Wednesday, Dec. 4, 1968

Proposition 1-A Costs Put Scare into Counties

By TERRY HEYER
sizes, Frank G. Bonelli, de-ling and maling—the "procedur-larsesge of Super-reality goes hat estimates that 2.4 million own-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office, super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office in the county super-reality goes hat county assessors with the state controller's office in the state county assessors with the state county assessors with the state county assessors office assessors with the state will pay the counties is the state will pay the counties is the state would gal dual with are total as now worked out will coult as now worked out will coult as the less that would mean the state would file for the state countor the state would gal dual with are total counties is the state would gal dual with are total county super-the state will pay the counties is the state will pay the counties is the state would gal dual with are total county super-the state would gal dual would mean the state would file to the state would file to the state countor the state would gal dual would mean the state would file to the state countor the state would gal to unites the state would file to the state would gal to unites in the state would file to the state would gal to unites in the state will for a

34

٠



70, and will be continued each year thereafter, although the property owner must file a new claim each year to receive the

xemption be eligible, the residence must have been occupied by the owner as his principal place of esidence as of March 1, 1968.

For the rentor, 1A provides that the personal exemption on the state income tax shall be doubled. That is, the present \$500 exemption for single per-sons will be doubled to \$1,000; the \$1,000 exemption for married ersons will be doubled to \$2,000.

But there is a big hooker. Not nly is the exemption not automatic — it must be applied for —it only applies if the rentor uses the short form (IBM card) for his state income tax return If he elects to use the long form, which he must do in order to itemize deductions such as medical expenses, he loses the dou-ble exemption.

Along with this hooker, 1A also has a sleeper or two.

For one thing, all brakes have been removed because of 1A from school district and local government indebtedness Whereas up to now school dis-tricts could only go into debt up to a certain percentage of their total assessed valuation, now there is no limit as to how deep they may become mired in debt. through the selling of bonds.

And, of course, as long as the ate legislature fails to provide school districts and other local furisdictions with alternate revenue sources, the higher the property taxes will go. Consi-dering how anxious school offi-cials are to expand present to expect the property tax rates to soar, now that all restraint has been removed.

Proposition 1A does provide that the state legislature can, at its discretion, establish min-imum tax rates for local juris-dictions. But little talk has been heard from Sacramento of es-tablishing any such minimums.

Economists point out that al-Sconomists boint out that ar-though many citizens are fright-ened by the overwhelming size of the national debt, which keeps right on growing, the debts of local government, particularly school districts, are growing much faster. IA now takes away what little control had existed what little control had existed.

Another sleeper effect of 1A which was not mentioned durwhich was not mentioned dar-ing the campaign by any of its authors is the subject of con-troversy. It has been stated on the one hand, and denied on the other hand, that 1A effec-tively destroys the initiative records we which the citizens. process, by which the citizens, through direct election, may put laws into effect that the state legislature is not willing to

It has been said that under 1A, the legislature may keep in-itiative measures off the ballot if it does not like them, regardless of whether they receive the re-quired number of signatures or

A spokesman for State Senator es Q. Wedworth, one of the co-authors of 1A, denies that this is the case. He says that 1A does not amend the existing con-stitution but only adds a new

A spokesman for County Asses-sor Philip Watson said that 1A itself does not appear to set up a legislative board of censors to screen initiative measures, but the precedent set by the legislaweapon to combat Proposition 9 does, in effect, destroy the in-itiative process. The spokesman explained that now the legislature may be expected to put counter-initiatives on the ballot whenever an initiative unpopular with the politi-cians qualifies for the ballot. cians qualifies for the ballot. Every state senator and state assemblyman from the south-west area proudly affixed his signature to 1A as a co-author. These are Senators Robert S. Stevens, Anthony C. Beilenson, Mervyn M. Dymally, James Q. Wedworth and Assemblymen Robert G. Beverly, Charles War-ren, Lester A. McMillan, Yvonne W. Brathwaite, Jesse M. Unruh, and L. E. Townsend. M. Unruh, and L. E. Townsend. 1A was defeated by Los Angel-es County voters, but gained sufficient support elsewhere to win, statewide.