithstanding Section 2812 of the Penal Code or any other provision of law which restricts the sale of inmate-provided services or inmate-manufactured goods, services performed and articles manufactured by joint venture programs may be sold to the public.

2717.8. The compensation of prisoners engaged in programs pursuant to contract between the Department of Corrections and joint venture employers for the purpose of conducting programs which use inmate labor shall be comparable to wages paid by the joint venture employer to non-inmate employees performing similar work for that employer. If the joint venture employer does not employ such non-inmate employees in similar work, compensation shall be comparable to wages paid for work of a similar nature in the locality in which the work is to be performed. Such wages shall be subject to deductions, as determined by the Director of Corrections, which shall not, in the aggregate, exceed 80 percent of gross wages and shall be limited to the following:

(1) Federal, state, and local taxes.

(2) Reasonable charges for room and board, which shall be remitted to the Director of Corrections.

(3) Any lawful restitution fine or contributions to any fund established by law to compensate the victims of crime of not more than 20 percent, but not less than 5 percent, of gross wages, which shall be remitted to the Director of Corrections for disbursement.

(4) Allocations for support of family pursuant to state statute, court order, or agreement by the prisoner.

Section 6. Section 14672.16 is added to the Government Code to read:

14672.16. (a) Notwithstanding Section 14670, the Director of General Services, with the consent of the Department of Corrections or the Department of the Youth Authority may let, in the best interest of the state, any real property located within the grounds of a facility of the Department of Corrections or the Department of the Youth Authority to a public or private entity for a period not to exceed 20 years for the purpose of conducting programs for the employment and training of prisoners or wards in institutions under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections or the Department of the Youth Authority.

(b) The lease may provide for the renewing of the lease for additional successive 10-year terms, but those additional terms shall not exceed three in number. Any lease of state property entered into pursuant to this section may be at less than market value when the Director of General Services determines it will serve a statewide public purpose.

Section 7. Section 17053.6 is added to the Revenue and Taxation Code to read:

17053.6. There shall be allowed as a credit against the "net tax" (as defined by Section 17039) an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount of wages paid to each prisoner who is employed in a joint venture program established pursuant to Article 1.5 of Chapter 5 of Title 1 of Part 3 of the Penal Code, through agreement with the Director of Corrections.

Section 8. Section 23624 is added to the Revenue and Taxation Code to read: 23624. There shall be allowed as a credit against the "tax" (as defined by Section 23036) an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount of wages paid to each prisoner who is employed in a joint venture program established pursuant to Article 1.5 of Chapter 5 of Title 1 of Part 3 of the Penal Code, through agreement with the Director of Corrections.

Section 9. If any provision of this measure or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid or unconstitutional, that invalidity shall not effect other provisions or applications of the measure which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this measure are severable.

Section 10. The statutory provisions contained in this measure may not be amended by the Legislature except to further its purposes by statute passed in each house by roll call vote entered in the journal, two thirds of the membership concurring, or by a statute that becomes effective only when approved by the electors.

## Proposition 140: Text of Proposed Law

This initiative measure is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article II, Section 8 of the Constitution.

This initiative measure expressly amends the Constitution by amending and adding sections thereof; therefore, new provisions proposed to be inserted or added are printed in *italic type* to indicate that they are new.

### PROPOSED LAW

SECTION 1. This measure shall be known and may be cited as "The Political Reform Act of 1990."

SEC. 2. Section 1.5 is added to Article IV of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 1.5. *The people find and declare that the Founding Fathers established a system of representative government based upon free, fair, and competitive elections. The increased concentration of political power in the hands of incumbent representatives has made our electoral system less free, less competitive, and less representative.*

*The ability of legislators to serve unlimited number of terms, to establish their own retirement system, and to pay for staff and support services at state expense contribute heavily to the extremely high number of incumbents who are reelected. These unfair incumbent advantages discourage qualified candidates from seeking public office and create a class of career politicians, instead of the citizen representatives envisioned by the Founding Fathers. These career politicians become representatives of the bureaucracy, rather than of the people whom they are elected to represent.*

*To restore a free and democratic system of fair elections, and to encourage qualified candidates to seek public office, the people find and declare that the powers of incumbency must be limited. Retirement benefits must be restricted, state-financed incumbent staff and support services limited, and limitations placed upon the number of terms which may be served.*

SEC. 3. Section 2 of Article IV of the California Constitution is amended to read:

SEC. 2. (a) The Senate has a membership of 40 Senators elected for 4-year terms, 20 to begin every 2 years. *No Senator may serve more than 2 terms.*

The Assembly has a membership of 80 members elected for 2-year terms. *No member of the Assembly may serve more than 3 terms.*

Their terms shall commence on the first Monday in December next following their election.

(b) Election of members of the Assembly shall be on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of even-numbered years unless otherwise prescribed by the Legislature. Senators shall be elected at the same time and places as members of the Assembly.

A person is ineligible to be a member of the Legislature unless the person is an elector and has been a resident of the legislative district for one year, and a citizen of the United States and a resident of California for 3 years, immediately preceding the election.

(d) When a vacancy occurs in the Legislature the Governor immediately shall call an election to fill the vacancy.

SEC. 4. Section 4.5 is added to Article IV of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 4.5. *Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution or existing law, a person elected to or serving in the Legislature on or after November 1, 1990, shall participate in the Federal Social Security (Retirement, Disability, Health Insurance) Program and the State shall pay only the employer's share of the contribution necessary to such participation. No other pension or retirement benefit shall accrue as a result of service in the Legislature, such service not being intended as a career occupation. This Section shall not be construed to abrogate or diminish any vested pension or retirement benefit which may have accrued under an existing law to a person holding or having held office in the Legislature, but upon adoption of this Act no further entitlement to nor vesting in any existing program shall accrue to any such person, other than Social Security to the extent herein provided.*

SEC. 5. Section 7.5 is added to Article IV of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 7.5. *In the fiscal year immediately following the adoption of this Act, the total aggregate expenditures of the Legislature for the compensation of members and employees of, and the operating expenses and equipment for, the Legislature may not exceed an amount equal to nine hundred fifty thousand dollars (\$950,000) per member for that fiscal year or 80 percent of the amount of money expended for those purposes in the preceding fiscal year, whichever is less. For each fiscal year thereafter, the total aggregate expenditures may not exceed an amount equal to that expended for those purposes in the preceding fiscal year, adjusted and compounded by an amount equal to the percentage increase in the appropriations limit for the state established pursuant to Article XIII B.*

SEC. 6. Section 2 of Article V of the California Constitution is amended to read:

SEC. 2. The Governor shall be elected every fourth year at the same time and places as members of the Assembly and hold office from the Monday after January 1 following the election until a successor qualifies. The Governor shall be an elector who has been a citizen of the United States and a resident of this State for 5 years immediately preceding the Governor's election. The Governor may not hold other public office. *No Governor may serve more than 2 terms.*

SEC. 7. Section 11 of Article V of the California Constitution 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. *No Lieutenant Governor, Attorney General, Controller, Secretary of State, or Treasurer may serve in the same office for more than 2 terms.*

SEC. 8. Section 2 of Article IX of the California Constitution is amended to read:

SEC. 2. A Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected by the qualified electors of the State at each gubernatorial election. The Superintendent of Public Instruction shall enter upon the duties of the office on the first Monday after the first day of January next succeeding each gubernatorial election. *No Superintendent of Public Instruction may serve more than 2 terms.*

SEC. 9. Section 17 of Article XIII of the California Constitution is amended to read:

SEC. 17. The Board of Equalization consists of 5 voting members: the Controller and 4 members elected for 4-year terms at gubernatorial elections. The state shall be divided into four Board of Equalization districts with the voters of each district electing one member. *No member may serve more than 2 terms.*

SEC. 10. Section 7 is added to Article XX of the California Constitution, to read:

*SEC. 7. The limitations on the number of terms prescribed by Section 2 of Article IV, Sections 2 and 11 of Article V, Section 2 of Article IX, and Section 17 of Article XIII apply only to terms to which persons are elected or appointed on or after November 6, 1990, except that an incumbent Senator whose office is not on the ballot for the general election on that date may serve only one additional term. Those limitations shall not apply to any unexpired term to which a person is elected or appointed if the remainder of the term is less than half of the full term.*

SEC. 11. Section 11 (d) is added to Article VII of the California Constitution, to read:

SEC. 11. (a) The Legislators' Retirement System shall not pay any

unmodified retirement allowance or its actuarial equivalent to any person who on or after January 1, 1987, entered for the first time any state office for which membership in the Legislators' Retirement System was elective or to any beneficiary or survivor of such a person, which exceeds the higher of (1) the salary receivable by the person currently serving in the office in which the retired person served or (2) the highest salary that was received by the retired person while serving in that office.

(b) The Judges' Retirement System shall not pay any unmodified retirement allowance or its actuarial equivalent to any person who on or after January 1, 1987, entered for the first time any judicial office subject to the Judges' Retirement System or to any beneficiary or survivor of such a person, which exceeds the higher of (1) the salary receivable by the person currently serving in the judicial office in which the retired person served or (2) the highest salary that was received by the retired person while serving in that judicial office.

(c) The Legislature may define the terms used in this section.

(d) *If any part of this measure or the application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications which reasonably can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.*