

think social services for inmates can be dispensed with.

Others appeal to the public: 48 hours after Los Angeles mayor Tom Bradley announced that 1,000 police would be cut, the Police Protective League ran a full-page newspaper ad depicting the aftermath of a mugging and asking, "Where will the police be when you need them?"

Still others want to proceed at full staff on full salary with no cuts and run the offices until the money runs out, then simply close the doors.

It appears that non-unionized workers like public defender staffs, county counsel staffs, and county parole administrators tend more toward the voluntary salary cut and shorter work week method of keeping as many jobs as possible. Unionized workers seem less likely to go that route.

An eligibility worker in the Contra Costa County welfare office and member of Service Employees International Union (SEIU), explains her reasoning. Five years ago, she said, when a financial crunch threatened the staff with layoffs, they all agreed to accept lowered salaries. However, full funding unexpectedly came in at the last minute. "Then," she fumes, "management hired additional people, gave themselves an 8 percent raise plus a 5 percent management differential and a huge insurance policy. We remained at the 'crisis' wage. We have no reason to think that would not happen again. We don't trust them."

Workers in her office are demanding that no line staff be laid off, that rules be relaxed so those who wish leaves of absence or part-time work can be accommodated, and that if the pay is reduced, the hours be reduced proportionately. "There are a lot of ways to cut budgets without cutting people," she concludes.

Wait and see attitude.

Tim Nesbitt of SEIU Local 616 in Oakland says that counties should not act on layoffs until they know what they will be getting from the state surplus. "The Jarvis forces told people that there was enough money at the state level to bail out essential services," he says. "We should keep all our programs going right

along full budget in anticipation of the county's share of the surplus."

Nesbitt adds that in the meantime people should press for progressive tax reform.

Frank Gold, a high school teacher in Mill Valley, reflects the position of the California Federation of Teachers: Voters protested bureaucratic waste and highly paid managers, he says, but not the cop on the corner or the teacher in the classroom. Therefore, a major effort must be made to trim such items as travel and expenses for administrators, consultant fees, and other similar outlays while maintaining essential services. If, after those things are done, there is insufficient funding to pay for teachers' salaries and run the schools, the schools should not open in the fall until the money is made available.

As response to Proposition 13 develops, some coalitions between community groups and unions are being formed in Los Angeles and Alameda County.

Women's crisis centers, health clinics, groups of disabled and elderly as well as those that provide legal and youth services in Alameda County, for instance, have joined with SEIU to form the Labor-Community Coalition for Jobs and Community Services.

Members have pledged that no one organization will compete with any other, and that the community groups will not be pitted against county workers. They have asked for a 90-day moratorium on layoffs, and for the county supervisors to declare human services the top priority for allocation of funds. A demonstration June 13 drew 500 people, who cheered speakers demanding that corporations be taxed to make up for revenue losses. The county supervisors, scheduled to begin budget hearings that day, postponed their session.

School board leaders and labor leaders have proposed a ballot measure in November that would cancel Proposition 13's benefits for businesses and landlords, but Gov. Jerry Brown opposes it.

Says SEIU's Nesbitt, "We should have had our own tax relief bill on the ballot before; everybody realizes that now. We made a total mistake in California." ■
Eve Pell is a free-lance writer in the Bay Area.

Support grows for overall tax limit

By Mary Ellen Leary

EFFORTS TO SLASH PROPERTY taxes in other states are sure to ride on the wave of victory sparked by the "Taxpayers' Revolt" in California, where Proposition 13—the Jarvis-Gann initiative—won in the June 6 primary by a margin of two to one.

The initiative, which cuts property taxes statewide by an estimated 57 percent and sets new standards for the legislature in implementing it, is being viewed as a "new mandate against politicians and insensitive bureaucrats whose philosophy is 'spend, spend, spend, tax, tax, tax,'" Howard Jarvis said in an election night victory speech.

Jarvis, who with Paul Gann sponsored the measure, said the win was the beginning of a "national campaign against property taxes.... I am going to do everything within my ability to help people [in other states] get started."

Before the victory, however, organized efforts to ride the tax revolt were under way in at least 30 states. And the man behind much of that movement is Lewis K. Uhler, president of the National Tax Limitation Committee and an aide to Ronald Reagan when he was California governor.

Uhler views the acceptance of the Jarvis-Gann initiative as support for his campaign of several years to reform taxes. "California's response to Proposition 13 has given the tax-cut movement an explosive push. ... Voter power has become a reality overnight. People see they can do something effective after all: They can control government."

"This is just what we hoped for, to make people understand and support our program," he says. The emotional charge from Jarvis-Gann is bringing into Uhler's organization "key political figures with powers in their own states to draft and enact laws." Currently, he says, the National Tax Limitation Committee is involved in tax-reducing moves in about half the states.

In mid-May the committee held its first convention in Chicago. Thirty-eight states were represented and 50 legislators were present. Not only was there a universal commitment to halt the growth of local governments, Uhler says, there also was a consensus that the federal government's tax bite also must be muzzled.

"A new phenomenon has simply burst out, all across the country. A lot of folks will run with the same drive that fueled the Jarvis-Gann campaign here—the same anger at unjust tax burdens, the same annoyance at declining public service, the same frustration at a government that is so big it can no longer be contained."

The Jarvis-Gann style of simplistic slash and roll-back is not, however, the National Tax Limitation Committee's concept of the way to control over-taxation, Uhler says. A far tighter curb on the politicians can be devised with less disruptive immediate consequences. His group aims to fashion a better-structured, long-range mechanism to stop the jack-in-the-beanstalk growth government has exhibited the past two or three years.

Uhler backed the Jarvis-Gann measure as "the only game in town." But he is critical of its broad sweep and its aim at only property taxes. His committee seeks to put

a cap on all taxes by holding government revenues, or government spending, at a fixed ratio of total capital in the public's hands.

In general, the aim is to hold government about where it is in proportion to government's rake-off from the money the total public earns. The committee estimates that all taxes today pluck in the aggregate about 40 percent of America's earnings. Other economists fix the sum lower at around 35 percent.)

Restraint over future government growth can be achieved, Uhler contends, by fixing a formula into the Constitution.

Such a plan was proposed in California's Proposition 8, the Behr bill, which was rejected by a close margin.

Uhler's committee's hope of implementing something akin to the Behr bill limitations has not been deterred by the Proposition 13 victory. In fact Uhler expects to work in California in coming weeks to help bring about some new form of restraint on state taxes—perhaps as early as the November ballot.

"It is clear that some clean-up kind of legislation will be needed, once the dust settles and emotions are reduced," Uhler says.

"Oddly enough," he says, "our ideas, which shocked the state and got defeated when proposed in 1973, look pretty conservative today in the context of the Jarvis-Gann hatchet-job. We think there will be a lot of new interest in our plan to curb state government, perhaps in exchange for easing some of the problems caused by Jarvis-Gann."

Coincidentally, some business leaders are eyeing a measure for the November ballot that might tie a government spending curb similar to the Behr plan to a split property tax roll. In exchange for a constitutional limitation on future state tax collections it has been reported that some business leaders would accept a split property assessment roll that would levy higher rates on business and commercial property than on homes.

Were taxes on commercial real estate to be set at, say, twice the rate of homes, the additional money for local governments would ease the gap Proposition 13 created.

Businessmen are studying the move in anticipation of political outcry once it is realized that the larger share of benefits from Jarvis-Gann goes to corporations rather than home-owners.

An analysis by the legislature's budget adviser, William G. Hamm, showed that in the aggregate homeowners would receive about 36 percent of the total tax reductions, and renters about 19 percent, but commercial and agricultural properties (which change hands less often) eventually would reap a total of 45 percent.

Uhler says he believes that a long-range state revenue limitation written into the California constitution might be bartered for new taxes on business property—a politically acceptable exchange if tied to a promise that no new state taxes would come along later to hit business.

It will be weeks before such maneuvers sort themselves out, but the feeling is strong in many quarters that the concept of an overall tax limitation is not dead. ■

(©1978 Pacific News Service)

Mary Ellen Leary is a free-lance writer specializing in California politics and a former Nieman Fellow.

But, Howard, you promised!



California's homeowners, who voted overwhelmingly for Proposition 13 June 6, will get less than \$2 billion of the \$7 billion in estimated tax savings, according to California's nonpartisan legislative analyst. The rest will go out of state or to non-resident property owners.

Of the \$2 billion savings to property owners, analyst William G. Hamm told the state legislature June 12, some \$3 billion will go to out-of-state corporations to fund their tax-cut plans in California. Another \$4 billion will go to the federal government to fund higher income taxes, because Californians will have smaller property tax deductions. And something less than half of the remain-

ing \$2 billion in savings will go to California business property owners. The rest, something over \$1 billion, will actually go to home owners.

In other words, the estimated \$5.8 billion accumulated surplus of California tax revenues could have provided homeowners with four years of relief equivalent to what they will receive as a result of the passage of Proposition 13 had that money been made available for tax refunds. Distribution of the surplus, supplemented by passage of legislation providing for a reduction of home owners' taxes, could thus have provided the projected level of tax relief with no cut in social services.

ELECTIONS

Yvonne Burke goes for state office

By Emily Gibson

YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE may well become the first black woman attorney general in the state of California. Having emerged victorious in a nip-and-tuck race with Los Angeles City Attorney Burt Pines for the Democratic Party nomination, Burke is gearing up for what will likely be a much tougher race come November.

Burke was a practicing attorney for ten years before being elected to the California State Assembly in 1966, and then to three terms as a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. She is now pitted against California's leading proponent of the death penalty—state Senator George Deukmejian (R-Long Beach) in the November contest for California attorney general.

In the wake of some skepticism about her decision to give up her congressional seat for a bid to become attorney general, Burke held her ground. Detractors among her political peers said the post would be a step down from Congress, but Burke didn't buy that.

"I will merely be making a move from representing a district to statewide representation," Burke said in a recent Los Angeles news conference.

Burke sees it as a challenge because only two other blacks in California history—Lt. Gov. Mervyn M. Dymally and state superintendent of public instruction, Wilson Riles—have been elected to statewide offices.

The office of attorney general has been monopolized for the past eight years by Republican Evelle Younger, who won his party's gubernatorial nomination earlier this month.

Largely because of his political posture, Younger was viewed by many as the state's "top cop" during his reign as attorney general.

Burke, on the other hand, wants people to see the attorney general's office in another light: "Most people see the attorney general's office as being one which is law enforcement. What I have to do is try to educate them that it is, of course, leadership in law enforcement, but...much more than that, it's a consumer protection job. It's a job where you advise the state government."

Burke said she would like to utilize her background to ensure that the attorney general's office places emphasis on such issues as producing more legislative programs on economy, transportation, the environment and energy.

The June primaries for attorney general drew very little media attention. The race took a back seat to the heady campaign waged by proponents of Proposition 13 (the Jarvis-Gann tax initiative) and to the colorful contest between former Los Angeles Police Chief Ed Davis and Evelle Younger for the Republican gubernatorial nomination.

Another reason for lack of attention to the attorney general race was that voters were not able to see any real differences between Burke and her Democratic opponent, Burt Pines.

It was a lackluster race, with both candidates agreeing on major legal issues. Both had stated opposition to the death penalty, but both said they would uphold the law that reinstated capital punishment.

They parroted each other on the issues of organized crime and agreed that "the Mafia," as well as street and prison gangs, pose a potential threat to California.

Both were vociferous in condemnation of an anti-gay initiative sponsored by state Senator John V. Briggs (R-Fullerton). And, although both would probably deny it, their statewide TV advertising campaigns had some similarities.

The Pines commercial focused on "law

After giving up her seat in Congress to run for attorney general, Yvonne Burke scored a narrow victory in the June primary. The election ahead promises to be a tough one.

and order" and, while Burke's was less dramatic, she came across clearly—particularly at one point when she made her appeal for election in what appeared to be a police officer's uniform.

The biggest dispute centered on a local police file-shredding controversy. In the last leg of the primary Burke criticized the unlawful destruction of more than four tons of Los Angeles police records by Pines' office in May 1976.

Her campaign took out a full-page ad in the *Los Angeles Times* charging that, "As a result of the unlawful destruction of official records, the courts were compelled to dismiss more than 130 criminal cases against persons accused of assaulting police officers or resisting arrest."

Pines, who tried unsuccessfully to block public disclosure of the file-shredding, also sought to prevent a court hearing or to suppress the testimony of key witness-

es against the police in at least three cases, the advertisement said.

Burke beat Pines 52 to 48 percent.

The November race will be a tough one. Burke will again be fighting to hold her own.

Her political career has not been spectacular, but she is far from the stereotype affixed to her by *New West* magazine

writer Marlene Marks, who called Burke "the Diana Ross of politics." Her congressional record is sound enough that *Redbook* recently said that she is among the most effective of 18 congresswomen, "second only to Texas' Barbara Jordan," who also is retiring from the House this year.

Emily Gibson is a writer in Los Angeles.



Yvonne Brathwaite Burke hopes to be the third black elected to high state office in California.

ABORTION

Hyde amendment challenged in court

ment for Medical abortions.

The defendant in both suits is Health Education and Welfare Secretary Joseph A. Califano, who is legally responsible for implementing the Hyde amendment.

Isabella Pernicone, a member of the National Right to Life Committee, is an intervenor—defendant in behalf of "unborn life." Representative Henry Hyde (R-IL), James Buckley, the former Republican Senator from New York; and Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) each has a similar status in behalf of taxpayers opposed to the expenditure of public funds for abortions.

Some 35 witnesses, including many medical professionals and religious representatives, brought in by pro-choice lawyers, have testified since the trial started last summer. The trial record includes some 200 exhibits and well over 4,000 pages of transcripts.

Perhaps the most controversial arguments have been those saying that the Hyde amendment violates separation of church and state. The First Amendment clause establishing this states, in part: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."

To be legal, the plaintiffs claim, a statute must have a secular purpose, must neither advance nor inhibit one religious view and must not promote excessive government intervention with religion. The plaintiffs' lawyers charge that the Hyde amendment is religiously motivated and promotes one religious view at the expense of others.

Religious leaders have testified on behalf of the plaintiffs, describing how their respective faiths either do not prohibit or actually support abortion as an option in various cases.

At issue also during the presentation of religious testimony was the involvement of the Catholic hierarchy in the fight against abortions. The court record in-

cludes considerable evidence showing that the Roman Catholic hierarchy has devoted money, personnel and organizational resources to the fight against abortion in general and against public funding of abortions for the poor in general.

The doctors who testified addressed the amendment's concept of "medical necessity" as well as the constitutional principles of due process and equal protection under the law.

Pro-choice advocates have had to wage a fight on many fronts. The Hyde amendment must be voted on each year by both the House and Senate. State governments are also free to decide whether or not to provide their half of the Medicaid payments for poor women who want abortions.

Demonstrators demanding that the Hyde amendment be rescinded have greeted Califano, its administrator, at almost every speaking engagement since the act was passed. At one such demonstration in New York City last fall, over 2,000 protesters filled the streets in front of New York University when Califano appeared to give a speech before the law school.

Opponents of the Hyde amendment have also criticized the government's continued funding of sterilization while abortion funding is denied.

"Medicaid cutbacks for abortion," said a spokesperson for the Coalition for Abortion Rights and Against Sterilization Abuse in New York last fall, "means the increasing sterilization of poor and minority women."

"Right to Life" forces have escalated their fight too, organizing state by state for resolutions calling for a national constitutional convention to amend the U.S. Constitution to give personhood to the fetus. Thus all abortions, not just those funded by Medicaid, would be made illegal.

—Liberation News Service