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PART I—ARGUMENTS

FOR THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL, AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1964. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to be used to meet the recreational requirements of the people of the State of California by acquiring and developing lands for recreational purposes.

AGAINST THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL, AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1964. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to be used to meet the recreational requirements of the people of the State of California by acquiring and developing lands for recreational purposes.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel *

This measure would authorize the State to issue and sell $150,000,000 general obligation bonds whose proceeds are to be appropriated in the annual budget bill for the acquisition and development of lands for recreation purposes.

The purposes for which the bond money could be appropriated, and the maximum that could be appropriated for each purpose until 1971 are as follows:

(a) Acquisition of real property for the state park system, including public beaches—$85,000,000.

(b) Minimum development of such real property acquired for the state park system—$30,000,000.

(c) Acquisition and development of real property for wildlife management in accordance with the Wildlife Conservation Law of 1947 and a master plan drafted as an element of the State Development Plan—$40,000,000.

(d) Grants to counties, cities, or cities and counties for acquisition and development of real property for park and beach purposes—$40,000,000.

The $40,000,000 for grants would be allocated to counties, based upon estimated 1975 population, at a rate of $1.25 per person per county, plus an additional 25 cents per person per county for counties which participate in an area wide or regional plan, or which assume planning responsibility for an urban area as a whole, in either case sufficient to qualify for financial assistance pursuant to the Federal Housing Act of 1961. Each county would, however, be entitled to receive an allocation of not less than $75,000. A city, district, or regional public agency would be permitted, with the approval of the board of supervisors of the county in which it is located, to apply for a grant, but any such grant would reduce the total otherwise allocable to the county.

Applications for grants of bond money and proposed state projects would be required to be reviewed by the Resources Agency Administrator and the State Office of Planning. Projects approved for grants, and recommended state projects organized by the administrator on a priority basis, would be required to be submitted to the Governor for inclusion in the Budget Bill.

The Resources Agency Administrator, on July 1, 1970, would be required to determine the unappropriated balance of the bond money. A program to appropriate this balance, consisting of projects deemed to be of the highest priority, would be required to be submitted in the budget for the 1971-72 fiscal year. This program would not be subject to the maximum amounts set forth above for each of the purposes specified.

The bonds authorized by the measure would be issued and sold pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law, and the full faith and credit of the State would be pledged for the payment of the bonds. The measure would also appropriate from the General Fund the sum necessary annually to pay the principal and interest on the bonds.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 1

YOU CAN SOLVE CALIFORNIA’S CRISIS IN RECREATION BY VOTING "YES" ON PROPOSITION ONE.

California’s vacation lands—beaches, parks and recreational areas—are being used today by more people than they are capable of accommodating. Potential beach and park areas, which should be acquired

—1—
immediately, are being lost forever to the exploding population increases and industrial expansions in California. Proposition One provides $150,000,000 to purchase beaches, parks, recreational and historical facilities. You have an opportunity—the last opportunity—to acquire and develop our State's rapidly disappearing open spaces. California's land values continue going up, up, up. Purchasing vacation land areas NOW makes economic sense. The cost will be far less TODAY than tomorrow.

WE DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH BEACHES AND PARKS FOR OUR PEOPLE.

Development of our recreational areas has not kept pace with California's heritage as the Number One State in the nation. While our population has increased 50%, our beaches, parks and other recreational areas have increased only 24%. Yet the use of these areas has increased over 430%! It is no wonder that over 4,000,000 people were turned away from public recreational areas last year! WE MUST ACT NOW to provide the parks, beaches, campgrounds, picnic areas and to conserve our wildlife areas. These land areas are disappearing fast, and those that do remain will soon be too expensive to buy. Our State's growth will continue to increase land values; the same growth will devour prime recreation lands for other purposes.

PROPOSITION ONE RELIEVES THE BURDEN ON LOCAL TAXPAYERS.

Over 50% of the land to be acquired is already off the tax rolls and in public ownership. It still must be bought for recreational purposes, and the proper recreational facilities constructed. $55,000,000 will be used for purchasing State beach and park land. $20,000,000 will be used for developing these projects. $5,000,000 will be assigned for wildlife conservation and management. To meet the need for local parks, beaches and other recreational facilities, $40,000,000 is available for grants to cities and counties. This $40,000,000 will help keep local property taxes from increasing to meet local recreational needs.

IT'S NOW—OR NEVER.

The FUTURE IS NOW in the race for California's remaining open spaces—areas that will fulfill YOUR present and future recreational needs. Beach front property is rapidly disappearing, yet we need more and more public beaches close to our homes and cities. Land suitable for parks and campgrounds is being subdivided and occupied, while existing park and campground facilities turn away millions of people for lack of room.

The TIME is NOW—YOUR YES VOTE ON PROPOSITION ONE is vital to you. The recreational areas of our State—for today and tomorrow—must be preserved at a cost we can afford to pay, and before they disappear forever. VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION ONE.

ALVIN C. WEINGAND
State Senator
County of Santa Barbara

RONALD G. CAMERON
Judge of the Superior Court
County of Placer

WALT DISNEY
Walt Disney Productions
Burbank, California

Argument Against Proposition No. 1

This measure is generally similar to the State Park and Recreation Bond Act rejected by the voters in 1962. It contains the same defects and would impose the same excessive tax burdens upon a few of the counties in the State as did the 1962 act.

These counties are presently faced with a situation in which vast areas of land within their boundaries are in public ownership, federal, state, and local, and are therefore not on the tax rolls. That situation has created a great hardship on the taxpayers in these counties, with the result that the tax rates in many of these districts are among the highest in the State at a time when school and other programs are forcing the greatest demand on ad valorem tax payer.

The State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964 would further aggravate the existing condition of hardship by making millions of dollars available for the acquisition of additional lands in these same counties for park and recreational purposes; this despite the fact that at the present time there are vast acres of land previously acquired by the State for these purposes which are lying undeveloped and idle! These additional lands could be acquired even though the taxpayers, and boards of supervisors of the counties in which the lands are located might object vehemently to the proposed acquisition. A provision which would have required the consent of the affected counties prior to acquisition of land therein was inserted into the measure by the Senate but was later stricken by the Assembly prior to its passage by the Legislature. Thus the affected counties will be denied any means of protecting themselves against further aggravation of a present injustice.

Furthermore, in other state programs in which lands are acquired and taken off the tax rolls (such as state forests and wildlife management areas), provision is made for the making of payments in lieu of taxes to the counties in which the lands are acquired. That is a fair and equitable solution to the problem caused in these counties due to public acquisition of lands and is supported by many
the state’s business and farm leaders as well as numerous other organizations. Such a provision was inserted into the measure by the Senate but was later eliminated by the Assembly prior to its passage. Thus, no provision for payments to affected counties in lieu of lost taxes would be made in the proposed bond act.

The need for state owned recreational facilities is undeniable but is also undeniable that this act would in effect place the greater share of the burden of paying for such facilities on the counties in which they happen to be located. Thus, in the interest of fairness and equity to the taxpayers in the counties which will be financially crippled by the proposed land acquisition program, let us resist this attempt to ram a once defeated and discredited proposal down our throats and vote NO on Proposition 1.

CARL L. CHRISTENSEN, JR.
State Senator
Third Senatorial District
Humboldt County

PAUL SHEEDY
Executive Vice President
Property Owners’ Tax Assn.,
of Calif., Inc.

FOR BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE, JUNIOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES, AND TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO MEET THE BUILDING NEEDS OF THE STATE, INCLUDING FACILITIES TO CARE FOR MENTALLY RETARDED AND MENTALLY ILL AND NARCOTICS CONTROL, CORRECTIONAL AND FOREST FIRE FIGHTING FACILITIES. (This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred eighty million dollars ($380,000,000).)

AGAINST BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE, JUNIOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES, AND TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO MEET THE BUILDING NEEDS OF THE STATE, INCLUDING FACILITIES TO CARE FOR MENTALLY RETARDED AND MENTALLY ILL AND NARCOTICS CONTROL, CORRECTIONAL AND FOREST FIRE FIGHTING FACILITIES. (This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred eighty million dollars ($380,000,000).)

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel
This measure, the State Construction Program Bond Act of 1964, would authorize the issuance and sale of state bonds not exceeding the sum of $380,000,000 to provide the necessary funds to meet the state’s building construction, equipment and site acquisition needs. Bond proceeds, in amounts to be subsequently determined by the Legislature, must be used to meet the state’s site acquisition needs for new institutions of public higher education. Not less than $50,000,000 of the bonds authorized must be used to meet the state’s building construction, equipment and site acquisition needs for public junior colleges.

The measure provides that the bonds are to be general obligations of the State for the payment of which the full faith and credit of the State is pledged, and it annually appropriates from the General Fund the sum necessary to make the principal and interest payments on the bonds as they become due.

The bonds are to be issued only for projects for which funds are appropriated in any year by the Legislature in a separate section of the Budget Act. The Department of Finance is required to total the appropriations made in such separate section of the Budget Act annually and to request the State Construction Program Committee, consisting of the Governor, the State Controller, the State Treasurer, the Director of Finance, and the Director of General Services, to have sufficient bonds issued and sold to carry out such projects.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 2
A “Yes” vote on Proposition No. 2 will enable California to continue to provide essential buildings for its ever-growing population—particularly our junior college, state college and university students.

Early in 1964 the state’s population exceeded 18 million and is increasing at a rate of more than 600 thousand persons per year. The projects contained in the State Construction Bond Program are limited to those state facilities needed to serve adequately this population growth.

By far the greatest needs are in higher education. Of the $380 million authorized by this Act, $120 million is earmarked for the University of California, $129 million for state colleges, and $50 million for junior college construction—a total of almost $300 million.

The college age group, whose educational needs are met almost entirely by state funds, is increasing at a rate more than double that of the total state. Our past support for education has proven one of our most productive investments. College gradu-
ates return to the state many times the cost of their education.

A relatively small portion of the program is for correctional and mental health facilities. The prison population has grown in direct relation to the high school and college population, and more effective correctional and rehabilitation programs will be made possible for both adult and juvenile offenders.

Significant achievements are being made in the field of mental health. Development of services in an effort to exploit these advances is needed. Experience has shown that the mentally retarded, with help and counselling, may return to gainful employment and more useful lives. The program provides for additional facilities to accomplish this and avoid increases in the backlog of cases requiring aid.

Inability to finance essential construction could result in the necessity for limiting enrollments at the colleges and the University and reducing the level of care of the mentally ill and mentally retarded. California experienced a similar dilemma at the end of World War II when facilities were obsolete, overcrowded and in some instances unsafe. In the postwar period the state was faced not only with a program for new construction, but with an expensive maintenance and repair program to bring facilities up to an acceptable level.

Proposition No. 2 is not a blank check; funds may be expended only for the purposes set forward in the Proposition and each project will be subject to specific legislative appropriation.

By the issuance of bonds the burden of repaying the cost of the construction will be borne by those generations using the facilities. With a net bonded debt of $8.03 per $100 of personal income, this state ranked 30th among the states in 1963. The all-state average was $4.23—one-third more than California.

Passage of this Proposition will contribute to economic growth in California and continue the development of California's educational facilities which attract one-fourth of the Nation's prime defense contracts and one-half of all research and development contracts awarded by the National Aerospace Administration. Passage of Proposition No. 2 will assure continued growth and prosperity for California.

WALTER W. STIERN
State Senator,
34th Senatorial District
Kern County

Argument Against Proposition No. 2

The public is conscious of the problems—the urgent need to provide proper facilities for many thousands of additional students in our tax-supported institutions. The tax-paying public wants to meet these problems but they know that unless a rigid program of economy is achieved, which can still provide fully adequate structures, grave difficulties impend. Even the most casual survey shows, on campus after campus, that structures for state institutions of higher learning have been far more lavish and expensive than buildings of private non-tax supported universities for identical purposes.

These were our exact words two years ago in opposing the similar $270,000,000 state construction bond issue on the ballot then. They are also true in 1964—except the condition is more acute. The Property Owners Tax Association warned voters in 1962 that an even larger bond issue would be asked this year. It is—$380,000,000—again mostly for these schools. Unless defeated, a larger one looms in 1966. The state's official construction program for the next five years totals $835,048,686—$565,849,132 for universities and state colleges.

Adequate, economical planning should be the strict rule. Right now being built is a lavish new small-class type university, styled like the Oxford colleges—renowned as the prerogative of Britain's elite, Rhodes scholars and other select few.

Is there waste?

A recent six-months survey by H. Wyllie, space utilization expert, espe hired by the Legislature, showed a 30 percent waste of building facilities in state colleges and universities. He reported that just to duplicate existing building capacity not being utilized would cost $480,000,000.

Is a crisis approaching?

Reflecting the same concern as taxpayers over the already existing vast operating costs of the state's tax-paid higher education, Finance Director Hale Champion, the state's top financial authority, in an official address recently at Sacramento titled "Can We Pay the Bill?" said:

"I think we are going to be confronted with at least one very significant choice in the next few years—the choice between abandoning our tuition-free system of higher education or finding additional acceptable tax sources to do the job."

Are other high officials concerned?

Assembly Speaker Jesse Unruh publicly warned the Legislature this would be the last bond issue of this type which would get his support—that tax costs for principal and interest payments would exceed funds from bonds by 1970, if present policies continued.

Has warning been given?

As to the state college and university projects submitted in the current budget—Legislative Analyst A. Alan Post br told the Legislature that almost half of these should be re-examined because of excessive costs and other elements.
of this $380,000,000, $126,000,000 has even
already been used in the budget. The
Legislature has anticipated spending what it
didn't have.
This proposition absolutely means higher
taxes or new taxes or both.
We most strongly urge a NO vote on
Proposition No. 2.

THE PROPERTY OWNERS TAX
ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA
PAUL SHEEDY
Executive Vice President
MELVIN HORTON
Secretary

FOR THE STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID BOND LAW OF 1964. This
act provides for a bond issue of two hundred sixty million dollars
($260,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improve-
ment of public schools.

AGAINST THE STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID BOND LAW OF 1964.
This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred sixty million dollars
($260,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improve-
ment of public schools.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This proposed bond act, entitled the State School Building Aid Bond Law of 1964, would authorize a $260,000,000 bond issue to
create a fund to provide aid to school dis-
tricts of the State in accordance with the
provisions of the State School Building Aid
Law of 1952. The latter law provides for
vouchers or grants of money to school districts
for acquisition of school sites and construc-
tion and acquisition of school buildings and
equipment. It would be required that suffi-
cient bonds be sold to make available for
apportionment to districts $70,000,000 on
December 5, 1964, and $12,000,000 on the
fifth day of each successive month thereafter
until the entire $260,000,000 has become
available. The State Allocation Board would
be authorized to order an increase in the sale
of bonds to raise the monthly apportionment
to districts from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000.

All or any part of the bonds would be sold
at the time or times fixed by the State Treas-
urer, pursuant to resolution of the State
School Building Finance Committee deter-
ing that such sale is necessary or desir-
able, based, in turn, upon the request of the
State Allocation Board, supported by a state-
ment of the apportionments to school dis-
tricts made or to be made.
The principal and interest on the bonds
would be paid by moneys appropriated an-
nually from the General Fund in the State
Treasury, and it would be required that the
sums necessary for these purposes be an-
ually collected in the same manner and at the
same time as other state revenue is collected.
The proceeds from the sale of bonds, except
those derived from premium and accrued
interest, would be used for purposes of aid
to school districts, and to repay moneys ad-
vanced or loaned to the State School Build-
ing Aid Fund under any other act of the
Legislature, and not for payment of bond
principal or interest. Provision would be
made for return, from the State School
Building Aid Fund to the General Fund, of
school district repayment moneys in amounts
equal to bond principal and interest.
A revolving fund would be established to
which would be deposited moneys withdrawn
from the General Fund, pursuant to execu-
tive order of the Director of Finance, in
amounts not exceeding bonds authorized to
be issued by the State School Building Fi-
nance Committee. This money would be used
to provide aid to school districts, but would
be returned to the General Fund from bond
proceeds.
The act would specify that bonds sold and
delivered constitute valid and legally bind-
ing general obligations of the State, and
that the full faith and credit of the State is
pledged for punctual payment of principal
and interest. The State General Obligation
Bond Law would govern the issuance, sale,
and repayment of the bonds, and related
matters.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 3

The success of this measure is essential for
California's boys and girls to have adequate
classrooms. A "Yes" vote on this proposition
is a vote to reduce crowded classrooms
and double sessions which will improve
teacher morale and efficiency. School chil-
dren in California are increasing by a quar-
ter of a million a year. This means we must
provide 10,000 new or renovated classrooms
annually. The passage of this program will
help many needy districts secure classrooms
to qualify for the additional $10 per child
in state aid by reducing class size in the
primary grades.

This school building program has proved
its value by not only providing loans to
school districts that have reached the limit
of their bonding capacity but also by enabling districts to build new schools which are permanent economic and moral assets to the community.

In order to intelligently handle our increasing school population, to reduce pressure on the local taxpayer, to insure our future prosperity, and to develop our most precious resource, our youth, every citizen should vote "Yes" on this measure.

CHARLES B. GARRIGUS
Assemblyman, 33rd District
California Legislature

GEORGE MILLER, Jr.
State Senator
Contra Costa County

ALVIN C. WEINGAND
State Senator
Santa Barbara County

VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION: RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 14. Provides as requirement that no veteran or survivor shall be entitled to the veterans' tax exemption of $1,000 unless the veteran was a resident of California either or both at the time of entry into service or on the effective date of this amendment. Widow or surviving parent eligible for exemption on effective date of this amendment shall not lose exemption because of amendment.

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 8, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would amend the second sentence of Section 11 of Article XIII. That section, among other things, now provides for a $1,000 property tax exemption for described veterans and their surviving widows or parents under specified conditions. The only existing limitation as to residency is that such a person be a legal resident of California.

This constitutional amendment would restrict the exemption to a veteran who was a resident of California either at the time of his entry into the service or on the effective date of the adoption of the amendment, and to such a veteran's surviving widow or parent. It would, however, provide that a surviving widow or parent otherwise eligible for the exemption at the effective date of the amendment shall not lose such eligibility because the deceased veteran who was survived could not have qualified under the residency requirements proposed by the amendment.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 4

This proposition modifies the veterans tax exemption to make it more fair and equitable. It would limit eligibility for the exemption to veterans who:

1. Entered military service from California; or
2. Are residents on November 2, 1964

(One who by action and intent indicates that he will remain in California indefinitely is a resident. It is not necessary to have lived here any specified time.)

In other words, the proposition eliminates from eligibility the veteran from some other state who comes here after this year. But no veteran or veteran's widow eligible today would lose that eligibility by this proposition.

Every other state which grants a veterans bonus (most frequently compared with the California exemption) limits it to their own veterans. But an out-of-state veteran can claim the bonus in his own state then move to California and receive tax exemption for the rest of his life. This practice would be stopped in the future by this proposition.

The CAL VET Farm and Home Loan Program is limited to California veterans. Thus, Proposition 4 brings the veterans exemption into line with other veterans benefit programs in this and other states.

Over 40 per cent of the veterans in California entered service in another state. These veterans are unaffected, but migrants in the future would not be eligible for the veterans exemption after their arrival.

Over $70,000,000 in local taxes were lost to cities, counties, school and other districts last year due to this exemption—or these costs were shifted to other taxpayers, including veterans now receiving the exemption.

This proposition reduces the future impact—giving some relief to all taxpayers, without affecting any veteran or veteran's widow now eligible or those in the future who will enter the service from this state for eligible service.

The subject of this proposition, included with other related changes in the exemption, was approved 2 to 1 by the voters in 1960, but, through a technicality, failed to become law; it was defeated narrowly in 1962 with opposition based on combining more than one element in the proposition. Only one change is made by Proposition 4. Other changes have been dropped or submitted as separate propositions.

Proposition 4 should be approved.
This amendment was supported by taxpayers, veterans, and civil organizations at the 1963 Legislature and was not opposed. It brings the exemption into conformity with other veterans benefits in California and other states. It does not affect any veteran or veteran's widow now eligible, but it will save all taxpayers of California, including veterans, tax dollars in the future.

Vote YES on Proposition 4.

LUTHER E. GIBSON
Senator for Solano County

JOHN C. BEGOVICH
Senator for Amador and El Dorado Counties

**Argument Against Proposition No. 4**

This Constitutional Amendment denies property tax exemption to war veterans who were not fortunate enough to reside in California at the time they were called into the service. In effect, it will divide our veterans into two segregated categories, and bestow the gratitude of our people not as a recognition of sacrifice but rather on the basis of an accident of residence.

Since 1911 our Constitution has provided for veterans tax exemption to insure that benefit to all veterans in California who have served in the defense of our nation. Legislative history of this constitutional amendment clearly indicates an intent of the people to offer this exemption for the purpose of assisting young veterans and attracting them to California. It was not, and is not, in any sense a "bonus." It is a reflection of the desire of the citizens of California to encourage and enable young veterans to fill useful and productive positions in their communities.

It is important to remember that the present tax exemption is limited to those veterans who are small property owners. The exemption is available only to those whose property assessment is $1,000 and not more than $3,000. The veteran contributes full tax rate on the remainder. If the property is assessed in excess of $5,000 he loses all exemption.

Furthermore, the exemption is strictly limited to veterans who actually served in the armed forces in time of war or in a campaign or expedition for which a medal was issued by the Congress of the United States. Even then, these veterans can only qualify by showing proof of such service.

The people of California are protected from abuse of this exemption provision by the presence of county grand juries throughout the State who investigate and seek prosecution for any fraudulent claims that might be presented.

The average actual tax benefit per exempt veteran is $75.00 per year for each veteran rightfully claiming his exemption. State Board of Equalization figures show in 1962, 1,111,000 veterans claimed their exemption on property assessed at $960,859,000. This represents only about 3% of all taxable property in California. Only a small percentage of our veterans claim the exemption—less than half the estimated 2.5 million veterans in the State and less than the total 1.5 million veterans still living in California who went into the service from this State. These are the people to whom the exemption has the most meaning and who are most in need of financial assistance in their personal affairs.

A recent survey shows that approximately one-third of our sister States presently offer a similar tax exemption to their veterans. Can we in California do less for ours?

It is in the best tradition of California history to extend this sort of benefit to all of our citizens, not to limit it to a privileged few. We urge you to vote "NO" on this proposal and to help keep intact California's reputation for fairness and equality to all of its citizens.

VIRGIL O' Sullivan
Senator from Tehama, Glenn and Colusa Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTION FOR WIDOWS</th>
<th>Senate Constitutional YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amendment No. 5</td>
<td>Increases from $5,000 to $10,000 amount of property widow of veteran may own and still receive exemption.</td>
<td>(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 9, Part II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

This measure would amend the first sentence of Section 11 of Article XIII. That section, among other things, now provides for a $1,000 property tax exemption for a surviving widow of a deceased veteran who has died during his term of service or, subject to specified conditions, after discharge. It also provides for an exemption for a pensioned widow of a veteran who had otherwise met the service requirement of the section. Each exemption is subject to the condition that the widow not own property of more than $5,000.

This constitutional amendment would increase from $5,000 to $10,000 the maximum amount of property that the surviving widow (other than a pensioned widow) may own and still qualify for the exemption.

**Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 5**

Proposition 5, which affects the veterans tax exemption, restores equity to the treatment of veterans' widows under that exemption.

It eliminates a quirk in the law by which some widows lose their veterans tax exemp-
tion upon the death of their husbands—at a
time of life, in fact, when they need the ben-
fit most.

Today, a veteran's widow is eligible to
receive the exemption if they own property
not exceeding $5,000 in value. Since 1924, how-
ever, if a veteran were married, the property
limitation has been $10,000 (rather than $5,000)—this occurs because of
the operation of the community property law
by which half of a married couple's assets
(with certain minority exceptions) belongs
to husband and half to wife.

But, under this system, when the veteran
dies, the community property status termi-
nates, and the $10,000 limitation applies to
the widow and she may lose the exemption
from which she has benefitted for many
years at a time of particular hardship—fi-
nancial and otherwise.

Take this example: A veteran and his
wife own $8,000 in property. In a com-
nunity property status, they are each allocated
$4,000, so they may receive the veterans tax
exemption. When the veteran husband dies,
the community property status terminates
and the wife is allocated the entire $8,000.
She is no longer eligible for the exemption.

This is not fair or equitable and is con-
trary to the intent of the Constitution in
making this provision for veterans' widows.

Proposition 5 changes this. It restores
equity by making the property limitation for
widows $10,000—the same limitation under
which they obtained benefits when their hus-
bands were alive.

This proposition applies only to widows of
veterans—not to veterans themselves, not to
widowers or any other members of the fam-
ily. And, under other provisions, the widow
loses her benefit if and when she remarries.

Like Proposition 4, this proposition was in-
cluded in amendments in 1960 and 1962—
overwhelmingly approved the first time and
narrowly defeated the second. The stated
grounds of opposition in 1962 have been
deleted from Proposition 5 before you now.

The financial impact of this proposition is
not great as far as the public is concerned,
but it will be great for the widow of modest
means at a time of special need in her life.
It is only right, in the spirit of the intent of
this exemption itself, to approve this
change which is endorsed by veterans and
civic groups.

Vote YES on Proposition 5.

LUTHER K. GIBSON
Senator for Solano County

ROBERT D. WILLIAMS
Senator for Kings County

Argument Against Proposition No. 5

If you are one of those taxpayers who
believes that property taxes are too high,
you will want to study the implications of
Proposition No. 5 very carefully.

Proposition No. 5 is designed to provide
one more extension of the property tax
exemptions which cause a substantial part
of the money problems of taxpayers, and of
cities, counties, and school districts through-
out the State. Every property that is wholly
or partly exempt from taxation requires the
non-exempt property owner to bear just that
much heavier a burden for schools and local
government than he would otherwise have
to pay. The greater the number of exemp-
tions authorized, the greater the burden on
those who can't claim, or decline to claim,
an exemption.

Proposition No. 5 is designed to allow the
widow of a veteran a greater opportunity
for property tax exemption than she is now
entitled to—indeed, more than a single vet-
eran would himself be entitled to! To the
extent that it is successful, taxes on other
property will go up. Where now the widow
can claim a $1,000 exemption, provided she
does not own more than $5,000 worth of
property, this proposition would allow her
to claim the $1,000 exemption if she does not
own more than $10,000 worth of property.
This may not sound like much until it is
remembered that, according to the 1962-63
figures of the State Board of Equalization,
more than 90,000 veterans are now claiming
the exemption, and potentially that man
widows will be able to do the same!

Moreover, remember that when Proposi-
tion No. 5 would allow the exemption for a
widow owning less than $10,000 worth of
property, it is speaking of assessed valua-
tion where real property is involved. Real
property assessed at just under $10,000 may
have an actual market value up to $40,000!

This proposition, therefore, is not just for
the purpose of helping the destitute widow
of a man who served his country in war
time. It can also be used as an indirect tax
subsidy favoring some persons who are far
better off than those who must pay all their
taxes or lose what they have!

Surely the existing $5,000 limitation is
generous enough! Surely it is inadvisable to
expand an already ample exemption when
property taxes on all those who must pay
their full share are such a crushing burden.

CALIFORNIA VOTERS ARE URGED TO
VOTE "NO" ON PROPOSITION NO. 5:

JOHN R. GLASS, Chairman
State & Local Government
Committee
Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. William Irvine
President
Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would amend subdivision (4) of Section 134 of Article XIII of the State Constitution, which now provides that when any other state or country taxes a California insurance company or its agents doing business in that state or country, to a greater extent than it taxes insurance companies formed in its own state, California may impose on the insurance companies of that state or country doing business in California a tax which is the same as that imposed by the other state or country on the California companies.

The amendment would provide instead that whenever any other state or country imposes or would impose on a California insurance company or its agents doing business in that state or country, a tax greater than that imposed by California on the insurance companies domiciled in that state or country but doing business in California, this State shall impose on such companies domiciled in such other state or country the same taxes as are imposed by the other state or country on California insurance companies doing business there.

The amendment would not apply to any personal income taxes, ad valorem property taxes, or special assessments imposed prior to the amendment by another state or country in connection with any type of insurance other than property insurance; but any tax deductible allowed with respect to property taxes paid would be taken into consideration in determining the propriety and extent of the tax imposed by California on insurance companies formed in other states and doing business in this State.

As used in this analysis "tax" includes taxes, fines, penalties, licenses, fees, deposits of money or securities or other obligations, or prohibitions or restrictions imposed on an insurance company or its agents or representatives.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 6

Forty-four states, including California, have enacted insurance company retaliatory laws. This proposal revises the provisions of California's constitution to parallel those in the laws of the 43 other states.

Retaliatory laws primarily affect the total amount of taxes, licenses and fees a foreign insurer must pay to a state for doing business within. As between California and another state that has higher taxes, licenses and fees than California, the retaliatory law operates automatically to impose on insurers from other states the same higher taxes, licenses and fees that such state imposes on California insurers.

The present California constitutional provision permits retaliation only if the other state discriminates between insurers domiciled in that state and California insurers. This requirement is unique to California, and is not in the law of any other state. The principal changes made by this amendment deletes this unique requirement, so that California's retaliatory law hereafter will apply to insurers from other states in the same manner the other 43 states now apply their retaliatory laws to California insurers.

Additionally, this amendment changes the language of California's constitutional provision to conform with that of the model retaliatory law, which model law was added to the California Insurance Code by Chapter 2120, Laws 1959, and has been included in all modern insurance codes enacted by other states since 1956.

These changes make provisions in detail the rules included in this model law for determining how and when retaliation is to be applied. Adding these details to the Constitution does not change the substance of the law in these respects, but will prevent any possible confusion in applying the Insurance Code retaliatory provisions, and will promote uniformity in interpreting retaliatory laws throughout the country.

Including such details of insurance company taxation in the Constitution has been done in California since 1910. Other Constitutional provisions prescribe the tax base and rate and limit the Legislature's power to change the rate. Under those sections, insurance companies are taxed on the basis of insurance premiums received, a form of gross income tax which results in §2.35 tax on every $100 of premiums paid by California's residents, less a deduction for local real estate taxes paid on investments in California principal office properties.

This particular constitutional amendment will close the gap that now permits foreign
insurers from some states to escape payment of retaliatory taxes to California, and will bring in additional tax revenue from such foreign insurers.

This amendment received the unanimous vote support of the members of the California State Legislature at the 1963 Session, and its adoption by the people is recommended. Vote YES.

LESTER A. McMILLAN
Assemblyman, 61st District

LOU A. CUSANOVOICH
Assemblyman, 64th District

PUBLIC RETIREMENT FUNDS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment

No. 7. Provides Legislature may authorize investment of moneys of any public pension or retirement fund, except Teachers Retirement Fund, in stocks, shares or other obligation of any corporation.

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

Many other states, the Federal Reserve System, universities such as Stanford, California Institute of Technology, Harvard, Yale, and many private companies invest their retirement funds in corporate stocks, and have done so successfully for years. The University of California is not under the constitutional prohibition against stock investment; its retirement reserve has for years been partly invested in them. As of the latest report, some $14 million (16 per cent) of its total reserve of $83 million is in common and preferred stocks. The average rate of return on stocks in the University retirement portfolio has been about two percentage points higher than that on the portfolio in government bonds, corporate bonds, and mortgages.

The State Employees Retirement System, the largest fund which would be affected by this proposition, at the end of the latest fiscal year had $1.549 billion invested in government securities, and corporate bonds. The System received 22 per cent of its total income for the fiscal year from earnings on its investment, but its net earnings rate was only 3.85 per cent. To illustrate what could happen under this proposition, had 25 per cent of the portfolio been invested in stocks, at the University rate differential the System would have earned an additional $8 million.

A University of Chicago study of earnings from stocks from 1926 to 1960 disclosed that the average return during the entire period was 9 per cent, which certainly supports the University experience.

The flexible approach to investments which would be enabled by approval of this proposition has been well proved by other systems. It is time for California to update its public retirement systems. A YES vote on this proposed amendment will protect such funds and help control their future costs.

DON A. ALLEN, Chairman
Joint Legislative Retirement Committee
Assemblyman 63rd District

ALAN SHORT, Vice Chairman
Senator 20th District

E. RICHARD BARNES, Member
Assemblyman 78th District
Argument Against Proposition No. 7

This proposed constitutional amendment would change the established practice of investing retirement funds in bonds and would allow the Legislature to authorize the investment of pension or retirement funds, other than the teacher’s retirement fund, in stock, shares, or other obligations of any corporation.

I believe it is necessary that we understand the fundamental difference between bonds and equities as they are affected by the market. A bond is an obligation of the issuer to pay a certain sum of money at a set maturity date and pay a specified rate of interest during interim between issue and maturity. A stock, on the other hand, represents a share of ownership in a business, with no fixed value or amount, even though issued at par, and there is no fixed rate of return. The exception to this statement lies in preferred stocks which have fixed value and set interest obligations on the part of the issuer.

The Legislature sets the policy for the administration of public retirement funds, the control of which includes broad outlines for investment policies.

The proponents of the legislation suggest a committee composed of retired personnel, taxpayers, and a technical member, able to analyze the market and invest properly. However, no such safeguard establishing a technical committee is provided in this constitutional amendment, so therefore, there may or may not be a technical group administering these funds.

The fluctuation of market values would greatly affect the sale of these securities. In order to realize a top profit, the securities would have to be sold at top market value. Needless to say, it may be impractical at times to hold on to the securities until the time that a profit would be realized. In such a case, a loss would result from their sale.

One of the main questions which remains unanswered by the proponents of this measure is, who will share in the depreciation of market values and in the decline in benefits to the retired personnel, or who would share in the unrealized profits when the securities are sold at top market value or when dividends are paid?

A special fund would be necessary to protect fund losses due to depreciated values. No provision is made for a special fund during these fluctuating periods. Retired personnel would not condone the reduction of their benefits during these periods.

The question arises then, who would underwrite the losses occurred by the reduction in equities in the pension fund? Of course, the taxpayer would have to underwrite these losses. In other words, there are serious drawbacks inherent in equity securities which do not make them suitable investments for public funds. The risk of public monies involved is too great for the benefits to be derived. The system up to this period, has been comparatively free of risks which would endanger the investment funds.

I voted against this Assembly Constitutional Amendment in the Legislature, and I am urging the public to do likewise.

Thank you.

W. BYRON RUMFORD
Member of California Assembly
17th District, Berkeley

Superior Court Judges: Election in Counties over 700,000

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would amend Section 6 of Article VI of the Constitution to make certain provisions governing the election of superior court judges applicable in a county or city and county having a population of 700,000 or more, whereas under the existing law the provisions are applicable only in a county or city and county having a population in excess of 5,000,000.

The provisions in question declare that in a county or city and county of the specified size the name of an incumbent superior court judge seeking reelection would not appear on the ballot at the general election if the judge is unopposed and no petition is filed indicating an intent to conduct a write-in campaign for someone else. Under these circumstances the incumbent judge would be declared reelected on the day of the general election without having had his name appear on the ballot. These provisions, according to the 1980 federal census, are now applicable only to elections in Los Angeles County, but this measure would make them applicable in San Diego, Alameda, San Francisco and Orange County elections also.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 8

This proposal would delete from the ballot the names of unopposed Superior Court judges in counties with populations over 700,000.
A shorter ballot and a saving of time of voters and election workers are the purposes of the amendment. A tax saving will also benefit county taxpayers.

The voters adopted by 2:1 a similar proposal in 1962, applying only to Los Angeles County (voters in Los Angeles County approved by about 4:1). The current proposal would apply only to the Counties of Alameda, San Diego, San Francisco and Orange.

Other counties would be affected as they reach the population and tax limits.

Taxpayers in each county would save an estimated $30,000 in each election by adoption of the amendment.

In the last ten years, 88%, 100%, 95%, and 95% of Superior Court judges for San Francisco, Orange, San Diego, and Alameda Counties, respectively, were unopposed.

This amendment would have no application whatever in event a judge is opposed, and it would not be effective when a write-in campaign is undertaken.

To obtain a shorter ballot and to reduce the cost of elections, you are urged to support deletion of the names of unopposed Superior Court judges.

Vote YES on Proposition No. 8.

JOHN W. HOLMDAHL
State Senator
Alameda County

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 8

A Yes Vote on this proposed Constitutional Amendment is a vote to bestow upon a county, city and county with a population of more than 700,000 the benefits now realized, under Section 6 of Article VI of the Constitution, by only Los Angeles County.

If passed this amendment would give meaning to the contested offices, as the voters would be able to ascertain immediately from the ballot which seats were being contested.

A Yes Vote would mean that in the counties encompassed, the length of the ballot would be measurably shortened, resulting in greater economy, speed up in vote counting and reporting and a more accurate result.

The amendment when adopted would realize to the taxpayers of these counties a savings of approximately $30,000.00 per election.

Write-in campaigns would be enhanced by the passing and adoption of this amendment because of doubling the opportunity for write-in campaign and would give the voter more opportunity to remove unqualified judges from office.

A yes vote is a vote for a more efficient government.

Vote Yes on Proposition No. 8.

FRANK S. PETERSEN
State Senator
Mendocino and Lake Counties

Argument Against Proposition No. 8

This proposed amendment is but another step in the direction of removing judicial offices from the electoral process altogether. In 1962, the people were urged to vote for Proposition 21, which only affected Los Angeles County. As adopted, it authorizes automatic reelection of judges in that County when there are no opposing candidates. Now we are asked to apply this same procedure to all counties with a population over 700,000. This change would include four more counties—San Diego, Alameda, San Francisco, and Orange.

The 1962 amendment was justified: (1) as focusing attention on unopposed judges, (2) as facilitating write-in campaigns against incumbent judges, (3) as being more economical and speeding up ballot counting because it shortened the ballot, (4) providing more general election contests, and (5) as informing the incumbent of opposition.

Arguments of this type avoid the real issue of whether judges should be elected at all.

As a practical matter, most judges are never really passed on by the people. Most judges are first appointed by the Governor—not elected by the people. Thereafter they are reelected time after time without opposition, because, as is common knowledge, it is extremely difficult to unseat an incumbent judge and most qualified candidates—attorneys—are reluctant to incur the judge's displeasure by running against him. Consequently, the people have little or no say in determining who are to be their judges.

This proposed change will further impair the right of the people to select their judges. If this change is adopted, in the counties affected many people will never know who their judges are—unless they make special effort to find out.

Election of public officers by the people is fundamental in a free society. It is obviously more expensive to require all candidates names to appear on the ballot. Yet, if pleas of economy and brevity are meaningful as applied to judges, the argument could be made that all elected officials should be reelected unless someone files against them. This procedure, however, would violate our most fundamental and cherished democratic traditions and privileges. Similarly, as applied to judges, the people should not give up a fundamental right for reasons of economy or brevity of the ballot.

We should not permit any candidate for public office to be considered elected without a single vote being cast in his favor. All elected officials should submit their candidates and records to the voters at regular intervals for their approval or rejection.

A measure such as this is justified as making write-in campaigns easier by providing
specific procedures to follow. Actually, the
truth is true. If the write-in campaign is
not started soon enough—or if the notice re-
quired is not filed within the time limits
specified—the incumbent’s name will not ap-
pear on the ballot, the office will not be
listed, and no voter opposition can be ex-
pressed.

For the foregoing reasons, the voters are
urged to reject this proposal and preserve
their right to vote.

SENATOR JACK SCHRADE
40th District—San Diego County
SENATOR ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO
33rd District—Ventura County

COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES. Senate Consti-
tutional Amendment No. 3. Provides that all counties, except as
provided by Legislature, shall be subject to general laws relating
to supervisory district boundary adjustments.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

The State Constitution now permits the
Legislature to enact general and uniform laws
for the election and appointment of boards of
supervisors, but authorizes a chartered county
to supersede such a law by a charter pro-
vision.

This measure would require that all
counties whether governed by general law or
charter follow the general laws relating to the
adjustment of boundaries of supervisory dis-
tricts, unless otherwise provided by the Legis-
lature.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 9

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 3
amends the Constitution of California in re-
gard to redistricting of the supervisory dis-
tricts in the 58 counties of the State, with
the exception of San Francisco, and is neces-
sary in order to provide uniformity between
the general law counties of the State and the
eleven counties which have charters.

There are some six counties in the State
with charters which make a provision for
redistricting; there are five other counties
with charters that could be amended and
provide conflicting and non-uniform proce-
dures for redistricting.

Senate Constitutional Amendment 3 sim-
ply states that every general law and charter
county, except as otherwise provided by the
Legislature, shall be subject to the general
laws adopted by the Legislature relating to
the adjustment of boundaries of supervisory
districts. By this method we will be able to
accomplish uniformity.

Without such a Constitutional Amendment
the counties with charters could set up dif-
ferent procedures and different times in con-
nection with redistricting following each
federal census.

It is very important that all counties con-
duct their redistricting at uniform times and
under uniform procedures.

This measure has the support of the
County Supervisors Association of California
and passed the Senate without opposition.
The California State Junior Chamber of
Commerce also supports this Proposition.

CLARK L. BRADLEY
State Senator
18th Senatorial District

CALIFORNIA JR. CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE

By: CHARLES P. BUCARIA,
State Chairman

STATE SCHOOL FUND. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 9.
Repeals provision requiring that proceeds from sale of lands granted
to State by United States for school support, estates of persons who
have died without a will or heir, and money granted by United
States for sale of land in State be kept in a perpetual fund with
interest thereon and income from unselected lands being used solely
for school support.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure repeals Section 4 of Article
IX of the Constitution which now creates a
"perpetual fund" and requires the interest
thereon, together with all the rents of cer-
tain unselected lands mentioned below, to be in-
vitably appropriated to the support of the
public schools. The "fund" is composed of
the proceeds of the sale or disposition of lands
granted by the United States to California
for support of the public schools and of the
500,000 acres of land distributed to California
as a new State by the United States, plus the
proceeds of estates of deceased persons who
Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 10

This fund which was initiated in 1849 and revised in 1879 has outlived its purpose. A "yes" vote on this proposition will eliminate unnecessary accounting procedures—it will not reduce the amount appropriated to public schools and could increase the amount so appropriated by releasing these otherwise frozen funds.

The office of the Auditor-General has recommended that this fund be dissolved. The accounting division of the Controller's office has also recommended that this fund be dissolved. Both of these offices noted that the current procedure requires unnecessary and costly accounting records with no benefit realized.

To allay any fears of the possibility that income to the public schools will be reduced by dissolving the fund, it is important to note that such dissolution will not decrease the amount of money otherwise appropriated. In fact, more money could well become available for school purposes from the unencumbered balance if the Legislature chose to make such additional appropriation.

Section 4 of Article IX of the California Constitution states that the School Land Fund—shall be and remain a perpetual fund, the interest of which together with the rents of all unsold lands and such other means as the legislature may provide shall be inviolably appropriated to the support of common schools throughout the State." (emphasis supplied)

This constitutional amendment in effect freezes the principal of the fund with only the interest on the principal and some other minor accruals being available for the support of the public schools. Consequently, only a relatively small amount of money has become available from this source for the schools.

The School Land Fund contains approximately $20,000,000 of income producing assets of which loan authorizations of over $20,000,000 have been made for various state construction projects. In this way, some use has been made of the fund but it can be seen from such transactions that the fund serves no vital purpose for the public schools.

The primary income to the School Land Fund has been from sales of school land granted the state by Congress in 1853. Most of the 5,500,000 acres granted have been disposed of, therefore a relatively small income accrues from this source. The state expenditure for public schools exceed $770,000,000 annually from the General Fund. If all of the remaining school land grant was sold during any one year, the income from sale would be less than $400,000 of the annual appropriation from the General Fund for the support of the public schools.

Vote YES on Proposition 10.

VIRGIL O'SULLIVAN
Senator, Eighth District

Argument Against Proposition No. 10

This proposed Constitutional Amendment should receive a "NO" vote. Section 4 of Article 9 of the Constitution provides that the proceeds of lands granted by the United States to California, when sold, shall go into a perpetual fund and the interest derived from this fund shall be used to support the schools of California. This fund also receives rents from unsold public lands and all estates of deceased persons who may have died without leaving a will or heir.

The present fund amounts to a substantial sum of money running into the millions of dollars. If this provision is repealed, that money will simply go into the general fund of the state and be lost in the operation of the state in the fiscal year in which it reverts. Several Western States have built up this fund so that the interest makes a material contribution toward the cost of education. California has only sold the less valuable public lands, and there remains some 500,000 acres of land which, when sold, will make a very valuable and substantial addition to the fund. If this section is repealed the money from the sale of this additional land will also be lost in the general fund.

I urge a "NO" vote so that the present funds may be preserved and the very substantial monies to be received in the future may be accumulated to help defray the ever increasing cost of education in California.

CLARK L. BRADLEY
State Senator, 10th District
FORMANCE OF MUNICIPAL FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY OFFICERS

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 35. Deletes requirement that the city council must approve transfer and performance of municipal functions by county officials; validates any agreements for performance of municipal functions by county officials heretofore made pursuant to general law.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

Section 6 of Article XI of the Constitution now provides, among other things, that the Legislature may by general laws provide for the performance by county officers of certain of the municipal functions of cities, whenever a majority of the city electors voting at a general or special election so determine.

This measure would amend the section to eliminate the requirement of a determination by the city electors voting at a general or special election. It would also validate any agreement for the performance of such service which was made prior to the date this measure is adopted.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 11

A YES vote on Proposition 11 will validate and permit the continuation of literally hundreds of contracts between counties and cities for the performance by county officers of several municipal functions.

A YES vote on Proposition 11 will continue to save local property taxpayers millions of dollars annually by avoiding duplication of services.

A YES vote on Proposition 11 will in no way remove from the voters their right to control their own local affairs or to determine matters of policy.

A YES vote on Proposition 11 will guarantee the administrative streamlining sought by the proponents of the 1914 amendment when they stated that it was "conceived in the interest of efficiency and economy."

The present provisions of Section 6 of Article XI, enacted in 1914, authorize county officers to perform certain municipal functions in order to avoid unnecessary costs and duplication of services. For example, property in all but a few cities is assessed for city tax purposes by the county assessor, and city property taxes are collected by the county tax collector. There is no valid reason to have a separate city assessor assessing the same property or to have several tax collectors when one is sufficient. The county health officer also serves as city health officer in all but 5 of the 383 cities in California. These two examples of avoiding duplicate services in cities and making unnecessary additional city employees and facilities save property taxpayers literally millions of dollars each year because of agreements between cities and counties for the performance by county officers of these services for cities. Other examples producing similar savings by avoidance of duplicate personnel and facilities to provide municipal services include jails, animal shelters, refuse disposal and disposal sites, libraries, elections, purchasing, law enforcement, civil service examinations, fire protection, planning, street construction and maintenance, flood control, water and air pollution control, building inspection, mosquito and fly control, emergency communications, record storage, recreation, sewer maintenance, and a host of others.

All of these joint services provided at great savings to taxpayers are jeopardized by the fact that each such joint contract has not been approved by the voters of the city. Proposition 11 simply deletes the need for a vote and permits such contracts to be entered into, as most have, by boards of supervisors and city councils. Proposition 11 also validates the many agreements entered into between cities and counties since 1914.

Proposition 11 was approved by both the Senate and Assembly without a single dissenting vote.

We urge a YES vote on Proposition 11 to validate hundreds of outstanding agreements between counties and cities and to encourage even greater efficiency, avoidance of duplicate facilities and services, and greater savings to California property taxpayers.

RANDOLPH COLLIER
Senator for Siskiyou and Del Norte Counties

EUGENE G. NISBET
38th Senatorial Dist.
San Bernardino Co.

LEO J. RYAN, Assemblyman
Twenty-seventh District
San Mateo County
**Analysis by the Legislative Counsel**

This measure relates to relief from taxes imposed upon property damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, earthquake, or other act of God, occurring after the lien date for a given tax year (which is fixed by law as the first Monday in March as to most types of property). It would permit the Legislature to provide, or authorize local taxing authorities to provide, for any appropriate relief from ad valorem taxation of such property if it is located in an area or region which, subsequent to the damage or destruction, is proclaimed by the Governor to be in a state of disaster.

**Argument In Favor of Proposition No. 12**

**VOTE YES on Proposition No. 12 to minimize the hardship resulting from the damage or destruction of property in public disasters.**

Your yes vote on Proposition No. 12 will authorize the Legislature by law either to provide appropriate property tax relief or authorize local agencies to provide such relief for the owners of property damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, earthquake or other Act of God within an area or region which is proclaimed by the Governor to be in a state of disaster. The requirement that the Governor must determine that the damage is extensive enough to constitute a disaster to the area or region will protect the general taxing public from unwarranted claims for tax relief.

The Constitution and laws of California now require that all real and personal property be assessed and taxed according to its value on the first Monday in March of each year. Under this rule, if privately owned property is destroyed after the first Monday in March by fire, flood, earthquake or other Act of God, the owner is required to pay the full amount of the taxes levied for the support of the state and local government for a full fiscal year beginning the following July 1st. The fact that the value existed and was owned by the taxpayers on the first Monday of March should not be a reason of equity or fairness require payment of taxes upon such value when the value was subsequently destroyed. In such a situation a property owner is penalized at the very time when he needs assistance most to restore his property to its original value.

The Legislature may not authorize direct tax relief to those suffering from natural disasters. This can be done only by Constitutional amendment.

Historically, such tax relief has been provided for major disaster victims after each disaster. Following the Long Beach earthquake in 1933 the people, by amendment to the Constitution, authorized property tax relief for the victims of that disaster. Tax relief was also provided for the victims of the Tehachapi earthquake in 1952.

The disastrous Bel Air fire, the devastation caused by the bursting of the Baldwin Hills Reservoir, the fire storm conflagration in Glendale, all in Los Angeles County, and the tidal wave which inundated Crescent City in Del Norte County have emphasized the necessity for giving the Legislature general authority to provide immediate tax relief for the victims of public disasters without the delay attendant upon the submission of individual constitutional amendments to the people at regular statewide elections allowing each disaster.

Your Yes vote on Proposition No. 12 will make it possible for the Legislature to act to alleviate the hardship and loss which substantial numbers of property owners suffer periodically by unforeseen natural disasters.

**FRANK LANTERMAN**  
Member of the Assembly  
47th Assembly District

**RANDOLPH COLLIER**  
State Senator  
Second Senatorial District

**Argument Against Proposition No. 12**

Vote NO on this give away!

1. This measure is discriminatory in its application as it limits its application to areas proclaimed to be in the state of disaster. Why should a single homeowner in the Glendale area be eligible for tax relief as a result of a fire when a single homeowner in Oakland who also loses his home as a result of a fire after the lien date is afforded no tax relief? The impact on the two homeowners is exactly the same, however, because one happens to be in an area proclaimed to be a state of disaster he is afforded some tax relief. There is no logical basis for granting tax relief to one and not to the other.

2. The wording of the measure is unclear as to whether all property damaged in an area declared by the Governor to be a dis-
shall be given tax relief or just prop-
y damaged in the disaster itself. For
example, twenty eight to thirty homes were
damaged in the Glendale fire. Subsequently,
Los Angeles County was declared a disaster
area. Will all the homes damaged by fire in
Los Angeles County after the lien date or
just the homes damaged in the Glendale fire
be eligible for this tax relief?
3. ACA 10 changes the entire concept of
the lien date. Real property has always been
assessed at one particular point and time.
This amendment provides for tax relief to
property reduced in value after the lien date
as a result of a disaster. Why not also pro-
vide for a tax increase on property which
is increase in value after the lien date?
4. The measure provides for property tax
relief whether the damaged property is cov-
ered by insurance or not. Where property is
damaged and covered by insurance, property
can be restored in three to six months and the,
taxpayer is thus in a favorable situation by
receiving tax relief but not actually receiv-
ing the loss of any property.

DOUGLAS J. HILL
Dem. Nominee,
16th Assembly Dist.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS: NAMING CORPORATIONS, As-
sembley Constitutional Amendment No. 12. Prohibits submission of
constitutional amendments, whether proposed by initiative or Legis-
lature, which name private corporations to perform any function
or have any power or duty. Declares that any such amendment
submitted to or approved by the electorate at the 1964 general elec-
tion or thereafter shall not go into effect.

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

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 13, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel
This measure would prohibit the submis-
sion to the electors of any amendment to the
Constitution which designates any private
corporation by name to perform any func-
tion or to have any power. It further pro-
hibits submission to the electorate at the election or any election here-
after shall be effective for any purpose.
At this election there is an initiative Con-
itutional Amendment (Proposition No. 16)
which would add Article XXXI to the Con-
stitution to establish a lottery in this State
to be conducted for the first ten years by a
particular named private corporation. Since
the naming of the corporation would be in
conflict with this measure, if both are
approved by the electors, the one receiving
the highest vote will prevail. Thus, if both
are approved and this measure receives the
higher number of votes, the provisions of
Article XXXI establishing the lottery will
not take effect.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 13
This amendment will prevent private cor-
porations from naming themselves in our
Constitution.
The Constitution is the basic document of
government—it should not be used as a ve-
hicle for profiteering by a small group of
promoters and it should not provide special
privilege for specific individuals or corpo-
ations. If a corporation were to be named in
the Constitution it would be a monopoly oper-
ation. It would not be subject to the economic
restraints of competition which have made our
economic enterprise society great.
There is already a clause which prohibits
the naming of individuals in the Constitu-
tion. A Yes vote on this proposition will ex-
tend the prohibition to corporations. John
Doe cannot now sponsor an initiative and
name himself to be Director of the Depart-
ment of Finance. However, John Doe can
corporate as the John Doe Corporation
and name the corporation of which he is the
sole officer to do the very thing the Consti-
tution now prohibits.
Passage of this measure will not limit the
use of the initiative process nor will it limit
the state's authority to contract with cor-
porations for building or highway construc-
tion. It simply prohibits the naming of private
corporations from being written into our
Constitution.
We wouldn't consider naming a private
corporation in the United States Constitu-
tion—why should we allow them in our State
Constitution?
Private promoters who had the gait to
make just this proposal will gain millions of
our dollars by writing themselves into the
Constitution. Let's stop them.
Vote YES for good government.

NICHOLAS C. PETRIS
Assemblyman, 16th District
California Legislature
THOMAS M. REES
State Senator

Argument Against Proposition No. 13
Corporations should not be named into the
State Constitution or into State law for that
matter. While the objective of this proposed
constitutional amendment is a good one, a
Constitution should contain only the basic
and fundamental law of the state—not in-
volved detail.
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I voted against ACA 12 in the Assembly not because I think it is a bad bill, but because I don’t think it should necessarily be a part of the Constitution. This reverses a trend we started only a few years ago. As recently as 1962, we passed Proposition 7 which removed 15,000 surplus words from the Constitution. I don’t know whether we should begin adding them again so soon.

In 1948 an initiative was circulated and gathered enough signatures to qualify for the November ballot. It specified a particular individual to be the Director of a reorganized Department of Social Welfare. The measure was approved by the voters at the general election, and this woman became Director of the State Department of Social Welfare. The Department budget went up—benefits went up—costs to the taxpayer went up—and thousands of buildings were purchased new automobiles—she bought truckloads of furniture which we are still putting to use. It took a full year before a special election could be called to remove her from office.

Because of this fiasco, the Constitution was amended to say that no individual could be named in the Constitution to hold any office or to perform any duty of State government, etc. Obviously the people expressed their opinions by adding the amendment which excluded individuals from the Constitution. If they had wanted to exclude private corporations from the Constitution, they would have done so at that time.

I believe that the voters of the State of California will not be duped by private corporations sponsoring initiative measures and getting themselves named in the Constitution to carry out quasi-state functions. While I favor keeping the Constitution free of extraneous matters, in the present situation, I believe that it would be entirely unbelievable and unworkable to have a private corporation named in the Constitution.

The answer to the dilemma then is to make certain that every voter in the State of California votes against any proposed amendment or initiative which would name a private corporation as part of the Constitution.

GORDON H. WINTON, Jr.
Assemblyman, 31st District
Merced, Madera and
San Benito Counties

SALES AND RENTALS OF RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Prohibits State, subdivision, or agency thereof from denying, limiting, or abridging right of any person to decline to sell, lease, or rent residential real property to any person as he chooses. Prohibition not applicable to property owned by State or its subdivisions; property acquired by eminent domain; or transient lodging accommodations by hotels, motels, and similar public places.

YES

NO

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure would add Section 26 to Article 1 of the California Constitution. It would prohibit the State and its subdivisions and agencies from directly or indirectly denying, limiting, or abridging the right of any "person" to decline to sell, lease, or rent residential "real property" to such person or persons as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses.

By definitions contained in the measure, "person" would include individuals, partnerships, corporations and other legal entities, and their agents or representatives, but would not include the State or any of its subdivisions with respect to the sale, lease, or rental of property owned by it. "Real property" would mean any residential realty, regardless of how obtained or financed and regardless of whether such realty consists of a single family dwelling or as a dwelling for two or more persons or families living together or independently of each other.

The measure would not apply to the obtaining of property by eminent domain, nor to the renting or providing of any transient lodging accommodations by a hotel, motel, or other similar public place engaged in furnishing lodging to transient guests.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 14

Your "Yes" vote on this constitutional amendment will guarantee the right of all home and apartment owners to choose buyers and renters of their property as they wish, without interference by State or local government.

Most owners of such property in California lost this right through the Rumford Act of 1963. It says they may not refuse to sell or rent their property to anyone for reasons of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

The Rumford Act establishes a new principle in our law—that State appointed bureaucrats may force you, over your objections, to deal concerning your own property with the person they choose. This amounts to seizure of private property.

Your "Yes" vote will require the State remain neutral: Neither to forbid nor to force a home or apartment owner to sell or rent to one particular person over another.
Under the Ranford Act, any person refused by a property owner may charge discrimination. The owner must defend himself, not because he refused, but for his reason for refusing. He must defend himself for alleged unlawful thoughts.

A politically appointed commission (Fair Employment Practice Commission) becomes investigator, prosecutor, jury and judge. It may "obtain . . . and utilize the services of all governmental departments and agencies" against you. It allows hearsay and opinion evidence.

If you cannot prove yourself innocent, you can be forced to accept your accuser as buyer or tenant or pay him up to $500 "damages."

You may appeal to a court, but the judge only reviews the FEPIC record. If you don't abide by the decision, you may be jailed for contempt. You are never allowed a jury trial.

If such legislation is proper, what is to prevent the legislature from passing laws prohibiting property owners from declining to rent or sell for reasons of sex, age, marital status, or lack of financial responsibility?

Your "Yes" vote will prevent such tyranny. It will restore to the home or apartment owner, whatever his skin color, religion, origin, or other characteristic, the right to sell or rent his property as he chooses. It will put this right into the California constitution, where it can be taken away only by consent of the people at the polls.

The amendment does not affect the enforceability of contracts voluntarily entered into. A voluntary agreement not to discriminate will be as enforceable as any other. Contrary to what some say, the amendment does not interfere with the right of the State or Federal government to enforce contracts made with private parties. This would include Federal Urban Renewal projects, College Housing programs, and property owned by the State or acquired by condemnation.

Opponents of this amendment show a complete lack of confidence in the fairness of Californians in dealing with members of minority groups. They believe, therefore, the people must not be allowed to make their own decisions.

Your "Yes" vote will end such interference. It will be a vote for freedom.

Submitted by:

L. H. WILSON
Pismo, California
Chairman, Committee for Home Protection

JACK SCHRADE
State Senator
San Diego County

ROBERT L. SNELL
Oakland, California
President, California Apartment Owners Association

Argument Against Proposition No. 14

Leaders of every religious faith urge a "NO" vote on Proposition 14.

Leaders of both the Republican and Democratic parties urge a "NO" vote on Proposition 14.

Business, labor and civic leaders urge a "NO" vote on Proposition 14.

Why such overwhelming opposition? Because Proposition 14 would write hate and bigotry into the Constitution. It could take away your right to buy or rent the home of your choice.

The evidence is clear:

1. Proposition 14 is a deception. It does not give you a chance to vote for or against California's Fair Housing Law. Instead, it would radically change our Constitution by destroying all existing fair housing laws. But more than that, it would forever forbid your elected officials of the state, cities and counties from any future action in this field. It would also threaten all other laws protecting the value of our properties.

2. Proposition 14 says one thing but means another. Its real purpose—to deny millions of Californians the right to buy a home—is deliberately hidden in its tricky language. Its wording is so sweeping it could result in persons of any group being denied the right to own property which they could afford.

3. Proposition 14 is not legally sound. California's Supreme Court has already said there are "grave" doubts as to its constitutionality. It destroys basic rights of individuals and thus is in violation of the U.S. Constitution.

4. Proposition 14 is misleading. California already has a fair and moderate housing law similar to those in effect in 10 other states. In five years the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which administers this law, has dealt with over 3,500 cases in both employment and housing. All but four cases were either dismissed or settled in the calm give-and-take of conciliation.

5. Proposition 14 is a threat. It would strike a damaging blow to California's economy through loss of $276,000,000 in federal redevelopment and other construction funds. Thousands of Californians could be thrown out of work.

6. Proposition 14 is immoral. It would legalize and incite bigotry. At a time when our nation is moving ahead on civil rights, it proposes to convert California into another Mississippi or Alabama and to create an atmosphere for violence and hate.

For generations Californians have fought for a tolerant society and against the extremist forces of the ultra-right who actively are behind Proposition 14.
Now a selfish, mistaken group would restrict free trade in real estate in California — a powerful lobby seeking special immunity from the law for its own private purposes is asking you to vote hatred and bigotry into our State Constitution.

Do not be deceived. Join the leaders of our churches, our political parties and businesses and labor in voting “NO” on Proposition 14. Before you vote study! Learn why you should join us!

TELEVISION PROGRAMS. Initiative. Declares it contrary to public policy to permit development of subscription television business. Provides no charge shall be made to public for television programs transmitted to home television sets. Contracts inconsistent with free transmission made after effective date of Act or still executory are void. Act does not apply to community, hotel, or apartment antenna systems, or non-profit educational television systems. Injured persons may seek damages or injunction for violation of Act. Repeals Sections 35001-35003, Revenue and Taxation Code, relating to subscription television.
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YES

NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 14, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Council

This initiative measure, the “Free Television Act,” states that the development of any subscription television business would be contrary to the public policy of the State.

The measure declares that the public shall have the right to view any television program on a home television set free of charge, regardless of how such program is transmitted, if the program is of a category, form, kind, nature or type which was transmitted on or before the effective date of the measure free of charge for reception on home television sets. It would prohibit any person from, directly or indirectly, making a charge inconsistent with such right.

Contracts, agreements, or understandings, where inconsistent with such free transmission, which are made or executed after the effective date of the measure, and those in existence on such effective date, to the extent that they are executory, would be void and unenforceable by the measure.

Any person injured by a violation of the measure would be permitted to recover three times the amount of any damages he suffers because of such violation and to enjoin such violation. He would also be entitled to his costs of suit and reasonable attorneys’ fees.

The measure would not apply to community antenna systems and to hotel and apartment antenna systems, where no charge is made to the viewer based upon or related to program content, nor to nonprofit educational television systems.

The measure would repeal existing statutes which now authorize subscription television corporations to engage in the subscription television business.

The measure would provide that if any portion or portions of the measure, or the application thereof, are adjudged to be unconstitutional or invalid, such adjudication shall not affect the validity of the remainder of the measure or valid applications of the measure.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 15

Your YES vote on Proposition 15 will:

1. Repeal the unregulated subscription PAY-TV monopoly.

2. Protect you from having to pay a monthly bill for sports programs and popular shows you now see on FREE-TV.

PAY-TV claims they will offer only cultural and educational programs. But a $28,000,000.00 venture will not be able to pay dividends with “trips to the museum” and “visits to Tokyo’s Kabuki Theatre.”

Rather, they will buy up sports attractions and your favorite shows now on FREE-TV and force you to pay or do without.

A good example is major league baseball. In every Eastern City in the National League, a major portion of the schedule is on FREE-TV.

In California Dodger and Giant games are monopolized by PAY-TV charging $1.50 per game if you are in the PAY-TV area. You can’t see the games at all (nine excepted this year) if you live in any low or most middle income neighborhoods, a suburban area, or any place outside Los Angeles and San Francisco.

And plans are underway to rob FREE-TV of football, basketball and other sports.

But this isn’t all. The three networks—ABC, NBC, CBS—have made it clear that PAY-TV is a financial success they will be forced into PAY-TV also in order to keep...
their best programs from being bought away at a higher price by PAY-TV. Thus you would be required to PAY for what you now see FREE.

In effect, it would be like making TOLL ROADS out of our FREEWAYS!

For the first year subscription television is reported to cost subscribers $15.00 a month minimum, if they see only 10 shows a month.

But this may be just the beginning.

On a San Francisco telecast the subscription television president who receives a salary of $85,000.00 a year plus bonus said:

"I'll bet you that within 10 years they will pay $1,000.00 (a year). I'll bet it will be a bigger item of their budget than the automobile."

Think what THIS would mean to YOUR family budget—and to shut-ins, disabled veterans, and low income people who rely on FREE-TV for their major entertainment.

This is not free enterprise. This is like putting a coin box on your family washing machine and making you pay to use it.

Showing programs to a FEW who can afford PAY-TV will prevent millions of others from seeing them on FREE-TV. The National Association of Broadcasters says that 4% of viewers paying $1.00 per program would be able to outbid FREE-TV for VERY top television attraction.

Subscription television promises no commercials. But the present law PERMITS them to use commercials!

Your YES vote on 15 will not outlaw PAY-TV if limited to cultural subjects not now produced on FREE-TV. But it will:

1. Repeal the unregulated PAY-TV monopoly which will be profitable only to its stockholders.

2. Preserve YOUR right to FREE-TV.

DON BELLING, Chairman Citizens' Committee for Free-TV and Director Eversharp Corporation; Financial Corporation of America

MRS. FRED S. (GERRI) TEASLEY, Vice Chairman Citizens' Committee for Free-TV and Radio-TV Chairman, California Federation of Women's Clubs

GEORGE JOHNS, Executive Secretary, San Francisco Central Labor Council

**Argument Against Proposition No. 15**

VOTE NO Proposition 15 and insure better TV programming.

STV lets the whole family watch baseball, football, movies, plays, operas, ballets, concerts—you pay only for what you see—at fractions of the box office price.

STV means support for 237,800 new jobs and a stronger economy, according to a recent study of economic trends reviewed by Dr. James Gillies of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Yet this brilliant new service is meeting sinister, organized opposition. Theater owners have duped the public into believing that STV is a threat to "free TV." On this ridiculous premise (plus the expenditure of extravagant sums) they managed to buy a place for Proposition 15 on the November ballot.

Their premise is absurd. STV will not affect commercial television. It will actually increase the value of your current set by adding three new color-capable channels.

Vote NO on Proposition 15. Legislation such as proposed by Proposition 15 is opposed by the Los Angeles Times, the Hearst Press, RCA, NBC, CBS, and virtually all responsible people in communications.

S. L. WEAVER, JR. President Subscription Television, Inc.

**Argument Against Proposition No. 15**

The ten incorporators of the group which sponsors this measure are all either owners or operators of Theatre or Theatre chains.

This is one of the most dangerous measures ever to be placed on a California Ballot. It is designed to serve a private interest group—Theatre Owners.

It is a maneuver to outlaw Home Pay TV in California, reserving the rights and benefits of Pay TV for Theatre use only. It is a device to legislate competitors (Home Pay TV operators) out of business, thereby creating a monopoly of Theatre TV.

This measure flouts our Free Enterprise System; deprives citizens freedom of choice between Commercial TV or Home Pay TV (both available simultaneously at all times on your present set); denies new employment of all kinds, throughout the State, in the development and maintenance of this new industry; prohibits the benefits of enormous local and state revenues, under State Revenue Act recognizing its legality, and ridicules the Initiative Process. Vote NO on Proposition 15.

RALPH BELLAMY Acting President Fair Trial for Pay TV Council
Argument Against Proposition No. 15

Far from destroying Free Television, Home Pay TV—through competition—will improve the quality of free TV programming.

All baseball games now shown on free TV will still be shown on free TV. Games now blacked out will become available on Home Pay TV. Theatre owners charge as much as $25 for theatre TV showings of sporting events. Home Pay TV operators are committed never to charge more than the general admission price.

Home Pay TV will create thousands of new jobs, not only in the entertainment industry but for many craftsmen in the communities served, thus helping to solve unemployment.

Home Pay TV must be permitted to succeed or fail in the open market in accordance with the American free enterprise system. Its opponents, theatre owners, are the very same people who tried to stamp out free TV at its inception.

The Joint Legislative Council of Teamsters is on record unanimously to vote NO on Proposition 15.

RALPH CLARE
Secretary,
Joint Council of Teamsters
of Southern California

LOTTERY. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Provides for statewide lottery with monthly drawings. Creates State Lottery Commission of three members appointed by Governor, with supervisory powers over licensee permitted to conduct lottery. Commission shall issue only one license to conduct lottery; original license to go to a named private corporation for a period of 10 years; licensee to pay annual fee of $500.00 for each county in State. Commission shall print and sell $2.00 tickets to licensee for $1.74; 74% of money received by Commission appropriated for public education; 26% to be used for expenses of Commission and prizes.
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NO

(For Full Text of Measure, See Page 16, Part II)

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure, the California State Controlled Lottery Fund Law, would establish a statewide lottery with monthly drawings to be conducted by a private corporation licensed and supervised by a new state agency, the State Lottery Commission.

The State Lottery Commission would be composed of three members appointed by the Governor, each for four-year terms and with an annual salary of $17,500.

The commission could license only one corporation to conduct the lottery and it would be illegal for any other person or corporation to conduct a lottery. For the first 10 years of the operation of the lottery, the commission would be required to license a particular private corporation known as the American Sweepstakes Corporation, which has done promotional work on the lottery proposal, to conduct the lottery. After this first 10-year period, the commission could license any one California corporation to conduct the lottery.

The licensee would be required to pay to the commission an annual license fee in an amount equal to $500 for each county in the State. No other license or excise tax or fee or personal property tax could be assessed against or collected from the licensee by reason of the licensee’s possession, distribution, or sale of lottery tickets or the machine vending the tickets, by the State or by any county, city, district or any other body having the power to assess or collect any license, tax, or fee.

The commission would be required to a range for the printing of lottery tickets and to sell the tickets to the licensed corporation for $1.74 per ticket. The licensee would sell the tickets to the public for $2 per ticket and retain the 26 cents for each ticket sold. Tickets not sold by the licensee would be returned to the commission and the purchase price refunded. Tickets would be sold to the public by means of automatic vending machines. It would be unlawful to sell tickets to minors or to sell tickets outside the State.

The revenues derived by the commission from the sale of tickets to the licensee would be deposited in two special funds in the State Treasury. Into one fund would be deposited 74 percent of the total revenues, which would be appropriated to meet the needs of public education on an average daily attendance basis and in amounts and for the purposes best calculated, in the judgment of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, to reduce public taxation for such purposes. The remaining 26 percent of the revenues, together with the annual license fee, would be deposited in a second fund and would be used for prizes and the expenses of the State Lottery Commission.

There would be a total of 12 drawings annually, one to be conducted each month, with a total of 3,000 winners per month. The drawings would be made by persons designated by the commission, and would be subject to the supervision of the commission.
Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 16

This initiative, out of all propositions, is the only one that tends to lower taxes. Under this initiative $25,000,000,000 annually will be produced to aid the school system. The taxation on real property owners is fast becoming intolerable and at the same time additional funds are needed for education. This proposal affords a logical method whereby schools can be financed without burden on the taxpayer. It further provides for $11,000,000,000.00 for prizes and 13% to the licensee to defray operational expenses which include the purchase of thousands of vending machines, employment of five thousand people, general, administrative and accounting costs.

It is a painless and voluntary method of taxation. It is conservatively estimated that $7,000,000,000.00 is gambled illegally in the United States every year, thus indicating that people satisfy their urge to gamble even though it is against the law. Since a sizeable portion of this $7,000,000,000.00 is from California and does not benefit the state, it would be better to legalize lotteries and divert this money into useful channels.

Each year thousands of Californians go to Las Vegas and purchase Irish Sweepstakes lottery tickets. When this urge to gamble can be satisfied by a monthly drawing in California much of the money which has been going to Nevada and Ireland will remain in California and serve a useful purpose.

A lottery is not immoral. There is no prohibition in the Ten Commandments or the Bible. It is when gambling is done to excess that it becomes immoral because one who does so misappropriates funds which are due his creditors or dependents.

A lottery by its very nature is a limited form of gambling. Surveys made on 88 national lotteries presently operating throughout the world demonstrated that people do not buy lottery tickets to excess. The purchase of a great number of tickets does not materially increase the purchaser's chance of winning. Consequently, it is clear that the purchase of one or two lottery tickets each month will not materially affect the economic security of any person in California, regardless of his class.

This initiative provides for private enterprise in the operation of the lottery, with an absolute working margin of 13%. Testimony before the Revenue and Taxation Committee of the State Assembly established that no state operated lottery was able to operate under 20% of the gross revenue. The private corporation undertakes to operate the California State Controlled Lottery on the theory that private enterprise has a history of doing things of a business nature more economically than the state.

Lotteries are not new to the United States. George Washington and Thomas Jefferson utilized this method in supporting the Revolution and early government. New Hampshire has now passed a state lottery which has demonstrated already that it is a success.

Governor Brown has promised to raise taxes at the next session of the Legislature. This is a method of avoiding that raise in taxes, if necessary.

ROBERT W. WILSON
Proprietor of Initiative

TESSIE SMITH
Proprietor of Initiative

VIRGINIA CRAWFORD
Proprietor of Initiative

Argument Against Proposition No. 16

Are you in favor of a State lottery?

Are you opposed to a State lottery?

Then VOTE NO on Proposition 16.

Are you opposed to any lottery?

Then VOTE NO on Proposition 16.

For the American Sweepstakes Corporation, which would get 13% of the proceeds from this lottery scheme, Proposition 16 is a gold mine.

For the rest of us, no matter how we feel about gambling, it's a very bad deal.

Let's make this clear: Proposition 16 is NOT a state lottery. It is a PRIVATE LOTTERY, conducted by the American Sweepstakes Corporation, as a monopoly, for ten years.

These promoters spent a half-million dollars just to get Proposition 16 on the ballot. They are spending additional huge sums in order to sell it to you. If it wins, according to their own estimates, they will take in sixty-five million dollars a year. In 10 years, that's well over half a billion dollars.

NOT A PENNY OF THAT MONEY WILL GO FOR EDUCATION.

Not a penny of it will go to reduce your taxes.

Every penny will go into the pockets of the American Sweepstakes Corporation.

The promoters are attempting to use education to sell this scheme—but responsible educators have denounced the proposal. The education of our children is too important to depend on such a speculative venture.

Lower taxes? The official legislative analyst has stated that a lottery wouldn't save you a dollar a year on your State taxes. It is more likely to increase your taxes because of increased welfare and police costs.

Lotteries are a tax on the poor; experience shows a lottery inevitably increases the welfare burden.
Unrestricted availability of lottery vending machines to persons of all ages is an uncontrolled invitation to gambling. Gambling losses cause other crimes including those of violence and corruption. Nevada, the state of legalized gambling, has the highest crime rate in the country. Higher crime rates mean higher police costs.

The Legislature is powerless to make the slightest modification in this private lottery scheme. It would take another state-wide election to effect any change whatsoever or to dissolve this stranglehold of the American Sweepstakes Corporation.

Even if you'd like a true State lottery, you don't want this. It would give one of the poorest pay-offs of any lottery anywhere. Analysis indicates that only 2% of the gross would be available as prizes! Compare that with the 50% pay-back by the Irish Sweepstakes, or the 85% return by the California race-tracks.

Educators, taxpayers, law enforcement officers, Republicans and Democrats, organized labor, church groups and business are all against this lottery grab.

Don't compare it with the New Hampshire Lottery. That is a true State lottery—it isn't. There is no 13% take-off to private promoters in New Hampshire.

Proposition 16 must not pass! Vote NO on Proposition 16—and be sure your friends and family do too!

CALIFORNIANS AGAINST THE LOTTERY SCHEME

LAUGHLIN E. WATERS, State Chairman
Former State Legislator and former U. S. Attorney

DON FAZACKERLEY, Co-Chairman, Northern California; Former San Francisco Police Commissioner

EUGENE W. BISCALUZ, Co-Chairman, Southern California; Past President, State Peace Officers Association

RAILROAD TRAIN CREWS Initiative. Declares state policy on manning trains. Provides that Award No. 282 of Federal Arbitration Board on manning of diesel powered freight trains shall be effective in California, and that no state law or regulation shall prevent a railroad from manning trains in accordance with federal legislation or awards pursuant thereto, or collective bargaining agreements. Repeals initiative provisions on crews required for freight, mixed, or work trains, and right of State Public Utilities Commission to determine number of brakemen on all trains, and repeals other legislation concerning crews on certain kinds of trains.

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

Analysis by the Legislative Counsel

This measure, the Railroad Anti- featherbedding Law of 1964, would amend the Labor Code to declare as policy of the State that “featherbedding” practices on railroads should be eliminated; that national settlement of labor controversies relating to the manning of trains should be made effective in California; and that the award of the Federal Arbitration Board No. 282, appointed pursuant to Public Law 88-308 and providing for the elimination of excess firemen and brakemen on diesel powered freight trains, or awards made pursuant thereto, shall be made effective in this State.

It would provide that nothing contained in the laws of this State or in any order of any regulatory agency of this State shall prevent a common carrier by railroad from manning its trains in accordance with the award of the Federal Arbitration Board No. 282, in accordance with any federal legislation or awards pursuant thereto, or in accordance with any agreement between a railroad company and its employees or their representatives.

It would also repeal existing provisions of the Labor Code which now prohibit common carriers operating certain trains from operating freight, mixed, or work trains, and certain other kinds of trains and equipment, without specified numbers and kinds of crew members, and would also repeal existing provisions authorizing the Public Utilities Commission to require common carriers by railroad to operate their trains with such number of brakemen as are necessary to promote safety.

Argument in Favor of Proposition No. 17

Proposition 17 is a non-partisan economic issue that merits the support of all Californians.

Your “yes” vote on Proposition 17 supports the peaceful solution which three United States Presidents, Dwight Eisenhower, John Kennedy, and Lyndon Johnson, achieved in the long-standing, nationwide controversy over railroad work rules. Moreover, a “yes” vote is necessary to make the settlement of this controversy effective in California.
The solution—in the form of a national award by the Federal Arbitration Board appointed by President Kennedy and a collective bargaining agreement reached under the leadership of President Johnson—averted a nationwide railroad strike which would have paralyzed the country.

The main dispute resolved by these settlements was over an antiquated requirement that a fireman ride in the cab of a diesel-powered freight train where there are no fires to stoke or coals to shovel. Another dispute resolved was over the requirement for excess brakemen on certain trains.

The presence of a fireman—in addition to the engineer and head brakeman—has meant that three men ride the cars on freight trains in contrast to only two men in the cars of passenger trains, where safety is naturally of paramount concern.

A Presidential Commission appointed by President Eisenhower, and an Emergency Board and an Arbitration Board appointed by President Kennedy, taking account of modern improvements in railroad equipment such as air brake systems and automatic signal devices, all found that firemen are unnecessary for the safe and efficient operation of diesel-powered freight trains.

The Arbitration Board's Award provides for the gradual elimination of firemen on 80 percent of all freight trains, and requires their continued presence on 10 percent where special situations may exist. This leaves at least two men in the cab on all trains.

The railroads are absolutely required to retain in their employment all present full-time firemen with more than two years seniority. Generous severance payments must be made to those few firemen affected by the Award with less than two years seniority.

Employment needs of California's railroads today are such that these men can transfer to other railroad jobs if they wish.

In California wasteful featherbedding, which the national Award gradually eliminates, costs consumers about $12 million a year. For our State to conform to the national transportation pattern established under the leadership of three Presidents, it is necessary to repeal conflicting, outmoded "excess crew" laws.

Proposition 17 repeals these outmoded featherbedding laws and makes possible genuine collective bargaining procedures.

The only opposition to Proposition 17 stems from certain labor leaders concerned about the eventual loss of membership dues.

Your "yes" vote on Proposition 17 will keep California competitive with other states, bring the benefits of the presidential settlements to California consumers, and help insure a thriving, job-building California transportation industry.

Proposition 17 is a necessary step forward for our fast-growing State, whose continuing prosperity depends upon the attractions of new industry to provide jobs for all our people.

Vote "yes" on Proposition 17.

SENATOR
HUGH M. BURNS
(D) Fresno
President Pro Tem
California State Senate

JOHN F. McCARTHY
State Senator,
13th Senatorial District

DR. MURIEL B. DUNCAN
Los Angeles
State Women's Club Leader

Argument Against Proposition No. 17
California's present law, regulating the size of train-crews through the State Public Utilities Commission, was wisely enacted to protect the safety of the general public, railroad patrons and workers. The Law was updated in 1959 to meet present day safety needs. California is one of 16 progressive states with similar "minimum crew" legislation.

Incalculable loss of human lives has been prevented through the proper manning of trains, and millions of dollars in equipment and property have been safeguarded. At the same time, the railroads in California have continued to make substantial profits (largely because the productivity of railroad workers is the second highest in American industry).

Through this initiative measure, the railroads are attempting to eliminate the all-important "co-pilot" and "assistant engineer" and other essential crewmen from diesel locomotives, a serious threat to public safety in the operation of trains.

Passage of Proposition 17 would also mean a complete surrender of all of California's regulatory powers governing the manning of freight trains. There would no longer be any state or Federal agency controlling the safe manning of trains, leaving this solely at the discretion of the railroad owners.

The California Public Utilities Commission, guardian of the people's interests, would thus be by-passed and the railroads would have a free hand to establish work rules as they see fit. With the Public Utilities Commission eliminated from the picture, the people's interests would no longer be protected.

The railroads are also attempting to circumvent the will of the State Legislature through this initiative petition by insisting that the sweeping generalities of the Federal
Arbitration Award ruling supersede California’s enacted statutes. This, in spite of the fact that the Arbitration Award ruling was never intended to apply to California, or to any other state already having laws controlling the manning of trains.

It was specifically emphasized by the Chairman of the House Committee on Interstate Commerce that “The Committee does not intend that any award made under this section may supersede or modify any State Law relating to the manning of trains”. Thus, on August 28, 1963, Congress made it crystal clear that compulsory arbitration awards under Public Law 88-106 were never intended to be substituted for California State Law.

California’s Minimum Crew Laws were established for safety reasons. Railroading is a hazardous operation, and in California, railroads operate over more miles of dangerous mountain terrain than in any other state. California has 11,000 grade crossing, each a potential hazard.

While wiping out all public control over safe manning of trains, the railroad interests are also attempting to write into the State Constitution, through Proposition 17, language which would prohibit California from ever enacting any legislation in the future to regulate the size of train-crews for public safety purposes.

To avoid surrendering constitutional state authority to regulate manning of trains for public safety purposes, Californians must vote NO on Proposition 17.

JAMES L. EVANS
Chairman, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, AFL-CIO, State Legislative Board

G. W. BALLARD
State Representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, AFL-CIO
PART II—APPENDIX

FOR THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL, AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1964. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to be used to meet the recreational requirements of the people of the State of California by acquiring and developing lands for recreational purposes.

AGAINST THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL, AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES BOND ACT OF 1964. This act provides for a bond issue of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to be used to meet the recreational requirements of the people of the State of California by acquiring and developing lands for recreational purposes.

This proposed law, by act of the Legislature passed at the 1963 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 BLACK-OUT TYPE to indicate that they are NEW.)

PROPOSED LAW

Section 1. Chapter 1.6 (commencing with Section 5096.1) is added to Division 5 of the Public Resources Code, to read:

Chapter 1.6. State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964

5096.1. This chapter may be cited as the Cameron-Urquhart Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964.

5096.2. The Legislature of the State of California hereby finds and declares that:

(a) It is the responsibility of this State to provide and to encourage the provision of outdoor recreation opportunities for the citizens of California;

(b) When there is proper planning and development, open space lands contribute not only to a healthy physical and moral environment, but also contribute to the economic betterment of the State, and, therefore, it is in the public interest for the State to acquire areas for recreation, conservation, and preservation and to aid local governments of the State in acquiring and developing such areas as will contribute to the realization of the policy declared in this chapter.

5096.3. The Legislature further finds and declares that:

(a) The present public outdoor recreation areas and facilities in the State are inadequate to accommodate the demands made on them at the present time and will become critically inadequate as time progresses.

(b) Land values are increasing at a steady rate and any delay by the State in securing additional lands for park and recreation purposes will result not only in the loss of suitable lands for recreation purposes, but also will reduce the economic ability of the State to acquire such lands.

(c) At the next general election the people of the State of California will vote upon a proposition authorizing a state bond issue in the amount of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000) to provide the moneys for the acquisition and development of lands needed for recreation purposes.

(d) It is desirable for the people of this State to have prior notice of the proposed disposition and allocation of the proceeds of this bond issue.

5096.4. Bonds in the total amount of one hundred fifty million dollars ($150,000,000), or so much thereof as is necessary, may be issued and sold to provide a fund to be used for carrying out the purposes expressed hereinafter. Said bonds shall, when sold, be and constitute a valid and binding obligation of the State of California, and the full faith and credit of the State of California are hereby pledged for the punctual payment of both principal and interest on said bonds as said principal and interest become due and payable.

5096.5. There shall be collected each year and in the same manner and at the same time as other State revenue is collected such sum in addition to the ordinary revenues of the State as shall be required to pay the principal and interest on said bonds maturing in said year, 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 such additional sum.

5096.6. There is hereby appropriated from the General Fund in the State Treasury for the purpose of this act, such an amount as will equal the following:

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

(b) The sum of twenty-five thousand dollars ($25,000) to pay the expenses incurred
by the State Treasurer in preparing and advertising the sale or prior redemption of bonds issued pursuant to this act, to defray expenses incurred by the State Park and Recreation Finance Committee pursuant to Section 16728 of the Government Code, and for the payment of legal services upon approval of the State Board of Control, pursuant to Section 16729 of the Government Code.

(c) Such sum as is necessary to carry out the provisions of Section 5096.7, which sum is appropriated without regard to fiscal years.

5096.7. For the purposes 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 have been authorized to be sold for the purpose of carrying out this chapter. Any amounts withdrawn shall be deposited in the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund, which fund is hereby created. Any moneys made available under this section shall be returned to the General Fund from moneys received from the sale of bonds sold for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this chapter.

5096.8. The proceeds of bonds issued and sold pursuant to this chapter shall be deposited in the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund. The money in the fund may be expended only for the purposes specified in this chapter and only pursuant to appropriation by the Legislature in the manner hereinafter prescribed.

5096.9. All proposed appropriations for the program contemplated by this chapter shall be included in a section in the Budget Bill for each fiscal year for consideration by the Legislature, and shall bear the caption "State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Act Program." The section shall contain separate items for each project for which an appropriation is made.

Such appropriations shall be subject to all limitations contained in the Budget Bill and to all fiscal procedures prescribed by law with respect to the expenditure of state funds. The section shall contain proposed appropriations only for the program contemplated by this chapter, and no funds derived from the bonds authorized by this chapter may be expended pursuant to an appropriation not contained in that section of the Budget Act.

5096.10. The bonds authorized by this act shall be prepared, executed, issued, sold, paid and redeemed as provided in the State General Obligation Bond Law (Chapter 4 (commencing with Section 16720) of Part 3, Division 4, Title 2 of the Government Code) and all of the provisions of that law are applicable to the bonds and to this chapter, and are hereby incorporated in this chapter as though set forth in full herein.

5096.11. The State Park and Recreation Finance Committee is hereby created. The committee consists of the Governor, the State Controller, the Director of Finance, the State Treasurer, and the Administrator of the Resources Agency. For the purposes of this chapter the State Park and Recreation Finance Committee shall be "the committee" as that term is used in the State General Obligation Bond Law. The Administrator of the Resources Agency is hereby designated as the board for the purposes of this chapter and for the purposes of the State General Obligation Bond Law.

5096.12. Out of the first money realized from the sale of bonds issued pursuant to this chapter there shall be redeposited to the credit of the appropriation made by subdivision (b) of Section 5096.8 such sums as have been expended for the purposes specified in subdivision (b) of Section 5096.6. The amounts so redeposited may be used for the same purposes whenever additional sales of bonds are made pursuant to this chapter. When all the bonds authorized by this chapter have been sold, the unexpended and unobligated balance of the appropriation made by subdivision (b) of Section 5096.8 shall revert to the General Fund.

5096.13. All money deposited in the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund which is derived from premium and accrued interest on bonds sold shall be reserved in the fund and shall be available for transfer to the General Fund as a credit to expenditures for bond interest.

5096.14. 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) "State grant" or "state grant moneys" means moneys received by the State from the sale of bonds authorized by this chapter which are available for grants to counties for acquisition and development of real property for park and recreation purposes.

(b) "Regional project" means the acquisition and development of real property for park and recreation purposes by a county, a city, or by two or more counties, a city, district or regional agency engaged in a project with the use of state grant moneys to serve regional recreational needs.

(c) "Minimum development" means the providing of public access, sanitary and water facilities, and public safety requirements.

5096.15. Except as otherwise provided herein, all money deposited in the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund shall be available for appropriation as set forth in Section 5096.9 for the purposes set forth below in amounts not
o exceed the following except as may be provided hereafter:

(a) For the acquisition of real property for the state park system, including public beaches $35,000,000
(b) For minimum development of real property acquired under subdivision (a) of this section $20,000,000
(c) For the acquisition, development, or acquisition and development, of real property for wildlife management in accordance with the provisions of the Wildlife Conservation Law of 1947 (Chapter 4 commencing with Section 1300), Division 2, Fish and Game Code and in accordance with a master plan drafted as an element of the State Development Plan $5,000,000
(d) For grants to counties, cities, or cities and counties for the acquisition, development, or acquisition and development, of real property for park and beach purposes $40,000,000

5096.16. The forty million dollars ($40,000,000) authorized by Section 5096.15 for grants shall be allocated to the counties, such allocation to be based upon the estimated population of the counties on July 1, 1975, as that population is shown in the document "Provisional Projections of California Areas and Counties to 1980" published by the State Department of Finance and dated February 15, 1983, as follows:

One dollar and twenty-five cents ($1.25) per person per county, plus an additional twenty-five cents ($0.25) per person per county for those counties which participate in an areawide or regional plan, or which assume planning responsibility for an urban area as a whole, in either case sufficient to qualify for federal financial assistance pursuant to the provisions of Title VII of the Federal Housing Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-70), provided, however, that each county shall be entitled to receive an allocation of not less than seventy-five thousand dollars ($75,000), and provided further, that any grant made to a city, district, or regional public agency shall be subtracted from the total otherwise allocable under the provisions of this chapter to the county or counties in which the city, district, or regional public agency is located. Any city, district, or regional public agency may participate with a county or counties in an application or a state grant under the provisions of this section, provided that a city, district, or regional public agency may apply for a grant only after receiving the approval of the boards of supervisors of the county whose allocation is affected and of the county or counties in which the city proposes to acquire real property.

5096.17. On July 1, 1970, the Resources Agency Administrator shall cause to be totaled the unencumbered balances remaining in the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund. A program shall be submitted in the budget for the 1971-72 fiscal year to appropriate this balance. This program shall consist of projects deemed to be of highest priority from among the purposes expressed in Section 5096.15 (a) through (d), inclusive, and shall not be subject to the maximum amounts allocated to those purposes in Section 5096.15.

5096.18. Projects involving state funds only, pursuant to subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 5096.15, shall originate by legislative resolution, resolutions, or resolutions of the State Park Commission directing studies of the projects included therein or upon initiative of the Administrator of the Resources Agency directing a study of the projects included therein.

Allocations for the purposes of subdivision (c) of Section 5096.15 that are authorized by the Legislature and approved by the Governor shall be made from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund and shall be expended in accordance with the provisions of the Wildlife Conservation Law of 1947 (Chapter 4 commencing with Section 1300), Division 2, Fish and Game Code and in accordance with a master plan drafted as an element of the State Development Plan.

5096.30. An application for a state grant pursuant to subdivision (d) of Section 5096.15 shall be submitted to the Resources Agency Administrator. The application for the state grant shall be accompanied by a countywide plan, or regional master or general plan as set forth in Section 65462 of the Government Code for the county or counties wherein the project lies. The plan shall contain a recreation element, as defined in Section 65465 of the Government Code, and shall have been adopted by the board of supervisors of the county or counties applying for state funds. The Resources Agency Administrator in cooperation with the State Office of Planning, shall review the material submitted by the county or counties for completeness and conformity with the State Development Plan.

Upon completion of the Resources Agency Administrator’s review, approved projects shall be forwarded to the Governor for inclusion in the Budget Bill.

5096.31. Projects proposed pursuant to subdivisions (a), (b) and (c) of Section 5096.15 shall be submitted to the office of the Resources Agency Administrator for review. The Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation shall provide the Resources
Agency Administrator with a statement concerning each project originated pursuant to subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 5096.15, which statement shall include at least the following data:

(a) The demand giving rise to the necessity for the project,

(b) The existing supply of opportunities for meeting such need and the relationship of the proposed project to said supply,

(c) The economic factors associated with the project, and

(d) The nonmarket factors, if any, associated with the proposed project, including historical importance, unique scientific or scenic value.

The administrator as part of his review shall refer the projects to the State Office of Planning for the purpose of determining their general compliance with the State Development Plan.

5096.22. The administrator, after completing his review, shall forward those projects recommended by the appropriate board or commission together with his comments thereon to the Governor for inclusion in the Budget Bill.

In submitting the list of projects recommended for inclusion in the annual budget, the administrator shall organize the projects on a priority basis within each of the purposes as set forth in subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) of Section 5096.15. This priority ranking shall take into account and be based upon at least the following factors:

(a) Location with respect to pressures arising from user demand,

(b) Project size and the reason for such size or extent,

(c) The kind of real property interests to be acquired,

(d) Whether the project is new or an addition to existing state property,

(e) The nature and extent of direct or indirect capital costs,

(f) Estimates of annual gross and net operating costs for the ensuing five years, and

(g) Compliance with the concept of orderly statewide recreational development consistent with the State Development Plan.

In addition, the statement setting forth the priorities shall include the relationship of each separate project on the priority list to a proposed time schedule for the acquisition and development expenditures associated with the accomplishment of the projects contained in said list. All projects proposed in the Governor's budget of each fiscal year shall be contained in the Budget Bill as provided in Section 5096.9 of this act.

5096.23. Projects authorized for the purposes set forth in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Section 5096.15 shall be subject to augmentation as provided in Section 16332 of the Government Code. The unexpended balance in any appropriation made hereunder may be transferred on order of the Director of Finance to and in augmentation of the appropriation made in Section 16332 of the Government Code.

5096.24. The Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation may make agreements with respect to any land acquired pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 5096.15 of this chapter for continued tenancy of the seller of the property for a period of time and under such conditions as mutually agreed upon by the State and the seller so long as the seller promises to pay such taxes on his interest in property as shall become due, owing or unpaid on the interest created by such agreement and so long as the seller continues his operations on the land according to specifications issued by the Director or the Department of Parks and Recreation to protect the property for the public use for which it was acquired. A copy of such agreement shall be filed with the county clerk in the county in which the property lies. Such arrangement shall be compatible with the operation of the areas by the State, as determined by the Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation.

5096.25. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, for the purposes of this chapter acquisition may include gifts, purchases, leases, easements, eminent domain, the transfer of property for other property of like value, purchases of development rights, and other interests unless the Legislature shall otherwise provide. Acquisition for the State Park System by purchase or by eminent domain shall be under the Property Acquisition Law, notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

5096.26. All grants, gifts, devises or bequests to the State, conditional or unconditional, for park, conservation, recreation or other purposes for which land may be acquired and developed pursuant to this chapter, may be accepted and received on behalf of the State by the appropriate department head with the approval of the Director of Finance.

5096.27. There shall be an agreement or contract between the State and the applicant in the case of a state grant project which shall contain therein the provisions that the property so acquired shall be used by the grantee only for the purpose for which the state grant funds were requested and that no other use of the area shall be permitted except by specific act of the Legislature.

Notwithstanding any other provision in this chapter, state grant moneys to be used for park acquisition purposes only shall be restricted to those projects contemplating...
FOR BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE, JUNIOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES, AND TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO MEET THE BUILDING NEEDS OF THE STATE, INCLUDING FACILITIES TO CARE FOR MENTALLY RETARDED AND MENTALLY ILL AND NARCOTICS CONTROL, CORRECTIONAL AND FOREST FIRE FIGHTING FACILITIES. (This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred eighty million dollars ($380,000,000).)

AGAINST BONDS TO PROVIDE STATE COLLEGE, JUNIOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACILITIES, AND TO PROVIDE FUNDS TO MEET THE BUILDING NEEDS OF THE STATE, INCLUDING FACILITIES TO CARE FOR MENTALLY RETARDED AND MENTALLY ILL AND NARCOTICS CONTROL, CORRECTIONAL AND FOREST FIRE FIGHTING FACILITIES. (This act provides for a bond issue of three hundred eighty million dollars ($380,000,000).)

This proposed law, by act of the Legislature passed at the 1964 First Extraordinary Session, is submitted to the people in accordance with the provisions of Article 1 of the Constitution.

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

PROPOSED LAW

Section 1. This act shall be known and may be cited, as the State Construction Program Bond Act of 1964.

Sec. 2. The purpose of this act is to provide the necessary funds to meet the major building construction, equipment and site acquisition needs for the state government, including junior colleges. At least fifty million dollars ($50,000,000) of the bonds authorized to be issued under this act shall be used only for building construction, equipment and site acquisition for public junior colleges.

Proceeds of the bonds authorized to be issued under this act, in an amount or amounts which the Legislature shall determine, shall be used for site acquisitions for new institutions of public higher education which institutions are approved or authorized by the Legislature subsequent to the adoption of this act by the people.

Sec. 3. Bonds in the total amount of three hundred eighty million dollars ($380,000,000), or so much thereof as is necessary, shall be issued and sold to provide a fund to be used for carrying out the purposes expressed in Section 2 of this act. Said bonds shall be known and designated as State Construction Program bonds and, when sold, shall be and constitute a valid and binding obligation of the State of California, and the full faith and credit of the State of California are hereby pledged for the punctual payment of both principal and interest on said bonds as said principal and interest become due and payable.

Sec. 4. There shall be collected each year and in the same manner and at the same time as other state revenue is collected, such sum in addition to the ordinary revenues of the state as shall be required to pay the principal and interest on said bonds maturing in said year, and it is hereby made the duty of all officials 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 such additional sum.

Sec. 5. There is hereby appropriated from the General Fund in the State Treasury for the purpose of this act, such an amount as will equal the following:

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

(b) The sum of seventy-five thousand dollars ($75,000) to be used as a revolving fund to pay the expenses incurred by the State Treasurer in preparing and advertising the sale or prior redemption of bonds issued pursuant to this act, to defray expenses incurred by the State Construction Program Committee pursuant to Government Code Section 16758, and for the payment of legal services upon approval of the State Board of...
shall be deposited in the State Construction Program Fund. Any moneys made available under this section to the board shall be returned by the board to the General Fund from moneys received from the sale of bonds sold for the purpose of carrying out this act, together with interest at the rate of interest fixed in the bonds so sold.

Sec. 9. The bonds authorized by this act shall be prepared, executed, issued, sold, paid and redeemed as provided in the State General Obligation Bond Law (Chapter 4 of Part 3, Division 4, Title 2 of the Government Code), and all of the provisions of said law are applicable to said bonds and to this act, and are hereby incorporated in this act as though set forth in full herein.

Sec. 10. The State Construction Program Committee is hereby created. The committee shall consist of the Governor, the State Controller, the State Treasurer, the Director of Finance, and the Director of General Services. For the purpose of this act the State Construction Program Committee shall be "the committee" as that term is used in the State General Obligation Bond Law.

Sec. 11. Out of the first money realized from the sale of bonds issued pursuant to this act there shall be redeposited to the credit of the appropriation made by subdivision (b) of Section 5 of this act such sums as have been expended for the purpose specified in said subdivision (b) of Section 5. The amounts so redeposited may be used for the same purposes whenever additional sales of bonds are made pursuant to this act. When all the bonds authorized by this act have been sold, the unexpended and unobligated balance of the appropriation made by subdivision (b) of Section 5 of this act shall revert to the General Fund.

### FOR THE STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred sixty million dollars ($260,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

### AGAINST THE STATE SCHOOL BUILDING AID BOND LAW OF 1984. This act provides for a bond issue of two hundred sixty million dollars ($260,000,000) to provide capital outlay for construction or improvement of public schools.

This proposed law, by act of the Legislature at its first ordinary and extraordinary sessions, 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 **black-faced type** to indicate that they are **new**.)

### PROPOSED LAW

**Section 1.** Chapter 15.6 (commencing with Section 19911) is added to Division 14 of the Education Code, to read:
1913. As used in this chapter, and for purposes of this chapter as used in the State General Obligation Bond Law, the following words shall have the following meanings:

(a) "Committee" means State School Building Finance Committee, created by Section 19010.
(b) "Board" means State Allocation Board.
(c) "Fund" means State School Building Aid Fund.

19014. For the purpose of creating a fund to provide aid to school districts of the State in accordance with the provisions of the State School Building Aid Law of 1902, including Section 19007 of the Education Code, and of all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and to provide funds to repay any money advanced or loaned to the State School Building Aid Fund under any act of the Legislature, together with interest provided for in that act, the committee shall be and 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 sixty million dollars ($260,000,000) in the manner provided herein, but not in excess thereof.

19015. All bonds herein authorized, which shall have been duly sold and delivered as herein provided, shall constitute and are hereby made the legal obligation 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 thereof.

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 such additional sum.

On the several dates of maturity of said principal and interest in each fiscal year, there shall be transferred to the General Fund in the State Treasury, all of the money in the fund, not in excess of the principal of and interest on the said bonds then due and payable, except as herein provided for the prior redemption of said bonds, and, in the event such money so returned on said dates of maturity is less than the said principal and interest then due and payable, the balance remaining unpaid shall be returned into the General Fund in the State Treasury out of the fund as soon thereafter as it shall become available.

19016. All money deposited in the fund by Section 19011 of this code and pursuant to the provision of Part 2, commencing with Section 16300, of Division 4, Title 2, of the Government Code, shall be available only for transfer to the General Fund, as provided in Section 19015. When transferred to the General Fund such money shall be applied as a reimbursement to the General Fund on account of principal and interest due and payable or paid from the General Fund on the earliest issue of the building bonds for which the General Fund has not been fully reimbursed by each transfer of funds.

19017. Whenever bonds are sold, out of the first money realized from their sale, there shall be redeposited in the revolving fund established in subdivision (b) of Section 19918 such sums as have been expended for the purposes specified in subdivision (b) of Section 19018 which funds may be used for the same purpose and repaid in the same manner whenever additional sales are made.

Whenever all the bonds authorized by this chapter have been sold, the amount remaining in the revolving fund established by subdivision (b) of Section 19018 shall revert to the unappropriated surplus in the General Fund.

19018. 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) The sum of seventy-five thousand dollars ($75,000) to be used as a revolving fund to pay the expenses incurred by the State Treasurer in having the bonds prepared and in advertising their sale or their prior redemption, for expenses incurred by the committee pursuant to Government Code Section 16768, and for legal services, upon approval of the State Board of Control, pursuant to Government Code Section 16760.

(c) Such sum as is necessary to carry out the provisions of Section 19018, which sum is appropriated without regard to fiscal years.

19019. For the purposes 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 to be allocated by the board in accordance with this chapter. Any moneys made available under this section to the board shall be returned by the board to the General Fund from moneys received from the sale of bonds sold for the purpose of carrying out this chapter.
19920. Upon request of the board, sup-
ported by a statement of the apportion-
ments made and to be made under Sections 19551 to 19689, inclusive, 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 ap-
portionments, and, if so, the amount of bonds
then to be issued and sold. A sufficient num-
ber of bonds authorized under this chapter
shall be issued and sold so that seventy mil-
lion dollars ($70,000,000) will be available
for apportionment on December 5, 1984, or
as soon thereafter as such bonds can be
issued and sold, and so that twelve million
dollars ($12,000,000) will become available
for apportionment on January 3, 1985, and a
like amount on the fifth day of each month
thereafter until a total of two hundred sixty
million dollars ($260,000,000) has become
available for apportionment. However, if the
board determines that an additional three
million dollars ($3,000,000) is necessary, a
sufficient number of bonds authorized under
this chapter shall be issued and sold so that
fifteen million dollars ($15,000,000), rather
than twelve million dollars ($12,000,000),
will become available for apportionment on
the fifth day of any month after January,
1985. Successive issues of bonds may be au-
thorized and sold to make such apportion-
ments progressively, and it shall not be
necessary that all of the bonds herein au-
thorized to be issued shall be sold at any one
time.

19921. In computing the net interest cost
under Section 19754 of the Government
Code, interest shall be computed from
date of the bonds or the last proceed-
payment date, whichever is latest, on
the respective maturity dates of the bonds
then offered for sale at the coupon rate or
rates specified in the bid, such computation
to be made on a 360-day year basis.

19922. 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.

19923. All proceeds from the sale of the
bonds herein authorized deposited in the
fund, as provided in Section 19757 of the
Government Code, except those derived from
premium and accrued interest, shall be avail-
able for the purpose herein provided, but
shall not be available for transfer to the
General Fund pursuant to Section 19105 to
pay principal and interest on bonds.

19924. With respect to the proceeds of
bonds authorized by this chapter and the pro-
visions of Sections 19551 to 19689, inclusive,
they shall apply except:
(a) Any reference in Sections 19551 to
19689, inclusive, to "Section 16.6, Article
XVI of the Constitution of this State" shall
be deemed a reference to this chapter.
(b) Any reference in Sections 19551 to
19689, inclusive, to "Section 19704" shall
be deemed a reference to "Section 19915."

19925. Out of the first money realized
from the sale of bonds under this act, it
shall be repaid any moneys advanced
loaned to the State School Building Au-
thority under any act of the Legislature, to-
gether with interest provided for in that act.

VETERANS TAX EXEMPTION: RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT. Senate
Constitutional Amendment No. 14: Provides as requirement that
no veteran or survivor shall be entitled to the veterans’ tax exemp-
tion of $1,000 unless the veteran was a resident of California either
or both at the time of entry into service or on the effective date of
the amendment. Widow or surviving parent eligible for exemption
on effective date. Amendment shall not lose exemption because of
amendment.

4

4

YES

NO

(This proposed amendment expressly
amends an existing section of the Consti-
tution, therefore, EXISTING PROVISIONS
proposed to be DELETED are printed in
STRIKE-OUT TYPE, and NEW PROVI-
SIONS proposed to be INSERTED are
printed in BLACK-FAUCED TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO
ARTICLE XIII

That the second sentence of Section 11 of
Article XIII of the Constitution of the State
be amended to read:

No exemption shall be made under the pro-
visions of this section of the property of a
person who is not legal resident of the State;
provided, however, no person described in
this section who has served in the Army, Navy,
Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Reven-
ue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service of the
United States, nor a widow, father, or
mother of such person, shall be eligible for
an exemption as a result of such service, un-
less such person was a resident of California
either or both (1) at the time of his entry
into such service or (2) at the effective date of
the amendment of this sentence as pro-
sed at the 1983 Regular Session of the
Legislature, except that a widow, father or
mother who was eligible for the exemption
at the effective date of said amendment of
this sentence shall not lose his or her eligi-
bility for the exemption as a result of that
amendment. All real property owned by
the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Re-
public and all property owned by the Cal-
ifornia Soldiers’ Widows Home Associ-
ate shall be exempt from taxation.
 sare

5

VETERANS TAX EXEMPTION FOR WIDOWS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 15. Increases from $5,000 to $10,000 amount of property widow of veteran may own and still receive exemption.

(This proposed amendment 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 BLACK-FACED TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XIII

That the first sentence of Section 14 of Article XIII of the Constitution of the State be amended to read:

The property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of every resident of this State who has served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service of the United States (1) in time of war, or (2) in time of peace, in a campaign or expedition for service in which a medal has been issued by the Congress of the United States, and in either case has received an honorable discharge therefrom, or who after such service of the United States under such conditions is continued in such service, or who in time of peace or under other honorable conditions, or lacking such amount of property in his own name, so much of the property of the wife of any such person shall be deemed to be such amount shall be exempt from taxation; provided, this exemption shall not apply to any person described in this subparagraph (a) owning property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more, or where the wife of such person owns property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more, and the (b) property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of the widow resident in this State, or if there be no such widow, of the widowed mother resident in this State, of every person who has so served and has died either during his term of service or after receiving an honorable discharge from said service, or who has been released from active duty because of disability resulting from such service in time of peace or under other honorable conditions; and the shall be exempt from taxation; provided this exemption shall not apply to any widow described in this subparagraph (b) owning property of the value of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) or more, nor to any widowed mother described in this subparagraph (b) owning property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more; and (c) property to the amount of one thousand dollars ($1,000) of pensioned widows, fathers, and mothers, resident in this State, of soldiers, sailors and marines who served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard or Revenue Marine (Revenue Cutter) Service of the United States shall be exempt from taxation; provided, this exemption shall apply to any person described in this subparagraph (c) owning property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more, or where the wife of such soldier or sailor owns property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more, or where the widow of such soldier or sailor owns property of the value of five thousand dollars ($5,000) or more.

TAXATION: RETALIATORY TAX ON OUT OF STATE INSURERS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 27. Revises provisions authorizing retaliatory taxation on out of state insurers; provides that when California insurer has imposed on it by laws of another state or country a greater tax, obligation, or restriction than an insurer of such state or country doing business in California has imposed on it by California, then California may impose such additional tax, obligation, or restriction on insurers from such other state or country.

(This proposed amendment 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 BLACK-FACED TYPE.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XIII

That the Constitution of the State be amended by amending subdivision (f) of Section 14 of Article XIII thereof, to read:

(f) The tax imposed on insurers by this section is in lieu of all other taxes and licenses, state, county, and municipal, upon such insurers and their property, except:

(1) Taxes upon their real estate.
(2) That an insurer transacting title insurance in this State which has a trust department or does a trust business under the banking laws of this State is subject to taxation with respect to such trust department or trust business to the same extent and in
the same manner as trust companies and the trust departments of banks doing business in this State.

(4) When by the laws of any other state or country any taxes, fines, penalties, license fees, deposits of money or securities or other obligations or restrictions are imposed upon insurance or in connection with insurance in such other state or country, or upon their agents or representatives, or upon their agents in the State, in excess of those imposed upon insurers of such other state or country or upon their agents in the State, so long as such laws continue in force, the same obligations and restrictions of whatever kind may be imposed by the Legislature upon insurers of such other state or country doing business in this State, or upon their agents in this State.

(3) When by or pursuant to the laws of any other state or foreign country any taxes, licenses and other fees, in the aggregate, and any fines, penalties, deposit requirements or other material obligations, prohibitions or restrictions are or would be imposed upon California insurers, or upon the agents or representatives of such insurers, which are in excess of such taxes, licenses and other fees, in the aggregate, or which are in excess of the fines, penalties, deposit requirements or other obligations, prohibitions, or restrictions directly imposed upon similar insurers, or upon the agents or representatives of such insurers, of such other state or country under the statutes of this State; so long as such laws of such other state or country continue in force or are so applied, the same taxes, licenses and other fees, in the aggregate, or fines, penalties or deposit requirements or other material obligations, prohibitions, or restrictions, of whatever kind shall be imposed upon the insurers, or upon the agents or representatives of such insurers, of such other state or country doing business or seeking to do business in California. Any tax, license or other fee or obligation imposed by any city, county, or other political subdivision or agency of such other state or country on California insurers or their agents or representatives shall be deemed to be imposed by such state or country within the meaning of this paragraph (3) of subdivision (f).

The provisions of this paragraph (3) of subdivision (f) shall not apply as to personal income taxes, nor as to ad valorem taxes on real or personal property nor as to special purpose obligations or assessments heretofore imposed by another state or foreign country in connection with particular kinds of insurance, other than property insurance; except that deductions, from premium taxes or other taxes otherwise payable, allowed on account of real estate or personal property taxes paid shall be taken into consideration in determining the propriety and extent of retaliatory action under this paragraph (3) of subdivision (f).

For the purposes of this paragraph (3) of subdivision (f) the domicile of an alien insurer, other than insurers formed under the laws of Canada, shall be that state in which is located its principal place of business in the United States.

In the case of an insurer formed under the laws of Canada or a province thereof, its domicile shall be deemed to be that province in which its head office is situated.

The provisions of this paragraph (3) of subdivision (f) shall also be applicable to reciprocals or interinsurance exchanges and fraternal benefit societies.

(4) The tax on ocean marine insurance.

(5) Motor vehicle and other vehicle registration license fees and any other tax or license fee imposed by the State upon vehicles, motor vehicles or the operation thereof.

PUBLIC RETIREMENT FUNDS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment

No. 13. Provides Legislature may authorize investment of moneys of any public pension or retirement fund, except Teachers Retirement Fund, in stocks, shares or other obligation of any corporation.

YES

NO

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

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XII

Sec. 13. The State shall not in any manner loan its credit, nor shall it subscribe to, or be interested in the stock of any company, association, or corporation, except that the State and each political subdivision, district, municipality, and public agency thereof is hereby authorized to acquire and hold shares of the capital stock of any mutual water company or corporation when such stock is so acquired or held for the purpose of furnishing a supply of water for public, municipal or governmental purposes; and such holding of such stock shall entitle such holder thereof to all of the rights, powers and privileges, and shall subject such holder to the obligations and liabilities conferred or imposed by law upon other holders of stock in the mutual water company or corporation in which such stock is so held.

Notwithstanding provisions to the contrary in this section and Section 31 of Article IV of this Constitution, the Legislature may authorize the investment of moneys of any public pension or retirement fund other than the Teachers Retirement Fund provided in Section 13901 of the Education Code, any successor thereto, in the stock, shares, or other obligations of any corporation.
EIGHTH COURT JUDGES. ELECTION IN COUNTIES OVER 700,000 POPULATION. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 31. Makes procedure for election of superior court judges when only incumbent files nomination papers applicable in counties with more than 700,000 people rather than counties with more than 5,000,000 people.

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

(This proposed amendment 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 black-faced type.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE VI

Sec. 6. There shall be in each of the organized counties, or cities and counties, of the State, a superior court, for each of which at least one judge shall be elected by the qualified electors of the county, or city and county, at the general state election, except that in any county or city and county containing a population of 6,000,000 or more than 700,000, as determined by the last preceding federally published decennial census, in which only the incumbent has filed nomination papers for the office of superior court judge, his name shall not appear on the ballot unless there is filed with the county or registrar of voters, within 30 days of the final date for filing nomination papers for the office, a petition indicating that a write-in campaign will be conducted for the office and signed by 100 registered voters qualified to vote with respect to the office.

If a petition indicating that a write-in campaign will be conducted for the office at the general election, signed by 100 registered voters qualified to vote with respect to the office, is filed with the county clerk or registrar of voters not less than 45 days before the general election, the name of the incumbent shall be placed on the general election ballot if it has not appeared on the direct primary election ballot.

There may be as many sessions of a superior court, at the same time, as there are judges elected, appointed or assigned thereto. The judgments, orders, and proceedings of any session of a superior court, held by any one or more of the judges sitting therein, shall be equally effectual as though all the judges of said court presided at such session.

If, in conformity with this section, the name of the incumbent does not appear either on the primary ballot or general election ballot, the county clerk or registrar of voters, on the day of the general election, shall declare the incumbent reelected.

COUNTY SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT BOUNDARIES. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 3. Provides that all counties, except as provided by Legislature, shall be subject to general laws relating to supervisory district boundary adjustments.

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

(This proposed amendment does not expressly amend any existing section of the Constitution, but adds a new section thereto; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in black-faced type to indicate that they are new.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XI

Sec. 5.1. Every general law and chartered county, except as otherwise provided by the Legislature, shall be subject to the general laws relating to the adjustment of boundaries of county supervisorial districts.
STATE SCHOOL FUND. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 9.

Repeals provision requiring that proceeds from sale of lands granted to State by United States for school support, estates of persons who have died without a will or heir, and money granted by United States for sale of land in State be kept in a perpetual fund with interest therefrom and income from unsold lands being used solely for school support.

THOUSAND ACRES OF LAND GRANTED TO THE NEW STATES UNDER THE ACT OF CONGRESS DISTRIBUTING THE PROCEEDS OF THE PUBLIC LANDS AMONG THE SEVERAL STATES OF THE UNION, APPROVED APR. 30, 1811, ONE THOUSAND EIGHT HUNDRED AND FORTY-ONE, AND ALL ESTATES OF DECEASED PERSONS WHO MAY HAVE DIED WITHOUT LEAVING A WILL OR HEIR, AND ALSO SUCH PER CENT AS MAY BE GRANTED, OR MAY HAVE BEEN GRANTED, BY CONGRESS ON THE SALE OF LANDS IN THIS STATE, SHALL BE AND REMAIN A PERPETUAL FUND, THE INTEREST OF WHICH, TOGETHER WITH ALL THE REVENUE FROM THE PUBLIC LANDS, AND SUCH OTHER MEANS AS THE LEGISLATURE MAY PROVIDE, SHALL BE INviolably appropriated to the support of common schools throughout the State.

PERFORMANCE OF MUNICIPAL FUNCTIONS BY COUNTY OFFICERS. Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 11.

Deletes requirement that city electorate must approve transfer and performance of municipal functions by county officials; validates any agreements for performance of municipal functions by county officials heretofore made pursuant to general law.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE XI

Sec. 6. Corporations for municipal purposes shall not be created by special laws; but the Legislature shall, by general laws, provide for the incorporation, organization, and classification, in proportion to population, of cities and towns, which laws may be altered, amended, or repealed; and the Legislature may, by general laws, provide for the performance by county officers of certain of the municipal functions of cities and towns so incorporated; whenever a majority of the electors of any such city or town voting at a general or special election shall so determine. Cities and towns heretofore organized or incorporated may become organized under the general laws passed for that purpose, whenever a majority of the electors voting at a general election shall so determine, and shall organize in conformity therewith. Cities and towns hereafter organized under charters framed and adopted by authority of this Constitution are hereby empowered, and cities and towns heretofore organized by authority of this Constitution may amend their charters in the manner authorized by this Constitution so as to become likewise empowered hereunder, to make and enforce all laws and regulations in respect to municipal affairs, subject only to the restrictions and limitations provided in their several charters, and in respect to other matters they shall be subject to and controlled by general laws. Cities and towns heretofore or hereafter organized by authority of this Constitution may, by charter provision or amendment, provide for the performance by county officers of certain of their municipal functions, whenever the discharge of such municipal functions by county officers is authorized by general laws or by the provisions of a county charter framed and adopted by authority of this Constitution.

Any agreement entered into before the effective date of this amendment between a city and a county pursuant to general laws enacted by the Legislature which agreement provides for the performance by county officers of certain municipal functions of such city is hereby validated.
OPERTY TAXATION; RELIEF IN EVENT OF DISASTER. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 10. Legislature may provide for or authorize local agencies to give relief from property taxes where property is destroyed by fire, flood, earthquake or other act of God after lien date, and property is located in disaster area proclaimed by Governor.

(Please note: This proposed amendment does not expressly amend any existing section of the Constitution, but adds a new section thereto; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE to indicate that they are NEW.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE XIII
SEC. 28. The Legislature shall have the power to provide for, or authorize local taxing agencies to provide for, any appropriate relief from ad valorem taxation where (a) after the lien date for a given tax year taxable property is damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, earthquake or other act of God, and (b) the damaged or destroyed property is located in an area or region which was subsequently proclaimed by the Governor to be in a state of disaster.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS: NAMING CORPORATIONS. Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 12. Prohibits submission of constitutional amendments, whether proposed by initiative or Legislature, which name private corporations to perform any function or have any power or duty. Declares that any such amendment submitted to or approved by the electorate at the 1984 general election or thereafter shall not go into effect.

(Please note: This proposed amendment expressly amends an existing section of the Constitution; therefore NEW PROVISIONS printed to be INSERTED are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE IV
Sec. 1d. (a) No amendment to the Constitution and no law or amendment thereto whether proposed by the initiative or by the Legislature which names any individual or individuals by name or names to hold any office or offices shall hereafter be submitted to the electorate, nor shall any such amendment to the Constitution, law, or amendment thereto hereafter submitted to or approved by the electors become effective for any purpose.

(b) No amendment to the Constitution, whether proposed by the initiative or by the Legislature, which names any private corporation, or more than one such corporation, by name or names, to perform any function or have any power or duty, shall be submitted to the electorate, nor shall any such amendment to the Constitution, submitted to or approved by the electors at the 1984 general election or any election thereafter become effective for any purpose.

SALES AND RENTALS OF RESIDENTIAL REAL PROPERTY. Initiative Constitutional Amendment. Prohibits State, subdivision, or agency thereof from denying, limiting, or abridging right of any person to decline to sell, lease, or rent residential real property to any person as he chooses. Prohibition not applicable to property owned by State or its subdivisions; property acquired by eminent domain; or transient lodging accommodations by hotels, motels, and similar public places.

(Please note: This proposed amendment does not expressly amend any existing section of the Constitution, but adds a new section thereto; therefore, the provisions thereof are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE to indicate they are NEW.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE I
The People of the State of California do enact the following constitutional amendment to be added as Section 36 of Article I of the Constitution of the State of California:

Neither the State nor any subdivision or agency thereof shall deny, limit or abridge, directly or indirectly, the right of any person, who is willing or desires to sell, lease or rent any part or all of his real property, to decline to sell, lease or rent such property to such person or persons as he, in his absolute discretion, chooses.

— 13 —
**TELEVISION PROGRAMS.** Initiative. Declares it contrary to public policy to permit development of subscription television business. Provides no charge shall be made to public for television programs transmitted to home television sets. Contracts inconsistent with free transmission made after effective date of Act or still executory are void. Act does not apply to community, hotel, or apartment antenna systems, or non-profit educational television systems. Injured person may seek damages or injunction for violation of Act. Repeals Sections 36001-36005, Revenue and Taxation Code, relating to subscription television.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This proposed law expressly repeals an existing law and adds new provisions to the law; therefore existing Provisions are strikethrough, and new Provisions are added.)

PROPOSED LAW

**AN ACT TO PRESERVE FREE TELEVISION IN CALIFORNIA.**

The People of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1: This Act shall be known and may be cited as the FREE TELEVISION ACT.

Section 2: The public has heretofore had available to it over existing television stations and privately owned receiving sets many different categories of free television programs, including telecasts of sporting events, political discussions, original dramatic presentations, variety programs, news programs, motion pictures, and other programs of interest. The development of television in the United States has been based upon the public policy of making proper use in the public interest of existing television channels and providing a broad range of interesting and informative programs free of charge to the viewing public. The information, instruction, and entertainment derived from such programs are in the public interest. The development of any subscription television business would have an adverse effect upon presently licensed television stations which do not make a charge to viewers; and would tend to deprive the members of the public, who have made a substantial investment in television receiving equipment, of their present freedom of choice with respect to television programs, and of the information, instruction and entertainment now readily and freely available to them. It would tend to create a monopoly. For those and related reasons it would be contrary to the public policy of this State.

Section 3: The public shall have the right to view any television program on a home television set free of charge regardless of how such program is transmitted, whether in whole or in part by wires, lines, radio waves, waveguides, coaxial cable, microwave transmitters or other electronic or mechanical means or any combination thereof; and no person shall, directly or indirectly, make a charge inconsistent with such right.

"Television program" includes any program of a category, form, kind, nature or type substantially similar to any category, form, kind, nature or type which was transmitted on or before the effective date hereof free of charge for reception on home television sets. "Home television set" includes any electronic or electrical device generally or customarily used for the reception of television programs in the home.

Section 4: The following contracts, agreements, or understandings, where inconsistent with such free transmission, are absolutely void and are not enforceable: (a) those made or executed after the effective date of this Act, and (b) those in existence on such effective date to the extent that they are executory.
Section 5: Any person who is injured by the violation of this Act may recover threefold any damages and may enjoin such violation and shall be entitled, in addition, to his costs of suit and reasonable attorneys fees.

Section 6: This Act shall not apply to community antenna systems or to hotel or apartment antenna systems, where no charge is made to the viewer based upon or related to program content, or to non-profit educational television systems, whether closed or open circuit.

Section 7: If any section, sentence or clause of this Act is adjudged to be unconstitutional or invalid, such adjudication shall not affect the validity of the remaining portion of this Act. It is hereby declared that this Act, and each section, sentence or clause thereof, would have been passed, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, sentences or clauses might be adjudged to be unconstitutional or for any other reason invalid. If any part of this Act is invalid in one or more of its applications, that part nevertheless remains in effect in all valid applications. It is the intention in this Act in respect of its subject matter to exercise the power of the State to the full extent of its express and implied, and so this Act shall be applicable to that extent regardless of any limitations of its applicability on a ground of a want of constitutional power.

PART 15. SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION

25001. For the purposes of this part, the following terms, phrases, words, and their derivations shall have the following meanings unless otherwise indicated in the context:
(a) "Local agency" shall mean a county, a city (whether general law or charter city) and a city and county. For the purpose of applying Section 25005, the term "local agency" when used in reference to a county includes only unincorporated areas of such county.
(b) "Subscription television" shall mean closed circuit television which is provided to and can be received only by subscribers. The provisions of this part shall not apply to community antenna television systems, hotel or apartment antenna systems, or educational television systems, whether closed or open circuit.
(c) "Subscription television business" shall mean the business of operating and providing subscription television to subscribers by the use of wires, lines, coaxial cables, wave guides or other tangible conduits of communication for the transmission to subscribers of television and music, including connecting the establishments of subscribers or causing such establishments to be connected, with each communication conduit preinstalled by a subscription television corporation, to the television systems of such corporation but shall not include any services furnished by a subscription television corporation directly or indirectly to any television system of such corporation.
(d) "Television service" shall mean any and all compensation and other consideration in any form whatever received directly or indirectly by a subscription television corporation for any service furnished by a subscription television corporation or any person or entity owning or operating such service.
(e) "Television station" shall mean any and all television systems, including television stations, whether public or private, and whether by wire or air, whether operating in color or only in black and white, received by any person or entity owning or operating such systems.
(f) "Television service" shall mean any and all compensation and other consideration in any form whatever received directly or indirectly by a subscription television corporation for any service furnished by a subscription television corporation or any person or entity owning or operating such service.
(g) "Television service" shall mean any and all compensation and other consideration in any form whatever received directly or indirectly by a subscription television corporation for any service furnished by a subscription television corporation or any person or entity owning or operating such service.
(h) "Television service" shall mean any and all compensation and other consideration in any form whatever received directly or indirectly by a subscription television corporation for any service furnished by a subscription television corporation or any person or entity owning or operating such service.

25003. (a) Each subscription television corporation shall pay quarterly to the State one percent (1%) of the gross receipts received in such quarter by such subscription television corporation. All amounts required to be paid to the State under this subdivision shall be paid to the State Board of Equalization.
(b) In addition thereto such subscription television corporation shall pay to each local agency within which it is conducting operations one percent (1%) of the total gross receipts received in such quarter by such sub-
oscopic television corporation from subscribers or sponsors whose establishments at
which subscription television was provided were within such local agency at the time
such revenue was received. The quarterly payments to a local agency required by this
subdivision are in lieu of all other taxes or fees imposed by the local agency receiving
the payment upon the subscription television corporation for the privilege of exercising
any franchise or engaging in business. The State Board of Equalization shall collect any
amount required to be paid to a local agency under this subdivision, and shall transmit to
the local agency involved the amount so

- The State Board of Equalization shall enforce the provisions of this part and shall
  adopt such reasonable rules and regulations as they may deem necessary or proper to pro-
  vide for and facilitate the making and reporting of payments provided for in this section.
  At all reasonable times the State Board of Equalization may examine all records kept or
  maintained by such subscription television corporation or under its control which treat
  of the operations, affairs, property or transactions of the corporation with respect thereto.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTTERY. Initiative Constitutional Amendment</th>
<th>Provides for statewide</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>lottery with monthly drawings. Creates State Lottery Commission of three members appointed by Governor, with supervisory powers and only one license to conduct lottery; original license to go to named private corporation for a period of 10 years; licensee to pay annual fee of $500.00 for each county in State. Commission shall print and sell $2.00 tickets to licensee for $1.74; 74% of money received by Commission appropriated for public education; 26% to be used for expenses of Commission and prizes.</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This proposed amendment does not expressly amend any existing section of the Constitution, but adds a new article thereto; therefore the words thereof are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE to indicate that they are NEW.)

PROPOSED ARTICLE XXXI
The People of the State of California do enact as follows:

ARTICLE XXXI
CALIFORNIA STATE CONTROLLED LOTTERY FUND LAW

SECTION I. The purpose of this article is to create a State Lottery to raise funds to provide for the reduction of state taxes, for direct aid to public education, and for the reduction of the present burden of state taxation, direct and indirect, upon the individual taxpayers of the state.

SECTION II. Steadily increasing costs of state government and the expanding diversity of participation by state government, particularly in areas of public education have made existing sources of state revenue inadequate and in order to provide funds for said purposes without new and more burdensome taxation, this article is necessary.

This article shall be cited as the California State Controlled Lottery Fund Law and all references to same shall be California State Controlled Lottery Fund Law.

SECTION III. Jurisdiction and supervision over the State Lottery in this state and over all persons or things having to do with the operation of the State Lottery is vested in the State Lottery Commission.

The Commission shall consist of three members; appointed by the Governor. Each member shall hold office for a term of four years. Any vacancy shall be filled by the Governor for the expired term. Each member shall have been a resident of this state for four years next preceding his appointment.

The members of the Commission shall receive a salary of $17,500.00 per annum.

The Governor may remove any commission member for cause upon first giving him a copy of the charges against him and an opportunity to be heard.

The members of the Commission shall appoint one of its members as chairman.

The Commission shall appoint a secretary who shall receive the annual salary provided for by Chapter 8 (commencing at Section 11550) of Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code.

The salaries of the commission members, the secretary and other employees and all other necessary expenses to carry out this lottery shall be paid monthly by the State Treasurer on the warrant of the State Controller and the certification of the Chairman of the Commission out of the California State Controlled Lottery Fund.

The Commission shall establish and maintain a general office for the transaction of its business at a place to be determined by the Commission. The Commission may establish any branch office for the transaction of its business at a place to be determined by it. The Commission may hold meetings any other place when the convenience of the members of the Commission requires.

All meetings of the Commission shall be open and public, and all persons shall be
omitted to attend any meeting of the
Commission.
A majority of the Commission constitutes
a quorum for the transaction of its business
or the exercise of any of its powers.

The secretary shall keep a full and true
record of all proceedings of the Commission,
preserve at the Commission's general office
all books, documents, and papers of the
board, prepare for service such notices and
other papers as may be required of him by
the Commission, and perform such other
duties as the Commission may prescribe.

All records of the Commission shall be
open to inspection by the public during reg-
ular office hours.

The Commission shall have all powers nec-
ecessary and proper to enable it to carry out
fully and effectually the purposes of this
law.

SECTION IV. It shall be unlawful for
any person, persons, corporation, assocation,
or other legal entity to conduct a lottery or
lotteries in this state without a license from
the Commission.

SECTION V. The Commission shall issue
only one license to conduct a lottery or lot-
terries in this state.

Due to the promotional work and financial
expenditure to inform and educate the citi-
zens of this state concerning this lottery
measure by American Sweepstakes Corpora-
tion, an original license shall be is-
issued to American Sweepstakes Corporation
for a period of ten years beginning 60 days
after the date of the official declaration of
the vote by the Secretary of State.

After the ten-year period of the original
license, the subsequent license shall be issued
to the corporation organized under the laws of
the State of California, by the Commission,
subject to all rules, regulations, and condi-
tions from time to time prescribed by the
Commission.

Thirty days after the issuance of the li-
ensure, the licensee shall pay to the Commissi-
on the sum of $500.00 for each county in
this state, as a license fee. The license fee
shall be paid into the State Treasury to the
credit of the California State Controlled Lot-
ttery Fund. The license fee shall be payable
annually thereafter by the licensee. The costs
of printing lottery tickets shall be paid
from time to time as necessary out of the
California State Controlled Lottery Fund by
the State Treasurer on the warrant of the
State Controller and the certification of the
Chairman of the Commission.

SECTION VI. The Commission shall from
time to time as necessary arrange for the
printing of lottery tickets. Lottery tickets
shall be sold to the licensee by the Commis-
sion in such numbers as requested by the
licensee. Lottery tickets shall be in denomi-
nations of $2.00. The licensee shall pay to the
Commission the sum of $1.74 per ticket and
shall receive a credit of $1.74 per ticket for
all unsold tickets returned to the Commission
by the licensee. Monies owed the Commission
by the licensee for the purchase of tickets
shall be paid the Commission by the licensee
within 30 days of the date of purchase of
tickets.

Out of the funds received by the Commis-
sion from the sale of lottery tickets, 74%
thereof shall be paid into the State Treas-
ury to the credit of the California State Con-
trolled Lottery Education Fund and shall be
appropriated annually to the needs of public
education on an average daily attendance
basis in amounts and for the purposes best
calculated, in the judgment of the State
Superintendent of Public Instruction to re-
duce public taxation for said purposes.

Out of the funds received by the Commis-
sion from the sale of lottery tickets, 26%
thereof shall be paid into the State Treasury
to the credit of the California State Con-
trolled Lottery Fund. The expenses of op-
eration of the Commission, including salaries
of members, the secretary and employees of
the Commission shall be paid from said fund
together with such prizes to be distributed
in accordance with the rules promulgated by
the Commission.

SECTION VII. The Commission shall es-
ablish and enforce all rules and standards to
be observed by the licensee in operating the
lottery or lotteries.

All tickets sold by the licensee shall be de-
posited in and dispensed by automatic vend-
ing machines to be regulated by the licensee
under rules and regulations established by
the Commission.

Monthly drawings for prizes shall be made
by persons authorized and under the super-
vision of the Commission.

No tickets shall be sold out of this state
or to any person under the age of 21. Any
such sale or purchase is a misdemeanor.

SECTION VIII. No license or excise tax
or fee or personal property tax shall be
assessed against or collected from the li-
ensure by reason of the licensee's possession,
distribution or sale of lottery tickets or the
machine vending the same, by the state or by
any county, city, district or any other body
having the power to assess or collect any
license, tax or fee.

SECTION IX. If this article is adopted
by the people, it shall take effect five days
after the date of the official declaration of
the vote by the Secretary of State and be-
come operative upon the first day of the first
month following the fourth day after the
date of the official declaration of the vote.

SECTION X. The amounts required to
be appropriated to the Commission to com-
mence operation under this article shall con-
stitute a charge against funds in the State
Treasury and shall be appropriated therefor
upon order of the Commission. The amount so appropriated shall be repaid from the California State Controlled Lottery Fund as soon as practicable and, pending such repayment, no distribution as provided in SECTION 6 of this article shall be made.

SECTION XI. There shall be a total of twelve drawings, one conducted each month of every year (per annum) with a total of 3,000 winners per month.

RAILROAD TRAIN CREWS. Initiative. Declares state policy on manning trains. Provides that Award No. 282 of Federal Arbitration Board on manning of diesel powered freight trains shall be effective in California, and that no state law or regulation shall prevent a railroad from manning trains in accordance with federal legislation or awards pursuant thereto, or collective bargaining agreements. Repeals initiative provisions on crews required for freight, mixed, or work trains, and right of State Public Utilities Commission to determine number of brakemen on all trains, and repeals other legislation concerning crews on certain kinds of trains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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(Proposed law expressly repeals existing sections and adds new provisions to the law; therefore EXISTING PROVISIONS proposed to be REPEALED are printed in STRIKE-OUT TYPE and NEW PROVISIONS proposed to be ADDED are printed in BLACK-FACED TYPE.)

PROPOSED LAW

An act to adopt the Railroad Anti-Featherbedding Law of 1964 by adding Sections 6000.1 and 6000.5 to the Labor Code and repealing Sections 6902, 6902.1, 6902.5, and 6903 of the Labor Code.

The People of the State of California do enact as follows:

Section 1: A new section to be numbered 6900.1 is hereby added to the Labor Code, to read:

6900.1. This Act shall be known and cited as the Railroad Anti-Featherbedding Law of 1964.

Section 2: A new section to be numbered 6900.5 is hereby added to the Labor Code, to read:

6900.5. It is the policy of the people of the State of California that featherbedding practices in the railroad industry should be eliminated and that national settlement of labor controversies relating to the manning of trains should be made effective in California. Accordingly, the award of the Federal Arbitration Board No. 282 appointed by President John F. Kennedy pursuant to Congressional Public Law 88-169 of August 26, 1963, providing for the elimination of excess firemen and brakemen on diesel powered freight trains, or awards made pursuant thereto, shall be made effective in this State. Said award was the culmination of the proceedings originating with the Presidential Railroad Commission which was appointed by President Dwight D. Eisenhower at the request of both railroad labor and management and reported to President Kennedy on February 28, 1962.

Nothing contained in the laws of this State or in any order of any regulatory agency of this State shall prevent a common carrier by railroad from manning its trains in accordance with said award, in accordance with any federal legislation or awards pursuant thereto, or in accordance with any agreement between a railroad company and employees or their representatives.

Section 3: Section 6902.1 of the Labor Code, reading as follows, is hereby repealed:

6902.1. No common carrier operating more than four trains each day per day of 24 hours on any main trunk or branch line of railroad within this State, or on any part of such main trunk or branch line, shall run or permit to be run on any part of such main trunk or branch line, any freight, mixed, or work train on which there is not employed at least one conductor and the following:

(a) One engineer and one fireman for each steam locomotive where the train is propelled or drawn by steam.

(b) One motorman for each train propelled or run by electricity.

(c) One motor or power control man for each train propelled by motive power other than steam or electricity.

(d) Two brakemen.

Section 4: Section 6902.1 of the Labor Code, reading as follows, is hereby repealed:

6902.1. No common carrier operating more than four trains each day per day of 24 hours on any main trunk or branch line of railroad within this State, or on any part of such main trunk or branch line, shall run or permit to be run on any part of such main trunk or branch line, any freight, mixed, or work train on which there is not employed one engineer and one fireman for each diesel locomotive weighing over forty-five tons (45) lbs.
Section 5: Section 6902.5 of the Labor Code, reading as follows, is hereby repealed:

6902.5. The Public Utilities Commission of the State of California shall have the power, after hearing had upon its own motion or upon complaint, by general or special order, rule, or regulation, or otherwise, to require each common carrier by railroad within the State of California to operate its trains, with such number of brakemen as are necessary to promote the safety of its employees, passengers, and the public, provided, however, that the Commission shall not require the employment of such number of brakemen as will result in feather-bed practices.

Section 6: Section 6903 of the Labor Code, reading as follows, is hereby repealed:

6903. No common carrier operating more than four trains each way per day of 24 hours on any main track or branch line of railroad within this State, or on any part of such main track or branch line, shall run or permit to be run, on any part of such main track or branch line, any self-propelled pile driver, or, or vehicle which has sufficient power to draw or propel itself and one or more standard cars, or any train propelled or drawn by steam; electricity; or other motive power other than those trains described in Sections 6901, 6902, and 6902.1 on which there is not employed at least one conductor and one brakeman and the following:
(a) One engineer and one fireman for each diesel locomotive.
(b) One motorman for each train propelled or drawn by electricity.
(c) One motor or power control man for each train propelled by motive power other than diesel or electricity.
(d) One steam engineer or one motor or power control man for each self-propelled pile driver or other self-propelled vehicle which has sufficient power to draw or propel itself and one or more standard cars. The provisions of this section with reference to self-propelled pile drivers or other self-propelled vehicles apply only where the self-propelled pile driver or vehicle is moved under its own power from one permanent station or siding to the place of work if the distance is one-half mile or more.

The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any diesel locomotive weighing forty-five tons (45) or less.
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