


# Official Voters Pamphlet


PUBLISHED BY A. LUDLOW KRAMER, SECRETARY OF STATE  
General Election Tuesday, November 6, 1973





STATE OF WASHINGTON  
**Congressional Districts**

\*See details, page 31  
 for Everett, Seattle, Tacoma and vicinities



STATE OF WASHINGTON  
**Legislative Districts**

\*See details, pages 30 and 31  
 for Everett, Seattle, Tacoma, Yakima,  
 Spokane, Vancouver and vicinities

# Voting Check List

Every Washington State voter, will be called upon to decide the fate of seven state measures and to elect a judge of the state supreme court at the approaching November 6, 1973 state election. A reproduction of this portion of the ballot is printed below to serve as a convenience to the voter when marking his ballot at the polling place.

positions and some county offices will be voted upon for unexpired terms in different parts of the state. Because of such great variance, a check list for local offices is not practical to include in this pamphlet. However, voters are encouraged to bring any guide lists or sample ballots to the polling place to make voting easier.

In addition, each voter will be called upon to elect candidates to local offices. Such ballots will, of course, vary according to the residence of the voter concerned. Also because of the new annual state election law, a few legislative

**NOTE: State law reads "Any voter may take with him into the polling place any printed or written memorandum to assist him in marking or preparing his ballot." (RCW 29.51.180)**

Proposed by Initiative Petition

**INITIATIVE MEASURE No. 282**

Shall state elected officials' salary increases be limited to 5.5% over 1965 levels, and judges' the same over 1972 levels?

**YES**

**NO**

Proposed to the People by the Legislature

**REFERENDUM BILL No. 32**

Shall county auditors be required to appoint precinct committeemen of major political parties as deputy voting registrars upon their request?

**YES**

**NO**

Amendment to the State Constitution  
Proposed by the Legislature

**HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 37**

Shall a graduated net income tax be authorized, excess levies for school operations be prohibited, and some excise taxes limited?

**YES**

**NO**

Passed by the Legislature and Ordered Referred by Petition

**REFERENDUM MEASURE No. 36**  
(CHAPTER 100, LAWS OF 1973)

**MINIMUM AGE - ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL**

This Act lowers from 21 to 19 years the age at which a person may, without limitation as to purpose, purchase or consume alcoholic beverages and be admitted to establishments licensed by the state to sell such beverages. It also lowers from 21 to 18 the age at which a person may be employed to sell spirituous liquor, beer and wine in Class H licensed establishments. It further removes the present requirement for adult supervision of persons between 18 and 21 who sell beer and wine in establishments holding Class E and/or F licenses only (primarily grocery stores).

**FOR** Chapter 100, Laws of 1973

**AGAINST** Chapter 100, Laws of 1973

Proposed to the People by the Legislature

**REFERENDUM BILL No. 33**

Shall personalized motor vehicle license plates be issued with resulting extra fees to be used exclusively for wildlife preservation?

**YES**

**NO**

Amendment to the State Constitution  
Proposed by the Legislature

**HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 40**

Shall the validation formula approved in 1972 for excess levy elections also be applied to bonds payable from such levies?

**YES**

**NO**

Amendment to the State Constitution  
Proposed by the Legislature

**HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 22**

May the legislature authorize urban development or redevelopment financing from property taxes attributable to increased valuations resulting from such projects?

**YES**

**NO**

**Judicial Ballot**

JUDGE, STATE SUPREME COURT  
POSITION NO. 1 (3 YEAR UNEXPIRED TERM)

Non-Partisan  Vote for One

**ROBERT F. BRACHTENBACH**

**D. B. SAWYER**

# Introduction

## Explanatory Comment

This Voters Pamphlet may become a collector's item since it is the first time in the history of the state of Washington that it has been published in an odd-numbered year. This is as a result of the 1973 Legislature enacting legislation requiring that state elections be held on a yearly schedule. The state election held in the odd-numbered year is primarily intended to present state measures ready for the ballot to the voters for decision. The advantages are three-fold:

1. Voters will no longer be overwhelmed with a two years' accumulation of state measures such as occurred in 1972.
2. Voters will be given an opportunity to vote on state measures in the same year the legislature acts upon them. Further, referendum measures petitioned by the citizens will be decided within a few months of certification instead of the previous 1½ years' delay.
3. With state measures being presented to the voters each year, the November elections held in the odd-numbered years will attract far greater interest and voters' participation to the benefit of the city, town, and district elections concerned.

## No Candidates Pamphlet this Year

The new annual state election law does trigger elections to fill unexpired terms of certain constitutional offices. However, these are limited to such offices which are now held by persons appointed to fill vacancies which occurred since the November 1972 state election. Because so few positions would ever be so affected, the Legislature specifically provided that no candidates pamphlet is to be published in conjunction with an odd-numbered year state election.

## Contents of this Pamphlet

Seven state measures have been certified to the voters for decision at the November 6, 1973 state election. As required by the state law, the official ballot titles, explanations, statements for and against, together with the complete text of each of the state measures must appear in the official voters pamphlet and, mailed to each place of residence by the Secretary of State prior to the election concerned. The official ballot titles and explanations have been prepared by the Attorney General as required by law. The statements for and against have been prepared by committees appointed under a procedure established by law.

A new feature, a rebuttal statement not to exceed 75 words, was established by the 1973 Legislature and appears as a part of each statement. This new feature was requested by my office and is intended to give each of the committees an opportunity to rebut objectionable points contained in the opposition arguments. Voters should understand that the Secretary of State has no authority to evaluate the truth or accuracy of any of the statements. Obviously each of the committees is doing its best to present the most convincing argument favoring their position. If nothing else, the rebuttal statements should help the voters understand the human frailties that might exist.

## CERTIFICATION

As Secretary of State of the State of Washington, I hereby certify that I have caused the text of all laws, proposed measures, ballot titles, official explanations, etc., that appear within this publication to be carefully compared with the original such instruments now on file in my office and find them to be a full and true copy of said originals.

Witness my hand and the seal of the State of Washington this 1st day of October, 1973.



A. LUDLOW KRAMER  
Secretary of State

# Toll Free Telephone Voters Service

Again this year the Office of the Secretary of State will provide a toll-free telephone line for election information. Voters from any part of the state may call the toll-free number to obtain answers to questions on registration and voting procedures, and the statewide ballot issues.


A special part of the information service is the Speakers Bureau. A club or organization, by calling the toll-free telephone line, may obtain names of potential speakers for or against any of the ballot measures.

The toll-free number is 1-800-562-6020. The hours are 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, until the November election. We encourage Washington voters to take advantage of this service.

Remember, your toll-free voter information number is:  
**1-800-562-6020**

## Table of Contents

	STATEMENTS FOR AND AGAINST	COMPLETE TEXT
	Pages	Starting Page
 <b>INITIATIVE TO THE PEOPLE</b> (Proposed by Petition)		
282 — Certain Elected Officials' Salaries . . . . .	6, 7	20
 <b>REFERENDUM MEASURE</b> (Passed by the Legislature and Ordered Referred by Petition)		
36 — Minimum Age — Alcoholic Beverage Control . . . . .	8, 9	21
 <b>REFERENDUM BILLS</b> (Proposed to the People by the Legislature)		
32 — Precinct Committeemen—Deputy Voting Registrars . . . . .	10, 11	22
33 — Personalized Motor Vehicle License Plates . . . . .	12, 13	23
 <b>PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS</b> (Proposed to the People by the Legislature)		
HJR 22 — Financing Urban Developments . . . . .	14, 15	25
HJR 37 — Graduated Net Income Tax . . . . .	16, 17	25
HJR 40 — Revised Formula for Validating Bond Issues . . . . .	18, 19	26



# Initiative Measure 282

## Ballot Title:

Shall state elected officials' salary increases be limited to 5.5% over 1965 levels, and judges' the same over 1972 levels?

## Statement for

### Your Vote For Initiative 282 Will Return Ethics To Government

Your vote for Initiative 282 will tell your elected officials that you will not tolerate ethically questionable legislative behavior.

### You Must Stay Within Government Pay-raise Guidelines — So Should Politicians

We must live with our pay inequities until the government tells us our economy will support complete correction. Our elected officials should be no different and, in fact, should be expected to set an example for the voters.

Your vote for Initiative 282 will stop what otherwise would be pay increases for elected officials as high as 193%.

### Your Vote For Initiative 282 Will Give Pay Raises That Are Fair

Example: As hidden in the budget and voted by the legislature.

#### 120 day session (Odd numbered year)

\$10,560 Annual Salary  
4,800 \$40 / day expense allowance  
\$15,360 \*

#### 60 day session (Even numbered year)

\$10,560 Annual Salary  
2,400 \$40 / day expense allowance  
\$12,960 \*

Example: As written in INITIATIVE 282 and proposed by the people.

#### 120 day session (Odd numbered year)

\$ 3,800 Annual Salary  
4,800 \$40 / day expense allowance  
\$ 8,600 \*

#### 60 day session (Even numbered year)

\$ 3,800 Annual Salary  
2,400 \$40 / day expense allowance  
\$ 6,200 \*

\* DOES NOT INCLUDE: \$40 / day expense allowance for each meeting attended between sessions, plus mileage.

### Your Vote For Initiative 282 Will Bring Legislators' Pensions Back to Reason

Since elected officials pensions are based on the two highest years' salary, the pay grab also tripled legislators' pensions. The ultimate cost of such an explosive increase in pension benefits would come right out of your pocket.

Your vote for Initiative 282 will bring retirement benefits back down to a more reasonable level.

## Rebuttal of Statement against

1. While more increases may be argued for some elected officials, the point remains that they should adhere to the same guidelines as are required of everyone else.
2. Continuing committee meetings and "mini-sessions" are not set standards, and may be discontinued tomorrow, but the giant salaries that become effective if 282 fails would go on.
3. If opponents admit that excessive pay increases can harm our economy, then how can they ask for them?

### Committee FOR Initiative Measure 282:

PAUL BARDEN, State Representative, Republican; GORDON HERR, State Senator, Democrat; BRUCE HELM, Sponsor, Initiative Measure 282.

## The Law as it now exists:

The 1973 legislature authorized an increase in the salaries of judges and state elected officials effective January 1, 1974. In addition, it increased the salary for legislators effective at the beginning of their next terms of office.

The present salaries of these officers have been in effect since 1965 for State elective officials (including legislators) and since 1972 for judges.

## Effect of Initiative Measure 282 if approved into Law:

The proposed act would take effect in December, 1973, and would replace the salary increases provided for by the 1973 legislature with an increase of approximately 5.5% over the 1965 levels for state elected officials (including legislators) and the same 5.5% increase over the authorized 1972 salary levels for judges. Salary increases for legislators would not take effect until the beginning of their next term of office.

The following table shows the current salary level; the salary effective December, 1973, if the initiative is approved; and the salary level effective January, 1974, if the initiative is not approved.

Office	Salary Since 1965	A "Yes" Vote Salary Effective December, 1973	A "No" Vote Salary Effective January 1, 1974
Governor	\$32,500	\$34,300	\$47,300
Lt. Governor	10,000	10,600	22,000
Secretary of State	15,000	15,800	26,400
State Treasurer	15,000	15,800	26,400
State Auditor	16,500	17,400	29,700
Attorney General	23,000	24,300	37,950
Superintendent of Public Instruction	22,500	23,750	37,950

(continued on page 27)

NOTE: Ballot title and the above explanatory comment were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. Complete text of Initiative Measure 282 appears on Page 20.

## Statement against

### Let's Be Fair

The Superintendent of Public Instruction has 17 positions in his department paying more than he makes. In addition there are 60 different independent school district superintendents making more money.

In the Auditor's office there are 27 men paid more than the boss.

The Attorney General has 16 attorneys making more money than he does. The comparable job for the city of Seattle pays \$11,000 more per year.

Even after the pay raise the Governor would make less than our University presidents and has far less tenure.

### "Something for Nothing" Does Not Exist

There are office holders who are not worth their present pay. The public can cure that problem by electing better people. Better people are more likely to run if the pay is commensurate with the job.

Passage of Initiative 282 will push the BEST people out of the legislature, not the worst.

### Set Pay for the Job—Elect People Worth the Pay

The legislature is now at least a half-time position. The minimum required time in actual legislative committee meetings for all legislators in 1975 will be two and one half times as many days as were required in 1965.

### Legislature Has Set Excellent Example

State law provides for the State Salary Commission to submit salary recommendations to the Governor and the legislature each year. In 1965 they recommended legislative salaries of \$3,600 per year, in 1966—\$4,800, in 1967—\$6,000, in 1969—\$7,200, in 1970—\$9,600, in 1971—\$9,600 and in 1972—\$10,560.

*If all employees, state and private, had refused salary increases as long as the legislature, our economy would be much better off today.*

**"Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."**

## Rebuttal of Statement for

**PENSIONS:** 51% of current legislators are not qualified for any pension. The average pension is approximately \$60 per month.

**EXPENSES:** The Internal Revenue Service allows \$36.00 per day for out-of-town business expense without verification.

**DAILY PAY:** It is anticipated that there will be 180 days of session plus 5 days per month of committee meetings for 18 months. A total of 270 days per biennium. At Seattle school teachers average pay per day this would be \$10,800 per year.

Committee **AGAINST** Initiative Measure 282:

JOHN S. MURRAY, State Senator, Seattle; AUGUST MARDESICH, State Senator, Everett; ALAN THOMPSON, Representative, Kelso.



# Referendum Measure 36

CHAPTER 100, LAWS OF 1973  
(43rd Leg., Regular Session)

## Minimum Age-Alcoholic Beverage Control

This Act lowers from 21 to 19 years the age at which a person may, without limitation as to purpose, purchase or consume alcoholic beverages and be admitted to establishments licensed by the state to sell such beverages. It also lowers from 21 to 18 the age at which a person may be employed to sell spirituous liquor, beer and wine in Class H licensed establishments. It further removes the present requirement for adult supervision of persons between 18 and 21 who sell beer and wine in establishments holding Class E and/or F licenses only (primarily grocery stores).

Vote cast by members of the 1973 Legislature on final passage:  
SENATE: (49 members) Yeas, 31; Nays, 15; Absent or not voting, 3.  
HOUSE: (98 members) Yeas, 80; Nays, 17; Absent or not voting, 1.

### Statement for

For more than two years in Washington State citizens 18 to 21 years of age have had almost all legal powers, rights and responsibilities as members of the adult community. The one exception—they cannot legally buy or consume alcoholic beverages.

#### Legislature Studied and Approved Bill

After very careful consideration the legislature passed HB 240 to extend the remaining majority right to citizens at 19 years of age. While acting on the measure the legislature raised the minimum age from 18 to 19 on the reasoning that most citizens of that age are out of school and making their own way in the society.

#### Full Rights and Responsibilities are Presently Denied

These young adults are responsible for all the other decisions of majority. They may enter into contract, make a will, marry and divorce, sue and be sued, volunteer for military service, sit on juries and even vote on lowering the age of legal drinking. The only thing they cannot legally decide for themselves as an adult is the question of alcoholic beverages.

#### Other States Have Lead the Way

By October of 1973, thirty-five states had reduced the legal drinking age below 21 years. The overwhelming evidence from other states is that alcohol is no more of a problem with this age group than it is with any other group of adults.

### Now Is the Time for Equality Under the Law

Our society has said that adults should decide for themselves whether or not to consume alcohol. By denying these young adults all the rights and responsibilities of majority we are treating them as partial citizens. These people clearly deserve and should be granted equality under the law.

### Rebuttal of Statement against

The validity of the Michigan study is questionable because the test periods are not comparable — not only did the drinking age lower, the assumed level of influence dropped (0.15% to 0.10%) and the state police began aggressively recording information.

"Only one (state with an 18 yr. drinking age) shows an increase in the traffic death toll. The others actually have experienced a decline . . . statistical data seem to punch a large hole in the traffic death argument." Tacoma News Tribune editorial 1/24/73.

Committee **FOR** Referendum Measure 36 (Chapter 100, Laws of 1973-:

JOHN LABEL, State Representative, Republican and RAY VAN HOLLEBEKE, State Senator, Democrat.

## The Law as it now exists:

At the present time the law requires a person to be at least twenty-one years of age to purchase, import, or be sold alcoholic beverages. In addition, with certain exceptions (for example, the use of liquor for medicinal or religious purposes) liquor may not be supplied to, nor consumed by a person under the age of twenty-one years. Other than as a professional musician who is eighteen years of age or older, a person under twenty-one is not permitted to enter or remain in certain establishments (mainly taverns and cocktail lounges) licensed by the state to sell alcoholic beverages and it is unlawful for any such person to misrepresent his age as being twenty-one or more years for the purpose of gaining admission to or remaining in these establishments.

Present law authorizes grocery stores and similar licensees holding only certain beer and wine licenses to allow their employees between eighteen and twenty-one years of age to sell beer and wine under direct adult supervision.

## Effect of Ref. Measure 36 (Chapter 100, Laws of 1973) if approved into Law:

This act would lower from twenty-one to nineteen years the age at which a person may purchase, import, possess, consume, and be sold alcoholic beverages.

It would also lower from twenty-one to eighteen years the age at which a person may be employed to sell spirituous liquor, beer and wine in Class H licensed establishments such as restaurants, hotels and clubs. It would remove the present requirement for direct adult supervision of employees between eighteen and twenty-one who sell beer and wine in grocery stores and similar establishments holding Class E and/or F licenses only.

*NOTE: Ballot title and the above explanatory comment were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. Complete text of Referendum Measure 36 starts on Page 21.*

## Statement against

### This Law Would Increase Driving Problems and Accidents!

Michigan's lowered age for consumption of alcoholic beverages from 21 to 18 produced dramatic increases (18-20 year olds):

#### Driving Under the Influence of Liquor

Fatal accidents . . . 54%  
Injury accidents . . . 104%  
Accidents . . . 119%  
Arrests . . . 132% -males  
332% -females

**Under 18**, arrests increased 98%

Alcohol-related accidents increased **nine times faster** in this age group than all other age groups.

Roadside surveys showed drinking-driving increased 361%.

California's Department of Motor Vehicles reported drivers under 20 average twice as many accidents as adults, yet drive half as many miles. "Teenagers are more likely to use the car as an emotional outlet." Car insurance rates support these conclusions.

### Laws Do Not Provide "Instant Maturity" or "Good Judgment", Therefore Rights, Responsibilities, Restrictions Vary with Age.

Airline pilots and patrolmen must be 21, Congressmen 25. Federal Drug administrators declare harmful substances illegal and remove them without considering age, rights, or ability to make mature choices. Washington's youth do not need America's number one narcotic, depressant drug — alcohol — already identified as major safety, drug, health, moral, and social problem.

### Let's Not Reward Poor Citizenship and Violations of the Laws!

Because many under 21 are drinking and driving is no reason to condone it! Removing legal restrictions would make it more difficult for those who respect the law to resist peer

pressure. The 14 to 20 year old has enough "growing up" problems already.

### Authorities Believe and Are Convinced by Facts They Have Compiled that No Community Is Improved by Increased Drinking of Alcohol.

Washington State's Division of Health reported approximately 70% of municipal law enforcement is involved apprehending and caring for drinking offenders. Alcohol is involved in 40% juvenile and family court cases, 50% violent crimes, homicide, divorce, mental illness, brain damage, billions in industrial costs, and family heartaches unlimited.

## Rebuttal of Statement for

LEGISLATURE'S "very careful consideration" . . .

. . . produced contradictory, inconsistent bill permitting 18 year olds to serve/sell liquor without adult supervision — allowing 19 year olds to drink. How many 18-20 really "making own way in society.?"

### FOLLOW OTHERS LEAD?

. . . with more accidents, crime, divorce, and juvenile delinquency? No "overwhelming evidence" to back "no more problem" statement. Statistics contradict proponents' statements:

New Jersey—arrests increased 145%

Memphis—accidents increased 25%

Minnesota, North Dakota, Manitoba officials say: "Nothing but problems."

Committee **AGAINST** Referendum Measure 36 (Chapter 100, Laws of 1973):

TED G. PETERSON, State Senator, Republican; HAL ZIMMERMAN, State Representative, Republican; LLOYD C. TREMAIN, Chairman, Citizens United for Responsible Legislation.

*Advisory Committee:* MATTHEW HILL, Former Chief Justice, State Supreme Court; SAM C. GUESS, State Senator, Republican; JOE STORTINI, State Senator, Democrat and football coach, Tahoma High School; BRIAN STERNBERG, N.W. area, Fellowship of Christian Athletes; LESTER WETZSTEIN, Exec. Director, Alcohol Problems Association.



# Referendum Bill 32

CHAPTER 199, LAWS OF 1973  
(43rd Leg., 1st Ex. Session)

## Ballot Title:

Shall county auditors be required to appoint precinct committeemen of major political parties as deputy voting registrars upon their request?

Vote cast by members of the 1973 Legislature on final passage:  
HOUSE: (98 members) Yeas, 60; Nays, 37; Absent or not voting, 1.  
SENATE: (49 members) Yeas, 25; Nays, 18; Absent or not voting 6.

## Statement for

### Voting: A "Right," Not a "Privilege"

Present voter registration procedures tend to make voting extremely difficult for many citizens, particularly the sick, the aged and the poor—people who do not normally have easy access to places of registration.

According to estimates from the Secretary of State's office, approximately 400,000 Washington citizens are eligible, but not registered to vote. That is 16 percent of the eligible population.

In our democratic system, voting is recognized as a "right," not a "privilege." To help us realize this principle in our registration laws, Referendum 32 has been proposed to make voter registration readily available to Washington citizens.

### Referendum 32 Will Accomplish This By:

1. Making full use of the new simplified voter registration form, since, in theory, any citizen could now become a qualified registrar with minimal training.
2. Giving more authority to the office of precinct committeeman, whose role as the neighborhood representative of the political parties is to encourage broader participation in politics and voting among the electorate.
3. Providing one-to-one personal contact between the registrar and the person he is registering, since precinct committeemen are usually more visible to the community than present deputy registrars, who are often not well known in local neighborhoods.
4. Balancing and equalizing the number of registered voters from neighborhood to neighborhood, since both political parties will try to register as many citizens as possible.

5. Allowing the employment of many more deputy registrars at no extra cost to the taxpayers, since precinct committeemen will work without salary.

Vote "Yes," Referendum 32!

## Rebuttal of Statement against

Referendum Bill 32 will assure quality registration at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers.

- Precinct committeemen work without pay to serve the local neighborhood that elects them.
- The political party's best interests are served by prompt and accurate filing of new registrations.
- The new simplified, single voter registration form eliminates the need for extensively trained deputy registrars.
- There is no "unnecessary expense" unless making registration readily available to Washington citizens is considered "unnecessary."

### Committee FOR Referendum Bill 32:

GARY GRANT, State Senator, Democrat, Kent; RICHARD KING, State Representative, Democrat, Everett; ARTHUR BROWN, State Representative, Republican, Seattle.

Advisory Committee: NEALE CHANEY, Chairman, Democratic State Central Committee; ROSS DAVIS, Chairman, Republican State Central Committee; DON BONKER, Clark County Auditor; HENRY "Hank" WHALEN, Chief Deputy Auditor, Snohomish County; JAMES BENDER, Executive Secretary, King County Labor Council.

## The Law as it now exists:

Under existing law the auditor of each county is designated as the chief registrar of voters for every precinct within the county. He is required by law to appoint deputy registrars for the various voting precincts in his county, including city or town clerks to serve as deputy registrars to assist in registering voters residing in cities, towns and rural precincts within the county.

A deputy registrar of voters is, himself, required to be a registered voter and, except for city and town clerks, holds office at the pleasure of the county auditor.

## Effect of Ref. Bill 32 if approved into Law:

If approved, this act will require county auditors to appoint the duly elected or appointed precinct committeemen of the major political parties as additional deputy registrars to assist in registering voters if the precinct committeemen so request. The precinct committeemen so appointed as deputy registrars of voters will not be subject to being discharged at the pleasure of the county auditor.

*NOTE: Ballot title and the above explanatory comment were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. Complete text of Referendum Bill 32 starts on Page 22.*

## Statement against

### Election Administrators Are Concerned

People who administer elections from the Supervisor of Elections in the Office of the Secretary of State to local officials, strongly oppose this measure, not because of the concept but because the bill would require the appointment of registrars without requiring them to accept any training, regulation or responsibility.

The "Effect of Referendum 32" printed above points out very clearly that the appointments cannot be revoked for inaccuracy or failure to send in registrations promptly.

### No Control Over Quality

Local election officials would continue to be responsible for the quality of elections but would no longer have the authority to supervise or regulate many of the people involved. Without proper supervision, invalid registrations could be taken or registrations could be lost or filed too late for processing, thus disenfranchising unsuspecting voters. Searching for incomplete or lost registrations could cause delays and confusion at the polling places.

### Extensive Registration Facilities Now Available

There are now approximately 6,000 precincts in the state which are serviced by more than 3,000 places of registration including all courthouses, city halls, most public schools, many fire stations, public libraries and many supervised deputy registrars in rural precincts. These facilities are established on a permanent basis and the registrars take great pride in turning in good work without delay.

In addition, present law requires that additional facilities be established during the final two weeks of registration.

### Unnecessary Expense

The administration of up to 12,000 additional, unnecessary registrars will be painfully expensive. Why destroy an effective, economically sound registration system that is doing a good job by creating an expensive and uncontrolled procedure?

## Rebuttal of Statement for

Even though Referendum Bill 32 will require *all* registrars to serve without fees, there will actually be a substantial increase in net costs because:

- Loss of experienced, dedicated registrars by elimination of their present fee.
- Notifying additional registrars of all closures.
- Additional effort to get all registrations returned in time for the election.
- Correcting errors or omissions.
- Cancelling registration records of inactive voters, who do not wish to vote but who were pressured into registration.

### Committee AGAINST Referendum Bill 32:

R. FRANK ATWOOD, State Senator, Bellingham; JAMES P. KUEHNLE, State Representative, Spokane; MARY A. FAYMONVILLE, Wahkiakum County Auditor and President, Washington State Association of County Auditors.

*Advisory Committee:* NORWARD J. BROOKS, Director, Records and Elections, King County; TED WRIGHT, Kitsap County Auditor; RICHARD A. GRECO, Pierce County Auditor; WELLA HANSEN, Whatcom County Auditor; CHET HATFIELD, Yakima County Auditor.

# Referendum Bill 33

CHAPTER 200, LAWS OF 1973  
(43rd Leg., 1st Ex. Session)

## Ballot Title:

Shall personalized motor vehicle license plates be issued with resulting extra fees to be used exclusively for wildlife preservation?

Vote cast by members of the 1973 Legislature on final passage:  
HOUSE: (98 members) Yeas, 68; Nays 29; Absent or not voting, 1.  
SENATE: (49 members) Yeas, 35; Nays, 9; Absent or not voting, 5.

## Statement for



**Wildlife, our future generations:**  
Voluntary purchase of a personalized license plate gives them both a chance.

## Referendum 33: For Now and Forever

Referendum 33, through the sale of personalized license plates, provides a voluntary funded program for the preservation, protection and propagation of Washington's over 400 non-game and endangered wildlife species without requiring tax monies from the general fund.

This is not a new concept to fund needed wildlife management programs. Many states have similar programs that are extremely successful.

## Washington Wildlife Needs This Program Now!

## Rebuttal of Statement against

Referendum 33 is unique. It does not ask for new taxes. It simply asks Washingtonians approve their own voluntary funding program for the protection of endangered wildlife. Department of Game's present program is commendable, but severely handicapped by lack of funds. The agency receives no operational tax monies from the General Fund. Its finances come through the sale of hunting and fishing licenses, an extremely limited source. Therefore, Referendum 33, for the good of everyone.

## Committee FOR Referendum 33:

JOHN MARTINIS, State Representative; LOWELL PETERSON, State Senator; TED G. PETERSON, State Senator.

Advisory Committee: JOAN THOMAS, President, Washington State Environmental Council; THOMAS O. WIMMER, Seattle; MRS. EMILY HAIG, Seattle; W. R. ROLLINS, JR., President, Washington State Sportman's Council; MRS. GEORGE A. MC KINNEY, President, Federated Women's Clubs.

## The Law as it now exists:

In order lawfully to operate a passenger motor vehicle on a public highway of this state, a Washington resident must have obtained and have in full force and effect a current state vehicle license. Washington license plates bearing an assigned registration designation consisting of three letters and three numbers are required to be displayed on all vehicles to which this licensing requirement applies. All fees derived from issuing such vehicle licenses are to be placed in the state motor vehicle fund to be expended exclusively for highway purposes.

Currently, any person who desires to obtain license plates containing his initials or other combination of letters and numbers consistent with the existing format of three letters and three numbers may apply to the director of motor vehicles for such license plates. If the director is satisfied that the plates so requested would be reasonable and proper and would not be a duplication of any other valid license plates, the applicant may receive, in lieu of regular motor vehicle license plates, similar plates bearing the letters and numbers requested. However, no combination may be issued with fewer than six symbols—three letters and three numbers.

In order to obtain or retain such license plates, the applicant is required to pay, in addition to the regular registration fees and any other fees and taxes required to be paid upon registration of his vehicle, an additional one time fee of thirty dollars. The revenues derived from this fee is also paid into the motor vehicle fund to be expended exclusively for highway purposes.

## Effect of Ref. Bill 33 if approved into Law:

If approved, this bill would repeal the existing authorization for personalized vehicle license plates as above described and would, instead, authorize personalized license plates consisting entirely of letters or of numbers, or of any combination thereof, so long as the total number of symbols (letters and/or numbers) is not less than two nor more than six. No

(continued on page 27)

*NOTE: Ballot title and the above explanatory comment were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. Complete text of Referendum Bill 33 starts on Page 23.*

## Statement against

### Users of Service Should Help Pay For It

The fairest form of taxation we know is one in which the person using the service pays for it. A good example of this is the tax on gasoline. When purchased for use in a highway vehicle, the tax goes for highway use purposes. When purchased for boat use, the tax paid is transferred to the Outdoor Recreation Account. In other words, if you use the service, you help pay for it.

### Special Auto License Plate Funds Should Not Be Used For Animal Protection

Propagation and protection of wildlife has long been funded by hunting and fishing license fees, as it should be. The Game Department has proposed that the tax dollars generated from the sale of certain license plates be spent to protect chipmunks, squirrels, groundhogs, hawks, eagles and other non-game wildlife. They have failed to explain how they would spend these tax dollars in order to protect these animals. Even if a program could be detailed in such a way as to generate merit for the proposal, such expenditures would more properly be funded from the General Fund in which is deposited the general taxes paid by the citizens for the support of government.

Additional monies are badly needed now for the highway safety fund which is used for the expenses incurred in operating our driver licensing and examining offices. These dollars could come from the sale of the license plates. For this reason, this proposal makes sense only if the additional tax dollars were retained for these purposes. It is urged that the people of this state reject the measure.

## Rebuttal of Statement for

The proponents still have not explained just how the expenditure of thousands of tax dollars can benefit the chipmunks, squirrels, groundhogs, etc. If such a program exists, the proponents should make it public so that the voters will know what they are being asked to approve.

Frankly, the need of starting a new spending program is not justified at this time when many existing programs cannot be properly funded.

Vote "No" on Referendum Bill 33.

**Committee AGAINST Referendum Bill 33:**

SAM C. GUESS, State Senator; PAUL BARDEN, State Representative; JAMES E. GILLELAND, State Representative.



# HJR 22

House Joint Resolution  
Proposed Constitutional Amendment

## Ballot Title:

May the legislature authorize urban development or redevelopment financing from property taxes attributable to increased valuations resulting from such projects?

Vote cast by members of the 1973 Legislature on final passage:  
HOUSE: (98 members) Yeas, 72; Nays, 25; Absent or not voting, 1.  
SENATE: (49 members) Yeas, 42; Nays, 4; Absent or not voting, 3.

## Statement for

### Increased Property Values Will Pay for Improvements

HJR 22 would provide Constitutional authority to the State and other taxing districts to define areas for urban development or redevelopment. Thereafter, anticipated increased tax revenue due to property value increases caused by the improvements within such an area would be pledged to retire the bonds which were used to finance the public improvements.

### Existing Units of Government Lose No Revenue

Existing units of government would continue to receive the same tax revenues they would have received if the area had not been designated as a development or redevelopment project. Upon final payment of the costs of the project, all units of government would share the higher tax yield of those increased property values caused by the improvement.

### Will Not Increase Property Tax Rates

HJR 22 will not in any way whatsoever alter the 1% tax on true and fair value of property. Only properties whose market values increase as a result of a project will be involved. The homeowner or businessman outside the project area will share the community benefit without any related property tax increase. HJR 22 will provide a method of economic stimulation without imposing additional taxes on such property owners.

### Examples

California, Oregon and Minnesota have already utilized the concept of tax-increment financing, with excellent results. In Washington, for example, Seattle's Pioneer Square Restoration or EXPO '74 in Spokane could have been accomplished much more quickly and economically had HJR 22 been a reality.

## Rebuttal of Statement against

The opponents say:

- *Radically new and untried.* FALSE! California, Oregon and Minnesota have experienced success with this plan for years.
- *Removes statutory safeguards.* FALSE! HJR 22 changes no statutory safeguards whatsoever.
- *Permits "siphoning" from general taxes.* MISLEADING! Bonds issued may be restricted only to taxes attributable to the increased property values resulting from the public improvements being financed.
- *Feasibility.* The project's feasibility has to be shown in advance; otherwise the financial markets will refuse to issue the bonds.

Committee **FOR** House Joint Resolution 22:

JOHN L. O'BRIEN, Speaker Pro Tempore, House of Representatives; ROBERT R. GREIVE, State Senator; PAUL B. KRAABEL, State Representative.

Advisory Committee: AVERY GARRETT, Mayor, City of Renton; AL STRATTON, Councilman, City of Spokane; KING LYSEN, State Representative; PAUL BARDEN, State Representative; LOWELL MICKELWAIT, Past President, Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

## The Law as it now exists:

The state constitution presently requires all taxes upon real estate to be uniform within the territorial limits of the taxing district which imposes the tax. Accordingly, any increase in the property tax base (i.e., in assessed valuation) attributable to an urban development or redevelopment project can be taxed by the city or other taxing district sponsoring the project only at that taxing district's ordinary statutory millage rate. This has the effect of requiring the city or other taxing district sponsoring an urban development or redevelopment project to share the potential increase in revenue from that project with all of the other overlapping taxing districts in which the project is also located.

## Effect of HJR 22 if approved into Law:

This proposed constitutional amendment would allow the legislature to permit a taxing district (such as a city) sponsoring an urban development or redevelopment project to obtain and use all of the increased property tax revenue arising by reason of the project in order to pay for indebtedness incurred in financing it.

*NOTE: Ballot title and the above explanatory comment were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. Complete text of House Joint Resolution 22 appears on Page 25.*

## Statement against

### Dangers Outweigh Benefits

The purpose of this proposal is to open up a radically new and untested method for financing public projects, principally by cities. Though its purpose be laudable, the dangers outweigh the benefits.

At present, there are two principal ways to issue bonds for a major public project, be it a new school or a new transit system. Either the voters must approve a special levy, or the governmental body must find enough money out of its regular revenues, within the safeguards provided by present statutory and constitutional limitations. Either way, there is a check on extravagant or unneeded projects.

### Would Remove Existing Checks

The amendment would remove both checks. It will allow cities to siphon off from counties, schools, etc., regular (non-voter approved) property tax revenues resulting from the increase in valuation (real or imaginary) attributable to the project.

### Implementing Legislation Not Drafted

This "siphoning" technique will require implementing legislation, which is not yet even drafted. But the statements made by the proponents of HJR 22 in House debate show the direction they are heading. They will demand that bonds issued under this technique be general obligation bonds, secured not just by revenues directly attributable to increased property valuations that hopefully will accrue in the designated project area, but also all of the revenue of all the taxing districts within the county.

The project's feasibility is not to be determined in the financial markets, but rather by the legislature's imagination in defining the increased revenue supposedly attributable to the project.

## Rebuttal of Statement for


Property tax rates should be cut. HJR 22 would freeze present rates.

Urban developments have caused devaluation of some properties, higher valuation of others. HJR 22 is a gimmick for debt financing of improvements but does not compensate for taxes lost from devaluation.

Proponents say projects will be financed solely from projected increased values in defined area. Fact: They defeated House Floor Amendment that would have imposed such a restriction.

*Committee AGAINST House Joint Resolution 22:*

S. E. "Sid" FLANAGAN, State Representative; PERRY B. WOODALL, State Senator; WILLIAM LECKENBY, State Representative.



# HJR 37

House Joint Resolution  
Proposed Constitutional Amendment

## Ballot Title:

Shall a graduated net income tax be authorized, excess levies for school operations be prohibited, and some excise taxes limited?

Vote cast by members of the 1973 Legislature on final passage:  
HOUSE: (98 members) Yeas, 72; Nays, 26; Absent or not voting, 0.  
SENATE: (49 members) Yeas, 36; Nays, 13; Absent or not voting, 0.

## Statement for

**Washington's present tax system is like an unfit incumbent who constantly works against most (but not all) taxpayers—it should be replaced**

- \* Property taxes are 4½ times higher than in 1958;
- \* "Special" school levies have jumped from \$8 million in property taxes in 1958 to \$220 million;
- \* Businesses pay gross income and inventory taxes, regardless of profit and even if they lose money;
- \* The Legislature has virtual blank-check power to impose new taxes and raise rates, without people having any real power to prevent it;
- \* Washington's incumbent tax system, most regressive and least fair in the nation, allows a 4-member family making \$50,000 a year to pay only about 3 percent of its income in state-local taxes, while a 4-member family earning \$4,000 a year pays 10 percent of its income in state-local taxes.
- \* Grossly unfair, some home owners pay no special levy property taxes to educate local children; others pay more than \$1,000 per child;
- \* Grossly uneven, in some districts, a 10-mill property tax levy raises \$100 per child; in others, it raises \$200 per child—while in Seattle, a 10-mill levy raises \$435.

**HJR 37 will reduce total taxes for 75% of all taxpayers!**

- \* Allows a graduated, net income tax with constitutional limits;
- \* Gives people veto power over any increases in state B & O, sales and income taxes;
- \* Eliminates special school operations property tax levies; and implementing legislation provides specific tax credits for renters.

- \* Guarantees full state funding of basic public education;
- \* Constitutionally eliminates sales tax from food and drugs, limits sales tax, cuts B & O taxes in half and eliminates inventory tax.

**HJR 37 Gives People More Veto Powers Over Tax Increases Than Any State-Local Tax System In All The 50 States!**

## Rebuttal of Statement against

We have reviewed the "Statement Against HJR 37". Each basic assertion is either untrue or cleverly distorted, as measured by legislative intent or Revenue Department analysis.

We both urge approval of HJR 37 because it constitutionally sets tax ceilings, stops taxing food, stops all school operating levies, assures additional tax breaks for elderly, restricts legislative taxing powers, assures people more taxing veto powers.

Senator Martin J. Durkan  
Chairman, Senate Ways & Means  
Committee

Governor Daniel J. Evans

**Committee FOR House Joint Resolution 37:**

R. TED BOTTIGER, State Senator; DONN CHARNLEY, State Representative; JOHN S. MURRAY, State Senator.

**Advisory Committee:** CHARLES W. HODDE, Olympia and THOMAS L. COPELAND, Walla Walla, co-chairmen, HJR 37, YES FOR PEOPLE, Against Unfair Taxes and For Property Tax Relief; LLOYD E. COOLEY, Des Moines, President, Washington State School Directors' Association; JENNINGS (JENKS') PEARD, Bremerton, President, Washington Association of Realtors; LOREN E. ARNETT, Seattle, General Secretary, Washington State Council of Churches.

## The Law as it now exists:

The state constitution now effectively prohibits the imposition of a tax on or measured by net income. It does not, however, prohibit the imposition of a sales or use tax on food or on prescription drugs, or the imposition of a property tax on business inventories. It contains no rate limitation on general sales or use taxes or on a business and occupation tax.

The constitution presently allows special property tax levies for the operation and maintenance of various taxing districts including school districts by voter approval; and it does not expressly require the state to guarantee full funding of basic education.

## Effect of HJR 37 if approved into Law:

This proposed constitutional amendment would remove the existing prohibition against a net income tax and would permit the legislature to impose such a tax so long as—

- (a) The highest tax rate on individuals does not exceed 8%.
- (b) The rate schedule for individuals is graduated and contains at least six rates, with equal differences of at least .5%.
- (c) The rate for corporations does not exceed 12%.

These limits could be exceeded only by a majority vote of both the legislature and the people following an automatic referendum.

Under the first implementing legislative act, the maximum rates could not exceed 6.5% on individuals and 10% on corporations and any amendment to this initial act changing the definition of taxable income or any income tax rate would be subject to referendum petition.

The proposed amendment would also permit direct payments to individuals for relief from state and local taxes and complete coordination with the federal internal revenue code.

(continued on page 27)

*NOTE: Ballot title and the above explanatory comment were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. Complete text of House Joint Resolution 37 starts on Page 25.*

## Statement against

For Most Taxpayers HJR 37 is a Tax Increase.

- HJR 37 permits greater state spending, not reform.
- HJR 37 permits cities and counties to also levy an income tax.
- HJR 37 destroys constitutional safeguards against skyrocketing state spending.
- HJR 37 permits legislative loopholes for raising lower income tax rates without a vote of the people.
- HJR 37 authorizes the legislature to pay grants to welfare recipients.
- HJR 37 creates another costly state bureaucracy to administer the new income tax and its collection.

### Schools:

- State funding of schools means state—not local—control.
- HJR 37 does not eliminate special levies.
- At least 50% of all school districts will suffer a substantial loss of money.

### Problems—In Fact, a Tax on a Tax:

Graduated tax for individuals; flat rate for business: Deductions to business are not granted to individuals.

**NO BREAK FOR HOMEOWNERS:**  
No deductions for property tax or mortgage interest.

**NO BREAK FOR RENTERS:**  
Most renters will receive no permanent relief from existing property taxes, but will pay a new tax.

**NO BREAK FOR SENIOR CITIZENS:**  
Provides no property tax relief, while taxing their income. Everyone will be denied deductions for interest payments, charitable donations, bad debt, federal taxes.

Voters should not be forced to vote a new tax on the vague promise of relief from existing taxes — when the obvious solution is prudent spending by a responsible legislature and administration.

HJR 37 is a tax proposal supported basically by the same Legislators who voted themselves a 193% pay raise.  
HJR 37 is a tax increase, not a shift in taxes.


## Rebuttal of Statement for

HJR 37 will not reduce taxes for 75% of the people  
HJR 37 does not eliminate school levies  
HJR 37 eliminates control on state spending  
HJR 37 is a rip-off for greater state spending. The average taxpayer, the guy in the middle, will again bear the burden of increasing costs of government. Hang on to your pocket-books. It's just the beginning.

### Committee AGAINST House Joint Resolution 37:

PERRY B. WOODALL, State Senator; JOHN E. "JACK" CUNNINGHAM, State Representative; HARLEY H. HOPPE, King County Assessor.

Advisory Committee: KEN JOHNSTON, Pierce County Assessor; RICK HELBERG, Editor, Bellevue American; DENNIS DUNN, Chairman, King County Republican Central Committee; KENNETH S. GREENBAUM, Chairman, Citizens' Committee for Bellevue School Levy.



# HJR 40

House Joint Resolution

Proposed Constitutional Amendment

## Ballot Title:

Shall the validation formula approved in 1972 for excess levy elections also be applied to bonds payable from such levies?

Vote cast by members of the 1973 Legislature on final passage:  
HOUSE: (98 members) Yeas, 88; Nays, 5; Absent or not voting, 5.  
SENATE: (49 members) Yeas, 37; Nays, 6; Absent or not voting, 6.

## Statement for

### This Change Has Been Tested

HJR 40 provides the opportunity to make the same change in the election process for general obligation bond levies as voters approved in 1972 for maintenance and operation levies. This beneficial Constitutional change in the law governing school and other special districts has been tested in many special levy elections. Those elections went both ways, some levies were approved and some rejected. The important point is that all of these elections were decided by the people voting and not by the people that stayed at home. The former voter turnout requirement for maintenance and operation levy elections, and present requirement for general obligation bond approval, is 40% of the total number of people voting in the previous general election.

### Here Is What It Would Do and Not Do

HJR 40 simply removes the condition that a minimum number of persons must vote on a bond issue proposition. It would make the process uniform for both types of levy elections. It would not change the number of votes required to validate a bond issue. The 60% yes vote would still be needed for passage, or at least what would be  $\frac{3}{5}$ ths of 40% of the total number of persons voting in the last general election. Under HJR 40, however, the voters would decide the fate of a proposition, not the stay at home citizens.

## Rebuttal of Statement against

HJR 40 will not permit bonded indebtedness by proportionately fewer voters approving the issue. Sixty percent of what would be forty percent of voters in the last general election, still must say "yes." This could result in an approval requirement of those interested enough to vote of greater than sixty percent. Postponement of needed construction projects causes inflationary costs. HJR 40 will help meet legitimate needs promptly. It will save costly delays and costly elections.

Committee **FOR** House Joint Resolution 40:

ALAN THOMPSON, State Representative, Democrat and JOHN MURRAY, State Senator, Republican.

## The Law as it now exists:

The state constitution currently restricts the aggregate of all property tax levies to one percent of the true and fair value of the property unless the voters of a taxing district have authorized levies in excess of this limit. Excess levies may be authorized by the voters on either an annual basis for current expenses or on a long-term basis to fund general obligation bonds.

By their approval of Amendment 59 to the constitution at the November, 1972, general election, the voters changed the preexisting restrictions of the constitution upon voter approval of annual excess levies so as to provide that such an election would be valid either—

(1) If the total number of all votes cast on the proposition is not less than forty percent of the number cast at the district's last preceding general election; or

(2) If, where the total number of votes on the proposition is less than forty percent of the number cast at the district's last preceding general election, the total number of "yes" votes is, nevertheless, equal to at least three-fifths of forty percent (i.e., 24%) of the number of votes cast at that election.

The voters did not, however, by their approval of this 1972 constitutional amendment authorize the use of the second of these two alternative methods of validation of an excess levy election where the election is held to authorize the issuance of general obligation bonds and the funding of such bonds by a long term excess levy; nor did they change the preexisting requirement of the constitution that neither an annual excess levy for current expenses nor a long-term excess levy to fund general obligation bonds would be deemed to have been authorized unless approved by at least 60% of the electors voting on the proposition.

## Effect of HJR 40 if approved into Law:

This proposed constitutional amendment would also retain the requirement that an excess levy proposition for any pur-

(continued on page 27)

*NOTE: Ballot title and the above explanatory comment were written by the Attorney General as required by state law. Complete text of House Joint Resolution 40 starts on Page 26.*

## Statement against

### Are You Concerned About Higher Taxes?

Are you among the many thousands of thinking people who are concerned about higher and higher taxes? Are you critical of the rapidly increasing cost of government? Are you one of the many who are urging spending reform? Then you will readily understand why passage of HJR 40 will open the door still wider to permit increased property taxes.

How so? In last November's election the people voted to change the 40-mill law to permit easier passage of excess levies to meet operational costs for a single year.

### What HJR 40 Would Do

What would HJR 40 do? It would allow the same easier passage to apply to capital levies. What is wrong with that? Simply this: such bonded debts could extend not just for a single year, but for as long as thirty years to finance capital construction. And capital construction generally calls for increased operational costs as well, paid for, of course, in increased taxes over the entire life of the bond issues.

Going into debt is not necessarily bad. Most of us have to do it at one time or another. But isn't it unwise to constitutionally permit an increasingly smaller number of voters to place such a long time debt upon the shoulders of all owners of property within a taxing district in such an easy manner?

We think HJR 40 is unwise legislation. We hope you agree, and will vote NO on HJR 40.

## Rebuttal of Statement for

The key words in the "FOR" statement are these:

"HJR 40 simply removes the condition that a minimum number of persons must vote on a bond issue proposition."

In opposing this concept, we feel that it is wrong to encourage and promote lesser citizen participation in public affairs. When long-time property taxes are proposed, it is particularly important that decision be made by a substantial number of voters, not just a few. VOTE "NO" on HJR 40.

**Committee AGAINST House Joint Resolution 40:**

DAMON R. CANFIELD, State Senator; DONALD G. GARRETT, State Representative; LESTER P. JENKINS, Secretary, 40 Mill Tax Limit Committee.

# Initiative Measure

# 282

Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:

**Shall state elected officials' salary increases be limited to 5.5% over 1965 levels, and judges' the same over 1972 levels?**

BE IT ENACTED, by the people of the State of Washington:

Section 1. Section 110, chapter 137, Laws of 1973 1st ex. sess. is amended to read as follows:

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATION TO THE GOVERNOR:

To be allocated by the governor in order to implement salary increases to enable the payment of salaries to the below described elective executive, judicial, and legislative officials according to the schedule of annual salaries prescribed in this section commencing January 1, 1974: PROVIDED, That such increases for legislators shall not take effect until the first date permitted by the Constitution of this state. . . . \$ 1,359,059

Schedule of Annual Salaries

Executive Officials

Governor . . . . .	<del>\$(47,300)</del>	<u>34,300</u>
Lieutenant Governor. . . . .	<del>\$(22,000)</del>	<u>10,600</u>
Attorney General. . . . .	<del>\$(37,950)</del>	<u>24,300</u>
Superintendent of Public Instruction . . . . .	<del>\$(37,950)</del>	<u>23,750</u>
Commissioner of Public Lands . . . . .	<del>\$(33,000)</del>	<u>21,100</u>
Auditor . . . . .	<del>\$(29,700)</del>	<u>17,400</u>
Insurance Commissioner . . . . .	<del>\$(29,700)</del>	<u>17,400</u>
Secretary of State. . . . .	<del>\$(26,400)</del>	<u>15,800</u>
Treasurer . . . . .	<del>\$(26,400)</del>	<u>15,800</u>

Judicial Officials

Supreme Court . . . . .	<del>\$(38,000)</del>	<u>34,825</u>
Court of Appeals . . . . .	<del>\$(35,000)</del>	<u>31,650</u>
Superior Court . . . . .	<del>\$(32,000)</del>	<u>28,500</u>
Full Time District Court Judges: PROVIDED, That no funds shall be allocated from this appropriation to implement these salary in- creases . . . . .	<del>\$(26,000)</del>	<u>23,250</u>

Legislative Officials

Legislators . . . . .	<del>\$(10,560)</del>	<u>3,800</u>
-----------------------	-----------------------	--------------

Sec. 2. Section 43.03.010, chapter 8, Laws of 1965 as last amended by section 1, chapter 100, Laws of 1967 ex. sess. and RCW 43.03.010 are each amended to read as follows:

The annual salaries of the following named state elected officials shall be: Governor, (~~thirty-two thousand five hundred~~) thirty-four thousand three hundred dollars; lieutenant governor, (~~ten thousand~~) ten thousand six hundred dollars; secretary of state, (~~fifteen thousand~~) fifteen thousand eight hundred dollars; state treasurer, (~~fifteen thou-~~

~~sand~~) fifteen thousand eight hundred dollars; state auditor, (~~sixteen thousand five hundred~~) seventeen thousand four hundred dollars; attorney general, (~~twenty-three thousand~~) twenty-four thousand three hundred dollars; superintendent of public instruction, (~~twenty-two thousand five hundred~~) twenty-three thousand seven hundred fifty dollars; commissioner of public lands, (~~twenty thousand~~) twenty-one thousand one hundred dollars; state insurance commissioner, (~~sixteen thousand five hundred~~) seventeen thousand four hundred dollars; members of the legislature shall receive for their service (~~three thousand six hundred~~) three thousand eight hundred dollars per annum; and in addition, ten cents per mile for travel to and from legislative sessions.

Sec. 3. Section 1, chapter 144, Laws of 1953 as last amended by section 2, chapter 106, Laws of 1973 and RCW 2.04.090 are each amended to read as follows:

Each justice of the supreme court shall receive an annual salary of (~~thirty-three thousand~~) thirty-four thousand eight hundred twenty-five dollars, but no salary warrant shall be issued to any judge of the supreme court until he shall have made and filed with the state treasurer an affidavit that no matter referred to him for opinion or decision has been uncompleted or undecided by him for more than six months.

Sec. 4. Section 6, chapter 221, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. as last amended by section 3, chapter 106, Laws of 1973 and RCW 2.06.060 are each amended to read as follows:

Each judge of the court shall receive an annual salary of (~~thirty thousand~~) thirty-one thousand six hundred fifty dollars, but no salary warrant shall be issued to any judge until he shall have made and filed with the state treasurer an affidavit that no matter referred to him for opinion or decision has been uncompleted by him for more than three months.

Sec. 5. Section 2, chapter 144, Laws of 1953 as last amended by section 3, chapter 100, Laws of 1972 ex. sess. and RCW 2.08.090 are each amended to read as follows:

Each judge of the superior court shall receive an annual salary of (~~twenty-seven thousand~~) twenty-eight thousand five hundred dollars.

Sec. 6. Section 100, chapter 299, Laws of 1961 as last amended by section 4, chapter 100, Laws 1st ex. sess. 1972 and RCW 3.58.010 are each amended to read as follows:

The annual salary of each full time justice of the peace shall be (~~twenty-two~~) twenty-three thousand two hundred and fifty dollars: PROVIDED, That in cities having a population in excess of five hundred thousand, the city which pays the salary may increase such salary of its municipal judges to an amount not more than the salary paid the superior court judges in the county in which the court is located: PROVIDED FURTHER, That no full time justice of the peace shall perform any civil marriage between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Monday through Friday.

**NEW SECTION.** Sec. 7. If any provision of this act, or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.

**EXPLANATORY COMMENT**

Initiative Measure No. 282 filed in the office of the Secretary of State as of June 12, 1973.

Sponsor filed 699,098 supporting signatures as of July 6, 1973.

Signatures found sufficient. Measure then certified to the November 6, 1973 state general election for approval or rejection by the voters.

# Referendum Measure

## 36

### CHAPTER 100, LAWS OF 1973

(43rd Leg., Regular Session)

*Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:*

#### MINIMUM AGE — ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL

THIS ACT lowers from 21 to 19 years the age at which a person may, without limitation as to purpose, purchase or consume alcoholic beverages and be admitted to establishments licensed by the state to sell such beverages. It also lowers from 21 to 18 the age at which a person may be employed to sell spirituous liquor, beer and wine in Class H licensed establishments. It further removes the present requirement for adult supervision of persons between 18 and 21 who sell beer and wine in establishments holding Class E and/or F licenses only (primarily grocery stores).

LEGISLATIVE TITLE  
(House Bill No. 240)

#### ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL — USE — LEGAL AGE LOWERED

AN ACT Relating to alcoholic beverage control; amending sections 1, 3, and 4, chapter 126, Laws of 1895 as last amended by section 37, chapter 292, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 26.28.080; amending section 1, chapter 38, Laws of 1967 and RCW 66.12.110; amending section 7, chapter 62, Laws of 1933 ex. sess. as last amended by section 1, chapter 15, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 66.16.040; amending section 3, chapter 67, Laws of 1949 as last amended by section 4, chapter 15, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 66.20.180; amending section 6, chapter 67, Laws of 1949 as last amended by section 7, chapter 15, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 66.20.210; amending section 2, chapter 70, Laws of 1955 and RCW 66.44.270; amending section 3, chapter 70, Laws of 1955 and RCW 66.44.280; amending section 4, chapter 70, Laws of 1955 as amended by section 1, chapter 49, Laws of 1965 and RCW 66.44.290; amending section 1, chapter 78, Laws of 1941 and RCW 66.44.300; amending section 36-A added to chapter 62, Laws of 1933 ex. sess., by section 1, chapter 245, Laws of 1943 and RCW 66.44.310; amending section 1, chapter 38, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 66.44.340; adding a new section to chapter 66.44 RCW; repealing section 2, chapter 49, Laws of 1965 and RCW 66.44.291; creating a new section; and repealing section 1, chapter 250, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 66.44.315.

BE IT ENACTED, by the Legislature  
of the State of Washington:

Section 1. Sections 1, 3, and 4, chapter 126, Laws of 1895 as last amended by section 37, chapter 292, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 26.28.080 are each amended to read as follows:

Every person who:

(1) Shall admit to or allow to remain in any concert saloon, or in any place owned, kept, or managed by him where intoxicating liquors are sold, given away or disposed of — except a

restaurant or dining room, any person under the age of eighteen years; or,

(2) Shall admit to, or allow to remain in any dance-house, public pool or billiard hall, or in any place of entertainment injurious to health or morals, owned, kept or managed by him, any person under the age of eighteen years; or,

(3) Shall suffer or permit any such person to play any game of skill or chance, in any such place, or in any place adjacent thereto, or to be or remain therein, or admit or allow to remain in any reputed house of prostitution or assignation, or in any place where opium or any preparation thereof, is smoked, or where any (~~narcoctic drugs~~) controlled substance is used, any persons under the age of eighteen years; or,

(4) Shall sell or give, or permit to be sold or given to any person under the age of (~~twenty one~~) nineteen years any intoxicating liquor, or to any person under the age of eighteen years any cigar, cigarette, cigarette paper or wrapper, or tobacco in any form; or

(5) Shall sell, or give, or permit to be sold or given to any person under the age of eighteen years, any revolver or pistol; Shall be guilty of a gross misdemeanor.

It shall be no defense to a prosecution for a violation of this section that the person acted, or was believed by the defendant to act, as agent or representative of another.

Sec. 2. Section 1, chapter 38, Laws of 1967 and RCW 66.12.110 are each amended to read as follows:

A person (~~twenty one~~) nineteen years of age or over may bring into the state from without the United States, free of tax and markup, for his personal or household use such alcoholic beverages as have been declared and permitted to enter the United States duty free under federal law.

Sec. 3. Section 7, chapter 62, Laws of 1933 ex. sess. as last amended by section 1, chapter 15, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 66.16.040 are each amended to read as follows:

Except as otherwise provided by law, an employee in a state liquor store may sell liquor to any person over the age of (~~twenty one~~) nineteen years for beverage purposes and may also sell to holders of permits such liquor as may be purchased under such permits.

Where there may be a question of a person's right to purchase liquor by reason of his age, such person shall be required to present any one of the following officially issued cards of identification which shows his correct age and bears his signature and photograph:

- (1) Liquor control authority card of identification of any state.
- (2) Driver's license of any state or "identocard" issued by the Washington state department of motor vehicles pursuant to RCW 46.20.117.
- (3) United States active duty military identification.
- (4) Passport.

The board may adopt such regulations as it deems proper covering the acceptance of such cards of identification.

No liquor sold under this section shall be delivered until the purchaser has paid for the liquor in cash.

Sec. 4. Section 3, chapter 67, Laws of 1949 as last amended by section 4, chapter 15, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 66.20.180 are each amended to read as follows:

A card of identification shall be presented by the holder thereof upon request of any licensee for the purpose of aiding the licensee to determine whether or not such person is at least (~~twenty one~~) nineteen years of age when such person desires to procure liquor from a licensed establishment.

Sec. 5. Section 6, chapter 67, Laws of 1949 as last amended by section 7, chapter 15, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 66.20.210 are each amended to read as follows:

No licensee or the agent or employee of the licensee shall be prosecuted criminally or be sued in any civil action for serving liquor to a person under (~~twenty one~~) nineteen years of age if such person has presented a card of identification in accordance with RCW 66.20.180 as now or hereafter amended, and has signed a certification card as provided in RCW 66.20.190.

twenty-one

Such card in the possession of a licensee may be offered as a defense in any hearing held by the board for serving liquor to the person who signed the card and may be considered by the board as evidence that the licensee acted in good faith.

Sec. 6. Section 2, chapter 70, Laws of 1955 and RCW 66.44.270 are each amended to read as follows:

Except in the case of liquor given or permitted to be given to a person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years by his parent or guardian for beverage or medicinal purposes, or administered to him by his physician or dentist for medicinal purposes, no person shall give, or otherwise supply liquor to any person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years, or permit any person under that age to consume liquor on his premises or on any premises under his control. It is unlawful for any person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years to acquire or have in his possession or consume any liquor except as in this section provided and except when such liquor is being used in connection with religious services.

Conviction or forfeiture of bail for a violation of this section by a person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years at the time of such conviction or forfeiture, shall not be a disqualification of such person to acquire a license to sell or dispense any liquor after such person shall have attained the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years.

Sec. 7. Section 3, chapter 70, Laws of 1955 and RCW 66.44.280 are each amended to read as follows:

Every person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years who makes application for a permit shall be guilty of an offense against this title.

Sec. 8. Section 4, chapter 70, Laws of 1955 as amended by section 1, chapter 49, Laws of 1965 and RCW 66.44.290 are each amended to read as follows:

Every person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years who purchases or attempts to purchase liquor shall be guilty of a violation of this title.

Sec. 9. Section 1, chapter 78, Laws of 1941 and RCW 66.44.300 are each amended to read as follows:

Any person who invites a minor into a public place where liquor is sold and treats, gives or purchases liquor for such minor, or permits a minor to treat, give or purchase liquor for him; or holds out such minor to be over the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years to the owner of the liquor establishment shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Sec. 10. Section 36-A added to chapter 62, Laws of 1933 ex. sess., by section 1, chapter 245, Laws of 1943 and RCW 66.44.310 are each amended to read as follows:

(1) It shall be a misdemeanor,

(a) To serve or allow to remain on the premises of any tavern any person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years;

(b) For any person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years to enter or remain on the premises of any tavern;

(c) For any person under the age of ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen years to represent his age as being ~~((twenty one))~~ nineteen or more years for the purpose of securing admission to or remaining on the premises of any tavern.

(2) The Washington state liquor control board shall have the power and it shall be its duty to classify the various licensees, as taverns or otherwise, within the meaning of this title, except bona fide restaurants, dining rooms and cafes serving commercial food to the public shall not be classified as taverns during the hours such food service is made available to the public.

Sec. 11. Section 1, chapter 38, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 66.44.340 are each amended to read as follows:

Employers holding class E and/or F licenses exclusively are permitted to allow their employees (~~(, between the ages of eighteen and twenty one years,))~~ eighteen years of age or over to sell beer or wine in, on or about any establishment holding a class E and/or class F license exclusively: ~~((PROVIDED, That there is direct supervision by an adult twenty one years of age or older in an adjacent check stand.))~~ PROVIDED, That minor

employees under the age of eighteen may make deliveries of beer and/or wine purchased from licensees holding class E and/or class F licenses exclusively, when delivery is made to cars of customers adjacent to such licensed premises but only, however, when the minor employee is accompanied by the purchaser.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 12. There is added to chapter 66.44 RCW a new section to read as follows:

Employers holding a class H license are permitted to allow their employees, who are eighteen years of age or older, to take orders for, to serve and sell liquor in any part of the licensed premises, and to perform clean-up work in any part of the licensed premises.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 13. The following acts or parts of acts are each hereby repealed:

(1) Section 2, chapter 49, Laws of 1965 and RCW 66.44.291; and

(2) Section 1, chapter 250, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 66.44.315.

Passed the House February 17, 1973.

Passed the Senate March 1, 1973.

Approved by the Governor March 14, 1973.

#### EXPLANATORY COMMENT

Referendum Measure No. 36 filed in the office of the Secretary of State as of April 4, 1973.

Sponsor filed 79,389 supporting signatures as of June 7, 1973 to prevent newly enacted legislation (Chapter 100, Laws of 1973) from becoming effective law.

Signatures found sufficient. Measure then certified to the November 6, 1973 state general election for approval or rejection by the voters.

#### COMPLETE TEXT OF

## Referendum Bill

# 32

#### CHAPTER 199, LAWS OF 1973

(43rd Leg., 1st Ex. Sess.)

*Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:*

**Shall county auditors be required to appoint precinct committeemen of major political parties as deputy voting registrars upon their request?**

LEGISLATIVE TITLE  
(Substitute House Bill No. 894)

#### VOTER REGISTRATION—PRECINCT COMMITTEEMEN—REGISTRATION AUTHORITY

AN ACT Relating to elections, voting, and voter registration; amending section 29.07.010, chapter 9, Laws of 1965 as amended by section 4, chapter 202, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 29.07.010; adding a new section to chapter 29.07 RCW; repealing section 29.07.040, chapter 9, Laws of 1965, section 6, chapter 202, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 29.07.040; and providing for a referendum.

**NEW SECTION.** Section 1. There is added to chapter 29.07 RCW a new section to read as follows:

The purpose of this 1973 amendatory act is to make registration to vote readily available to Washington's citizens and to recognize that voting under the democratic system is a right, not a privilege; that the present voting registration laws serve to effectively defeat this right by making it extremely difficult, and even impossible, for many citizens to vote, particularly the aged, the sick, and the poor who do not normally have easy access to places of registration.

Sec. 2. Section 29.07.010, chapter 9, Laws of 1965 as amended by section 4, chapter 202, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 29.07.010 are each amended to read as follows:

In all counties the county auditor shall be the chief registrar of voters for every precinct within the county. He shall appoint a deputy registrar for each precinct or for any number of precincts and shall appoint city or town clerks as deputy registrars to assist in registering voters residing in cities, towns, and rural precincts within the county. In addition, he shall appoint the precinct committeemen elected or appointed pursuant to the provisions of RCW 29.42.050 as deputy registrars to assist in registering voters if the precinct committeemen so request.

A deputy registrar shall be a registered voter and, except for city and town clerks and precinct committeemen, shall hold office at the pleasure of the county auditor.

The county auditor shall be the custodian of the official registration records of each precinct within that county. The expenses of registration shall be apportioned between the county and cities or towns therein in the same manner as provided in RCW 29.07.030.

**NEW SECTION.** Sec. 3. Section 29.07.040, chapter 9, Laws of 1965, section 6, chapter 202, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 29.07.040 are each repealed.

**NEW SECTION.** Sec. 4. This 1973 amendatory act shall be submitted to the people for their adoption and ratification, or rejection, at the next general election to be held in this state on the Tuesday next succeeding the first Monday in November, 1973, in accordance with the provisions of section 1, Article II of the state Constitution, as amended, and laws adopted to facilitate the operation thereof.

Passed the House April 7, 1973.

Passed the Senate April 15, 1973.

Received directly from the office of the Chief Clerk, House of Representatives, and filed at 3:15 P.M., April 26, 1973, in the office of the Secretary of State.

## PERSONALIZED LICENSE PLATES—REVENUE—STATE GAME FUND

AN ACT Relating to state government; amending section 77.12.170, chapter 36, Laws of 1955 as amended by section 33, chapter 199, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 77.12.170; adding new sections to chapter 46.16 RCW; adding a new section to chapter 36, Laws of 1955 and to chapter 77.12 RCW; repealing section 4, chapter 114, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 46.16.355; and providing for submission of this act to a vote of the people.

BE IT ENACTED, *By the Legislature  
of the State of Washington:*

**NEW SECTION.** Section 1. There is added to chapter 36, Laws of 1955, and to chapter 77.12 RCW a new section to read as follows:

It is declared to be the public policy of the state of Washington to direct financial resources of this state toward the support and aid of the wildlife resources existing within the state of Washington in order that the general welfare of these inhabitants of the state be served. For the purposes of this chapter, wildlife resources are understood to be those species of wildlife other than that managed by the department of fisheries under their existing jurisdiction as well as all unclassified marine fish, shellfish, and marine invertebrates which shall remain under the jurisdiction of the director of fisheries. The legislature further finds that the preservation, protection, perpetuation, and enhancement of such wildlife resources of the state is of major concern to it, and that aid for a satisfactory environment and ecological balance in this state for such wildlife resources serves a public interest, purpose, and desire.

It is further declared that such preservation, protection, perpetuation, and enhancement can be fostered through financial support derived on a voluntary basis from those citizens of the state of Washington who wish to assist in such objectives; that a desirable manner of accomplishing this is through offering personalized license plates for motor vehicles, the fees for which are to be directed to the state treasury to the credit of the state game fund for the furtherance of the programs, policies, and activities of the state game department in preservation, protection, perpetuation, and enhancement of the wildlife resources that abound within the geographical limits of the state of Washington.

In particular, the legislature recognizes the benefit of this program to be specifically directed toward those species of wildlife including but not limited to songbirds, protected wildlife, rare and endangered wildlife, aquatic life, and specialized-habitat types, both terrestrial and aquatic, as well as all unclassified marine fish, shellfish, and marine invertebrates which shall remain under the jurisdiction of the director of fisheries that exist within the limits of the state of Washington.

**NEW SECTION.** Sec. 2. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

Personalized license plates, as used in this chapter, means license plates that have displayed upon them the registration number assigned to the passenger motor vehicle for which such registration number was issued in a combination of letters or numbers, or both, requested by the owner of the vehicle.

**NEW SECTION.** Sec. 3. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

Any person who is the registered owner of a passenger motor vehicle registered with the department or who makes

COMPLETE TEXT OF

## Referendum Bill

# 33

CHAPTER 200, LAWS OF 1973  
(43rd Leg., 1st Ex. Sess.)

Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:

**Shall personalized motor vehicle license plates be issued with resulting extra fees to be used exclusively for wildlife preservation?**

application for an original registration of a passenger motor vehicle or renewal registration of a passenger motor vehicle may, upon payment of the fee prescribed in section 7 of this 1973 amendatory act, apply to the department for personalized license plates, in the manner described in section 6 of this 1973 amendatory act, which plates shall be affixed to the passenger motor vehicle for which registration is sought in lieu of the regular license plates.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 4. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read follows:

The personalized license plates shall be the same design as regular passenger motor vehicle license plates, and shall consist of numbers or letters, or any combination thereof not exceeding six positions and not less than two positions: PROVIDED, That there are no conflicts with existing passenger, commercial, trailer, motorcycle, or special license plates series or with the provisions of RCW 46.16.230 or 46.16.235.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 5. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

Personalized license plates shall be issued only to the registered owner of a vehicle on which they are to be displayed.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 6. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

An applicant for issuance of personalized license plates or renewal of such plates in the subsequent year pursuant to this chapter shall file an application therefor in such form and by such date as the department may require, indicating thereon the combination of letters or numbers, or both, requested as a vehicle license plate number. There shall be no duplication or conflict with existing or projected vehicle license plate series or other numbering systems for records kept by the department, and the department may refuse to issue any combination of letters or numbers, or both, that may carry connotations offensive to good taste and decency or which would be misleading or a duplication of license plates provided for in chapter 46.16 RCW.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 7. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

In addition to the regular registration fee, and any other fees and taxes required to be paid upon registration, the applicant shall be charged a fee of thirty dollars. In addition to the regular renewal fee, and in addition to any other fees and taxes required to be paid, the applicant for a renewal of such plates shall be charged an additional fee of twenty dollars.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 8. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

Whenever any person who has been issued personalized license plates applies to the department for transfer of such plates to a subsequently acquired passenger motor vehicle, a transfer fee of five dollars shall be charged in addition to all other appropriate fees. Such transfer fees shall be deposited in the motor vehicle fund.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 9. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

When any person who has been issued personalized license plates sells, trades, or otherwise releases ownership of the vehicle upon which the personalized license plates have been displayed, he shall immediately report the transfer of such plates to an acquired passenger motor vehicle pursuant to section 8 of this 1973 amendatory act, or he shall surrender such plates to the department forthwith and release his priority to the letters or numbers, or combination thereof, displayed on the personalized license plates.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 10. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

The director of motor vehicles may establish such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of sections 2 through 9 of this 1973 amendatory act.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 11. There is added to chapter 46.16 RCW a new section to read as follows:

All revenue derived from the fees provided for in section 7 of this 1973 amendatory act shall be forwarded to the state treasurer accompanied by a proper identifying detailed report and by him deposited to the credit of the state game fund.

Administrative costs incurred by the department of motor vehicles as a direct result of this 1973 amendatory act shall be appropriated by the legislature from the state game fund from those funds deposited therein resulting from the sale of personalized license plates. If the actual costs incurred by the department of motor vehicles are less than that which has been appropriated by the legislature the remainder shall revert to the state game fund.

Sec. 12. Section 77.12.170, chapter 36, Laws of 1955 as amended by section 33, chapter 199, Laws of 1969 ex. sess. and RCW 77.12.170 are each amended to read as follows:

There is established in the state treasury a fund to be known as the state game fund which shall consist of all moneys received from fees for the sale of licenses and permits provided in this title, from the personalized vehicle license plate fees provided in chapter 46.16 RCW, and from fines, forfeitures, and costs collected for violations of this title, or any other statute for the protection of wild animals and birds and game fish, or any rule or regulation of the commission relating thereto: PROVIDED, That fifty percent of all fines and bail forfeitures shall not become part of the state game fund and shall be retained by the county in which collected: PROVIDED FURTHER, That all fees, fines, forfeitures and penalties collected or assessed by a justice court because of the violation of a state law shall be remitted as provided in chapter 3.62 RCW as now exists or is later amended.

All state and county officers receiving any moneys in payment of fees for licenses under this title or from fees for the personalized vehicle license plates provided in chapter 46.16 RCW, or in payment of fines, penalties, or costs imposed for violations of this title, or any other statute for the protection of wild animals and birds and game fish, or any rule or regulation of the commission; from rentals or concessions, and from the sale of real or personal property held for game department purposes, shall pay them into the state treasury to be placed to the credit of the state game fund: PROVIDED, That county officers shall remit only fifty percent of all fines and bail forfeitures: PROVIDED FURTHER, That all fees, fines, forfeitures and penalties collected or assessed by a justice court because of the violation of a state law shall be remitted as provided in chapter 3.62 RCW as now exists or is later amended.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 13. Section 4, chapter 114, Laws of 1971 ex. sess. and RCW 46.16.355 are each hereby repealed.

NEW SECTION. Sec. 14. This 1973 amendatory act shall be submitted to the people for their adoption and ratification, or rejection, at the next general election to be held in this state in accordance with the provisions of section 1, Article II of the Constitution of the state of Washington, as amended, and the laws adopted to facilitate the operation thereof.

Passed the House April 13, 1973.

Passed the Senate April 14, 1973.

Received directly from the office of the Chief Clerk, House of Representatives, and filed at 3:20 P.M., April 26, 1973, in the office of the Secretary of State.

# HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION

# 22

## Proposed Constitutional Amendment

*Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:*

**May the legislature authorize urban development or redevelopment financing from property taxes attributable to increased valuations resulting from such projects?**

BE IT RESOLVED, *By the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in Legislative Session Assembled:*

THAT, At the next general election to be held in this state there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the state for their approval and ratification, or rejection, an amendment to Article VII of the Constitution of the state of Washington by adding a new section to be known as Section 12, such new section to read as follows:

**NEW SECTION.** Article VII, section 12. The legislature may, notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, provide that the ad valorem taxes levied by the state or by any taxing district in which there is located all or a part of an area included in an urban development or redevelopment project, as those two terms shall be defined by the legislature, may be divided so that the taxes levied against any increase in the true and fair value, as defined by law, which may be reasonably construed to have arisen from an associated project, of property in such area obtaining after the effective date of the ordinance or resolution approving the project, or obtaining after the date of the acquisition of the property for urban development or redevelopment purposes, as determined by the legislature, shall be used to pay any indebtedness incurred for the project. The legislature may enact such laws as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the secretary of state shall cause notice of the foregoing constitutional amendment to be published at least four times during the four weeks next preceding the election in every legal newspaper in the state.

Passed the House April 7, 1973.  
LEONARD A. SAWYER,  
Speaker of the House.

Passed the Senate April 14, 1973.  
JOHN A. CHERBERG,  
President of the Senate.

# House Joint Resolution

# 37

## Proposed Constitutional Amendment

*Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:*

**shall a graduated net income tax be authorized, excess levies on school operations be prohibited, and some excise taxes limited?**

BE IT RESOLVED, *By the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in Legislative Session Assembled:*

THAT, At the next general election to be held in this state there shall be submitted to the qualified electors of the state for their approval and ratification, or rejection, an amendment to Article VII of the Constitution of the State of Washington by adding a new Section 12 thereto to read as follows:

**NEW SECTION.** Article VII, Section 12. (1) Income shall not be deemed property within the meaning of this Article, and a tax imposed upon or measured by income shall not be deemed a tax on property.

(2) The legislature shall have the power to impose a tax upon, or to measure a tax by, net income as defined by the legislature in accordance with the following condition:

(a) The highest rate of any tax imposed upon or measured by the net income of individuals shall not exceed eight percent and the highest rate of any tax imposed upon or measured by the net income of corporations shall not exceed twelve percent.

(b) The rate schedule for a tax imposed upon or measured by the net income of individuals shall be at rates progressively higher on income amounts over specified levels and shall contain no less than six different rates, the difference between each of which shall be equal and shall be no less than one-half of one percent.

(c) In the first statute implementing this amendment the highest rate of the rate schedule for a net income tax imposed upon individuals shall not exceed six and one-half percent and the highest rate of the rate schedule for a net income tax imposed upon corporations shall not exceed ten percent. The rate limitations prescribed in this subsection may be exceeded only if those sections of an act which change such rates are enacted by a majority of the members of each of the two houses of the legislature and are referred to the people and approved by a majority vote thereon at a general election.

(d) From and after the initial adoption of an act by the legislature imposing a tax upon or measured by net income no amendment to such act which changes: (i) the definition of taxable income, (ii) a rate or rates, within the limitations set forth in (a), (b) or (c) above or (iii) an amount or amounts of taxable income in the rate schedule, shall be valid unless such amendment is enacted by a majority of the members of each of the two houses of the legislature, and is subject to referendum petition.

(3) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, not later than twelve months after a tax imposed upon or measured by net income takes effect, and during the time such tax is in effect thereafter:

(a) No school district in any year shall, for maintenance and operations purposes, impose a tax upon property pursuant to the provisions of paragraph (a) of section 2, as now or hereafter amended, of this Article VII.

(b) The state shall guarantee full funding of a basic program of education, as defined by the legislature.

(c) No sale or use tax shall be imposed on the sale or use of the following articles as defined by the legislature: (i) food products for off-premises human consumption, and (ii) prescription drugs.

(d) The aggregate rate of any general retail sales or use tax as imposed by the state and political subdivisions thereof may not exceed five and three-tenths percent.

(e) The state shall not impose any general business and occupation tax at a greater rate than one-quarter of one percent of gross income where such tax is imposed as of January 1, 1973 by session laws sections 82.04.010 through 82.04.290, chapter 15, Laws of 1961, as amended and where such income

is also subject to a tax imposed upon or measured by net income derived from such business or occupation.

(4) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Constitution:

(a) Upon and after December 31, 1979, business inventories held for sale shall be exempt from ad valorem taxes.

(b) In the case of capital property as defined by the legislature held by a taxpayer on the effective date of a state income tax act and disposed of after such effective date, such taxpayer shall be allowed to exclude from the computation of taxable income the amount of any gain attributable to a difference in value of such property occurring between the time of acquisition by the taxpayer and the effective date of such act.

(5) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, the legislature may by law:

(a) Provide for direct payments to an individual to the extent that (i) insufficient income tax liability exists for full application of an otherwise applicable credit, and (ii) such credit is granted for the purpose of providing direct or indirect relief from other state or local taxes.

(b) Coordinate the administration and collection of state income taxes with the income tax laws and procedures of the United States. The legislature may adopt by reference any federal statutes relating to federal income taxes, as existing at time of adoption and as amended from time to time.

(c) Define terms used in this Section 12 to the extent necessary to facilitate the operation thereof.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the foregoing amendment shall be construed as a single amendment within the meaning of Article XXIII, Section 1 (Amendment 27) of this Constitution.

The legislature finds that the changes contained in the foregoing amendment constitute a single integrated plan for a balanced revision of the tax structure for state and local government. In the event the foregoing amendment is held to be separate amendments, this joint resolution shall be void in its entirety and shall be of no further force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the secretary of state shall cause notice of the foregoing constitutional amendment to be published at least four times during the four weeks next preceding the election in every legal newspaper in the state.

Passed the House April 14, 1973.  
LEONARD A. SAWYER,  
Speaker of the House.

Passed the Senate April 14, 1973.  
JOHN A. CHERBERG,  
President of the House.

COMPLETE TEXT OF

## House Joint Resolution

# 40

### Proposed Constitutional Amendment

*Ballot Title as issued by the Attorney General:*

**Shall the validation formula approved in 1972 for excess levy elections also be applied to bonds payable from such levies?**

BE IT RESOLVED, *By the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in Legislative Session Assembled:*

THAT, At the next general election to be held in this state there shall be submitted to the qualified voters of the state for

their approval and ratification, or rejection, an amendment to Article VII of the Constitution of the state of Washington by amending section 2 (Amendments 55 and 59) thereof to read as follows:

Article VII, section 2. Except as hereinafter provided and notwithstanding any other provision of this Constitution, the aggregate of all tax levies upon real and personal property by the state and all taxing districts now existing or hereafter created, shall not in any year exceed one per centum of the true and fair value of such property in money: PROVIDED, HOWEVER, That nothing herein shall prevent levies at the rates now provided by law by or for any port or public utility district. The term "taxing district" for the purposes of this section shall mean any political subdivision, municipal corporation, district, or other governmental agency authorized by law to levy, or have levied for it, ad valorem taxes on property, other than a port or public utility district. Such aggregate limitation or any specific limitation imposed by law in conformity therewith may be exceeded only

(a) By any taxing district when specifically authorized so to do by a majority of at least three-fifths of the electors thereof voting on the proposition to levy such additional tax submitted not more than twelve months prior to the date on which the proposed levy is to be made and not oftener than twice in such twelve month period, either at a special election or at the regular election of such taxing district, at which election the number of persons voting "yes" on the proposition shall constitute three-fifths of a number equal to forty per centum of the total votes cast in such taxing district at the last preceding general election when the number of electors voting on the proposition does not exceed forty per centum of the total votes cast in such taxing district in the last preceding general election; or by a majority of at least three-fifths of the electors thereof voting on the proposition to levy when the number of electors voting on the proposition exceeds forty per centum of the total votes cast in such taxing district in the last preceding general election;

(b) By any taxing district otherwise authorized by law to issue general obligation bonds for capital purposes, for the sole purpose of making the required payments of principal and interest on general obligation bonds issued solely for capital purposes, other than the replacement of equipment, when authorized so to do by majority of at least three-fifths of the electors thereof voting on the proposition to issue such bonds and to pay the principal and interest thereon by an annual tax levy in excess of the limitation herein provided during the term of such bonds, submitted not oftener than twice in any calendar year, at an election held in the manner provided by law for bond elections in such taxing district, at which election the total number of persons voting ~~(on the proposition shall constitute not less than forty per centum of the total number of votes cast in such taxing district at the last preceding general election))~~ "yes" on the proposition shall constitute three-fifths of a number equal to forty per centum of the total votes cast in such taxing district at the last preceding general election when the number of electors voting on the proposition does not exceed forty per centum of the total votes cast in such taxing district in the last preceding general election; or by a majority of at least three-fifths of the electors thereof voting on the proposition to issue such bonds when the number of electors voting on the proposition exceeds forty per centum of the total votes cast in such taxing district in the last preceding general election; PROVIDED, That any such taxing district shall have the right by vote of its governing body to refund any general obligation bonds of said district issued for capital purposes only, and to provide for the interest thereon and amortization thereof by annual levies in excess of the tax limitation provided for herein, AND PROVIDED FURTHER, That the provisions of this section shall also be subject to the limitations contained in Article VIII, section 6, of this Constitution;

(c) By the state or any taxing district for the purpose of

paying the principal or interest on general obligation bonds outstanding on December 6, 1934; or for the purpose of preventing the impairment of the obligation of a contract when ordered so to do by a court of last resort.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the secretary of state shall cause notice of the foregoing constitutional amendment to be published at least four times during the four weeks next preceding the election in every legal newspaper in the state.

Passed the House April 4, 1973.  
LEONARD A. SAWYER,  
Speaker of the House.

Passed the Senate April 11, 1973.  
JOHN A. CHERBERG,  
President of the Senate.

**EXPLANATORY COMMENT**

All words in double parentheses and lined through are in our State Constitution at the present and are being taken out by this amendment. All words underscored do not appear in the State Constitution as it is now written but will be put in if this amendment is adopted.

**Initiative Measure 282**

(continued from Page 7)

Office	Salary Since 1965	A Vote "For" Salary Effective December 1973	A Vote "Against" Salary Effective January 1, 1974
Commissioner of Public Lands	20,000	21,100	33,000
Insurance Commissioner	16,500	17,400	29,700
Legislators	3,600	3,800*	10,560*

\*The increases for legislators cannot take effect until the beginning of their next terms of office.

	Salary Since 1972		
Supreme Court Judges	\$33,000	\$34,825	\$38,000
Judges—Court of Appeals	30,000	31,650	35,000
Superior Court Judges	27,000	28,500	32,000
Full-time District Court Judges	22,000	23,250	26,000

**Referendum Bill 33**

(Continued from Page 13)

such plates could be issued, however, which would duplicate or conflict with existing or projected license plate series; and, in addition, the department of motor vehicles would be authorized to refuse to issue any combination of letters or numbers carrying connotations offensive to good taste and decency or which would be misleading.

In order to obtain or retain such license plates, a person would be required to pay, in addition to the regular registration fee and any other fees and taxes required to be paid upon registration of his vehicle, an additional fee of thirty dollars upon its initial registration and a fee of twenty dollars upon each annual renewal of such registration. All revenues derived from the additional fees would be paid into the state game fund rather than the motor vehicle fund, where they would be available for use exclusively for the preservation, protection, perpetuation and enhancement of nongame wildlife primarily related to endangered species such as Bald Eagles, Columbia River White Tail Deer or song birds.

**House Joint Resolution 37**

(Continued from Page 17)

On the other hand twelve months after a net income tax has gone into effect and so long as it remains in effect, it would prohibit the following:

1. Sales or use taxes on food and prescription drugs;
2. Any combined state and local sales tax rates in excess of 5.3%;
3. Any further school district special property tax levies for operation and maintenance;
4. A business and occupation tax rate in excess of one-quarter of one percent for those businesses subject to the net income tax;
5. Application of the property tax to business inventories after December 31, 1979;
6. The taxing, under the income tax, of gain from disposition of capital property (as defined by the legislature) attributable to periods arising prior to the effective date of the income tax.

The proposed constitutional amendment would also:

1. **Require** the state to guarantee full funding of a basic program of education; and
2. **Validate** certain implementing legislation passed by the 1973 legislature. Under this legislation the income tax rate on corporations would be 7½% in 1974, 8% in 1975, 8½% in 1976, 9% in 1977, 9½% in 1978, and 10% in 1979 and subsequent years, while the rate schedule for individuals, estates and trusts would range from 2% to 6.5%.

Taxable income for individuals under this legislation generally would be the same as adjusted gross income for federal income tax purposes, less \$1,250 for each personal exemption, and less certain other deductions allowable as itemized deductions for federal income tax purposes. These provisions of the implementing legislation would be tied into the constitutional amendment by the fact that any change in the rate schedule or the definition of taxable income would be subject to referendum as explained above.

**House Joint Resolution 40**

(Continued from Page 19)

poses be approved by at least sixty percent of the electors voting thereon. However, in the case of long-term excess levies to fund general obligation bonds, this amendment would change the formula for validation of the election so as to provide the same two alternative methods of validation as now exist with respect to excess levies voted on an annual basis for current expenses of a taxing district.

# Voting Information

Polling hours for all elections are now **7:00 A.M.** to 8:00 P.M. The early opening of the polling places is to accommodate those persons who can vote before going to work.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mid-morning and mid-afternoon are traditionally slack hours and are usually the best times to vote. However, all persons at their polling place by the close of the polls at 8:00 P.M. will be allowed to vote even if it requires time past the closing hour.

\*\*\*\*\*

A marked sample ballot or a check list of state measures as appears on page 3 in the pamphlet can be of great convenience when voting. However, be careful not to leave such references at the polling place after you have voted, otherwise you could be guilty of electioneering.

\*\*\*\*\*

If any person cannot appear in person to vote, he should send a signed application for an absentee ballot to his county auditor as early as possible. An application form appears on the opposite page for such purpose. In order to be counted, an absentee ballot must be voted and post-marked no later than the day of the election. For this reason, sufficient time must be allowed for an exchange of correspondence with the county auditor.

# How To Obtain an Absentee Ballot

Any registered voter who will be away from home on the day of the election—or is so physically handicapped that he (or she) cannot vote in person should apply directly to his county auditor for an absentee ballot. Any **signed** request containing the necessary information will be honored. For your convenience, a model application is reproduced below.

In order to be certain that voter's application is authentic, our election laws require that the signature upon the application be verified by comparison with the signature on the voter's permanent registration record. For this reason, if husband and wife both wish to vote by absentee ballot, signatures of each are necessary. To be valid an absentee ballot must be voted (and the return envelope post-dated) no later than the day of the election.

Apply Now for An Absentee Ballot If You Cannot Vote in Person.

-----CLIP OUT FORM ALONG THIS LINE-----

SEND COMPLETED AND SIGNED APPLICATION DIRECTLY TO YOUR COUNTY AUDITOR.



## APPLICATION FOR STATE GENERAL ELECTION ABSENTEE BALLOT

(Together with all other local ballots it can be determined that the applicant is entitled to vote at said election)

This application is being made for an absentee ballot for the approaching:

\_\_\_\_\_

(Date) .....

I hereby declare that I am a qualified elector  
in \_\_\_\_\_, State of  
(Name of County)

Washington, and that I am registered for  
voting at the following address:

.....  
(Street and number, or rural route)

.....  
(City or town)

My voting precinct is:

.....  
(If possible, fill in precinct name or number)

**November 6, 1973**  
**State General Election**

My reason for requesting an absentee  
ballot is:

(Check appropriate square)

I expect to be absent from my precinct  
during the polling hours on the day of said  
election.

I am so incapacitated that I cannot attend  
at the polls and vote in the usual way at  
said election.

.....  
(Print name here for positive identification)

**SIGN HERE**



.....  
(Signature of voter)

.....  
(Street)

**Fill in address where you wish  
absentee ballot to be sent**




.....  
(City)


.....  
(State)

**Note:** If husband and wife both want absentee ballots, signatures of each are necessary.


# Legislative Districts




Yakima and vicinity



Spokane and vicinity



Vancouver and vicinity



**6**  
 Congressional Districts

Everett, Seattle,  
 Tacoma and vicinities

BULK RATE  
U. S. POSTAGE  
**PAID**  
Seattle, Washington  
Permit No. 1216

RESIDENTIAL PATRON, LOCAL

# Official Voters Pamphlet