

## LEGISLATIVE FILE

**A** look at Assembly votes on some provocative (readers may decide whether they are "good" or "bad") bills that died last session. Why? First, because dead bills often rise from the grave, second, they indicate where the losers would take the state if they gain sufficient power to do so, and, third, votes cast on controversial bills, whether or not the bills die, often presage the next year's campaign issues, especially in "swing" districts.

**A**ssembly Constitutional Amendment 11 — a playful little measure by Assemblywoman Debra Bowen (AD 53-Torrance) to permit the Legislature to amend already qualified ballot propositions to make sure the voters do nothing really foolish. ACA 11 garnered 36 votes on the Assembly floor and is now on the Assembly "Inactive File," awaiting reconsideration at the request of its author (and possibly a future incumbent-protecting gerrymander).

**H**ow They Voted — ACA 11 — June 5, 1997: All but eight Assembly Democrats voted yes; all but one Republican opposed it. Democrats opposed: Sally Havice (AD 56-Artesia), Wally Knox (AD 42-Los Angeles), Jack Scott (AD 44-Pasadena), and Scott Wildman (AD 43-Glendale). De-

mocrats not voting: Denise Ducheny (AD 79-National City), Dick Floyd (AD 55-Carson), Michael Machado (AD 17-Stockton), Michael Sweeney (AD 18-Hayward). Republicans voting "aye": Brett Granlund (AD 65-Yucaipa).

**S**enate Bill 1113 (vetoed by Wilson) — by Senator Hilda Solis (SD 24-El Monte), a measure invoking "environmental racism" as an added reason to push people around through regulation.



**H**ow They Voted — AB 1113, September 9, 1997: Every Democrat but two voted yes; every Republican but two opposed it. Passed the Assembly, 42-36, (the two GOP votes were its margin of victory.) Democrats opposed: Michael J. Machado (AD 17-Stockton), Dennis Cardoza (AD 26-Turlock). Republicans voting "aye": Peter Frusetta (AD 28-Hollister), Jim Morrissey (AD 69-Santa Ana). Republicans not voting: Robert Prenter (AD 30-Hanford).

**A**ssembly Bill 1162 — as reported in Assemblyman Steve Baldwin's "Education" column last issue, this is a measure by Assemblywoman Sally Havice (AD 56-Artesia) to drop funding, passed in 1996, from the 1997-98 budget for a phonics training program for teachers — a move against public schools' return to phonics, which Democrats have long opposed. After 1162 passed the Assembly, 42-36, Democrats agreed during budget negotiations to let the measure die in the Senate.

**H**ow They Voted — AB 1162 — June 4, 1997: In the Assembly, every Democrat but one voted for the measure; all but one Republican opposed it. Democrats not voting: Diane Martinez (AD 49-Alhambra). Republicans not voting: Robert Prenter (AD 30-Hanford).

**W**atch for these votes to emerge as key issues next year in "swing" districts. Sally Havice's 1996 margin of victory was 1,941 votes; Scott Wildman's was 544 votes; and Dennis Cardoza's was 86 votes, all in a good year for Democrats. These seats will be among the most hotly-contested Assembly races next year. Voters in these districts may have the opportunity (as the campaigns will certainly tell them repeatedly) to decide California's future regarding initiatives, phonics, and "environmental racism." **CPR**

tional privacy" that would permit it to exclude as members and adult leaders persons who do not meet its criteria or share its values?

Who could possibly be opposed to the Boy Scouts, you might ask, and what type of controversial values does the organization stand for? Its long-standing values (as old as the organization itself), and the conflict they supposedly present to California's "non-discrimination" laws, provide a sad commentary on our secularized, politically-correct culture and our legal system's willingness to sacrifice the interests of the majority to those of an aggressive and destructive minority.

The Boy Scouts, you see, are for boys. (This unremarkable fact has spawned a lawsuit by a girl who was excluded for that reason, which is also now pending before the state high court.) More fundamentally, the Boy Scouts embrace as values (among other things) devotion to God and adherence to traditional morality. Although the Boy Scouts are non-denominational, and not even an exclusively Christian group, the organization promotes religious faith and opposes homosexuali-

ty. As a condition of membership, Scouts must literally pledge to honor these values, and adult leaders must exemplify them. The collision between the Boy Scouts' values and those reflected in our modern culture (the increasingly wide gap that prompts many parents to participate in Scouting) occurs when atheist children (or, more accurately, the children of atheist parents) desire to belong to the Boy Scouts without taking the "Scout Oath," and when adult homosexuals desire to be adult leaders notwithstanding the Boy Scouts' objection to homosexuality.

**W**HO PREVAILS in this conflict? The question is not a difficult one. In other states and in the federal courts, the Boy Scouts have won, and California should not be any different. But given the current direction of the California Supreme Court, don't count on it. Commentators and court watchers across the political spectrum are beginning to agree that Chief Justice Ron George is steering the court to the left (or, in the code

---

## WHAT YOU HAVEN'T BEEN TOLD ABOUT GUN CONTROL

By WILLIAM E. SARACINO

---

*Inspired by the even more than usually ill-informed, not to say hysterical, debates on repealing the Second Amendment that characterized the just-concluded legislative session, this new regular feature adopts the novel approach of considering Facts about guns, gun control, and gun owners.*

### Vetoing SB 500

Governor Wilson's veto of SB 500, the so called "Saturday Night Special" gun bill, has received much flack from the usual, uninformed sources. As a relief from the tedium of liberal whining, consider these facts. (Imagine such a thing in political dialogue!) The bill's sponsors said it would elimi-

*William E. Saracino is executive director of Gunowners of California.*

nate "junk guns" and was needed because such guns were "dangerous to their users," "prone to misfire and malfunction," and were crooks' "weapon of choice."

### User safety

There has never been a successful prosecution of the manufacturer of any of these guns based on malfunction, misfire, explosion, or any product liability consumer safety issue. If such suits were viable, would California's zillions of blood-sucking trial attorneys be silent? No indeed. Were these guns dangerous to their users as

claimed, trial attorneys would be lined up for miles to sue. They aren't.

### The "weapon of choice"

According to the California Department of Justice, short barreled hand guns were used in 13 percent of all violent crimes statewide. In the city of Los Angeles, hardly a bastion of law and order, these guns were used in only 3 percent of violent crimes.

And, of the many millions of such handguns in private hands in California, less than 3 tenths of one percent (that's 0.03%) are ever used in any type of crime.

Governor Wilson used facts, not emotion, in vetoing this frontal assault on the Bill of Rights. Well done, Pete.

CPR

