

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE
FIFTY-SIXTH (SECOND EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION

ASSEMBLY DAILY JOURNAL

FIRST LEGISLATIVE DAY
FIRST CALENDAR DAY

IN ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO
Monday, July 22, 1946

The Assembly met at 10.30 a.m., pursuant to the provisions of the Proclamation of His Excellency, Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California, dated July 18, 1946, convening the Legislature of the State of California on this day in extraordinary session.

Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly for the Fifty-sixth (Regular) Session, presiding.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly, announced that, pursuant to the requirements of the Government Code, Section 9150, the following officers of the Assembly of the Fifty-sixth (Regular) Session of the Legislature were present, and in their respective positions: Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk; Geraldine B. Hadsell, Minute Clerk; and Wilkie Ogg, Sergeant-at-Arms.

ROLL CALL

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus directed the Assistant Clerk to call the roll of Assemblymen.

The roll was called, and the following answered to their names:

Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyon, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg—73

Quorum present.

PRAYER

The following prayer was offered by the Rev. Torrance Phelps, Chaplain of the Assembly for the Fifty-sixth (Regular) Session of the Legislature:

Eternal God:

We pause in gratitude this morning for all the beauty and wonder of Thy world, for the green earth, for sunlight and flowers and for the starry night.

May we be grateful for the privileges of this unrivaled State, for its romance and its progress, and may we labor to preserve unstained its great name and estate.

Let us be thankful for the many personal blessings we enjoy, for homes lit by love, for loyal friends and for the wealth of culture and knowledge.

Let us give thanks that we are citizens of this great Nation, unsurpassed in its freedom and opportunity for all, and the main oasis of security and hope for mankind.

In gratitude to all who have given us this glorious inheritance, let us labor with unwearyed zeal and incorruptible conscience for the generation that shall follow us.

Above all, let us be grateful to the Divine Source of Our Many Blessings from whose Mind has sprung the earth and its riches, and by whose truth we are inspired.—Amen.

PROCLAMATION OF THE GOVERNOR

The Chief Clerk directed the Assistant Clerk to read the Proclamation of the Governor convening the Legislature in extraordinary session.

Whereupon the Assistant Clerk read the following Proclamation :

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Proclamation

WHEREAS, An extraordinary occasion has arisen and now exists requiring that the Legislature of the State of California be convened in extraordinary session; now, therefore,

I, EARL WARREN, Governor of the State of California, by virtue of the power and authority in me vested by Section 9 of Article V of the Constitution of the State of California, do hereby convene the Legislature of the State of California to meet in extraordinary session at Sacramento, California, on Monday, the twenty-second day of July, 1946, at 10.30 o'clock a.m. of said day for the following purposes and to legislate upon the following subjects.

1. To consider and act upon legislation to declare an emergency in respect to the renting of residential housing accommodations, including hotels and rooming houses; to provide for the regulation, control, and stabilization of rents in such housing accommodations; to regulate the procedure for removal or eviction of tenants of such housing accommodations; to provide for the administration and enforcement of such regulation, control, and stabilization, and to make funds available for such purposes.

2. To approve or reject charters and charter amendments of cities, counties, or cities and counties, ratified by the electors pursuant to the Constitution of the State of California.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this eighteenth day of July, 1946.

[SEAL]

EARL WARREN, Governor of California

Attest: FRANK M. JORDAN, Secretary of State

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered :

By Mr. Sam L. Collins :

House Resolution No. 1

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the following named persons constitute the officers of the Assembly for the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session, with the per diem as fixed by statute or resolution :

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Hon. Charles W. Lyon | Speaker |
| Hon. Thomas A. Maloney | Speaker pro tempore |
| Arthur A. Ohnimus | Chief Clerk |
| Geraldine B. Hadsell | Minute Clerk |
| Wilkie Ogg | Sergeant-at-Arms |
| Rev. Torrance Phelps | Chaplain |

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, and Wollenberg—63.

NOES—None.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus announced the appointment of Messrs. Collins, Sam L., Fourt, and Robertson, as a Select Committee to escort Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker-elect, to the rostrum.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus announced the appointment of Messrs. Wollenberg, Field, and Debs, as a Select Committee to escort Hon. Thomas A. Maloney, Speaker pro tempore-elect, to the rostrum.

OATHS OF OFFICE ADMINISTERED

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker-elect; Hon. Thomas A. Maloney, Speaker pro tempore-elect; Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk-elect; Geraldine B. Hadsell, Minute Clerk-elect; and Wilkie Ogg, Sergeant-at-Arms-elect, took and subscribed to the following oath, administered by Hon. Frank M. Jordan, Secretary of State:

I do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office to which I have been elected according to the best of my ability.

Speaker Presiding

At 10.42 a.m., Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Upon request of the Speaker, the Assembly then gave the pledge of allegiance to the Flag.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR THE DAY

The following members were granted leaves of absence for the day, because of illness:

Mr. Burns, on motion of Messrs. Clarke and Heisinger.

Mr. Knight, on motion of Mr. Watson.

The following member was granted leave of absence for the day, because of legislative business elsewhere:

Mr. Werdel, on motion of Mr. Doyle.

The following member was granted leave of absence for the day, because of personal business elsewhere:

Mr. Dekker, on motion of Mr. Beck.

APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

The Speaker announced that the standing committees of the Fifty-sixth (Regular) Session would be the standing committees of the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered:

By Mr. Stream:

House Resolution No. 2

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That a Select Committee of Five be appointed to wait upon His Excellency, the Governor, and inform him that the Assembly is organized and awaits any communication he may have to make to it.

Resolution read and adopted.

Appointment of Select Committee

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution No. 2, the Speaker announced the appointment of Messrs. Stream, Crichton, O'Day, Leonard, and Maloney as such Select Committee.

By Mr. Field:

House Resolution No. 3

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Speaker of the Assembly appoint a Committee of Three to inform the Senate that the Assembly is in session pursuant to the Proclamation of His Excellency, the Governor, dated the eighteenth day of July, 1946, and ready for the transaction of legislative business, with the following officers, to wit:

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| Hon. Charles W. Lyon | Speaker |
| Hon. Thomas A. Maloney | Speaker pro tempore |
| Arthur A. Ohnimus | Chief Clerk |
| Geraldine B. Hadsell | Minute Clerk |
| Wilkie Ogg | Sergeant-at-Arms |
| Rev. Torrance Phelps | Chaplain |

Resolution read and adopted.

Appointment of Select Committee

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution No. 3, the Speaker announced the appointment of Messrs. Field, Niehouse, and Middough as such Select Committee.

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 4

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That until further notice the Standing Rules of the Fifty-sixth First Extraordinary Session, as printed in the Assembly Journal of January 7, 1946, at pages 7 to 28 inclusive, are hereby adopted as the Permanent Standing Rules of this Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Call, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Davis, Debs, Denny, Diekey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick,

King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—62.

NOES—None.

By Mr. McCollister:

House Resolution No. 5

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California. That the State Controller be and he is hereby directed and ordered to draw his warrants on the proper fund in favor of the following members and officers of the Assembly for the amount set opposite their respective names, and the State Treasurer is hereby directed and ordered to pay the same:

| District | Name | Address | Distance from county seat. | Distance from county seat, more. | Distance from county seat, less. | Mileage one way. | Total mileage. | Amount at 5 cents per mile. |
|----------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 2 | Paul Denny | Etna, Siskiyou County | 295 | 37 | -- | 332 | 664 | \$33 20 |
| 3 | Lloyd W. Lowrey | Rumsey, Yolo County | 23 | 36 | -- | 59 | 118 | 5 90 |
| 4 | Albert M. King | Oroville, Butte County | 56 | -- | -- | 86 | 172 | 8 60 |
| 5 | Ernest C. Crowley | Fairfield, Solano County | 40 | -- | -- | 40 | 80 | 4 00 |
| 6 | Allen G. Thurman | Colfax, Placer County | 37 | 17 | -- | 54 | 108 | 5 40 |
| 7 | Richard H. McCollister | Mill Valley, Marin County | 105 | 8 | -- | 113 | 226 | 11 30 |
| 8 | Chester F. Gannon | Sacramento, Sacramento County | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 9 | Dwight H. Stephenson | Elk Grove, Sacramento County | -- | 13 | -- | 13 | 26 | 1 30 |
| 11 | Charles M. Weber | Stockton, San Joaquin County | 48 | -- | -- | 48 | 96 | 4 80 |
| 12 | James E. Thorp | Lockeford, San Joaquin County | 48 | -- | 3 | 45 | 90 | 4 50 |
| 13 | Francis Dunn, Jr. | Oakland, Alameda County | 84 | -- | -- | 84 | 168 | 8 40 |
| 14 | Randal F. Dickey | Alameda, Alameda County | 84 | 5 | -- | 89 | 178 | 8 90 |
| 15 | Bernard A. Sheridan | Oakland, Alameda County | 84 | -- | -- | 84 | 168 | 8 40 |
| 16 | Marvin Sherwin | Piedmont, Alameda County | 84 | -- | -- | 84 | 168 | 8 40 |
| 17 | Edward J. Carey | Emeryville, Alameda County | 84 | -- | 2 | 82 | 164 | 8 20 |
| 18 | Gardiner Johnson | Berkeley, Alameda County | 84 | -- | 1 | 83 | 166 | 8 30 |
| 20 | Thomas A. Maloney | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | 9 00 |
| 21 | Albert C. Wollenberg | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | 9 00 |
| 22 | George D. Collins, Jr. | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | 9 00 |
| 23 | William Clifton Berry | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | 9 00 |
| 24 | Edward F. O'Day | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | 9 00 |
| 25 | Gerald P. Haggerty | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | 9 00 |
| 26 | Edward M. Gaffney | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | 9 00 |
| 27 | Harrison W. Call | Redwood City, San Mateo County | 119 | -- | -- | 119 | 238 | 11 90 |
| 28 | Raup Miller | Palo Alto, Santa Clara County | 128 | 18 | -- | 146 | 292 | 14 60 |
| 29 | John F. Thompson | San Jose, Santa Clara County | 128 | -- | -- | 128 | 256 | 12 80 |
| 30 | Ralph M. Brown | Modesto, Stanislaus County | 77 | -- | -- | 77 | 154 | 7 70 |
| 31 | George A. Clarke | Planada, Merced County | 114 | 10 | -- | 124 | 248 | 12 40 |
| 32 | Jacob M. Leonard | Hollister, San Benito County | 173 | -- | -- | 173 | 346 | 17 30 |
| 33 | Fred Emlay | Salinas, Monterey County | 208 | -- | -- | 208 | 416 | 20 80 |
| 34 | James G. Crighton | Fresno, Fresno County | 169 | -- | -- | 169 | 338 | 16 90 |
| 35 | S. L. Heisinger | Calwa, Fresno County | 169 | 5 | -- | 174 | 348 | 17 40 |
| 37 | Alfred W. Robertson | Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County | 460 | -- | -- | 460 | 920 | 46 00 |
| 38 | Walter J. Fourt | Ventura, Ventura County | 490 | -- | -- | 490 | 980 | 49 00 |
| 40 | William H. Rosenthal | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 41 | Julian Beck | San Fernando, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | 21 | 426 | 852 | 42 60 |
| 42 | Everett G. Burkhalter | North Hollywood, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 43 | C. Don Field | Glendale, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | 10 | 437 | 874 | 43 70 |
| 44 | John B. Pelletier | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 45 | Thomas J. Doyle | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 46 | Glenn M. Anderson | Hawthorne, Los Angeles County | 447 | 12 | -- | 459 | 918 | 45 90 |
| 47 | Albert I. Stewart | Pasadena, Los Angeles County | 447 | 13 | -- | 460 | 920 | 46 00 |
| 49 | Ernest R. Geddes | Pomona, Los Angeles County | 447 | 30 | -- | 477 | 954 | 47 70 |
| 50 | Thomas M. Erwin | Puente, Los Angeles County | 447 | 19 | -- | 466 | 932 | 46 60 |
| 51 | Elwyn S. Bennett | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 52 | Jonathan J. Hollibaugh | Huntington Park, Los Angeles County | 447 | 6 | -- | 453 | 906 | 45 30 |
| 53 | Montivel A. Burke | Alhambra, Los Angeles County | 447 | 9 | -- | 456 | 912 | 45 60 |
| 54 | Ralph A. Beal | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 55 | Vernon Kilpatrick | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 56 | Ernest E. Debs | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 58 | Frank J. Waters | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 59 | Charles W. Lyon | Beverly Hills, Los Angeles County | 447 | 8 | -- | 455 | 910 | 45 50 |
| 60 | M. Philip Davis | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 61 | Lester A. McMillan | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 62 | Augustus F. Hawkins | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 63 | Don A. Allen | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 64 | John C. Lyons | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 65 | John W. Evans | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |
| 66 | Jack Massion | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 44 70 |

| District | Name | Address | Distance from county seat | Distance from county seat, less | Mileage one way | Total mileage | Amount at 5 cents per mile |
|----------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 67 | Clayton A Dills | Gardena, Los Angeles County | 447 | 11 | 458 | 916 | 45 80 |
| 68 | Vincent Thomas | San Pedro, Los Angeles County | 447 | 23 | 470 | 940 | 47 00 |
| 69 | Ralph C Dills | Compton, Los Angeles County | 447 | 18 | 465 | 930 | 46 50 |
| 70 | Lorne D. Middough | Long Beach, Los Angeles County | 447 | 22 | 469 | 938 | 46 90 |
| 71 | Carl Fletcher | Long Beach, Los Angeles County | 447 | 22 | 469 | 938 | 46 90 |
| 72 | R Fred Price | Upland, San Bernardino County | 508 | -- | 23 485 | 970 | 48 50 |
| 73 | Douglas P. Armstrong | Redlands, San Bernardino County | 508 | 9 | 517 | 1,034 | 51 70 |
| 74 | Clyde A. Watson | Orange, Orange County | 481 | -- | 481 | 962 | 48 10 |
| 75 | Sam L. Collins | Fullerton, Orange County | 481 | -- | 11 470 | 940 | 47 00 |
| 76 | Philip L. Boyd | Palm Springs, Riverside County | 512 | 54 | 566 | 1,132 | 56 60 |
| 77 | George R. Butters | Brawley, Imperial County | 661 | -- | 14 647 | 1,294 | 64 70 |
| 78 | Fred H. Kraft | Ocean Beach, San Diego County | 572 | -- | 573 | 1,146 | 57 30 |
| 79 | Kathryn T. Niehouse | San Diego, San Diego County | 573 | -- | 573 | 1,146 | 57 30 |
| 80 | Charles W. Stream | Chula Vista, San Diego County | 573 | 10 | 583 | 1,166 | 58 30 |

| Name | Address | Distance from county seat | Distance from county seat, less | Mileage one way | Total mileage | Amount at 10 cents per mile |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------------|
| Arthur A. Ohnimus | San Francisco, San Francisco County | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Geraldine B. Hadsell | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | 89 40 |
| Willie Ogg | Sacramento, Sacramento County | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. McCollister asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 5, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEES

The Select Committee appointed to wait upon the Governor reported that it had performed its duties.

The Select Committee appointed to wait upon the Senate reported that it had performed its duties.

COMMITTEE FROM THE SENATE

Senators Biggar, Tenney, and Dilworth appeared before the bar of the Assembly, and announced that the Senate was organized, and ready to proceed with the regular business.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered :

By Mr. Middough :

House Resolution No. 6

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Sergeant-at-Arms or the Chief Clerk be and they are hereby authorized to receipt to the Controller for all warrants for the payment of members, officers, and attaches of the Assembly.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Middough asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 6, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

By Mr. Thurman :

House Resolution No. 7

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That all of those persons who heretofore filed their credentials and were duly recognized as representatives of the publications they represented for the Fifty-sixth (Regular) Session are hereby recognized as the representatives of those publications for this Second Extraordinary Session.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Thurman asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 7, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

By Mr. Maloney :

House Resolution No. 8

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be and he is hereby directed to procure from the State Purchasing Department on requisition, for the use of the Assembly, all necessary stationery and supplies.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Maloney asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 8, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

By Messrs. Waters and Fourt :

House Resolution No. 9

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Controller be and he is hereby directed to draw his warrant upon the Contingent Fund of the Assembly in favor of the Chief Clerk of the Assembly, and the State Treasurer is hereby directed to pay same, in the sum of three thousand nine hundred fifty dollars (\$3,950), said amount being for the purchase of postage stamps to be used by the Members of the Assembly for official mail ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk be and he is hereby directed to purchase postage stamps in such amounts and denominations, not exceeding three thousand nine hundred fifty dollars (\$3,950) in the aggregate, as shall be necessary for the use of the Members of the Assembly for official mail ; and be it further

Resolved, That the amount of stamps requisitioned by any one Member of the Assembly for official mail shall not exceed the sum of fifty dollars (\$50).

Request for Unanimous Consent

Messrs. Waters and Fourt asked for, and were granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 9, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay,

Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—69.
 NOES—None.

By Mr. Sam L. Collins :

House Resolution No. 10

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Controller be and he is hereby authorized and directed to draw his warrant on the Contingent Fund of the Assembly in favor of Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, and the State Treasurer is hereby directed to pay the same, for the sum of two hundred dollars (\$200), said amount being for the payment of postage, telegraphing, expressage, and incidental expenses of the Chief Clerk's office.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 10, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

By Mr. Dickey :

House Resloution No. 11

Relating to the amendment of Section 4232 of the Political Code

WHEREAS, The people of the County of Alameda, a county of the third class, at a special election held in the County of Alameda, State of California, on June 4, 1946, did approve by substantial margins eight separate amendments to the charter of the County of Alameda ; and

WHEREAS, It will be necessary to amend Section 4232 of the Political Code of the State of California to put into effect the mandate of the people of the County of Alameda on Amendment No. 1 ; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendment affects only counties of the third class ; and

WHEREAS, The proposed amendment to Section 4232 of the Political Code is non-controversial ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly of the State of California by this resolution does respectfully request Governor Earl Warren to include in his call for the present special session of the Legislature an item calling for consideration of Section 4232 of the Political Code of the State of California.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Dickey asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 11, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Rosenthal, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Dickey asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the Chief Clerk be instructed to send a copy of House Resolution No. 11 to the Governor with the information that it has been adopted.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS**

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 1: By Messrs. Lyon and Waters
—Relative to Howard Hughes.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Messrs. Lyon and Waters asked for, and were granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 1, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 1—Relative to Howard Hughes.
Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Holli-
baugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion,
McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robert-
son, Rosenthal, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp,
Thurman, Waters, Watson, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—68.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. O'Day asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the following communication be ordered printed in the Journal, and the attached ordinance be referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy :

DISTRICT ATTORNEY, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, July 19, 1946

*Honorable Edward F. O'Day
Member of the Assembly
Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. O'DAY: In accordance with your recent request I am forwarding certain information on problems confronting the City and County of San Francisco following the lapse of Federal Rent Control. I trust these data may be helpful to members of the San Francisco Delegation and your other colleagues in the consideration of temporary rent control legislation at this extraordinary session of the Legislature.

It is my impression that the people of California are deeply disturbed over the crisis that has arisen since expiration of OPA rent regulation. Governor Earl Warren is to be commended for his position that California can not gamble on the outcome of OPA legislation in Congress. I am sure the Members of the Legislature are fully informed on the facts of the rent crisis and will adopt a form of temporary rent control which will stabilize rents at levels fair to everyone, as well as appropriating funds for a rent control enforcement agency.

Our experience in San Francisco after rent stabilization expired is, I believe, typical of the serious emergency confronting other congested metropolitan areas of the State. Many persons telephoned my office complaining of 100 to 300 per cent rent increases and of instances of great hardship due to evictions of veterans, their families,

and other citizens. These new problems accentuated San Francisco's already acute housing shortage.

The Office of District Attorney is especially concerned with these problems because family dislocations are one of the principal causes of juvenile delinquency and postwar increase in crime.

Three steps were immediately taken in San Francisco to meet these new rent problems. The board of supervisors adopted a rent ordinance No. 4188 declaring it is a misdemeanor for anyone receiving or entitled to receive rents to increase said rents in excess of 15 per cent over the ceiling in effect on June 30, 1946. This ordinance is enforced by my office.

Subsequently the board adopted an eviction ordinance, a copy of which is hereto attached.

There was created by me in my office a rent bureau staffed by deputies familiar with housing problems to assist people in the thousands of inquiries made to my office on the subjects of rent and housing.

However, despite considerable success through these measures, rent control appears to be too encompassing a problem to be solved by action on municipal or county levels. For example, industrial workers in San Francisco depend on housing facilities spread over a vast area of Northern California, and residents of our community engage in livelihood activities outside the legal boundaries of San Francisco. Thus rent control becomes a problem of home dislocation, local population pressures, and shifting residence, which is state-wide in its ramifications. Black market rentals will result unless uniform stabilization and enforcement methods are applied.

I therefore urge your honorable body to adopt fair and equitable State rent control statutes.

I or one of my deputies will be glad to assist the Legislature on the matter of our experience with rent control, if requested. If my office can provide you with any other aid, we will be happy to do so.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN, District Attorney
City and County of San Francisco

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered:
By Messrs. Waters and Fourn:

House Resolution No. 12

WHEREAS, There has been published by the State Printing Department a book entitled *The California Legislature* written by Joseph Allan Beek, Secretary of the Senate; and

WHEREAS, This book contains a wealth of information, presented in a manner to be easily understood by the students of our public schools, and facts and comments on our legislative system which have been favorably commented upon by statesmen and educators generally; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby requested to order printed for the use of the Members of the Assembly such number of said books as shall be necessary to supply the demand, all to be paid for from the Legislative Printing Fund.

Resolution read, and referred to Committee on Rules.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE, SACRAMENTO 14, July 22, 1946

*To the Honorable Members of the Assembly
State of California, Sacramento, California*

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the provisions of Section 1774 of the Government Code, which provides that within 10 days after the meeting of the Legislature the Governor must transmit to it a list of all appointments made by him under the provisions of that section, I have the honor to transmit to you herewith a list of all appointments so made since the last session of the Legislature.

Respectfully,

EARL WARREN, Governor

HARRY LUTGENS, a resident of San Rafael, a member of the State Personnel Board prior to entering military service in January, 1943, was reappointed to the State Personnel Board February 27, 1946, vice Ford Chatters, resigned.

N. LOYALL McLAREN, a resident and certified public accountant of San Francisco, was appointed March 18, 1946, as member of the Board of State Harbor Commissioners, vice J. W. Mailliard, Jr., resigned.

HIRAM W. JOHNSON, 3RD, a resident and attorney of San Francisco, was appointed March 27, 1946, to the California Unemployment Insurance Appeals Board and member of the California Employment Stabilization Commission, vice Edgar E. Lampton, resigned.

WILLIAM J. SILVA, a resident of Modesto, prominent in sportsmen's activities in Central California, was appointed March 20, 1946, as member of the Fish and Game Commission, vice Dom Civitello, resigned.

GENERAL H. H. ARNOLD, United States Army, Retired, a resident of Sonoma, was appointed March 20, 1946, as member of the Fish and Game Commission, vice H. L. Ricks, deceased. However, General H. H. Arnold resigned on April 6, 1946, because of a conflict which would arise between his Army status and acceptance of a State appointment. On July 1, 1946, this difficulty having been removed, General H. H. Arnold was again appointed to the same vacancy.

CHARLES SWEENEY, a resident and Fire Chief of Antioch, was appointed April 2, 1946, as member of the State Fire Advisory Board, vice Bart W. Arundel, resigned.

LAWRENCE C. STEVENS, a resident of Long Beach; Public Defender of the City of Long Beach; recently discharged with rank of Lieutenant from United States Navy after more than two years of overseas service; was appointed April 15, 1946, as Chairman and member of Veterans Welfare Board, vice Thomas J. Riordan, resigned.

CAPTAIN C. F. MAY, a resident of San Francisco, President of West Coast Local No. 90 of the International Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America and former Vice President of the California State Federation of Labor, was appointed May 22, 1946, as member of the Board of Pilot Commissioners for the Bays of San Francisco, San Pablo and Suisun, vice Captain Andrew G. Townsend, deceased.

DANIEL JUDSON CALLAGHAN, JR., a resident of Oakland; public relations and sales; recently discharged with the rank of Lieutenant Commander from the United States Navy after three years of overseas service; was appointed May 21, 1946, as member of the California Veterans' Board.

ORIEN W. TODD, a resident of San Diego; businessman; recently discharged with the rank of Captain from the United States Marine Corps after two years of overseas service; was appointed May 21, 1946, as member of the California Veterans Board.

LAURENCE W. CARR, a resident of Redding; former District Attorney of Shasta County; recently discharged with the rank of Lieutenant (J.G.) from the United States Navy after serving on a destroyer in the Pacific Theatre; was appointed May 21, 1946, as member of the California Veterans Board.

EDWARD M. SEACORD, a resident of San Jose; businessman; veteran of World War I; Past Commander of Veterans of Foreign Wars; was appointed May 21, 1946, as member of the California Veterans Board.

LOUIS H. BURKE, a resident of Montebello; attorney practicing in Los Angeles; recently discharged from the United States Army after serving with the First and Ninth Armies in France and Germany; was appointed May 21, 1946, as member of the California Veterans Board.

ERNEST R. ORFIIA, a resident of Los Angeles; attorney practicing in Los Angeles; veteran of World War I; Past Commander of the Hollywood Post, American Legion; was appointed May 21, 1946, as member of the California Veterans Board.

AUSTIN M. HEALEY, a resident of Fresno; businessman; veteran of World War I; first Departmental Commander and past National Committeeman of the Disabled American Veterans; was appointed May 21, 1946, as member of the California Veterans Board.

COLONEL CURTIS D. O'SULLIVAN, a resident of Napa; in command of California National Guard Units which fought in the Aleutians, Marshalls, Kwajalein and Leyte; Captain in the Infantry during World War I; Major in the Reserve, 1923-1929; Lieutenant Colonel in the National Guard, 1929-1939; Colonel and Chief of Staff of the 40th Infantry Division, National Guard, 1939-1940; was appointed April 29, 1946, as Adjutant General of California, vice Victor R. Hansen, resigned.

COMMUNICATIONS

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication and resolution from The Lawyers' Club of Los Angeles, recommending commercial rent control, were received, and

ordered referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy for consideration, afterward to be filed with the Secretary of State.

By Speaker Lyon:

A number of communications relative to rent control and evictions were received, and those pertaining to rent control were referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, and those pertaining to evictions were referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Mrs. Benjamin F. Warmer, President, California Federation of Women's Clubs, relative to full-time Chaplains with clinical training in our State Institutions, was received, and ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

By Speaker Lyon:

A telegram from H. B. Isher, relative to rent control, was received, and ordered referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By the Chief Clerk:

A communication from Virginia Masters of San Francisco, relative to State ceiling on rentals, was received, and ordered referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By the Chief Clerk:

A communication from Jack H. Levin, Covina, relative to rent controls, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By the Chief Clerk:

A communication from "A California Resident" relative to rent control, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By the Chief Clerk:

A communication from Mrs. Beatrice Patton, acknowledging receipt of House Resolution No. 21, Fifty-sixth (First Extraordinary) Session, relative to the death of General George S. Patton, was received, and ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Richard H. Holmes, Santa Monica, relative to legislation on housing, National Traffic Law, antitrust investigation, promotion of small business enterprise, foreign policy in Latin America, and loan to Great Britain, was received, and ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

By the Chief Clerk:

A communication and resolution from Langenbach Post No. 948, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Marysville, relative to living war memorials, were received, and ordered filed with the Committee on Military Affairs.

By the Chief Clerk:

A communication from Stanley Cook of Bendix Local U. A. W.-C. I. O. 179, relative to Section 56A of the Unemployment Insurance Act, was received, and ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

By the Chief Clerk:

A communication from Bill Snideker, relative to beach erosion at Santa Monica, was received, and ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communications were received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

DEAR ARTHUR: Please accept our sincere thanks and appreciation for the beautiful tribute paid to Harry by the Members of the Legislature.

I have distributed the resolutions to my family, and they, like myself, will treasure them always.

It is hard to realize he has left us, but it is a great comfort to me in the knowledge that he left so many kind, true friends.

Sincerely,

RUTH RILEY
(Mrs. Harry B. Riley)

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 19, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Assembly Chamber
State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California*

MY DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: May I thank you for your letter of February 6, 1946, in which you enclose an Assembly Joint Resolution No. 10, which was adopted by the California Legislature on February 1, 1946.

I thank you very much for the copy of this resolution, and deeply appreciate the support of the Legislature of the State of California in the Department of Justice's efforts to combat the rising tide of juvenile delinquency. I am aware that the State of California has done, and is doing, much to solve this very stressing problem.

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK, Attorney General

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 18, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
California Legislature, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Thank you very much for sending me copies of Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 3, 11, 14, and 19

I have studied these resolutions, and you may be sure that I will give my full support to the various objectives outlined.

Sincerely yours,

ELLIS E. PATTERSON

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 18, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: This will acknowledge your letter of February 11th just received enclosing copies of Assembly Joint Resolutions Nos. 3, 11, 14, and 19, memorializing Congress to enact S-1592 (Wagner-Ellender-Taft Housing Bill) as soon as possible; urging the establishment of foreign trade zones at the ports of San Francisco and Los Angeles; memorializing Congress to withhold any action on Bills HR-3604, HR-3605 and HR-3606 and urging the President and the Office of Price Administration to refrain from effecting any amendment to Regulation RMPR-26.

The House Committee on Indian Affairs informs me that it has received unfavorable reports as to HR-3604, HR-3605, and HR-3606 from the Attorney General and from the Budget Bureau, and that action will be withheld on these bills permitting an interested Committee of the California Delegation to investigate the facts fully.

The Office of Price Administration has informed me that they are withholding the issuance of the amendment to Regulation RMPR-26 providing a premium on shipments of Douglas fir pending complete investigation of the matter by the Civilian Production Administration.

Sincerely yours,

LEROY JOHNSON
Member of Congress

NAVY DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 19, 1946

Address reply to Material Division Office of the Assistant Secretary and refer to M250 RZS:emb

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The Secretary of the Navy has referred to me for reply your letter of January 18, 1946, in which you invited attention to an enclosed copy of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, which was adopted by the California Legislature on January 17, 1946.

The Navy Department is in complete sympathy with the urgent needs of the civilian economy for essential building materials, particularly those required to alleviate the critical housing shortage throughout the Nation. We wish to assure you that it is the Navy's policy to reduce its stocks of the types of materials involved to an absolute minimum. In pursuance of this policy, the Navy periodically redetermines its required inventory position in order that it may release to the civilian economy all excess stocks that may result therefrom. To that end, the Navy will probably declare surplus, in the near future, approximately \$46,000,000 of equipment and material which is presently located at Port Hueneme, California. Of this amount, approximately one-half is comprised of building material and equipment, and the remainder comprises miscellaneous commercial and industrial type items. In addition, there is on board in ships at Port Hueneme awaiting unloading, approximately \$15,000,000 worth of material and equipment.

As you know, the Navy has no control over the methods of disposal or sale of such surplus stocks. This is governed by acts of Congress.

You may be assured that the Navy will continue to do all that it can to release additional quantities of essential building materials to the civilian economy. It is hoped that through this means stocks will be made available to at least partially alleviate the present critical situation.

Sincerely yours,

B. MOREELL, Vice Admiral, U.S.N.

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal, and the press release transmitted therewith ordered filed with the Secretary of State:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C., February 20, 1946.

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California State Assembly, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: I have your letter of January 29, 1946, with which you enclosed copy of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5 which was adopted by the California Legislature on January 24, 1946. This resolution refers to RMPR-26, which is similar to all other maximum price regulations as regards the subject referred to and protests against the provision denying a markup to a distribution yard for lumber shipped directly from mill to consumer.

All prices in our maximum price regulations cover direct mill shipments where the lumber is not routed through a distribution yard and it was necessary to provide that no one could sell lumber with a markup in order to avoid over-ceiling sales. When a lumber yard brings a carload of lumber into its yard and unloads same and delivers it they are naturally entitled to a markup on the sale but there is no reason why a lumber yard should receive a markup on a direct mill shipment when such markup was denied to wholesalers, and at the time these price regulations were adopted the wholesaler obtained his commission from the selling mill.

Recently, because of the unprecedented demand for lumber of any kind which has sent buyers into the lumber producing areas who have offered full ceiling price, without wholesale commission, it has been impossible for the wholesaler to secure an adequate supply of lumber.

I am enclosing herewith copy of a press release issued February 8, 1946, notifying the trade that this office will immediately proceed to issue amendments to the various regulations providing a wholesale markup of 5 per cent. These amendments will permit distribution yards to add the 5 per cent on a direct mill shipment to the consumer. However, where the lumber goes through his yard and the distribution yard markup is added he will be able to pass on to the customer only 2 per cent of the wholesale markup.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES, Administrator

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communications were received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON 25, D. C., February 21, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus
Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR SIR: I am taking this means of acknowledging receipt of your recent communication. Before specific information is given you, I would like to obtain the views and opinions of those people in the agency who are most directly concerned with this matter.

If a satisfactory reply does not reach you soon, I would appreciate hearing from you again.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES, Administrator

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 21, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California State Assembly,
Sacramento, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: I have your wire of February 11, 1946, quoting Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19, adopted by the California Legislature February 11, 1946, with reference to the proposed allowance of \$2.50 per thousand feet on intercoastal shipments of Douglas fir.

This allowance of \$2.50 per thousand feet to cover extra costs of loading intercoastal vessels was proposed as a matter of over-all policy in an effort to revive the normal transportation practice.

The matter is being very carefully considered from every aspect, and in order to have sufficient time for this consideration, this action has been withdrawn from an amendment to RMPR 26 which is now in process.

You may rest assured that no precipitate action will be taken in the matter, and whatever decision is finally arrived at will be after mature consideration of all effects it may have geographically or otherwise.

Sincerely yours,

PETER A. STONE
Price Executive, Lumber Branch

NAVY DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C., February 21, 1946

In Reply Refer to Initials and No. Serial 876P21

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Assembly,
Assembly Chamber, State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California.

MY DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Your letters of February 5th to the President and to the Secretary of the Navy, enclosing copies of a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California, have been referred to me for reply. The resolution requests that the *USS Saratoga* be retained as a relic in the San Francisco Bay Area.

In order to obtain information on which to base defenses against the atomic bomb, it is necessary that ships of every type be subjected to the shock of the bomb's explosion. The Navy Department does not believe that it could justify the use for this purpose of ships which are still of value in combat. The *Saratoga* is one of the very few obsolete carriers in the Navy, and there is no other which could be substituted.

The interest of the Legislature of California in the *Saratoga* is greatly appreciated, and it is deeply regretted that the Navy Department can not accede to its wishes.

Sincerely yours,

D. C. RAMSEY
Admiral, U. S. Navy

February 22, 1946

MY DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: I have been quite ill, and so, up to now, I have been unable to write to tell you, the San Francisco Delegation, and all the Members of the Assembly, how deeply I appreciate the magnificent tribute paid to the memory of my beloved husband, Justus S. Wardell. It was, indeed, a great consolation—and the "Assembly Journal" for January 7, 1946, is a keepsake which will be treasured not only by myself, but by my children and grandchildren as well.

My daughter, Virginia, and my son, Benjamin, join in this expression of heartfelt gratitude.

Very sincerely yours,

CLARA LOUISE WARDELL

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, February 25, 1946

MY DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: On behalf of my children and myself permit me to thank you for the beautiful tribute, in the form of resolutions, sent in memory of my husband by the State Assembly.

We shall always cherish the kind thought.

Sincerely,

MRS. HARRY A. HOLLZER

WILSHIRE BOULEVARD TEMPLE
LOS ANGELES 5, CALIFORNIA, February 25, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
Assembly, California Legislature
State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Thanks for mailing us an illuminated copy of House Resolution No. 47 in tribute to Judge Harry A. Hollzer. His family and I appreciate beyond words this beautiful recognition of his service as a great citizen.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

RABBI EDGAR F. MAGNIN

DIXON, CALIFORNIA, February 27, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus
Sacramento, California

MY DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: I received with grateful appreciation the four beautiful copies of the House resolution relative to the passing of Mr. Madden.

It was indeed a beautiful tribute, and my two daughters, my son, and I shall cherish it always as a reminder of the high regard in which our beloved father and husband was held.

My family joins me in heartfelt thanks to the Assembly for its kind thoughtfulness in passing this resolution.

Sincerely yours,

GRACE K. MADDEN

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
 SACRAMENTO, February 27, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR SIR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 18, 1946, enclosing copy of House Resolution No. 102, adopted by the Assembly on February 16, 1946, wherein the Division of Highways is requested to investigate the feasibility and advisability of a direct highway route between San Luis Obispo and the California border near Kingman, Arizona, and to furnish a report to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Highways, Streets, and Bridges, and to each Member of the Legislature through whose district any part of such route would pass, this report to be furnished not later than April 1, 1946.

Although the time limit of April 1, 1946, may not permit of a full and thorough investigation of the location in question, the assignment will be undertaken immediately; and we will report on our findings prior to April 1, 1946.

Yours very truly,

G. T. McCOY
 State Highway Engineer

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
 WASHINGTON, D. C., February 27, 1946

In reply refer to: 6073:30

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California State Assembly, Sacramento, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Your letter of February 12, 1946, addressed to the Honorable Chester Bowles, Administrator, with reference to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19, has been referred to the Lumber Branch for attention.

I wrote you on February 21, 1946, advising that the proposal to make an allowance of \$2.50 per thousand feet on intercoastal shipments had been withdrawn in order to give the matter further study.

Sincerely yours,

PETER A. STONE
 Price Executive, Lumber Branch

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC STABILIZATION
 WASHINGTON, D. C., February 27, 1946

The Honorable Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislative Assembly, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Although I am very glad to acknowledge the Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 20 of the California Legislative Assembly, it is necessary for me to forward this to Mr. Wilson Wyatt, Administrator of the National Housing Authority and National Veterans Housing Expediter.

As you know, Mr. Wyatt has been given the full responsibility by the President for the solution of the current housing emergency and the resolution of the Assembly properly falls within his field.

Sincerely,

CHESTER BOWLES, Director

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal, and the resolution transmitted therewith ordered filed with the Secretary of State:

WASHINGTON STATE COMMISSION ON INTERSTATE COOPERATION
 OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON, February 28, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Clerk of the Assembly
Sacramento, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: In conformity with the provisions of Chapter 195, Session Laws of 1945, of the Washington State Legislature, I am pleased to transmit to you

the provisions of the act which created a Commission on Interstate Cooperation for the State of Washington.

Your Legislature, if it has not already done so, is hereby memorialized to enact a law similar to this measure, thus joining with the State of Washington in the common cause of reducing the burdens which are imposed upon the citizens of every State.

The members of this commission for Washington are Victor A. Meyers, Lieutenant Governor, Chairman; Belle Reeves, Secretary of State; Russell H. Fluent, State Treasurer; Smith Troy, Attorney General; Cliff Yelle, State Auditor; Pearl A. Wana-maker, State Superintendent of Public Instruction; and Otto A. Case, State Land Commissioner. We are most anxious to work with you on any and all projects for the welfare and advancement of our States.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. JOHNS, Executive Secretary

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communications were received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 28, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, California Legislature,
Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: This will acknowledge receipt of House Resolution No. 100, adopted by the Assembly of the State of California on February 16, 1946.

The resolution requests Congress and the Social Security Board to make such changes in the provisions and interpretation of the Social Security Act as will permit recipients of old-age assistance to engage in the production and processing of food without suffering any loss of or disqualification for old-age assistance.

Congress has, in part at least, provided for such a contingency by temporary legislation. Public Law No. 45 of the Seventy-eighth Congress provides as follows:

Notwithstanding provisions of Title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of April, 1943, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from agricultural labor performed by him as an employee, or from labor otherwise performed by him in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities, after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

States may invoke the provisions of this act if they so wish, and California has done so.

Since its original enactment, there have been changes. Public Law No. 67 changed the word "April" to "July." The provisions were continued without change in Public Law No. 229 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. The 1945 Deficiency Appropriation Act, Public Law No. 40 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, amended Public Law No. 45, but made no change in regard to consideration of income or resources arising from agricultural labor.

I call this to your attention because it is pertinent to the problem and the remedy suggested by House Resolution No. 100.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR M. POWELL, Executive Director

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 28, 1946

In Reply Refer to: 6073 30

The Honorable Arthur A. Ohnimus,
Chief Clerk, California State Assembly
Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS. Your letter of February 12, 1946, addressed to The President, Harry S. Truman, with reference to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19, has been referred to the Lumber Branch for attention.

I wrote you on February 21, 1946, advising that the proposal to make an allowance of \$2.50 per thousand feet on intercoastal shipments had been withdrawn in order to give the matter further study.

Sincerely yours,

PETER A. STONE

Price Executive, Lumber Branch

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 28, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1946, enclosing copy of Concurrent Resolution No. 20, passed by the California Legislature on February 19, 1946.

The contents of this resolution have been noted with interest. We suggest that your delegation confer with Mr. Wilson Wyatt, the Housing Expediter.

Sincerely yours,

HANS A. KLAGSBRUNN, Deputy Director

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION
WASHINGTON, D. C., February 28, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The President has asked this office to acknowledge your letter of January 18th, together with the attached joint resolution of the California Legislature calling for measures to effect the immediate release of Government-owned materials suitable for housing construction.

The Administration is conscious of the acute shortage of construction materials throughout the Country, and is taking strong measures along the lines suggested by the joint resolution.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER, Director

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Assembly
Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Reference is made to your letter of February 22d, relative to the adoption of Resolution No. 111 by the Legislature Assembly on February 18th.

This is to advise you that the space occupied by the Office of Defense Transportation in the Western Pacific Building has been cancelled effective as of March 31, 1946.

Very truly yours,

MILDRED G. SIMS
Service Operations Officer

TREASURY DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
Assembly Chamber, State Capitol
Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The receipt is acknowledged, with thanks, of your letter of February 11, 1946, with which you transmitted a copy of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 11, adopted by the California Legislature on February 6, 1946, relative to the establishment of foreign-trade zones in California.

I appreciate being apprised of the views of the California Legislature and assure you that they will be given due consideration should formal application be made for grants to operate foreign-trade zones in your State.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, JR.
Acting Secretary of the Treasury

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 6, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Your letter of January 29, 1946, addressed to President Truman, has been referred to this office for attention. Your communication enclosed copy of "Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5—Relative to the modification of the application of price controls to retailers in the sale of lumber."

The Lumber Branch of this agency has in preparation a price action which will permit retail lumber dealers, when making sales where the shipment originates at a mill, and does not become an integral part of the seller's stock, a margin of profit over the mill price, which is precisely what the resolution suggests. This action will be issued in the relatively near future.

Very truly yours,

W. S. INGRAM, Price Executive
Building Materials and Construction Price Branch

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D. C., March 8, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Sacramento 14, California

MY DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The President has referred to me for consideration and reply a copy of your letter of February 21st, transmitting copies of Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23 and Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 20, adopted by the Assembly of the State of California on February 13th and February 8th, respectively.

Let me assure you that the interest and action of the California Legislature with regard to the housing problem is sincerely appreciated. I would also like to indicate the desire of the National Housing Agency to be of maximum assistance to the California Joint Committee on the Housing Emergency, created pursuant to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 20.

Under Section 2 of the concurrent resolution, the committee is directed to proceed to Washington to consult with the proper Federal officials in order to secure for the special problem of California the degree of special consideration which the magnitude of California's housing problem, occasioned by its great increase in population, clearly requires. In order that the maximum results might be obtained in the shortest possible time, I would suggest that the members of this Joint Committee might find it extremely helpful, prior to coming to Washington, to discuss their problems fully with my Regional Representative, Mr. Preston L. Wright, who is located in the Balboa Building, 593 Market Street, San Francisco 5, California.

Sincerely yours,

WILSON WYATT, Administrator

PORTERVILLE, CALIFORNIA, March 19, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus
Sacramento, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The resolutions came this morning. My children and I sincerely appreciate this beautiful tribute, and I assure you they will be sacredly preserved.

Our sessions in Sacramento were short, and are now only happy memories. From childhood Less' one desire was to serve his State. He was sincere—he enjoyed the work, and he dearly loved his many friends. You were all so very kind and I know the terrible aching in my heart will be shared by all who knew him.

With my heartfelt thanks and all good wishes, I am,

Very truly,

MRS. LESS GUTHRIE

PORTERVILLE, CALIFORNIA, March 26, 1946

Arthur A. Ohnimus
Sacramento, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The several copies of the prayer, delivered by the Chaplain in memory of Mr. Guthrie, came yesterday. It is beautiful, and my children and I do so deeply appreciate all the expressions of love for the one who was nearest and dearest to our hearts.

Less was honest and sincere in all his words and actions—he spent his entire life doing for others, and I know the many kindnesses shown his family would fill his cup of happiness.

Sincerely,

MRS. LESS GUTHRIE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION
MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT BRANCH, WASHINGTON, D. C., March 21, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: This is in reply to your recent letter to the Secretary enclosing copy of the Assembly Joint Resolution No. 22 adopted on February 18, 1946, with regard to shortages of farm machinery and equipment and the channeling of surplus machinery, equipment and housing facilities to farmers.

The present outlook for sufficient supplies of new farm machinery and equipment is the darkest it has been since the early war years. It was anticipated the reconversion period would achieve the liberal output of farm machinery which our food goals demand and that farmers deserve but the industrial difficulties prevalent through the Country have sharply curtailed manufacture of farm machinery; manufacturers are affected by work stoppages in their own plants, and several plants have been forced to close down because of lack of steel resulting from the wage disputes of the steel industry.

Agriculture's position has been presented to the Department of Labor, soliciting that agency's most intensive action in mediating the labor difficulties of farm machinery manufacturers and of their suppliers. The Civilian Production Administration has been urgently requested also to take immediate steps to provide assistance for manufacturers of farm machinery in procurement of materials when normal deliveries are resumed.

The foregoing circumstances make the channeling of war surpluses with agricultural potentialities even more imperative, and we are working closely with the owning and

disposal agencies to this end. Except for crawler tractors, the armed forces bought relatively small quantities of farm machinery and the amount being declared surplus is not significant in terms of farm requirements. Demands for crawler tractors, particularly among Federal, State and local governments which, pursuant to the Surplus Property Act, are entitled to priority in acquiring surplus property, result in the major portion of the available quantity being acquired by such organizations. Veterans are accorded priority in the purchase of surplus equipment, and Department of Agriculture War Food Order 135 establishes veterans' preference in the purchase of new farm machinery.

A considerable amount of farm machinery is being declared surplus at the Guayule Emergency Rubber Project which is being liquidated, and, although the quantity is small in relation to over-all need, negotiations are being carried on with the War Assets Corporation to have the equipment sold to farmers. Strong action has been instituted also in cooperation with the War Assets Corporation and the Civilian Production Administration to divert surplus war supplies of critical materials to farm machinery manufacturers which will augment to some extent supplies reduced by interrupted steel deliveries.

We realize fully the grave consequences which attach to prolonged lack of adequate farm machinery and equipment, and you may be assured our efforts will be continued through every medium at our command to provide assistance for farm machinery manufacturers and to obtain surplus equipment for farmers.

• Sincerely yours,

L. B. TAYLOR, Director

BAKERSFIELD, CALIFORNIA, March 26, 1946

Arthur Ohnimus, Chief Clerk

California Assembly, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: This will acknowledge receipt of copies of the resolution adopted during the recent session of the Legislature concerning the passing of my father, former Senator James I. Wagy.

I assure you that I, as well as the rest of my family, appreciate very much this action on the part of the Legislators.

Very truly yours,

PHILIP M. WAGY

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communications were received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal, and the reports transmitted therewith ordered filed with the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

SACRAMENTO, March 29, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR SIR: Under the terms of House Resolution No. 102 of the First Extraordinary Session of the California Legislature for 1946, the Division of Highways was requested to furnish by not later than April 1, 1946, any information which it might have concerning the route between San Luis Obispo and the California Border near Kingman, Arizona, together with its recommendations and suggestions concerning such route to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Highways, Streets, and Bridges and to each Member of the Legislature through whose district any part of such route would pass.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the resolution, copies of the above report have been mailed to each Member of the Legislature through whose district any part of such route would pass, and a copy to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee.

For your records there is attached hereto a copy of a reconnaissance report relating to the development of a direct State highway route from San Luis Obispo to the California Border near Kingman, Arizona, included in which are our conclusions and recommendations with respect to such a route.

I am very pleased to transmit to you this information

Yours very truly,

G. T. MCCOY

State Highway Engineer

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

SACRAMENTO, March 29, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR SIR: Under the terms of House Resolution No. 96 of the First Extraordinary Session of the California Legislature for 1946, the Division of Highways was requested to furnish, by not later than April 1, 1946, to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Highways, Streets, and Bridges and to the Legislators through whose district any part of the road passes, certain information, together with recommendations and suggestions with regard to a possible highway route between Fresno and Salinas, California, by way of Panoche, San Benito County.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the resolution, copies of the above report have been mailed to each Member of the Legislature through whose district any part of such route would pass and a copy to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee.

For your records there is transmitted herewith copy of a reconnaissance report relating to the development of a direct State highway route from Salinas to Fresno via Panoche in accordance with House Resolution No. 96.

I take pleasure in furnishing you the information requested by the Legislature.

Yours very truly,

G. T. McCOY
State Highway Engineer

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communications were received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA, April 4, 1946

Hon. Arthur A. Ohnimus

Chief Clerk of the Assembly, California Legislature

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: I wish to acknowledge receipt of the engrossed copy of House Resolution No. 82 of the Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Legislature.

May I assure you that I am deeply touched by such a wonderful tribute to a wonderful mother as well as a distinguished educator and woman.

The tribute paid by your august body in the press of public service shall always be treasured in my memory, and the resolution shall remain the most prized of possessions.

Most sincerely yours,

PAUL H. DORSEY

OFFICE OF THE SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS

TOKIO, JAPAN, April 4, 1946

Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk,

Assembly of California, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The sentiment expressed in Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 23 of the California Legislature has moved me deeply. Nowhere could one find greater inspiration to perform the tasks which yet lie ahead than in such an expression of confidence from his fellow Countrymen.

It is my fervent hope that from the victories of the past, to which the people of California in brain, brawn, and blood made so notable a contribution, may emerge a lasting peace among the peoples of the Pacific Basin—an enlightened peace dedicated to the furtherance of international trade, commerce, and good will, with a higher standard of life for all men as the impelling underlying impulse. To such end I know that the people of California, who tend a great gateway between the opportunities of the East and the opportunities of the West, will resolutely extend their leadership.

Please convey to the members of both houses of the Legislature my profound appreciation for their thoughtful courtesy, the memory of which I shall treasure always.

Faithfully yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, April 11, 1946

Arthur A. Ohnimus, Esq., Chief Clerk,

Assembly of the State of California,

Assembly Chamber, State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Your letter of March 28, 1946, addressed to my mother, Mrs. Hiram Johnson, at my San Francisco address, was forwarded by me without opening to her in Washington, D.C., where she has been for the last four months. She has just returned your letter to me for acknowledgement, as she recently met with an accident to her right arm which has prevented her from writing and from giving proper attention to other matters.

She has asked me to write in her behalf, and on my own, expressing our thorough appreciation for the copies of House Resolution No. 25, which was adopted by the State Assembly during the late extraordinary session. The kindly expressions in this resolution and the fact that it came from one of the houses of the California Legislature which was so dear to my father, Senator Johnson, was a source of deepest gratification to us.

The copy of this resolution will always be held by us in the fondest reverence, and we most respectfully request that you convey to the proper officials our deepest thanks and appreciation.

Very truly yours,

HIRAM W. JOHNSON, Jr.

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, April 16, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus
Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: I gratefully acknowledge the receipt of a copy of the resolution, introduced in the Assembly on February 8th by Speaker Lyon, paying tribute and respect to the memory of my aunt, Mrs. Susan M. Dorsey.

Very truly yours,

SUSIE E. MILLER

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION
FIELD SERVICE BRANCH, WASHINGTON 25, D. C., May 6, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk
California Legislature, Assembly, Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The resolution prepared by the California Legislature which was mailed to the White House has been referred to this office for reply.

The interest and recommendations regarding the farm programs which were given in the resolutions are sincerely appreciated.

The amount of grain used in farm production efforts and for other domestic requirements in the past have been unusually heavy. In meeting these demands we have consumed the surplus stocks of grain; therefore, it has become necessary to use feed and grain to the utmost advantage. In addition, the grave needs of starving humanity across the seas present another very important need for grain.

The department is genuinely concerned with the unsatisfied demands of grain requirements here at home and the famine crisis abroad. Grain orders have been issued to aid in the distribution of the available grain supply through channels to provide a fair share for all users.

It is our aim to conduct such grain orders in an orderly, economical and impartial manner to all concerned.

Very truly yours,

LAURENCE VORTON, Director
Western Region Field Service Branch

By Speaker Lyon:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, June 2, 1946

Honorable Charles W. Lyon

DEAR SIR: The beautiful engrossed copy of the House resolution paying tribute to memory of my beloved aunt, Mrs. Susan M. Dorsey, which you introduced in the Assembly on February the 8th, is deeply appreciated and will always be cherished. I shall have it suitably framed and hung where I may find comfort in being reminded of the high regard in which she was held.

Sincerely yours,

SUSIE E. MILLER

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal, and the report transmitted therewith ordered filed with the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
SACRAMENTO, June 15, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR SIR: Under the terms of House Resolution No. 85 of the First Extraordinary Session of the Legislature for 1946, the Division of Highways was requested to investigate the minimum cost of reconstructing State Route 25, between Coalinga and Gilroy, and State Route 33, between Maricopa Junction and Coalinga, to bring the entire route up to the standard of a modern two-lane highway and to report its findings thereon not later than June 30, 1946, to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Highways, Streets and Bridges.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the resolution, a copy of this report has been mailed to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee.

For your records there is transmitted herewith a copy of the Reconnaissance Report Relating to Modernization of the Airline Highway Route, Maricopa Junction to Gilroy, via Coalinga.

I take pleasure in furnishing you the information requested by the Legislature.

Yours very truly,

G. T. MCCOY
State Highway Engineer

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal, and the resolution transmitted therewith ordered filed with the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
SACRAMENTO, June 24, 1946

*Honorable Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
California State Legislature
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

DEAR SIR: House Resolution No. 314 as printed in the Assembly Journal of June 16, 1945, at page 22, which was called to the attention of the California Toll Bridge Authority by your letter of June 28, 1945, has been considered by the authority, and by it referred to the Department of Public Works.

Under the California Toll Bridge Authority Act, Statutes of 1929, Chapter 763, as amended, the authority does not have, and is not concerned with, toll-free bridges. The State Highway Engineer has been requested to make the study and report desired by the Assembly, and work thereon is now under way.

A certified copy of the resolution of the authority is enclosed for the information of the Assembly.

Yours very truly,

C. H. PURCELL
Director of Public Works and
Secretary and Member of the
California Toll Bridge Authority

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

EUREKA, CALIFORNIA, July 4, 1946

*Assembly, California Legislature
Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: Please inform the Assembly of my great appreciation of the honor they have bestowed on my nephew, H. P. Ricks. I am sending a copy of the resolution, I so greatly prize, to my niece, Mrs. Hazel Ricks Murphy.

Sincerely,

MRS. H. P. JACKMAN

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal, and the report transmitted therewith ordered filed with the Secretary of State:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
SACRAMENTO, July 10, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR SIR: Under terms of House Resolution No. 134 of the First Extraordinary Session of the California Legislature for 1946, the Director of the State Department of Public Works was requested to investigate the cost of widening and straightening State Route 37 and its connection, State Route 48 (Black Point Road-Sears Point Cut-Off) to it junction with State Route 29, and report his recommendations and findings to the Joint Legislative Fact-Finding Committee on Highways, Streets, and Bridges, and to the Assembly at its regular session in 1947.

In accordance with the instructions contained in the resolution, a copy of the above report has been mailed to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee.

There is attached hereto for your records a copy of this report.

I take pleasure in furnishing you the information requested by the Legislature.

Very truly yours,

C. H. PURCELL
Director of Public Works

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. Geddes asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the following Report of the Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee be ordered printed in the Journal:

**FINAL REPORT OF THE ASSEMBLY HEALTH CARE
INVESTIGATING INTERIM COMMITTEE**

(House Resolution No. 295)

Letter of Transmittal

ASSEMBLY HEALTH CARE INVESTIGATING INTERIM COMMITTEE, July 1, 1946
*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
California State Legislature,
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The Legislature not being in session I hand you herewith the original copy of the Final Report of the Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee, House Resolution No. 295.

Duplicate copies are being transmitted to the Governor and to the State Printer and a quantity ordered printed at this time for distribution to the public and Members of the Legislature.

The printing is in addition to mimeographed copies of a Preliminary Report, dated June 26, 1946, containing substantially the same material as the Final Report.

It is my understanding that you become the custodian of the present report until the convening of the Fifty-seventh Session of the Legislature or any Extraordinary Session which may intervene.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST R. GEDDES, Chairman
Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HONORABLE CHARLES W. LYON,
Speaker of the Assembly
California State Legislature
Sacramento, California

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee, appointed by you pursuant to House Resolution No. 295 (Regular Session 1945), submits herewith to you and through you to the Governor, the Legislature and to the people of California this report of your committee.

Cut off at an early date because of the peculiar provision in the resolution which requires us to report back on or before July 1, 1946, this report is filed as of this date with the Chief Clerk of the Assembly since the Legislature is not in session.

The major portions of this report have been prepared in mimeographed form as a Preliminary Report dated June 26, 1946, for more immediate distribution to the Governor, the members of the Legislature and interested persons and an order placed with the State Printer to print 1,000 copies of this report for general distribution to the public.

According to our understanding of the somewhat unusual technicalities which confront us in filing a report when the Legislature is in adjournment the printing is in the nature of a "pre-print" of a portion of the complete and final report which the next session or an extraordinary session may order printed and which may, if it is the will of the Legislature, include the many pages of testimony gathered by this committee in its hearings.

Recommendations of the committee are made in the body of this report and individual recommendations of several members. However, it is our unanimous recommendation that the present committee be reconstituted at the beginning of the next regular session and that hearings be held on the factual matter in this report. In the ensuing six months much may be brought to light to supplement the data herein contained.

What is set forth here is the result of study, hard work and dispassionate analysis and we believe that many of the questions in the minds of the Legislators are answered or, at least, the members of the Legislature will now have valid information upon which to determine their future course of action.

Respectfully submitted.

ERNEST R. GEDDES, Chairman

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

Sam L. Collins
James G. Crichton
Ernest E. Debs

John W. Evans
Fred H. Kraft
Vincent Thomas

REPORT OF THE ASSEMBLY HEALTH CARE INVESTIGATING INTERIM COMMITTEE

House Resolution No. 295*

INTRODUCTION

During the fifty-sixth session of the Legislature a number of hearings were held to consider Assembly Bills Nos. 449 and 800 and other bills pertaining to the subject of a State operated plan of prepaid medical care.

However, most of the debate and public interest centered around Assembly Bill No. 449 and Assembly Bill No. 800 both of which provided for a State operated plan financed by compulsory contributions from persons engaged in employment covered by unemployment insurance provisions generally.

The chief point of difference in the two proposed pieces of Legislation was that under Assembly Bill No. 449 the physicians would be paid on a capitation basis while under Assembly Bill No. 800 the physician would be paid on a "fee for service" basis.

Both of these bills failed to become law although proponents of one would have probably accepted the other as a compromise to establish a system of prepaid medical service in California. But all the members of the Assembly were not satisfied that complete and valid answers had been given to many of the most important questions relating to the subject.

Accordingly House Resolution No. 295 was adopted creating the present committee to study the subject at greater length and in greater detail and report back not later than July 1, 1946.

The membership of the committee was not appointed for some weeks following the close of the session and so has been faced with the task of rendering a comprehensive report in a shorter period of time than is generally allotted interim committees.

A study of the text of the Resolution, which is printed in full in the appendix of this report will show that the committee is charged with reporting on a number of subjects all relating to the general subject of means for maintaining and improving the health of the people of the State of California.

Early in its history the members of the committee agreed that the sociological and political arguments already presented before it were but repetitions of arguments for and against compulsory sickness insurance which have been presented many times in many places and by many authorities in the past.

It was also agreed that if a substantial service is to be rendered to the members of the Legislature no great good would obtain from hearings before which repetitious speeches were made but little valid factual information presented.

Accordingly it was determined to make an approach differing materially from those made previously and engage principally in an actuarial

* For text of the Resolution see page 172.

survey of all data obtainable in order to determine; first, the incidence of illness which may be expected to obtain among large groups of the population and; secondly, to endeavor to make a valid estimate of possible costs of rendering medical and hospital service.

Because of their intimate connection most of the other subjects set forth in the Resolution are touched upon and considered in the discussion attending the principal subjects as stated above.

Probably the chief exponent of Prepaid Medical Care is Dr. Nathan Sinai who was witness for the proponents of the proposed Legislation lately before us. In going over some the material left by Dr. Sinai in Sacramento seeming discrepancies were noted and the chairman wrote him as follows:

April 24, 1946

*Dr. Nathan Sinai, Professor of Public Health
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan*

DEAR DR. SINAI: As you are aware this Committee is engaged in making a survey of the various aspects of Health Care of the people of California. In so doing we are endeavoring to ascertain and compile statistical and factual information from all available sources. In the course of your testimony and other work in this State you supplied the office of the Governor with certain estimates in connection with the incidence and costs of medical care. The source of much of that material is stated in the text but there were some other points concerning which we should be very much interested in determining the authority or statistical basis. Should you be able to furnish us with this, your action in doing so will be much appreciated. It will undoubtedly be of great assistance to this committee in the furtherance of its purposes.

Much of the material mentioned above is in the form of letters and transcripts of telephone conversations. We have reviewed them and have, for your convenience in referring to the estimates in question, noted down enough of the leading data to give you an idea of what kind of information we require.

The enclosed list, therefore, is not sent to you in the nature of a questionnaire but rather as memos signifying what we have in mind. In addition to this, any other source material you may like to suggest to us will receive our earnest attention.

With reference to "Estimates Costs of Services under A.B. 800"

- (a) Administrative assumed 6%—How arrived at?
- (b) Hospital based on Blue Cross—The experience of which Blue Cross Plans were included and for what year?
- (c) X-ray and Laboratory—On what is this figure of \$2.00 per person per year based?
- (d) Physician Service of \$15.20—is this basis on National Average?—if so for what year? Is it not based on the amount actually paid to physicians and surgeons?

Re: Letter of April 3, 1945

Sub: Fiscal Aspects of Assembly Bill 800

- (a) "Basic Factors": estimates there will be 22,181,200 services (defined as office and home calls, hospital service, X-rays, and other services and treatments—Study of Dr. Nathan Sinai), per member per year for 4,720,000 eligibles. This is less than 2 services per eligible per year. On what factual data is it based?

To File
From W.T.S.

Sub. beg. 1945
Date 5-7-45

- (a) States that Dr. Sinai estimates Hospital for surgical cases only would cost \$6.00 per person while previous estimates estimated cost of Hospitalization for all causes at \$6.56. What are the sources of the estimate that hospitalization for sickness would be about \$.56 per person per year?
- (b) What are sources of estimate that surgical and obstetrical costs would be, average, \$.650 per person?

Paper headed
re: A.B. 2201

Dr. Sinai 5-8-45

- (a) States surgical cost----- \$7.00
X-ray and Lab.----- \$2.50

On what assumptions are these estimates based?

- (b) Part "3" of following page states inclusion of "anaesthetics, drugs, medicine"—What is the estimated cost of these, and where included in the estimated total of \$17.30?

- (c) Part "5" indicates "pre-natal services to maternity cases." Costs? Where included in \$17.30?
- (d) "Comments by phone"—(4) "Care during and following childbirth"—What is estimated cost and where included in \$17.30?
- (e) Under "Financial Comment" estimate of hospitalization raised to \$7.56, would this affect previous estimates under A.B. 800?

We are indebted to the cooperation of Mr. Sweigert of Governor Warren's office who extended every courtesy to Mr. Virgil M. Griffin, our Actuary, and since these estimates have a direct bearing on those arrived at through our own efforts we are most anxious to have the information requested and thank you sincerely.

Very truly yours,
(Signed)

ERNEST R. GEDDES

To this letter Dr. Sinai replied:

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, May 2, 1946

*Mr. Ernest R. Geddes, Chairman
Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee
1445 Alameda Street, Pomona, California.*

DEAR MR. GEDDES: I have your letter relating to the basic data used in arriving at estimates of services and administrative costs under the legislative proposals submitted last year. I note with pleasure that the Committee has employed an actuary to serve on its technical staff.

In arriving at the estimates a number of sources were utilized, including some unpublished studies of experience in the operation of voluntary plans. The studies included those of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, the Blue Cross experience, certain of the earlier studies made in California, our data from the State of Washington, data from the Social Security Board and the United States Public Health Service, our research program in Ontario, Canada, and some information from other reported experience. The chief task was to take the existing information and adjust it to the conditions that might obtain in California if an organized system of prepayment were developed.

In arriving at estimates of costs one of the chief elements, too often given little attention, is the type of organization and administration under which a system is expected to operate. Of necessity certain assumptions must be made concerning the way a system is to work because these have a distinct bearing on the costs. The assumptions involve the form of physicians, for formula of payment to hospitals, the "paper-work," the process of controls and other factors. In other words, one starts with the concept of organization and administration and works toward the costs. Too often the reverse of this procedure is followed—with some disastrous results.

Since you are approaching the problem with a fresh start and with the services of a technical staff, may I suggest that much would be gained by independent investigation. In this way it would be possible for your Committee to resolve, in its own mind, the enormously differing estimates that were presented to the Assembly in 1945. While my own time is limited, I would be glad to make accessible to a member of your staff our files of information and have him discuss with members of my staff the administrative procedures and their influence on the subjects mentioned in your letter.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed)

NATHAN SINAI

Thus it is seen that at least one authority in the field agrees with this committee that the subject of costs has not generally received the attention it deserves.

In order to conduct its researches the committee engaged Mr. Virgil M. Griffin an actuary of wide experience with commercial insurance companies and lately engaged by a highly respected firm of consulting actuaries on the Pacific Coast.

This work is lengthy, since there is much to discuss. However, not all of the material gathered by the committee is printed but is filed according to provisions of the joint rules with the Legislative Auditor for further use and reference of the Legislature if desired.

It is idle to presume that the subject of prepaid medical care will not again be brought before the Legislature and if such is the case the principal arguments as to need and desirability will again be advanced. Therefore, little of those arguments appear here.

While a majority of the people of this State are against Compulsory Sickness Insurance a substantial majority nevertheless favor a State operated plan in competition to the voluntary plans now in operation. This is borne out by a Survey of Public Opinion conducted for the committee by California Associates in which a representative sample was taken in areas blanketing the entire State. The complete report appears as a Section of this report.

The majority and minority recommendations of the committee are in the final Section of this report together with the observations of individual members.

Only those who have attempted research on the general subject of Health Care know the vast amount of material on hand on the library shelves and in the document files. Much of it is old and most of the newer writings refer to the previous works and in many cases the advocates fail to give complete quotations. However, this committee through its staff, has not hesitated to search this material for any tables or statements which are felt to be of value.

Two publications which are matters of record, having been presented before the former legislative committee and reintroduced before the present committee, are the Argument in Support of Assembly Bill No. 449 by the State C.I.O. Council, Research Department and the work "Financial Aspect of Health Insurance" by Samuel C. May, Bureau of Public Administration, University of California. Both of these refer to major works previously published and where such works are quoted reference is made to the original work rather than the second.

Some evaluation is made of the argument found in already published works but for the most part such publications are listed in the bibliography for the information of those interested.

The members of this committee well knowing the heavy demands on the time of the legislator suffer no delusion that all will read this report in its entirety. Subsequent sections of this report substantiate the statements made in the next section which is a summary of the entire report.

Section 1

SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Sickness strikes among the rich and the poor, rural dwellers and urban dwellers, in California in much the same pattern of frequency as in the rest of the Nation.

2. The insurance carriers and the voluntary plans have demonstrated that by the insurance plan of spreading the risk the cost may be averaged and protection afforded at equitable rates to the insured.

3. There is general satisfaction with insurance and voluntary plans among the subscribers.

4. Many who want Sickness Insurance can not obtain it because of the group provisions.

5. Few in the moderate income groups can afford complete coverage for all members of the family at average premium rates.

6. High rates result in adverse selection against the insurer.

7. Compulsory insurance eliminates lapsations on the part of those who have collected benefits, thus requiring post benefit contributions as well as prebenefit contributions.

8. Compulsory Sickness Insurance can not be provided for three per cent of payroll unless:

(a) Physicians operate on a salary, capitation or reduced fee basis, or

(b) Medical Care is rendered through group practice with facilities provided by the State, and

(c) Hospitals are supported or regulated by the State or new methods of hospitalization as relating to operative and non-operative cases are adopted, or

(d) Indigent sick are still cared for as at present.

9. Facilities in this State are below the level which must obtain if the people are to have adequate care.

10. The State can and should provide facilities so that no person goes without medical care who needs it.

11. The State Department of Health should be given the duty and power to collect data pertaining to the health of the people, the availability of medical care and its effectiveness.

12. Full actuarial studies should be initiated and maintained to measure the incidence of illness among employed persons in the State eligible to collect benefits under the recent Unemployment Compensation Disability Benefits Act, Chapter 81, 1946.

13. Commercial Insurance companies have no proprietary interest in the health of the people.

14. The medical fraternity operates out of its proper sphere when it engages in insurance practice but the non-profit motive if adhered to and the expansion of the service entitled it to license as a means of making medical care more widely available.

15. There is great need for better health education among all the people.

16. While the costs of medical care may be averaged as among persons comprising a group the equalization of costs through proportionate amount of income results in increased total costs to groups in the higher income levels.

17. The argument that Compulsory Sickness Insurance is an exercise of the Police Power of the State is falacious unless the police power be extended to regulate the individual not only in the matters of sanitation and quarantine but to the point of forcing attendance upon the physician and compliance with the physician's orders, thus making the physician an enforcement officer with full powers over the individual in all matters pertaining to the individual's health.

Section 2

HEALTH OF THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

A measurement of the health of the people of this State presupposes; first of all, some unit by which measurement may be made and; secondly, some reportorial device by which all of the departures from normal health may be arranged for comparison and observation. But neither of these exist and the means of surveying a population presently estimated to number more than nine millions of persons are not available to this committee.

Locked in the records of our hospitals and of the practitioners of the healing arts are more or less complete data concerning most of the persons who sought, and obtained, medical treatment. In the records of the various Bureaus of the State Department of Health we have accessible the records of births and deaths, of the number of persons afflicted with communicable diseases and of those affected by epidemics and the daily census of governmental institutions reflects the thousands of persons confined therein for treatment of mental disorders, as well as the diseases and illnesses peculiar to the aged and the sicknesses and accidents which strike among the indigent.

But there are thousands of persons who do not receive the service of the physician either because of inability to secure such services or an unwillingness to do so.

There are thousands of others who in time will add to the case load because today through poverty, ignorance or indifference they are not receiving proper care, shelter or nourishment and thousands of children who will not long survive because of lack of attention which might be afforded them at birth and in the first few years of life.

On the other hand there are thousands of people living because, through the application of medical knowledge by the practitioner and the activities of the State Department of Health, vaccinations, inoculations and immunizations have stamped out, almost to the vanishing point, those diseases which formerly took such deadly toll.

In another section of this report recommendations are made for expansion of the activities of the State Department of Health by which, through the cooperation of the medical fraternity, insurance firms and other interested parties, more accurate measures may be made of that portion of the population requiring medical attention in each locality and in various groups classified as to age, occupation, race and economic status.

There have been numerous previously undertaken projects dealing with the subject of prepaid medical care and the amounts spent by individuals and families for medical care and hospitalization during the periods surveyed. Many works on the subject, however, are frankly arguments in support of either National or State plans to provide medical care by means of compulsory insurance methods.

It is to be expected, and is, indeed the case, that most of these works incorporate, at least by reference, the findings and tabulations of earlier surveys which were made with the expenditure of considerable time and money.

The California C.I.O. Council, Research Department, in its presentation and exhibits in support of Assembly Bill No. 449 during the fifty-sixth session of the Legislature quotes from various of these authorities and has filed with the present committee a copy of the work through its research director Mr. Paul Pinsky.(1)*

As in the C.I.O. presentation many of the authorities quoted are frankly attacking the question from the social viewpoint and stress the lack of medical care obtained or possible to be obtained by families in the lower income groups.

One of the most frequently quoted of the major project reports is that entitled—Medical Care for the American People, Final Report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care. (2)

This volume although furnishing a tabulation showing Medical Services Needed and Received per 1,000 individuals classified according to Families With Specified Income gives no estimate of the morbidity rate or incidence of illness. But this work does state on page 5—"In a nation wide survey of illness and costs of medical service among 9,000 white families, the committee found that there was substantially the same incidence per family or per individual in the various broad income groups." A footnote to the foregoing quotation adds, however, the following, "The incidence of recognized and recorded illnesses in the Committee's study was lowest in the low income groups and highest in the groups with highest income. It is not known to what extent the higher rate in the upper income classes is due to economic and social factor. Data from the U. S. Public Health Service and other sources indicate that when the groups with incomes under \$1,500 or \$2,000 are further subdivided, a definite relation appears between poverty and illness, the lower income groups having more illness and illness of longer duration."

This last contention seems borne out by most of the other statistical matter which has come to the attention of this committee. The State C.I.O. Council in its presentation quotes the publications—Health Insurance for California, Report of the Social Security and Man-power, and Research Departments, California State Chamber of Commerce (3) which in turn quotes the following figures for California taken from the State Relief Administration Study of 1935 showing the rates of disabling sickness by income for 1933.

| <i>Annual Income Class</i> | <i>Disabling Illnesses Per 1,000 Persons in Families in 3-Month Period</i> | |
|----------------------------|--|-----|
| | <i>Year*</i> | |
| Relief ----- | 180 | 720 |
| 0- \$599 ----- | 137 | 558 |
| \$600-1,199 ----- | 127 | 508 |
| 1,200-1,999 ----- | 123 | 492 |
| 2,000-2,999 ----- | 128 | 512 |
| 3,000-Over ----- | 116 | 464 |
| All Incomes ----- | | 542 |

* Yearly incidence estimated at 4 times the three-month figure.

We also show below a tabulation made by Margaret C. Klem, State Relief Administration—"Medical Care and Costs in California Families in Relation to Economic Status, 1937" (Page 174) (5) which we have

* Figures refer to works listed in bibliography.

converted to a per 1,000 person basis to make it comparable to the foregoing table.

| <i>Annual Income Class</i> | <i>Persons Per Thousand Reporting Illness</i> |
|----------------------------|---|
| Relief ----- | 658 |
| 0- \$599 ----- | 681 |
| \$600-1,199 ----- | 668 |
| 1,200-1,999 ----- | 641 |
| 2,000-2,999 ----- | 607 |
| 3,000-Over ----- | 600 |
| | <hr/> 642* |

* Our estimate of over all incidence.

The discrepancy between the over all figures of 542 and 642 respectively may be because of the fact that the illnesses reported in the first survey were classed as disabling or that the second figure shows the results of a wider and more comprehensive survey.

However, the former figure seems valid according to a statement on Page 99 of the work of Klem in collaboration with I. S. Falk and Nathan Sinai: "The Incidence of Illness and the Receipt and Costs of Medical Care Among Representative Family Groups, 1933," (6) which states—"Considered by income, the percentage of persons reporting *no illness* does not depart significantly from the average of 47 per cent except for the persons in families with incomes of \$5,000 and more."

If 47 per cent report *no illness* then 53 per cent or 530 per thousand individuals may be inferred to have reported illness.

The various tables in the report of the Senate Committee to Investigate the High Costs of Medical Care, (7) income divisions, are on a difference basis but we may use the overall figure obtained during a three months survey, multiply by four to convert to a yearly basis and express as persons per thousand reporting illness or needing medical attention.

It should be remembered that the survey made by the Senate Committee covered large groups and included all of the members of all of the families surveyed. The significant figures follow:

| <i>Source</i> | <i>Persons Needing Medical Care Per 1,000 Individuals</i> |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Appendix D. {Table II ----- | 544 |
| {Table III ----- | 552 |

All of the foregoing figures show that if the surveys made were indicative of the experience of the entire population of the State from 500 to 650 individuals in every thousand suffered from illness during the years 1933-1934 and 1935.

Coming now to more recent experience collected by the present committee in analysis of the claim records of various insurance companies and prepaid plans none the less significant because they relate to illnesses occurring to persons insured against the costs for medical care arising out of the illness reported.

Reference is made to the complete tables which appear in this work in the section devoted to the report of the actuary. For purposes of making

ready comparison we give the incidence of illness per 1,000 individuals and name the table from which the information is derived.

| <i>Actuarial Report Page</i> | <i>Table</i> | <i>Experience</i> | <i>Incidence Per 1,000 Insured Individuals</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 17 | 14 | C.P.S. (Med. Rider—2 Visits Deduct.) ----- | 413 |
| 17 | 15 | C.P.S. (Med. Contract—Males) ----- | 456 |
| 17 | 15 | C.P.S. (Med. Contract—Females) ----- | 645 |
| 18 | 16 | C.P.S. (Med. Contract—All Members) ----- | 580 |
| 25 | 24 | H.S.S. of S.F. (All Members) ----- | 637 |

In addition to the above figures and those presented in the foregoing pages it should not be lost sight of that under insured plans there is an incidence of from 120 to 190 cases requiring hospitalization per 1,000 individuals.

In none of the surveys has much attention been paid to that unfortunate segment of our population confined in the various governmental institutions and hospitals for the tubercular, and mentally afflicted.

In the tables immediately following this section will be found the estimated number of persons cared for largely at public expense. Those exclude veteran facilities which are a responsibility of this State and the Federal Government by which provision is made for our sons and daughters whose service to their country entitles them not only to everlasting gratitude but to the best in medical and rehabilitation services that can be afforded.

Those factors affecting availability of medical service which should be discussed as affecting the different groups of our population are treated in a subsequent portion of this report.

**BEDS AND AVERAGE DAILY LOAD IN VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL
HOSPITALS ***

| <i>Name of Hospital</i> | <i>Owner- ship</i> | <i>Beds</i> | <i>Average Daily Census</i> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| Agnew State..... | State | 3,725 | 3,663 |
| Ahwahnee Tri-County T.B..... | Co. | 101 | 90 |
| Riverside County..... | Co. | 355 | 190 |
| Wish-i-ah Sanitarium..... | City | 100 | 90 |
| Placer County..... | Co. | 136 | 92 |
| Kern County General..... | Co. | 575 | 533 |
| Ernest Cowell Memorial..... | City & Co. | 100 | 43 |
| Camarillo State..... | State | 4,500 | 3,900 |
| Colusa County Memorial..... | Co. | 32 | 26 |
| Imperial County Farm..... | Co. | 91 | 85 |
| Sonoma State Home..... | State | 3,492 | 3,325 |
| Humboldt County Sanitarium..... | Co. | 55 | 35 |
| Humboldt County Isolation..... | Co. | 16 | 6 |
| Solano County General..... | Co. | 110 | 95 |
| Fowler Municipal..... | City | 10 | 7 |
| San Joaquin General..... | Co. | 640 | 394 |
| Fresno County General..... | Co. | 550 | 409 |
| Kings County General..... | Co. | 225 | 141 |
| Los Amigos County..... | Co. | 2,844 | 2,391 |
| Hoopa Valley Indian..... | U. S. | 29 | 25 |
| Napa State..... | State | 3,980 | 3,900 |
| Stony Brood Retreat..... | Co. | 102 | 99 |
| Lindsay Municipal..... | City | 23 | 20 |
| Arroyo Del Valle Sanitarium..... | Co. | 276 | 211 |
| Los Angeles County General..... | Co. | 3,394 | 2,621 |
| Los Angeles Co. Jail Hosp..... | Co. | 64 | 54 |
| Los Angeles Juvenile Hall..... | Co. | 121 | 97 |
| Los Angeles Receiving..... | City | 29 | 24 |
| Madera County..... | Co. | 130 | 75 |
| Contra Costa County..... | Co. | 216 | 155 |
| Yuba County..... | Co. | 87 | 61 |
| Merced General..... | Co. | 245 | 183 |
| Stanislaus County..... | Co. | 250 | 187 |
| Brete Harte Sanitarium..... | Co. | 159 | 110 |
| Nevada County..... | Co. | 100 | 82 |
| Newell Community..... | U. S. | 210 | 141 |
| Norwalk State..... | State | 2,465 | 2,344 |
| Highland-Alameda County..... | Co. | 485 | 271 |
| Olive View Sanitarium..... | Co. | 1,045 | 1,000 |
| Orange County..... | Co. | 369 | 254 |
| Palo Alto..... | Co. | 163 | 150 |
| Patton State Hospital..... | State | 3,826 | 3,745 |
| El Dorado County..... | Co. | 60 | 46 |
| Plumas County..... | Co. | 44 | 35 |
| Tehama County..... | Co. | 56 | 48 |
| Shasta County..... | Co. | 54 | 54 |
| Canyon Sanitarium..... | Co. | 87 | 65 |
| Hassler Health Home..... | City | 275 | 200 |
| Olson Prison..... | State | 136 | 51 |
| Sacramento County..... | Co. | 475 | 325 |
| Monterey County..... | Co. | 230 | 162 |
| San Bernardino County Char..... | Co. | 324 | 247 |
| San Diego County General..... | Co. | 762 | 508 |
| Laguna Honda Home..... | City & Co. | 900 | 775 |
| Langley Porter Clinic..... | State | 100 | 30 |
| San Francisco Hospital..... | Co. | 1,366 | 964 |
| University of California..... | State | 279 | 243 |
| Soboba Indian..... | U. S. | 34 | 20 |
| Santa Clara County Hospital..... | Co. | 421 | 344 |
| Santa Clara County Sanitarium..... | Co. | 104 | 100 |
| Fairmont Hospital of Alameda Co..... | Co. | 750 | 725 |
| San Luis Obispo General..... | Co. | 80 | 42 |
| San Luis Obispo T.B. Sanitarium..... | Co. | 44 | 22 |
| Community Hospital of San Mateo..... | Co. | 201 | 101 |
| Neumiller Hospital (San Quentin)..... | State | 203 | 130 |
| Marin County Hospital..... | Co. | 99 | 45 |
| Santa Barbara General..... | Co. | 275 | 182 |
| Santa Cruz County..... | Co. | 163 | 132 |

* Data taken from American Hospital Directory 1945, published by American Hospital Association.

**BEDS AND AVERAGE DAILY LOAD IN VARIOUS GOVERNMENTAL
HOSPITALS—Continued ***

| <i>Name of Hospital</i> | <i>Owner- ship</i> | <i>Beds</i> | <i>Average Daily Census</i> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Sonoma County----- | Co. | 416 | 336 |
| Tuolumne County----- | Co. | 41 | 28 |
| Pacific Colony----- | State | 1,821 | 1,528 |
| Tulare-Kings Counties Joint T.B.----- | Co. | 108 | 107 |
| Stockton State----- | State | 5,679 | 4,732 |
| Mendocino State----- | State | 3,081 | 2,904 |
| Tulare County General----- | Co. | 193 | 44 |
| Vallejo Community----- | Co. | 261 | 50 |
| Ventura County----- | Co. | 328 | 206 |
| Visalia Municipal----- | City | 50 | 30 |
| Weimar Joint Sanitarium----- | Co. | 550 | 484 |
| Lewis Memorial----- | U. S. | 12 | 3 |
| Siskiyou County----- | Co. | 155 | 109 |
| Sutter County----- | Co. | 45 | 26 |
| Total----- | | 55,577 | 47,507 |

* Data taken from American Hospital Directory 1945, published by American Hospital Association.

NOTE: The significance of the daily census (i.e. average beds occupied) is that based on estimated population of 9,000,000 persons, 5.28 out of every thousand persons were each day confined in some sort of an institution provided by City, County, State or Federal Government.

In other words there were 17,340,055 bed days or almost 2 for every man, woman and child of the State.

At an average assumed cost of \$4.00 per day for each patient per day the cost would be \$69,360,220.00 or a yearly per capita cost of \$7.71 for this type of care alone.

Section 3

ADEQUACY OF EXISTING SOURCES TO MAINTAIN AND IMPROVE THE HEALTH OF THE PEOPLE

It may be broadly stated that in many areas facilities exist for health care but to certain of the people they are not available because of economic barriers. In other areas sufficient wealth exists but facilities are lacking.

Included with the report of the Actuary are tables showing distribution of hospital beds and physicians in respect to population.

There is now and there has been an acute shortage of beds in California's non-governmental hospitals.

It may be categorically stated here that if Assembly Bills 449 or 800 had been enacted at the fifty-sixth session of the legislature and the people entitled today to hospitalization because of payment of contributions qualifying them to enter the hospitals the normal incidence of demand would result in a shortage of 18,000 beds.

Now this shortage of hospital beds exists regardless of whether charges for their use are prepaid or not and the chief reason it is not brought more forcibly to our attention is that the governmental hospitals take on the indigent load while the least pressing cases continue to get along without operations and hospital treatment.

Doctors are returning to California practice since the termination of their service in the Armed Forces and there are a number who came to this State during the war. They are with few exceptions exceedingly busy because most of the population is financially able at present to afford their services—but a shortage exists, particularly in those sections outside our metropolitan areas. The table printed below shows the count of members of the professions classified under the healing arts as their names are listed in the current Telephone Directories for 1945-1946 in California.

Such listing, where the practitioner is exposed to being sought out by prospective patients is a better indicator than the professional directories which contain the names of many licensed to practice but not in the field of ordinary availability to the public.

COUNT OF PRACTITIONERS OF HEALING ARTS AS LISTED IN TELEPHONE DIRECTORIES OF VARIOUS AREAS

| DIRECTORY | Chiro- practcrs | Dent- ists | Optic- ians | Optom- etrists | Physicians & Surgeons D.O. | Physicians & Surgeons, M.D. |
|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Alhambra ----- | 39 | 66 | 2 | 20 | 35 | 90 |
| Barstow ----- | - | 1 | - | - | - | 7* |
| Calaveras ----- | 6 | 20 | - | 9 | 3 | 28 |
| Canoga Park ----- | 52 | 49 | 1 | 14 | 33 | 93 |
| Coachella Valley ----- | - | - | - | - | 1 | 7* |
| Colton ----- | 8 | 5 | - | - | 4 | 14 |
| Colusa County ----- | 1 | 4 | - | - | - | 6 |
| Compton ----- | 19 | 19 | - | 5 | 13 | 24 |
| Contra Costa County ----- | 29 | 56 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 73 |
| Corona ----- | 4 | 3 | - | 1 | - | 6 |
| Covina ----- | 9 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 19 |
| Crescent City ----- | 2 | 8 | - | 3 | - | 7 |
| Culver City ----- | 5 | 8 | - | 4 | 4 | 15 |
| Downey ----- | 10 | 9 | - | 4 | 5 | 24 |

* Not otherwise stated

**COUNT OF PRACTITIONERS OF HEALING ARTS AS LISTED IN
TELEPHONE DIRECTORIES OF VARIOUS AREAS—Continued**

| DIRECTORY | Chiro- practcrs | Dent- ists | Optic- ians | Optom- etrists | Physicians & Surgeons, D.O. | Physicians & Surgeons, M.D. |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Elsinore ----- | 4 | 4 | - | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| Fowler ----- | - | 1 | - | 1 | - | 2 |
| Fresno ----- | 30 | 62 | 2 | 25 | 17 | 84 |
| Gilroy ----- | 3 | 2 | - | - | - | 4 |
| Glendale ----- | 62 | 113 | 2 | 25 | 58 | 168 |
| Glenn ----- | 6 | 8 | - | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| Humboldt ----- | 7 | 19 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 22 |
| Huntington Beach ----- | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Imperial County ----- | 6 | 7 | - | 4 | 3 | 19 |
| Inglewood ----- | 23 | 30 | - | 6 | 15 | 56 |
| Kern County ----- | 20 | 32 | - | 11 | 17 | 63 |
| Laguna Beach ----- | 1 | 7 | - | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| Lake Tahoe ----- | - | 1 | - | - | - | 10* |
| Lancaster ----- | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| Lassen ----- | 2 | 8 | - | 2 | - | 10 |
| Lindsay ----- | 1 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 4 |
| Lodi ----- | 7 | 10 | - | 6 | 3 | 16 |
| Lompoc ----- | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 3 |
| Long Beach ----- | 78 | 133 | 6 | 35 | 73 | 336 |
| Los Angeles ----- | 590 | 1,209 | 32 | 333 | 603 | 2,264 |
| Los Gatos ----- | 2 | 5 | - | 1 | - | 5 |
| Manteca ----- | - | 1 | - | - | - | 2 |
| Marin County ----- | 9 | 32 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 37 |
| Midway District ----- | 4 | 3 | - | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| Modesto ----- | 14 | 22 | 1 | 13 | 3 | 42 |
| Monrovia ----- | 6 | 5 | - | 2 | 8 | 17 |
| Montebello ----- | 3 | 3 | - | 1 | 3 | 10 |
| Monterey ----- | 9 | 32 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 53 |
| Napa County ----- | 17 | 45 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 71 |
| Needles ----- | 1 | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Newhall ----- | 2 | 1 | - | - | 1 | 3 |
| Oakland ----- | 138 | 425 | 21 | 83 | 38 | 583 |
| Ontario ----- | 8 | 11 | - | 4 | 5 | 19 |
| Orange County ----- | 42 | 55 | 4 | 20 | 26 | 96 |
| Oxnard ----- | 1 | 6 | - | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| Palm Springs ----- | 8 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 17 |
| Palo Alto ----- | 2 | 31 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 38 |
| Pasadena ----- | 20 | 40 | 11 | 27 | 60 | 207 |
| Pomona ----- | 13 | 26 | - | 8 | 10 | 41 |
| Redlands ----- | 5 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 19 |
| Reedley ----- | 1 | 3 | - | 1 | - | 5 |
| Riverside ----- | 14 | 24 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 40 |
| Sacramento ----- | 36 | 90 | 10 | 28 | 15 | 115 |
| San Bernardino ----- | 24 | 32 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 47 |
| San Diego ----- | 57 | 140 | 34 | 20 | 41 | 267 |
| San Fernando ----- | 3 | 8 | - | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| San Francisco ----- | 19 | 742 | 32 | 116 | 37 | 1,003 |
| San Jose ----- | 44 | 55 | 3 | 21 | 7 | 98 |
| San Luis Obispo ----- | 6 | 14 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 21 |
| San Mateo County ----- | 16 | 58 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 67 |
| San Pedro ----- | 20 | 27 | - | 8 | 5 | 53 |
| Sanger ----- | - | 1 | - | 2 | - | 5 |
| Santa Barbara ----- | 10 | 28 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 62 |
| Santa Clara County ----- | 6 | 22 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 18 |
| Santa Cruz County ----- | 11 | 23 | - | 6 | 7 | 35 |
| Santa Maria ----- | 3 | 5 | - | 3 | 1 | 11 |
| Santa Monica ----- | 25 | 70 | 3 | 15 | 17 | 102 |
| Santa Paula ----- | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| Shasta ----- | 8 | 13 | - | 6 | 4 | 23 |
| Sierra Madre ----- | 2 | 3 | - | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Sonoma ----- | 21 | 47 | - | 11 | 10 | 66 |
| South Bay Area ----- | 8 | 16 | - | 5 | 0 | 22 |
| Stockton ----- | 20 | 42 | - | 16 | 11 | 56 |
| Ventura County ----- | 8 | 5 | - | 5 | 9 | 28 |
| Whittier ----- | 9 | 17 | - | 4 | 10 | 25 |
| Total ----- | 1,722 | 4,152 | 198 | 1,053 | 1,328 | 6,973 |

* Not otherwise stated.

It is stated by Klem that the following pattern of illnesses recurs among the entire population of the United States.

In a Group of 1,000,000 Persons 470,000 each year will suffer no recognized illness.

| | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 320,000 will be sick once ----- | 320,000 illnesses |
| 140,000 will be sick twice ----- | 280,000 illnesses |
| 50,000 will be sick three times ----- | 150,000 illnesses |
| 20,000 will be sick four or more times ----- | 80,000 illnesses |
| <hr/> 530,000 persons will suffer ----- | <hr/> 740,000 illnesses |

If every illness requires at least one doctor call the nine million people of California would require at least 6,660,000 calls a year.

But the experience for 1945 of the San Francisco Health Service for County and Municipal employees shows 7.7 calls per patient per year and on this basis the people of California should have a total of 51,282,000 calls per year if the above incidence and experience holds true. Only an adequate medical force can cope with this case load. In the table below the uneven distribution of doctors and hospital beds is shown.

The fact is that not all of the sick go to the members of the medical profession but are divided among other practitioners of the healing arts. Also many of the sick are not treated, either because of inability to pay, distrust of the professions or reliance on simple home remedies and treatments for at least the most simple ailments.

In 1940 according to Public Health Bulletin No. 292 (9) the following distribution of facilities existed in California.

**DISTRICTS IN CALIFORNIA SHOWING POPULATION HOSPITAL BEDS
PER 1,000 PERSONS AND PHYSICIANS PER 100,000 PERSONS AS OF
YEAR 1940**

| <i>Districts</i> | <i>Population</i> | <i>Beds Per 1,000 Persons</i> | <i>Physicians Per 100,000 Persons</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|
| Fresno ----- | 346,498 | 4.4 | 86 |
| French Camp ----- | 142,761 | 5.4 | 99 |
| Merced ----- | 52,593 | 6.6 | 87 |
| Modesto ----- | 85,753 | 5.1 | 89 |
| <hr/> Total Fresno Region ----- | <hr/> 627,595 | <hr/> 4.9 | <hr/> 90 |
| Los Angeles ----- | 3,121,212 | 3.7 | 177 |
| San Bernardino ----- | 274,257 | 4.7 | 135 |
| San Diego ----- | 349,088 | 3.9 | 194 |
| Santa Barbara ----- | 103,801 | 7.1 | 193 |
| <hr/> Total Los Angeles Region ----- | <hr/> 3,846,358 | <hr/> 3.9 | <hr/> 176 |
| Sacramento ----- | 266,566 | 4.2 | 109 |
| Chico ----- | 81,857 | 1.0 | 109 |
| Red Bluff ----- | 54,664 | 3.3 | 97 |
| Grass Valley ----- | 22,308 | 3.5 | 112 |
| Westwood ----- | 23,192 | 3.5 | 116 |
| <hr/> Total Sacramento Region ----- | <hr/> 448,587 | <hr/> 3.4 | <hr/> 108 |
| San Francisco ----- | 1,412,686 | 5.9 | 222 |
| Eureka ----- | 82,125 | 5.1 | 105 |
| Salinas ----- | 84,424 | 4.9 | 163 |
| San Jose ----- | 220,006 | 6.0 | 181 |
| Santa Rosa ----- | 182,606 | 4.4 | 195 |
| <hr/> Total Bay Region ----- | <hr/> 1,982,847 | <hr/> 5.7 | <hr/> 207 |
| <hr/> Total State ----- | <hr/> 6,907,387 | <hr/> 4.5 | <hr/> 172 |

Note: Adapted from Public Health Bulletin No. 292, U. S. Public Health Service.

For the indigent of this State the Counties and municipalities provide care. At what expense to the taxpayers may be determined by a study of the records. The State C. I. O.¹ gives the following figures for the year 1943.

EXPENDITURES OF COUNTIES FOR THE OPERATION OF COUNTY HOSPITALS, HOMES FOR THE AGED AND CHRONIC CASES, AND TUBERCULAR CARE—CALENDAR YEAR 1943 *

| <i>Counties</i> | <i>Hospital and County Physician</i> | <i>Home for Aged (Chronic Cases)</i> | <i>Tubercular Care</i> |
|-----------------------|--|--|----------------------------|
| Alameda ----- | \$680,214.64 | \$578,038.88 | \$227,269.13 |
| Alpine ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Amador ----- | ----- | 28,527.97 | 13,857.03 |
| Butte ----- | 105,249.64 | ----- | ----- |
| Calaveras ----- | 19,783.43 | ----- | 1,794.01 |
| Colusa ----- | 77,568.01 | ----- | 11,873.47 |
| Contra Costa ----- | 123,230.24 | ----- | 79,746.45 |
| Del Norte ----- | 19,190.00 | ----- | ----- |
| El Dorado ----- | 23,503.87 | ----- | 5,242.78 |
| Fresno ----- | 577,023.69 | 34,700.80 | 129,854.38 |
| Glenn ----- | 31,053.30 | ----- | 4,262.21 |
| Humboldt ----- | 127,071.11 | ----- | 38,389.26 |
| Imperial ----- | 87,049.42 | ----- | 7,465.23 |
| Inyo ----- | ----- | 18,470.87 | ----- |
| Kern ----- | 963,172.49 | ----- | ----- |
| Kings ----- | 215,263.45 | 18,814.98 | 35,602.70 |
| Lake ----- | 9,463.19 | ----- | ----- |
| Lassen ----- | 20,536.53 | ----- | ----- |
| Los Angeles ----- | 6,439,699.96 | 1,426,078.66 | 1,562,299.51 |
| Madera ----- | 62,991.70 | ----- | 10,807.68 |
| Marin ----- | 23,486.48 | 80,864.33 | ----- |
| Mariposa ----- | 8,928.52 | ----- | 100.70 |
| Mendocino ----- | ----- | 28,466.09 | ----- |
| Merced ----- | 223,689.29 | ----- | 40,361.65 |
| Modoc ----- | 34,143.14 | ----- | ----- |
| Mono ----- | 8,284.02 | ----- | ----- |
| Monterey ----- | 265,457.53 | ----- | ----- |
| Napa ----- | 10,442.35 | 21,349.88 | 13,922.68 |
| Nevada ----- | 71,725.66 | ----- | 17,668.68 |
| Orange ----- | 294,262.95 | ----- | ----- |
| Placer ----- | 36,090.49 | ----- | 31,922.68 |
| Plumas ----- | 36,762.99 | ----- | 7,190.74 |
| Riverside ----- | 354,518.10 | ----- | ----- |
| Sacramento ----- | 640,492.08 | 14,433.78 | 207,667.40 |
| San Benito ----- | 8,466.43 | 850.28 | ----- |
| San Bernardino ----- | 388,756.67 | 37,539.46 | ----- |
| San Diego ----- | 816,080.15 | 107,058.51 | 28,865.29 |
| San Francisco ----- | 2,113,762.17 | 364,586.08 | 714,887.46 |
| San Joaquin ----- | 742,927.78 | ----- | 123,157.41 |
| San Luis Obispo ----- | 161,176.59 | ----- | 32,124.86 |
| San Mateo ----- | 260,534.36 | 41,429.54 | 76,648.95 |
| Santa Barbara ----- | 280,426.94 | ----- | ----- |
| Santa Clara ----- | 579,860.47 | 67,069.98 | ----- |
| Santa Cruz ----- | 125,896.46 | ----- | 2,665.55 |
| Shasta ----- | 67,821.09 | ----- | ----- |
| Sierra ----- | 3,325.49 | ----- | 6,391.30 |
| Siskiyou ----- | 151,466.73 | ----- | ----- |
| Solano ----- | 79,208.89 | ----- | 26,786.72 |
| Sonoma ----- | 396,750.56 | ----- | ----- |
| Stanislaus ----- | 263,119.93 | ----- | 62,001.10 |
| Sutter ----- | 47,804.23 | ----- | 9,572.31 |
| Tehama ----- | 43,906.05 | 386.80 | 3,270.20 |
| Trinity ----- | 19,542.96 | ----- | ----- |
| Tulare ----- | 129,653.90 | 40,773.40 | 99,994.96 |
| Tuolumne ----- | 39,634.10 | 9,145.09 | 3,871.27 |
| Ventura ----- | 301,333.62 | ----- | 8,719.28 |
| Yolo ----- | 87,014.31 | ----- | 33,755.72 |
| Yuba ----- | 64,953.98 | ----- | 25,388.67 |
| Totals ----- | \$18,859,372.13 | \$2,918,585.38 | \$3,844,935.03 |

SOURCE: Social Security Board
 * California C. I. O. Council.

That existing sources would be entirely inadequate for maintaining and improving the health of the people of this State under any prepayment plan covering a large proportion of the population is only another way of saying that under existing conditions facilities are inadequate. Increasing the load by extending the right to service only accentuates the shortage.

Those factors which stand in the way of the poor obtaining medical care have been stated time and again. Either the local or State governments must provide the care at public expense, private charities must provide it, the poor must be fitted into a broad scheme or they must go without.

In our modern community they will not long go without medical care, nor have they in the main since, while there may be an antipathy toward County Hospital care and a feeling that it is not the same or of as high a quality as that afforded paying patients in private institutions an appraisal of the services rendered fails to substantiate any such claim.

Section 4

MEANS FOR IMPROVING THE HEALTH OF THE PEOPLE

Since this committee is not a court of competent jurisdiction no judgment is passed upon the efficiency of the medical profession nor is such criticism from laymen felt to be germane to the problem before us.

The Commercial Insurance Companies do not have the proprietary interest in the health of the people that may be held to accrue to the medical practitioner whose practice is based on study and personal investment in time, money and materials to make him competent. Yet Commercial Insurance has filled a need and provided protection where it was not otherwise obtainable. If some companies profit unduly through their entrance into this field their regulation is in the hands of the legislature.

The non-profit plans have been successful in widening the scope of service but only the fact that they are non-profit can give sanction to the fact that insofar as such plans are controlled or operated by members of the medical profession the physicians themselves, as entrepreneurs, enter a field denied the commercial companies on the basis of the position stated above.

The position of the State in entering the field can only be supported on a service basis. The argument is weak that the establishing of prepaid medical service under state administration is an exercise of the police power of the State unless this police power extends to the individual; not only in matters of quarantine and sanitation as well as contributions in support of a system to treat him when he is sick, but also to insist that he not only obtains treatments but complies with the directives of his physician. The physician becomes then police officer of the State with such powers conferred upon him to exercise in addition to the treatment of common ailments, which he now possesses only by mutual agreement between him and his patient in cases of a serious nature.

The question then resolves itself to one of expediency and practicality. Can the State, should the State, must the State enter the insurance field; what ills may follow?

If a substantial portion of the population is now without prepaid medical insurance it must be because:

- (a) It is beyond economic reach, or
- (b) It is not really desired, or
- (c) It is unnecessary because private or public charity provides an acceptable substitute, or
- (d) The people are not educated to the need or desirability of such insurance, or
- (e) It has not been possible for private enterprise to furnish either the service or the insurance widely enough.

If wider coverage under prepaid medical care insurance plans has not obtained because of economic factors which make its price prohibitive to those of low income then we must understand what factors relate to the cost of furnishing the service.

These costs, if they cannot be avoided or lowered by different methods of operation and administration, must obtain as well under a State plan as under private plans.

Whether the costs can be equalized through requiring compulsory contributions calls for careful calculation.

The very figures which can be advanced to show the need for equalization of medical costs are the figures which relate to the costs of providing the service.

If, as is probably the case, one third of the families in this State have yearly income less than \$1,500.00 and one third have income between that amount and \$5,000.00 then these are the families which it is desired to protect.

Approximately two-thirds of the families in the State then suffer approximately two-thirds of the illnesses and require two-thirds of the hospitalization since the incidence of illness is remarkably constant.

Now as to the class in the lower income bracket the persons in it require the same services, but do not get them, or they obtain them free or at reduced rates because of their economic status.

Making an assumption that the incidence of illness is 600 per thousand persons per year and basing the costs of providing medical care at the arbitrary figure (used only for purpose of illustration) of \$10.00 per individual treated we can illustrate the process of distributing costs among the insured as provided by application of the insurance principle.

| <i>Income Group</i> | <i>Number Families</i> | <i>Persons Per Family</i> | <i>Total Persons</i> | <i>Illness Reported</i> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Under \$1,500 ----- | 1,000 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 |
| \$1,500 to \$5,000----- | 1,000 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 |
| | 2,000 | | | |
| Total Demands ----- | | | | 4,080 |
| Per Treatment ----- | | | | \$10.00 |
| Total Medical Cost----- | | | | \$40,800.00 |
| Per Family ----- | | | | 20.00 |
| Per Person ----- | | | | 6.00 |

Expressing the percentage of cost per family according to income per family at different levels we find that while the costs of medical treatment is equalized the cost of obtaining the coverage is not, when family purchasing power is considered.

| <i>Family Income</i> | <i>Medical Care Cost</i> | <i>Percentage of Income</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| \$500----- | \$20.40 | 4.08 |
| 1,000----- | 20.40 | 2.04 |
| 1,500----- | 20.40 | 1.36 |
| 2,000----- | 20.40 | 1.02 |
| 2,500----- | 20.40 | .816 |
| 3,000----- | 20.40 | .68 |
| 3,500----- | 20.40 | .58 |
| 4,000----- | 20.40 | .51 |
| 4,500----- | 20.40 | .45 |
| 5,000----- | 20.40 | .41 |

This illustrates why most of the existing plans do not sell readily to families of low income although to them perhaps the real savings to be effected would rank of highest importance if such families rank just above the class receiving free care.

Again for purposes of illustration let us assume a distribution of a number of families according to income levels on the basis that half receive income of \$1,500 per year or less and the others receive more than that amount to the upper figure of \$5,000.

| <i>Number of Families</i> | <i>Yearly Income</i> | <i>Persons Per Family</i> | <i>Total Persons</i> | <i>Illnesses Reported</i> | <i>Medical Care Cost Per Illnesses*</i> |
|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1,000----- | \$500 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | \$20,400 |
| 3,000----- | 1,000 | 3.4 | 10,200 | 6,120 | 61,200 |
| 3,000----- | 1,500 | 3.4 | 10,200 | 6,120 | 61,200 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| 7,000----- | Low Income | | | | \$142,800 |
| 1,000----- | \$2,000 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | \$20,400 |
| 1,000----- | 2,500 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | 20,400 |
| 1,000----- | 3,000 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | 20,400 |
| 1,000----- | 3,500 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | 20,400 |
| 1,000----- | 4,000 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | 20,400 |
| 1,000----- | 4,500 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | 20,400 |
| 1,000----- | 5,000 | 3.4 | 3,400 | 2,040 | 20,400 |
| <hr/> | | | | | |
| High Income | | | | | \$142,800 |

* Using \$10.00 as an arbitrary figure.

We are now dealing with a larger group in which the subdivisions have been taken in thousands in order to afford easier calculations. The same assumptions are used as to persons per family and incidence of illness as well as average cost of medical care per case.

But it is necessary to visualize what happens if an attempt is made to furnish the care on a basis of percentage of income disregarding the fact that even 1% of income is a significant amount to the family with a \$500 income.

Therefore, we calculate the total income derived from these families in order to determine the amount needed to produce the costs.

Amount needed to provide \$10.00 Medical Care to anticipated beneficiaries based on an expectancy of 600 illnesses per 1,000 persons—\$285,600.00.

| <i>Families</i> | <i>Yearly Income</i> | <i>Total Income</i> | <i>Total for Income Class</i> |
|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1,000----- | \$500 | \$500,000 | |
| 3,000----- | 1,000 | 3,000,000 | |
| 3,000----- | 1,500 | 4,500,000 | |
| <hr/> | | | \$8,000,000 |
| 1,000----- | 2,000 | 2,000,000 | |
| 1,000----- | 2,500 | 2,500,000 | |
| 1,000----- | 3,000 | 3,000,000 | |
| 1,000----- | 3,500 | 3,500,000 | |
| 1,000----- | 4,000 | 4,000,000 | |
| 1,000----- | 4,500 | 4,500,000 | |
| 1,000----- | 5,000 | 5,000,000 | |
| <hr/> | | | \$24,500,000 |
| Total Income ----- | | | \$32,500,000 |

Since there are total costs of \$285,600 and total income of \$32,500,000 the percentage of income necessary in such a group is approximately .878%.

The next table shows the relation between averaged costs and contributions based on percentage of income.

| <i>Family Income</i> | <i>Contribution at .878% of Income</i> | <i>Averaged Family Medical Cost</i> | <i>Saved by Plan</i> | <i>Increase by Plan</i> |
|--------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 500----- | \$4.39 | \$20.40 | \$16.01 | ---- |
| 1,000----- | 8.78 | 20.40 | 11.62 | ---- |
| 1,500----- | 13.17 | 20.40 | 7.23 | ---- |
| 2,000----- | 17.56 | 20.40 | 2.84 | ---- |
| 2,500----- | 21.95 | 20.40 | ---- | \$1.55 |
| 3,000----- | 26.34 | 20.40 | ---- | 5.94 |
| 3,500----- | 30.73 | 20.40 | ---- | 10.23 |
| 4,000----- | 35.12 | 20.40 | ---- | 14.72 |
| 4,500----- | 39.51 | 20.40 | ---- | 19.11 |
| 5,000----- | 43.90 | 20.40 | ---- | 23.50 |

On the basis of the assumptions made, while the family in the lowest income classification may have paid nothing and would contribute \$4.39, nevertheless the reduction from the averaged cost is approximately 75% while the family in the highest bracket makes an increased contribution in excess of 100% of the averaged cost.

Since the actual cost of medical care per individual is at present levels of remuneration to the physician and hospital in excess of the \$6.00 arbitrarily used for purposes of illustration in the foregoing tables and since such a large part of the population falls into classifications below the Annual Family Income Level of even \$4,000 and since incidence of demand may well be higher than that used for purposes of illustration it is easy to understand why proponents of a State Operated System of Prepaid Medical Care advocate:

- (a) A proportionate amount of contributions to be paid by employers.
- (b) A ceiling on annual earnings above which no contributions would be required.
- (c) Allocations by the State to make up deficits.
- (d) Organization of Physicians on a Capitation Basis and encouraging group practice and clinical procedures to reduce the cost of individual treatment and care.

The exact distribution of the population according to families and individuals earning at certain levels, the number of adult and minor dependents making up the families and the ratio of children born to these families are not only imponderables but the very masses which must be surveyed are in a constant state of movement and change.

While some medical care is undoubtedly better than none and means must be discovered to give not only some but adequate care, where such is not now obtained, a deterioration of all or most of medical care now afforded the people is certainly not an end to be desired merely to secure to a certain portion of the population care they do not now enjoy.

In a community as rich as this State people should not die either from want of food or lack of medical care; yet ambition, industry and thrift are to be encouraged in every individual so that he does first of his own volition those things which he should do to provide for himself and family against sickness and want.

But when through no fault of his own he is unable to procure food or medical attention his fellow citizens find it their indispensable duty to relieve his distress.

To this end it is within the scope of this resolution that an alternative proposal be made for the establishing of a State Medical Service, supported by general taxation, which will provide the finest facilities for treatment of injury and disease and provide maternity and pediatric service on a scale designed to bring strong healthy children into the world and to full stature.

Such service should be free as to the individual and a general charge upon all citizens. Because it is free and a different institution than now exists it can be maintained and operated on a different basis from any charity work, clinic or hospital. What competition it affords the medical profession should be healthy competition and conducive to an increase in skill and knowledge.

Those who prefer to be attended by their private physician, maintain the relationship between him and them and pay for his service on the present basis can continue to do so. Those who believe in the new system would be entitled to use it and should do so since it will not vary materially from what must exist in any plan of prepaid medical care that can be afforded under a scale of contributions reasonable to all classes.

What demand might obtain in such facilities can not be forecast with certainty but the higher the demand the greater would be the evidence that a new method of furnishing medical care has been evolved.

I. S. Falk in his book "Security Against Sickness" makes the statements quoted below which seem to this committee to bear on the problem we have been discussing. At page 332 and following we read:

"As we review the needs and the arguments for one form of insurance or another, one point stands out in especially bold relief. The most important single objection to compulsory—and in favor of voluntary—insurance, which was advanced by the Majority of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care and which determined their stand against "required" insurance, may be expressed in this form: *there is no sound justification why the state should compel contribution of funds until there can also be an equivalent guarantee for the adequate performance of service. The hasty establishment of a compulsory plan would mean compulsion of contributions without guarantee of service beyond that which is provided by existing agencies. And this is insufficient ground to justify compulsion.*

"Against this weighty argument must be balanced the following: (a) *At the outset, the compulsory insurance need not call for larger funds than are now being spent in the private purchase of medical care; the objective at first is merely to distribute the burden of costs among groups of individuals and to replace variable and uncertain costs by fixed and certain contributions.*

"(b) The "power of the purse" offers the strongest possible opportunities to press for improvement in the means of furnishing medical care; *a compulsory system could be so organized that economic as well as other incentives are offered to practitioners to stimulate improvement of service.* This, it seems, is an important type of argument for compulsory insurance; while offering a solution for the need to distribute the costs under government control, it simultaneously offers the means of increasing and stabilizing professional income, and of providing incentives to more efficient and more qualified service.

"In following the Majority of the Committee, the ideal would be to recommend voluntary systems of groups payment and utilize all possi-

ble means of encouraging—but not requiring—desirable forms of organized, efficient, group practice of the highest quality. Then, when the organization of medical service has progressed to the point where it is possible to guarantee the quality and sufficiency of service, the voluntary system should be made compulsory. But this is frankly a counsel of perfection. What is to encourage the rapid and effective organization of medical facilities? Certainly there is no ground in recent experience to warrant the view that the desired objective will be reached by waiting upon the experiments now in progress. There is as much likelihood that the swirling current of events will lead to the predominance of exploited contract practice as that it will intrench desirable forms of voluntary insurance. Commitment to a voluntary program holds no promise that it will bring us to that threshold which would warrant the establishment of a compulsory scheme. There is little evidence in experience, at home or abroad, to indicate that compulsory insurance may be expected to evolve out of the successes of voluntary insurance. History is on the other side of the argument.

“The reorganization of medical practice which is badly needed will not come of itself, the product of *laissez faire*. It will come—if at all—only as the fruit of strong and directed labors, the product of compelling forces. Of all the forces which society can muster in a program of medical reformation, the strongest is “the power of the purse.” Thus, the case is inverted. Instead of organizing for the payment of medical costs after having achieved improvement of service, society must organize for payment in order to achieve improvement of service. In our opinion, this conclusion—when taken in conjunction with the strictly economic arguments and with the need for the compulsory principle to give an effective implementation to social insurance—tips the beam of the balance in favor of compulsory, as against voluntary, group payment. It compels us to recognize, however, that *a compulsory scheme must be planned in such a way that it calls for contributions and expenditures proportional to the availability of qualified medical facilities. Beyond certain minimum requirements, compulsion should be used in different degrees, calling for larger contributions in one place and for smaller in another, according to local circumstances with respect to the capacity to pay the costs and to furnish good medical care.*

“Among the essential arguments for compulsory insurance special prominence must be given to the one that voluntary insurance fails to reach the population in need of insurance protection. That voluntary insurance has actually failed in this respect both in foreign countries and in the United States is a matter of record.”

We have italicized portion of the above quotation in order that they may be stated as premises upon which agreement may be reached in order that we may endeavor to find justification either historical or statistical for them or state the position this committee takes in respect to the argument presented.

PREMISE 1. There is no sound justification why the State should compel contribution of funds until there can be an equivalent guarantee for the adequate performance of service.

Comment—Every study made by this committee shows that the facilities for rendering adequate service are not at hand.

This does not mean that the skills of the practitioners are not developed but that a shortage of physical facilities exists which must be relieved before adequate medical care can be obtained under any system—voluntary or compulsory.

Unless the establishing of the facilities is undertaken by the State contemporary with the enactment of a law requiring compulsory sickness insurance the benefits promised can not be furnished.

To undertake to institute a program by areas or to certain classes only is inequitable.

Private enterprise, except under the strongest altruistic motives, is not going to provide facilities which are likely to be expropriated by the State.

PREMISE 2. At the outset, compulsory insurance need not call for larger funds than are now being spent in the private purchase of medical care; the objective at first is merely to distribute the burden of costs among individuals and to replace variable and uncertain costs by fixed and certain contributions.

Comment—It is to be noted that the sense “at first” is twice repeated. No factual information has been advanced in support of the contention that larger funds would not ultimately be required.

It is the opinion of the majority of this committee that after the initiation of a program of compulsory sickness insurance the demand from that portion of the community which has not, heretofore received adequate medical care would be so heavy as to upset previously calculated estimates of cost and result either in curtailment of services or increases in costs or lower payments to practitioners and hospitals.

We have already discussed by means of illustration the differences which may obtain between distribution of costs among groups of individuals and the application of the theory that these averaged cost may be recovered by contributions fixed at a percentage of income or wages.

PREMISE 3. A compulsory system could be so organized that economic as well as other incentives are offered to practitioners to stimulate improvements of service.

Comment—Leisure, fame or fortune—what incentives can be offered the practitioners to stimulate improvement of service?

Medical history abounds with the names of hundreds who have sacrificed not only their own health and fortunes, and their lives as well, to discover in laboratories, fevered swamps, plague spots and festering slums the causes and nature of disease and the treatment by which medicine has conquered disease. Such work goes on for something exists in the souls of such men and women that calls forth that high adventuring the effect of which has caused medicine to advance.

When it is proposed to offer the physician economic security and a guaranteed income either as bait to induce him to conform to a new system of performing his art or as something he can take or get out of the profession only the most credulous can square the proposal with the statement that Compulsory Sickness Insurance will provide doctors with greater income than they now enjoy.

PREMISE 4. A compulsory scheme must be planned in such a way that it calls for contributions and expenditures proportional to the availability of qualified medical facilities. Beyond certain minimum requirements, compulsion should be used in different degrees, calling for larger contributions in one place and for smaller in another, according to local circumstances with respect to the capacity to pay the costs and furnish good medical care.

Comment—Falk was writing probably of a nation-wide scheme. This committee flatly rejects the promise stated above in considering any State plan.

We fail to agree that compulsion should be used in varying degrees.

Local circumstances limiting the capacity to pay the costs and to furnish good medical care force upon the State the obligation of providing the care and the costs are part of the overall costs which must obtain under a State-wide program.

If some communities are to have only the "certain minimum requirements" and others are provided these requirements in full scale then discrimination as between communities would exist which is just as repugnant as that discrimination between persons or classes of the population which it is the intent of proponents of Compulsory Sickness Insurance to eliminate.

PREMISE 5. Among the essential arguments for compulsory insurance special prominence must be given to the one that voluntary insurance fails to reach the population in need of insurance protection.

Comment—This committee agrees with the above statement.

a. For the most part the voluntary plans, except as to individual contracts have failed to reach into rural areas or urban areas at distance from larger centers of population. This is particularly true of those plans affording the advantages of clinical group practice.

b. Costs of voluntary plans and insurance studied are such that protection to all the members of the worker's family becomes a severe financial strain.

Summing up the above: the majority of the committee agree that there is a conflict not only of opinions and interests but also that there are fundamental objections to compulsory insurance, not on the grounds that a large portion of the population does not require more and better medical care but that compulsory insurance will not necessarily provide it without introducing new problems and, perhaps, creating evils of no mean magnitude.

Section 5

HOSPITAL COSTS

Although the report of the actuary of this committee takes into consideration the costs of hospitalization as derived from experience in plans in operation it is felt that the subject should be investigated from the standpoint of the hospitals. Accordingly this committee through an independent investigator has accumulated data from the operating statements of representative California hospitals.

Statistics from twenty hospitals were obtained. Fifteen of the hospitals, five in Southern California and ten in Northern California, were found to have kept records on a comparable basis and their combined experience is recorded in the accompanying tables. We also include a table showing the break-down of charges of the Los Angeles County General Hospitals.

The first table shows the percentage increase or decrease in various items of expense in the years 1940 and 1944.

FIFTEEN CALIFORNIA HOSPITALS COMPARATIVE STATISTICS
1940 AND 1944

| | 1940 | 1944 | Percentage Increase or Decrease * |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Net Operating Revenue----- | \$7,669,371 | \$12,809,555 | 67 |
| Operating Expenses: Pay Roll----- | 4,208,829 | 7,589,983 | 80 |
| Supplies ----- | 2,766,062 | 3,871,474 | 40 |
| Total Expenses ----- | \$7,849,328 | \$12,411,396 | 58 |
| Admissions ----- | 86,468 | 111,181 | 29 |
| Patient Days ----- | 852,638 | 1,051,844 | 23 |
| Average Length of Stay----- | 9.7 | 9.2 | 5 * |
| Average Cost per Patient Day----- | \$9.21 | \$11.80 | 28 |
| Average Cost per Patient----- | \$96.44 | \$108.56 | 13 |

Most significant in the above table is the increase in cost indicating a mounting trend which must lead to a higher charge on the patient or curtailment of personnel if it continues.

Patient days or "load" increased 23% while overall expenses increased 58%. Pay roll increased 80% and cost of supplies 40%. As a result the daily patient cost increased from \$9.21 to \$11.80.

The cost per patient, however, increased by only 13%, reflecting a decrease in the average length of stay.

FIFTEEN CALIFORNIA HOSPITALS REVENUES AND EXPENSES

| Year | 1940 | 1942 | 1944 |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Gross Operating Revenue----- | \$8,394,222 | \$10,595,171 | \$13,497,792 |
| Deductions from Income----- | 724,851 | 688,280 | 688,237 |
| Net Operating Revenue----- | \$7,669,371 | \$9,906,891 | \$12,809,555 |
| Operating Expenses ----- | 7,849,328 | 9,859,395 | 12,411,396 |
| Results of Operations----- | (\$179,957) | \$47,496 | \$398,159 |
| 1. Normal Bed Occupancy ----- | 2,529 | 2,751 | 2,868 |
| 2. Number of Admissions ----- | 86,468 | 103,200 | 111,181 |
| 3. Patient Days ----- | 852,638 | 975,914 | 1,051,844 |
| 4. Average Length of Stay----- | 9.7 | ----- | 9.2 |
| 5. Average Cost per Day----- | \$9.21 | ----- | \$11.80 |
| 6. Average Cost per Patient----- | \$96.44 | ----- | \$108.56 |

FIVE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA HOSPITALS—DETAIL

| <i>Year</i> | <i>1940</i> | <i>1942</i> | <i>1944</i> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gross Operating Revenue----- | \$3,490,359 | \$4,648,096 | \$5,930,527 |
| Less: | | | |
| 1. Charity Allowance ----- | 61,114 | 75,981 | 88,472 |
| 2. Bad Debts ----- | 50,362 | 51,587 | 40,880 |
| 3. Allowance to Professional and Employees ----- | 27,653 | 19,885 | 46,348 |
| 4. Other ----- | 2,256 | 8,596 | 13,158 |
| Total Deduction from Income | \$141,285 | \$156,049 | \$188,858 |
| Net Operating Revenue----- | \$3,349,074 | \$4,492,047 | \$5,741,669 |
| Operating Expense: | | | |
| 1. Pay roll ----- | 1,817,091 | 2,616,011 | 3,403,958 |
| 2. Taxes and Interest----- | 178,954 | 170,930 | 141,855 |
| 3. Depreciation ----- | 233,929 | 226,345 | 218,337 |
| 4. Food, Supplies and Other Expenses | 1,027,156 | 1,341,606 | 1,622,758 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | |
| 1. Debt Retirement ----- | \$127,501 | \$161,980 | \$89,881 |
| 2. New Equipment ----- | 42,872 | 39,756 | 40,938 |
| 3. Renovation and Rehabilitation---- | 3,515 | 582 | 87,024 |
| 4. Other ----- | 3,681 | 5,358 | 6,029 |
| Total Operating Expenses----- | \$3,434,690 | \$4,562,568 | \$5,660,780 |
| Result of Operations | | | |
| 1. Normal Bed Occupancy----- | 1,222 | 1,328 | 1,330 |
| 2. Number of Admissions----- | 38,856 | 44,697 | 48,226 |
| 3. Patient Days ----- | 375,828 | 425,767 | 460,186 |
| 4. Average Length of Stay, Days----- | 9.5 | ----- | 9.3 |
| 5. Average Cost per Day----- | \$9.14 | ----- | \$12.30 |
| 6. Average Cost per Patient----- | \$86.83 | ----- | \$114.39 |

TEN NORTHERN CALIFORNIA HOSPITALS—DETAIL

| <i>Year</i> | <i>1940</i> | <i>1942</i> | <i>1944</i> |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Gross Operating Revenue ----- | \$4,903,863 | \$3,947,075 | \$7,567,265 |
| Less: | | | |
| 1. Charity Allowance ----- | 188,627 | 134,725 | 132,854 |
| 2. Bad Debts ----- | 65,605 | 73,440 | 84,047 |
| 3. Allowance to Professional and Employees ----- | 33,697 | 32,730 | 39,837 |
| 4. Other ----- | 2,295,637 | 291,336 | 242,641 |
| Total Deductions from Income | \$583,566 | \$532,231 | \$499,379 |
| Net Operating Revenue----- | \$4,320,297 | \$5,414,844 | \$7,067,866 |
| Operating Expense: | | | |
| 1. Pay roll ----- | \$2,391,738 | \$2,983,272 | \$4,186,025 |
| 2. Taxes and Interest----- | 77,289 | 90,637 | 102,448 |
| 3. Depreciation ----- | 206,696 | 225,297 | 283,427 |
| 4. Food, Supplies, and Other Expenses | 1,738,906 | 1,997,621 | 2,198,716 |
| Capital Expenditures | | | |
| 1. Debt Retirement ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| 2. New Equipment ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| 3. Renovation and Rehabilitation---- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| 4. Other ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Total Operating Expenses---- | \$4,414,629 | \$5,296,827 | \$6,750,616 |
| Result of Operations----- | (94,332) | 118,017 | 317,270 |
| 1. Normal Bed Occupancy----- | 1,307 | 1,423 | 1,538 |
| 2. Number of Admissions----- | 47,612 | 58,503 | 62,956 |
| 3. Patient Days ----- | 476,810 | 550,147 | 591,658 |
| 4. Average Length of Stay, Days----- | 10.0 | ----- | 9.1 |
| 5. Average Cost per Day----- | \$9.26 | ----- | \$11.41 |
| 6. Average Cost per Patient----- | \$92.60 | ----- | \$103.83 |

The table showing how charges are distributed between various departments of the Los Angeles County General Hospital is on two pages, the second being a continuation to the right of the first page.

The first column of costs on the first page refers to "Ward Service" and the intervening columns to the last two on the following page show distribution of charges (i.e. costs) for other services going to make up the total charge.

Note the proposed increase in the 1945-46 schedule over 1944-45 showing that in this institution also there are mounting costs attending the care of the sick. It should be stated that although the word "charges" is used this is bookkeeping parlance and does not mean that the patient pays the bill.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY GENERAL HOSPITAL

Analysis of Proposed Inpatient Schedule of Charges for Fiscal Year 1945-46

| <i>Inpatient:</i> | <i>Ward Service</i> | <i>Educa- tional</i> | <i>Labora- tory</i> | <i>Dental</i> | <i>X-Ray</i> | <i>Radium</i> | <i>X-Ray Therapy</i> |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Admitting Ward ----- | \$4.64 | \$.2159 | \$.2025 | \$.0081 | \$.0009 | ---- | ---- |
| Burns and Plastic ----- | 5.29 | .2159 | .2025 | .0050 | .0055 | ---- | \$.0077 |
| Communicable Diseases ----- | 9.68 | .2159 | .2025 | .0004 | .0327 | ---- | ---- |
| Diabetic ----- | 5.54 | .2159 | .2025 | .0134 | .0517 | ---- | .0017 |
| Ear, Nose and Throat ----- | 5.45 | .2159 | .2025 | .2350 | .3021 | ---- | .0346 |
| Empyema ----- | 4.98 | .2159 | .2025 | .0069 | .1374 | ---- | ---- |
| Eye ----- | 4.59 | .2159 | .2025 | .0186 | .0777 | ---- | .0026 |
| Genito-Urinary ----- | 4.38 | .2159 | .2025 | .0015 | .2564 | ---- | .0058 |
| Gynecology ----- | 4.95 | .2159 | .2025 | .0022 | .0221 | ---- | .0012 |
| Jail ----- | 6.48 | .2159 | .2025 | .0592 | .2485 | ---- | .0082 |
| Medical ----- | 4.42 | .2159 | .2025 | .0054 | .1052 | ---- | .0038 |
| Neuro-Medical ----- | 4.24 | .2159 | .2025 | .0020 | .1116 | ---- | .0002 |
| Neuro-Surgical ----- | 5.12 | .2159 | .2025 | .0196 | .7530 | ---- | .0020 |
| Obstetrical: | | | | | | | |
| Mother Only ----- | 6.62 | .2159 | .2025 | .0010 | .0549 | ---- | ---- |
| Infant-Nursery ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ---- | ---- |
| O.B. Infected ----- | 5.17 | .2159 | .2025 | .0037 | .0310 | ---- | ---- |
| Orthopedic ----- | 4.49 | .2159 | .2025 | .0038 | .2708 | ---- | .0037 |
| Pediatrics ----- | 4.57 | .2159 | .2025 | .0007 | .0769 | ---- | ---- |
| Placement (Infirmary) ----- | 5.02 | .2159 | .2025 | ----- | .0091 | ---- | .0057 |
| Pneumonia ----- | 5.02 | .2159 | .2025 | .0030 | .0915 | ---- | .0016 |
| Psychopathic ----- | 8.37 | .2159 | .2025 | .0018 | .0311 | ---- | ---- |
| Rectal ----- | 4.66 | .2159 | .2025 | .0059 | .2995 | ---- | ---- |
| Skin and Malaria ----- | 4.04 | .2159 | .2025 | .0061 | .0311 | ---- | .0022 |
| Surgical ----- | 5.32 | .2159 | .2025 | .0009 | .0969 | ---- | .0103 |
| Tuberculosis ----- | 4.16 | .2159 | .2025 | .0088 | .0176 | ---- | .0006 |
| Tumor (Malignancy-Radiology) ----- | 4.22 | .2159 | .2025 | .0054 | .0178 | \$.6073 | .3452 |
| Venereal Disease ----- | 3.36 | .2159 | .2025 | .0243 | .0164 | ---- | ---- |
| Overall | | | | | | | |
| Obstetrical (alternate method): | | | | | | | |
| Mother Only | | | | | | | |
| Infant-Nursery | | | | | | | |

Note: It is suggested that the "Admitting Ward" take the "Medical" rate and the "O. B. Infected" take the "Gynecology" rate since mothers on the O. B. Infected are charged as a matter of policy at the "Obstetrical" rate.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY GENERAL HOSPITAL—Continued
Analysis of Proposed Inpatient Schedule of Charges for Fiscal Year 1945-46

| <i>Inpatient:</i> | <i>Ambu- lance</i> | <i>Mortuary</i> | <i>Transfusion</i> | <i>Surgeries</i> | <i>*Extraneous</i> | <i>Proposed Schedule 1945-46</i> | <i>Schedule of Charges Eff. 8-1-44</i> |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| Admitting Ward ----- | \$.5181 | \$.0019 | ----- | ----- | \$.4940 | \$6.09 | \$5.66 |
| Burns and Plastic ----- | .0219 | .0213 | \$.0785 | \$.3137 | .4488 | 6.61 | 6.06 |
| Communicable Diseases ----- | .0760 | .0339 | .0052 | .1570 | .6607 | 11.07 | 10.50 |
| Diabetic ----- | .0569 | ----- | .0115 | .2297 | .4456 | 6.77 | 6.30 |
| Ear, Nose and Throat ----- | .0959 | .0127 | .0098 | .7834 | .5329 | 7.88 | 6.48 |
| Empyema ----- | .0507 | .0190 | .0731 | .5515 | .4835 | 6.72 | 6.21 |
| Eye ----- | .0379 | .0036 | .0009 | .9515 | .5003 | 6.61 | 5.88 |
| Genito-Urinary ----- | .0642 | .0365 | .0308 | 1.0244 | .5288 | 6.75 | 5.81 |
| Gynecology ----- | .0826 | .0126 | .0883 | 1.1090 | .5248 | 7.22 | 6.84 |
| Jail ----- | .0065 | .0190 | .0025 | .0175 | .3397 | 7.71 | 8.29 |
| Medical ----- | .1374 | .0995 | .0207 | .0705 | .4585 | 5.74 | 5.20 |
| Neuro-Medical ----- | .1222 | .0976 | .0190 | .1227 | .4603 | 5.60 | 6.44 |
| Neuro-Surgical ----- | .1783 | .0484 | .0336 | 3756 | .5314 | 7.48 | 6.58 |
| Obstetrical: | | | | | | | |
| Mother Only ----- | .0602 | .0612 | .0438 | 4.0785 | .7607 | 12.10 | 11.08 |
| Infant-Nursery ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| O.B. Infected ----- | .1221 | ----- | .1266 | 1.7999 | .5866 | 8.26 | 7.22 |
| Orthopedic ----- | .1092 | .0126 | .0220 | 1.1122 | .5413 | 6.99 | 6.33 |
| Pediatrics ----- | .0114 | .0246 | .0290 | .0371 | .4283 | 5.60 | 5.78 |
| Placement (Infirmary) ----- | .0395 | .0053 | ----- | .0186 | .4218 | 4.10 | 4.06 |
| Pneumonia ----- | .1595 | ----- | .0132 | .0254 | .4469 | 6.18 | 5.77 |
| Psychopathic ----- | .1611 | .1221 | ----- | .3445 | .5815 | 9.93 | 9.10 |
| Rectal ----- | .0715 | .0147 | .0285 | .9830 | .5287 | 7.01 | 6.88 |
| Skin and Malaria ----- | .0333 | .0087 | .0029 | .0844 | .4287 | 5.06 | 4.72 |
| Surgical ----- | .0679 | .0344 | .0922 | 1.3960 | .5535 | 7.99 | 7.44 |
| Tuberculosis ----- | .0096 | .0189 | .0002 | .0160 | .2681 | 4.92 | 4.53 |
| Tumor (Malignancy-Radiology) ----- | .0674 | .0400 | .0120 | .4540 | .5388 | 6.73 | 6.50 |
| Venereal Disease ----- | .0287 | ----- | ----- | .7295 | .4794 | 5.06 | 3.99 |
| Overall | | | | | | \$6.64 | \$6.31 |
| Obstetrical (alternate method): | | | | | | | |
| Mother Only | | | | | | \$7.95 | \$7.66 |
| Infant-Nursery | | | | | | \$3.97 | \$3.83 |

Note: It is suggested that the "admitting ward" take the "medical" rate and the "O. B. Infected" take the "Gynecology" rate since mothers on the O. B. Infected are charged as a matter of policy at the "Obstetrical" rate.

* Extraneous column covers depreciation, compensation insurance, interest on bonded indebtedness, public liability and property damage.

Section 6

COSTS OF PROVIDING HEALTH CARE

THE REPORT OF THE ACTUARY OF THE COMMITTEE

In reading the following report which represents the major portion of the work performed by the actuary of this committee it must be remembered that a few columns of figures on a single page may often reflect weeks of accumulating and tabulating data, its analysis and evaluation.

Also that it is founded upon the actual experience of firms and organizations providing that amount of protection afforded the public or groups of employees through the voluntary plans and commercial insurance in force today.

Previous attempts to determine the amount of money spent by the families in California or in the United States have been based either on surveys in which a sample, small or large, has been taken and the average assumed to apply to the entire population or all the reported expense or costs of institutions or practitioners added together and divided by the number of the population to obtain an average cost.

The fact of the matter is that under any proposed plan it must first be determined what services will be offered. From the data here presented valid estimates may be made with the exception of those items pertaining to maternity and obstetrical care and minute segregation of particular ailments.

It must be remembered that the costs vary as among the various plans and a final figure must be taken based on these costs and modified according to prevailing rates then existing if such calculations are made in the future at a date very far removed from today.

While much of the matter in the appendices to the actuarial report may seem lengthy it is included because it demonstrates how difficult it is to compare one form of coverage with another.

Another thing that should be kept in mind is the fact that in the presentation by Samuel C. May in the study "Financial Aspects of Health Insurance" which was furnished the Legislature at the fifty-sixth session the distinct impression was given that the San Francisco Plan furnished a working formula of cost and experience which might be applied state-wide to the employed population.

No attention was called to the fact that this plan does not include obstetrical care or hospitalization in maternity cases for dependent members and that there are restrictions in the contract for minor dependents which exclude operations for adenoids and tonsilectomies.

REPORT

TO THE

ASSEMBLY HEALTH CARE INVESTIGATING INTERIM
COMMITTEE, HON. ERNEST R. GEDDES, CHAIRMAN

By

VIRGIL M. GRIFFIN, *Actuary*

INTRODUCTION

The Purpose of this report is the study and discussion of the following:

- A. Incidence of Illness: The extent of Health Care Requirements.
- B. Facilities: Kind and amount required to meet the Health Care Demand.
- C. Cost: The Financial Requirements of Health Care.

These elements are interdependent and each must be considered in relation to the others. A large part of the discussion is based on the recent experience of the various sources described. In any such actual experience the three elements are in a certain state of balance. If a change occur in any one, a corresponding but not precisely predictable change will be brought about in the other two.

Most of the factual data presented is drawn from experience during 1943 and 1944, a period in which there were extraordinary social and economic conditions. There was full employment at high wages with exceptional income derived from overtime, great demand, and high prices; the population was increasing, while the number of practicing physicians was decreasing; and there was an abatement in the normal increase of medical care facilities. The over all effect as reflected by the experience under discussion would be difficult to evaluate. However, in general, the increase in ability to pay for medical services would have effected an increase in the demand for them as is indicated by any study of relative amounts spent for medical care by income groups, while the existing shortage of physicians and the inadequacy of medical care facilities would have tended to decrease the recorded incidence of demand.

The sources of the experience studied, may be grouped into four general types of "Plan."

Type I, so designated for convenience of reference, may be described as noncontractual individual service. The patient usually makes a separate arrangement with physician, clinic or hospital for service, and is personally obligated for the fees and charges. Questionnaires were sent out to a number of physicians practicing in California, and their answers with respect to incidence, facilities and cost recorded.

Type II may be called "Insured Plans" being offered by insurance companies. They undertake to assume in advance a specified amount of the obligation of the patient to the physician or hospital. In theory, and usually, they do not undertake to pay all the expenses of health care but such stipulated amounts of it as the premium paid justifies. Very often, however, the amounts allowed under the contract represent full payment.

In practice the coverage varies greatly. It is often tailored to fit the desire of the applicant and a premium charged accordingly. It may cover hospitalization only with widely differing limits such as \$3.00 to \$10.00 per hospital day and with few or many expressed restrictions such as noncoverage of obstetrics, tonsillitis, hernia and the like. It may represent very liberal coverage such as physicians fees for calls, after the first three for disease, and all for accident, \$6.00 or more per day for each day of hospitalization with limits of from 30 to 90 days, payment or surgical fees limited according to a stipulated "Schedule of Operations" with maximum of \$150.00 to \$225.00 and in some cases, indemnity

for loss of time due to accident or disease. The contracts may be entered into with individuals or with groups. From a standpoint of a discussion of adequate or near adequate medical care, the group coverage is by far the more important. Two such California groups are described herein, and their experience, as far as possible from the data available, presented. It should be pointed out that in the administration of insured groups little or no attempt is made to control medical, surgical, or hospital fees, and service is contracted for by the individual practically as in Type I.

Type III and IV are prepaid medical care plans, and differ mainly in their methods of operation. Type III undertakes to pay fees and charges for medical, surgical and hospital benefits as stipulated by contract. It differs from all insured plans in two major respects. First, it undertakes to pay all medical expenses except as limited and restricted by contract. Second, it enters into agreements with physicians, surgeons, and perhaps hospitals, with respect to their fees and charges, and exercises more or less control as to the kind and amount of service rendered. The experience for certain periods of two such plans is included herein, that of the California Physicians Service, and that of Health Service System of San Francisco. In the payment of physicians' and surgeons' fees, both of these organizations employ the point schedule system, and may be kept solvent by a variation in the monetary value of a unit service. In a sense, therefore, the impaneled physicians underwrite the financial structure of the plan.

Type IV is similar to Type III in the scope of service rendered. It differs from Type III in that the doctors are employees of the organization. They receive salaries and perhaps other remuneration depending on the financial success of the plan. Its methods of operation lends itself more readily to close control and immediate supervision than any of the other types. Some extracts from the experience of two of these plans are included here: the Roos-Loos Medical Group, and Permanente Foundation Hospitals. Permanente operates its own hospital. Roos-Loos, like all the other plans mentioned, relies upon general hospitals for service.

An analysis of the methods of operation of these types, discloses that they differ as to management, control, and scope of service. Since, with few exceptions, they are commercial or are dependent on volume, some expense is incurred in an effort to gain membership. The acquisition expense may vary from nothing up to 50 or more percentum of revenue, and is the largest single factor in the variation of administration expense. From a standpoint of incidence of demand for service and the cost of the service extended, the kind and degree of control is far the most important. Where little or no control is exercised in the doctor patient relationship relative to fees or amount and kind of service, the incidence and total cost of medical care is apt to amount to unpredictable heights. Insurance companies find it necessary to reserve the right to increase rates, decrease benefits, or to cancel the service contracts. The wide difference in cost exhibited by the studies presented under the general heading of "Insured Groups" will illustrate this, but not so strikingly as would studies of some groups no longer insured. In Type I, the control is exercised by the pocket book of the individual. Many studies have

been made of the cost of medical care by income groups and these show a graduated expense of from about \$12.00 to over \$100.00 per annum per individual. Type II, Insured Groups, are controlled by the contractual limit of the amount of benefits that will be paid for each medical service.

In Types III and IV control is exercised by a medical director who supervises the administration of medical care in accordance with contractual provisions and in questionable cases, in accordance with the policy of operation of the plan. In some instances there is supervision of the doctors in their administration of health care and their use of facilities in doing so, and indirectly, therefore, control of the amount and kind of service to the patient. Type I and II lacking any kind of control over the patient are, as a rule not subject to his complaint of inadequacy of service, but under Type III and IV, if the patient feels his health is being adversely affected, he may complain of the service to the "plan," which usually has machinery set up for the adjudication of complaints.

"Control" as used here refers to the regulation and administration of health care within the contractual obligations of the "plan." With the exception of Type I, no individual plan now operating offers complete health care. All specify by contract exclusions and limitations as to the kind and amount of service that will be given. Some exclusions are common to almost all prepaid or insured plans, such as treatment of accident or disease covered by workmen's compensation. Others, such as treatment of preexisting conditions may or may not be stipulated. Limitations are by no means standardized. Insured plans exhibit a wide variety of limitations and their values are generally reflected in the premium charged. Prepaid plans usually find it necessary to impose limits such as: number of hospital days per illness or per year; length of time a single illness will be treated; number of doctors' calls per month.

Exclusions and limitations function as financial differentials. If the cost of benefits exceeds revenue, some kinds of service may be excluded or limited; if a surplus develops, the service can be liberalized. Most insured and prepaid plans are consequently in a state of change or projected change with respect to the kind and amount of service rendered.

Such flexibility is highly desirable. Experience has shown that the cost of health care can only approximately be predicted. As has been stated, it varies greatly in different groups. It is affected by the general economic conditions of the times. It may vary in different localities and also as has been mentioned, it is a function of the availability of facilities. Although some plans have been in operation for a number of years, prepaid medicine may be said to be in its infancy, and undoubtedly will continue to evolve as do other institutions.

From a statistical standpoint these differences in kind and amount of services given, as well as their state of constant change, add to the difficulty of interpreting and evaluating such experience as has been recorded and is available. Since the services of no two of the sources of experience are identical in degree and scope, no comparison of incidence or cost can be properly made without adjustment. In this report the practice has been followed of setting down the experience just as recorded. An attempt has then been made to analyze it into its common

factors, by means of which it can be readily compared. For this purpose it has been found necessary to employ certain assumptions. These are fully noted in the text, but the following perhaps requires special explanation.

In the discussion of Class IV plans, a device has been used in an attempt to analyze the values of individual treatments. It consists of applying the point credit schedules of C.P.S. or H.S.S. of S.F. (they being generally commensurate) to the various services recorded in the experience of the plans studied. The purpose of this is to find the relative value of a particular service to other services in the same plan, and relative incidence under different conditions. The results obtained can be assigned a dollar value *only conditionally*. The device will be found useful, however, in estimating probable cost under defined conditions.

TYPE I, PRIVATE PRACTICE

A questionnaire containing 14 parts (see form of questionnaire) was sent to 1,600 practicing physicians throughout California. The first 11 questions relate to incidence and cost, and questions 12, 13 and 14 relate to facilities. About 310 replies were received and tabulated. The results as to incidence and cost are shown in the accompanying tables 1 and 2. The results regarding facilities are shown in Table 45.

The names and addresses of the physicians were taken from the "Board of Medical Examiners, Directory, 1945." In localities where there were very few practicing physicians, questionnaires were sent to all of them. In more densely populated areas such as Los Angeles and San Francisco counties, a questionnaire was sent to every fifth physician listed.

| For Committee Use | | |
|-------------------|------|------|
| Rec'd. : | | |
| Code | Tab. | Area |
| | | |

California State Legislature
Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee
Data Survey—Physicians and Surgeons

Name-----Address-----

| | Men | Women | Infants under Age 3 | Children Age 3-18 |
|--|-----|-------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Estimated average number of patients per week seen and treated by you----- | | | | |
| 2. Estimated average number of first office calls per week. (New patients or 1 time calls) ----- | | | | |
| 3. Estimated average number of follow-up office calls per week----- | | | | |
| 4. Estimated average number of complete exams per week----- | | | | |
| 5. Estimated average number of home calls per week -----City ----- | | | | |
| Rural | | | | |

6. What is your normal fee for an office call?
 (a) First call \$-----
 (b) Follow-up call \$-----
 (c) Complete physical examination including only blood count and urinalysis
 \$-----
7. What is your normal fee for a home call?
 (a) City \$-----
 (b) Rural \$-----

8. Remarks: _____

9. If you are a specialist, in what field?_____

10. Do you maintain a private office?

| Yes | No | Clinic | Public Bldg. | Medico Bldg. | Home | Share with other |
|-----|----|--------|--------------|--------------|------|------------------|
|-----|----|--------|--------------|--------------|------|------------------|

(a) Number of assistants -----

11. What percent of your office income is derived from office surgery and treatment involving special equipment? -----%

12. In your opinion are there sufficient hospital facilities in your district? _____|_____

Yes No

13. When physicians now in service have returned to practice, do you anticipate there will be a sufficient number in your district? -----|-----
Yes No

14. Do you believe there is an inadequacy of medical facilities of any kind in your territory? In what respect? _____

Remarks: _____

Table 1

| | Average Number | | Per Doctor | Per Year | |
|--|----------------|-------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| | Men | Women | Children Under age 3 | Children Age 3-18 | Total |
| 1. First Office Calls (Without complete examination) ----- | 134 | 94 | 0 | 49 | 277 |
| 2. First Office Calls (With complete examination) ----- | 295 | 377 | 123 | 125 | 920 |
| 3. Follow up Office Calls ----- | 1,040 | 1,452 | 255 | 349 | 3,096 |
| 4. Total ----- | 1,469 | 1,925 | 378 | 523 | 4,293 |
| 5. Percentage of Total ----- | 34.2 | 44.8 | 8.8 | 12.2 | ---- |

Table 2

| | |
|---|--------|
| 1. Average number of calls per doctor per year | |
| —Office ----- | 4,293 |
| —Residence, City ----- | 705 |
| —Residence, Country ----- | 80 |
| —Total Calls ----- | 5,078 |
| 3. Average number of office assistants ----- | .6 |
| 4. Average fee for Medical Examination ----- | \$9.05 |
| 5. Average fee for first office call ----- | \$4.77 |
| 6. Average fee for follow up office call ----- | \$3.16 |
| 7. Average fee for residence call | |
| —City ----- | \$4.72 |
| —Country ----- | \$5.00 |
| 8. Percentage of Income derived from office surgery and use of special office equipment ----- | 29.5 |

INSURED GROUPS

GROUP 1—BANK OF AMERICA

The period studied was Feb. 1, 1943 to Feb. 1, 1945. During that time there was an average membership of 7,345 employees, approximately half of whom were female, 2,382 dependent adults, almost all female, and 1,420 families of children. Dependent wives were admitted only up to the age 45 and dependent children between the ages of 3 and 20 inclusive.

There were no benefits for maternity, pregnancy, miscarriage, insanity of a dependent, accidents or illness covered by Workmen's Compensation, dental service except removal of impacted wisdom teeth. See Exhibit A.

The experience had been kept by individual cases in a claims register. The following information was available separately for male employees, female employees, male dependents, female dependents, male children and female children.

(a) Days in Hospital

(b) Surgical cost (as per schedule)

(c) Special Hospital Service Cost, the limit for dependents and the full cost for employees

(d) Miscellaneous benefits cost.

Table 3 below exhibits the experience compiled from the claim register. The exact number of children was not known and the experience is for families of children. All adult dependents may be classed as female, there being very few adult male dependents. The surgical schedule of operations for dependents was defined in the Plan to be two thirds of schedule of operations for employees. The surgical cost for employees appearing in the claim register has been taken to be the full cost. This is not precisely correct for undoubtedly there were instances of a greater cost for an operation than the amount of reimbursement according to the schedule. However, the schedule is a very liberal one and may be

thought of as closely approximating reasonable standard surgical fees. It is probable that the amounts provided by the schedule were accepted as full payment in most cases.

The amount allowed employees for Special Hospital Service (\$150.00) is also quite liberal, and costs shown in the register may be taken as the full cost. The amount provided for dependents is comparatively limited and has not been included in the present study.

With respect to employed members the table exhibits a rather complete representation of the actual cost. A table of hospitalization incidence and duration based on the experience of this group has been prepared and included in another section of this report.

If an average cost per day of bedside care be determined or assumed, and used to extend the experience as indicated in the table, the result will be found useful in arriving at comparative cost. Provisionally, \$7.00 per day for adults and \$7.65 for children, derived from the experience of C.P.S. during 1945, See Table (19), may be considered representative bedside care costs. Applying these figures to the number of hospital days, line (4) of the table, we may extend Table 3 as shown in Table 4.

Table 3
Male Employees Female Employees Adult Dependents (Selected) Families of Children (Selected) Total Employees

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. Life Years ----- | 7,345 | 7,345 | 4,764 | 2,840 | 14,690 |
| 2. Cases of Illness ----- | 966 | 1,130 | 380 | 513 | 2,146 |
| 3. Cases of Hospitalized ----- | 427 | 690 | 251 | 295 | 1,117 |
| 4. Hospital Days ----- | 3,741 | 5,673 | 2,648 | 1,221 | 9,414 |
| 5. Average Stay, Days ----- | 8.76 | 8.22 | 10.55 | 4.14 | 8.43 |
| 6. Average Hosp. Days Per Member Per Year ----- | .509 | .772 | .556 | .430 | .641 |
| 7. Cost—Special Hosp. Service ----- | \$21,796 | \$28,057 | ---- | ---- | \$49,853 |
| 8. Cost—S.H.S. Per Case ----- | \$51.05 | \$40.06 | ---- | ---- | \$44.63 |
| 9. Cost—S.H.S. Per Member Per Year ----- | \$2.97 | \$3.82 | ---- | ---- | \$3.39 |
| 10. Surgical Cases ----- | 593 | 811 | 233 | 392 | 1,401 |
| 11. Surgical Fees ----- | \$32,604 | \$55,757 | \$15,533 | \$13,197 | \$88,361 |
| 12. Average Surgical Cost per Case ----- | \$54.98 | \$68.75 | \$66.66 | \$33.67 | \$62.94 |
| 13. Average Surgical Cost Per Member Per Year ----- | \$4.44 | \$7.59 | ---- | ---- | \$6.01 |
| 14. Average Misc. Cost Per Member Per Year ----- | \$.14 | \$.14 | \$.14 | \$.14 | \$.14 |

Table 4
Male Employees Female Employees Adult Dependents Families of Children Total Employees

| | | | | | |
|---|----------|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| 15. Cost of Bedside Care ----- | \$26,187 | \$39,711 | \$18,536 | \$9,341 | \$65,898 |
| 16. Average Cost Bed Side Care Per Member Per Year ----- | \$3.57 | \$5.41 | \$3.89 | \$3.29 | \$4.49 |
| 17. Cost—Per Member Per Year equals (9) plus (13) plus (14) plus (16) ----- | \$11.12 | \$16.96 | ---- | ---- | \$14.03 |

GROUP 2—ADEL PRECISION PRODUCTS CORPORATION

The period studied was from September 1, 1943 to September 1, 1944. During that time there was an average membership of 2,266 employed persons, of whom about 40% were female.

There were certain hospital and surgical benefits of a limited nature for maternity. The cost of these has been eliminated in the figures given in the accompanying Table 5. The table exhibits the experience as derived from a claim register similar to the one described in connection with Group 1.

The results may be compared with those in the corresponding table of Group 1. In comparing surgical costs, allowance should be made for the fact, that, in Group 1, the schedule of operations was more liberal than that of Group 2. The surgical costs in the Group 2 table are undoubtedly appreciably more below the actual costs than are the surgical costs shown in the Group 1 table. The cost of "Special Hospital Benefits" in Group 2 is not known.

In order readily to extend the comparison to the costs of "Hospital Bed Care," the same assumption of a daily cost of \$7.00 has been made for Group 2 as was made for Group 1, and Table 6 prepared showing results. Table 7 exhibits the experience in the two groups as far as comparable. For this purpose, since the cost of "Special Hospital Service" is not recorded in the experience of Group 2, the average cost of these services was assumed to be the same per case as that of Group 1.

Table 7 indicates that, after suitable allowance be made for additional surgical costs in Group 2, the cost of hospital and surgical care in Group 2 is appreciably higher than that of Group 1, and that the cost for women (exclusive of maternity) is very much greater than for men.

Attention is particularly directed to the incidence of Hospitalization in Group 2. The average hospital days per year is almost twice the "expected" as indicated for a 30-day limit in section "Duration of Hospitalization," Table E.

Hereafter, this group will be referred to as Group 2 of Type 2 plans.

Table 5

| | <i>Male Employees</i> | <i>Female Employees</i> | <i>Total Employees</i> |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Life Years Experience----- | 1,360 | 906 | 2,266 |
| 2. Cases Hospitalized ----- | 122 | 123 | 245 |
| 3. Hospital Days ----- | 947 | 1,316 | 2,263 |
| 4. Average Stay ----- | 7.76 | 10.70 | 9.24 |
| 5. Average Hospital Days per Member per Year----- | .696 | 1.452 | .999 |
| 6. Surgical Cases ----- | 161 | 197 | 358 |
| 7. Surgical Cost ----- | \$6,272 | \$10,831 | \$17,103 |
| 8. Average Surgical Cost per Case--- | \$38.96 | \$54.98 | \$47.77 |
| 9. Average Surgical Cost per Member | \$4.61 | \$11.95 | \$7.55 |

Table 6

| | | | |
|---|------------|------------|-------------|
| 10. Bedside Care—Cost ----- | \$6,629.00 | \$9,212.00 | \$15,841.00 |
| 11. Bedside Care—Per Member per year ----- | \$4.88 | \$10.17 | \$6.99 |

Table 7

| | <i>Employed Members</i> | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|
| | <i>Group 1</i> | | | <i>Group 2</i> | | |
| | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> | <i>Total</i> |
| 1. Average Stay in Hospital —Days ----- | 8.76 | 8.22 | 8.43 | 7.76 | 10.70 | 9.24 |
| 2. Average Hospital Days per Member per Year--- | .509 | .772 | .641 | .696 | 1.452 | .999 |
| 3. Average Hospital Cost per Member per Year--- | \$6.44 | \$9.23 | \$7.88 | \$10.18 | \$16.58 | \$12.39 |
| 4. Surgical "Cost" per Case | \$54.98 | \$66.66 | \$62.94 | \$38.96 | \$54.98 | \$47.77 |
| 5. Surgical "Cost" per Mem- ber per Year----- | \$4.44 | \$7.59 | \$6.01 | \$4.61 | \$11.95 | \$7.55 |
| 6. Cost of Hospital and Surgical per Member per Year ----- | \$10.88 | \$16.82 | \$13.89 | \$14.79 | \$28.53 | \$19.94 |

CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS SERVICE

Through the courtesy of the California Medical Association and the officers of C.P.S., a very thorough breakdown of the Experience of California Physicians Service has been made available. Exhibit C contains excerpts from the various contracts offered sufficient to indicate the scope of its services. In the fall of 1943 a review was made of the incidence and cost of service under the present contract, and the results reported to the trustees. In part, the report states as follows:

"Attached hereto are tables setting forth claim experience during the months of June, July and August, 1943. These months are the first in which conversion from full coverage was complete with respect to all members and all groups.

During the period reviewed, all beneficiary members held the surgical contract or the two visit deductible medical rider, and there were also approximately 2,000 C.P.S. hospitalization contracts in force.

C.P.S. membership dues permit analysis of experience by surgical treatments separate from medical treatments. All members have the basic surgical coverage, and in addition some have the two visit deductible medical coverage as a rider, for which additional membership dues are charged. The contracts in force have been separated into three general classes—namely, surgical, two visit deductible and C.P.S. hospitalization. All surgical treatments have been charged against the income from surgical contracts; all medical treatments have been charged against the income from the two visit deductible medical rider; and all hospital care costs have been charged against the income from C.P.S. hospitalization contracts.

These tables do not take into account administrative costs or reserves, but are based on the general principle that the costs of services rendered should not exceed 75 per cent of the gross income. Administrative costs may vary with changing conditions, and for the purposes of comparison of experience in one period against another, the use of the claims ratio expression eliminates the effects of fluctuating administrative costs.

In analyzing this experience it is well to first consider the composition of C.P.S. membership. The proportion of women among members has increased considerably in the past two years. In 1941 the distribution was approximately 55 per cent women and 45 per cent men. At present there are approximately 70 per cent women and 30 per cent men. This may be wholly or partly the result of the actual change in proportions of men and women in general employment throughout California, but it also confirms the wisdom of setting a differential rates for women members.

There are interesting variations within this general average. In the so-called "large groups" holding surgical contracts, nearly as many contracts are held by men employees as by women employees. In the so-called "small group" surgical contracts, the ratio is one man to two women. Among those carrying surgical contracts on an individual basis after leaving employment, the ratio is one man to more than three women.

Probably because the two visit deductible rider is active in the older groups, the distribution of men and women holding medical riders is a little more favorable—approximately 60 per cent women

and 40 per cent men. However, among those members on individual status who hold medical riders, the proportion is one man to almost four women.

The tables follow a general pattern, setting forth in Column 1 the type of contract—that is, whether it is a man employee, woman employee, two-person contract or three or more person contract.

Column 2 sets forth the number of contracts that are active.

Column 3 sets forth the average cost of services rendered, per contract per month, based upon the average expenditure for the three months. In calculating this cost per contract, the number of units of service rendered has been multiplied by the par value of \$2.50 and the expenditures on a dollar basis for X-ray, laboratories added thereto. These costs are representative of what the expenditure would have been were C.P.S. in a position to compensate doctors' services at the \$2.50 unit value."

Table 8 below sets forth the results pertinent to this study:

Table 8
California Physicians Service
Experience During June, July and August, 1943
All Contracts

| Type of Contract | Surgical Contracts | | Med Riders Two Visit Ded | | Hospitalization | | Total Average Cost |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| | Number of Contracts | Average cost per Contract per Month | Number of Contracts | Average cost per Contract per Month | Number of Contracts | Average cost per Contract per Month | |
| Male Employees ----- | 8,812 | .5279 | 11,229 | .5201 | 330 | .5403 | 1.5883 |
| Women Employees ----- | 17,370 | .8809 | 16,949 | .8805 | 1,182 | .5847 | 2.3461 |
| Employee and One Dependent ----- | 4,333 | 1.3929 | ---- | --- | 226 | .5853 | 1.9782 |
| Employee and Two or More Dependents ---- | 4,079 | 2.5075 | ---- | --- | 299 | 1.1808 | 3.6883 |

Table 9
California Physicians Service
Experience Under Full Coverage Contracts, All Visits Covered

| Year | Month | Members | Total Visits | Visits per 1,000 Members |
|--|-----------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1940 | March ----- | 9,322 | 4,210 | 452 |
| | April ----- | 10,868 | --- | --- |
| | May ----- | 11,949 | 5,664 | 474 |
| | June ----- | 14,065 | 5,430 | 386 |
| | July ----- | 15,608 | 5,654 | 362 |
| | August ----- | 16,650 | --- | --- |
| | September ----- | 17,398 | --- | --- |
| | October ----- | 18,561 | 9,104 | 491 |
| | November ----- | 19,990 | 9,792 | 490 |
| | December ----- | 20,993 | 12,603 | 600 |
| 1941 | January ----- | 21,936 | 12,327 | 562 |
| | February ----- | 22,948 | 12,163 | 530 |
| | March ----- | 24,107 | 14,497 | 602 |
| | April ----- | 24,500 | 13,584 | 553 |
| | May ----- | 27,057 | 13,394 | 495 |
| | June ----- | 27,632 | 13,763 | 498 |
| | July ----- | 28,518 | 13,137 | 460 |
| Total ----- | | | | 6,955 |
| Average Visits per Month per Member----- | | | | .4968 |
| Average Visits per Member per Year----- | | | | 5.96 |

Table 10

| | | <i>Incidence of Illness %</i> | <i>Medical Units per Member</i> | <i>Surgical Units per Member</i> | <i>X-ray and Laboratory Units per Member</i> |
|------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1940 | May ----- | 16.4 | .60 | .15 | .17 |
| | June ----- | 14.2 | .48 | .13 | .13 |
| | July ----- | 14.2 | .46 | .11 | .16 |
| | August ----- | 14.8 | -- | -- | -- |
| | September ----- | 16.9 | -- | -- | -- |
| | October ----- | 17.2 | .61 | .11 | .11 |
| | November ----- | 17.5 | .62 | .13 | .10 |
| | December ----- | 20.4 | .81 | .11 | .10 |
| | January ----- | 19.8 | .75 | .14 | .05 |
| | February ----- | 18.7 | .64 | .15 | .16 |
| 1941 | March ----- | 19.7 | .76 | .18 | .22 |
| | April ----- | 18.1 | .67 | .19 | .18 |
| | May ----- | 16.8 | .61 | .16 | .16 |
| | June ----- | 16.4 | .53 | .20 | .21 |
| | Average ----- | 17.3 | .62 | .14 | .14 |

Medical units represent the personal services of the physician in office, home, and hospital. Surgical units include fractures and injuries. X-ray and laboratory include diagnostic procedures performed for both ambulatory and hospitalized cases. It also includes X-ray and radium therapy.

Table 11

California Physicians Service
Contract Analysis Register—1945

| | | <i>April</i> | | <i>July</i> | |
|----------------------------------|--------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| | | <i>Contracts</i> | <i>Persons</i> | <i>Contracts</i> | <i>Persons</i> |
| Medical Riders ----- | ---- | | 39,862 | ---- | 48,380 |
| Males ----- | ---- | | 15,841 | ---- | 19,226 |
| Females ----- | ---- | | 24,021 | ---- | 29,154 |
| Surgical Contracts ----- | 72,384 | | 121,961 | 84,534 | 143,766 |
| Males ----- | 13,318 | | 13,318 | 15,713 | 15,713 |
| Females ----- | 28,685 | | 28,685 | 33,814 | 33,814 |
| 2 Person ----- | 15,623 | | 31,246 | 18,416 | 36,833 |
| 3 Person ----- | 14,758 | | 48,712 | 16,591 | 57,406 |
| C.P.S. Hospital Contracts* ----- | 16,571 | | 27,913 | 18,171 | 30,552 |
| Males ----- | 2,535 | | 2,535 | 2,796 | 2,796 |
| Females ----- | 7,296 | | 7,296 | 7,973 | 7,973 |
| 2 Person ----- | 3,200 | | 6,400 | 3,572 | 7,144 |
| 3 Person ----- | 3,540 | | 11,682 | 3,830 | 12,639 |

* C. P. S. Hospital Contracts only. Majority of C. P. S. membership holds Blue Cross Hospital Contracts.

| | <i>Average Monthly Membership, April to July, Inclusive</i> | <i>Life Years Exposure</i> |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Medical Riders ----- | | |
| Male ----- | 17,534 | 5,845 |
| Female ----- | 26,587 | 8,862 |
| Total ----- | 44,121 | 14,707 |

Table 12
California Physicians Service
Units of Service Paid—1945

| | <i>Number of Medical Units Paid</i> | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| | <i>April</i> | <i>May</i> | <i>June</i> | <i>July</i> |
| Medical Rider Costs----- | 13,627.0 | 12,887.3 | 13,430.0 | 14,016.4 |
| Attending Physicians----- | 9,349.6 | 8,848.4 | 8,890.6 | 9,262.8 |
| Assistants, Consultants and | | | | |
| Anesthetists----- | 92.7 | 57.0 | 115.5 | 106.2 |
| X-ray and Radium----- | 2,424.6 | 2,546.5 | 2,810.2 | 2,686.4 |
| Laboratory and Miscellaneous-- | 1,761.1 | 1,435.4 | 1,613.7 | 1,961.0 |
| Surgical Contract Costs----- | 40,046.8 | 35,251.6 | 46,997.8 | 51,357.2 |
| Attending Physicians----- | 34,243.2 | 30,332.0 | 40,811.1 | 46,988.0 |
| Assistants, Consultants and | | | | |
| Anesthetists----- | 5,293.2 | 4,446.8 | 5,758.2 | 6,735.5 |
| X-ray and Radium----- | 496.6 | 456.4 | 419.3 | 615.5 |
| Laboratory and Miscellaneous-- | 13.8 | 16.4 | 9.2 | 18.2 |
| Total Medical Units Paid----- | 53,673.8 | 48,138.9 | 60,427.8 | 68,373.6 |
| Average Unit Value Paid----- | 2.25 | 2.25 | 2.22 | 2.06 |
| Total Paid on Unit Basis----- | 120,766.10 | 108,312.51 | 134,149.79 | 140,849.63 |
| Total Paid on Dollar Basis----- | 29,148.42 | 46,123.81 | 33,913.61 | 39,819.23 |
| Total Medical Costs----- | 149,914.52 | 154,436.32 | 168,063.40 | 180,668.86 |

Table 13
California Physicians Service
Experience During April, May, June and July, 1945

| MALE | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| <i>Month</i> | <i>Cases of Illness</i> | <i>Attending Physician</i> | <i>Consultants Assistants Anaesthetists</i> | <i>X-ray and Radium</i> | <i>Laboratory and Miscellaneous</i> | <i>Total Cost</i> |
| April ----- | 464 | \$17,949.85 | \$2,417.18 | \$852.70 | \$839.09 | \$22,058.02 |
| May ----- | 465 | 14,533.41 | 1,970.25 | 1,645.10 | 1,088.93 | 19,237.69 |
| June ----- | 434 | 17,346.67 | 2,168.25 | 1,088.60 | 739.60 | 21,343.12 |
| July ----- | 614 | 21,419.26 | 2,770.50 | 1,572.20 | 1,119.60 | 26,887.56 |
| Total ----- | 1,977 | \$71,249.19 | \$9,326.28 | \$5,168.60 | \$3,787.22 | \$89,526.39 |
| FEMALE | | | | | | |
| April ----- | 557 | \$26,546.22 | \$3,464.59 | \$1,237.75 | \$1,307.00 | \$32,555.56 |
| May ----- | 580 | 22,852.52 | 3,563.00 | 1,595.10 | 1,429.52 | 29,440.17 |
| June ----- | 655 | 29,122.70 | 4,297.38 | 1,276.00 | 1,304.35 | 36,000.43 |
| July ----- | 715 | 29,249.35 | 4,701.10 | 2,034.76 | 1,764.83 | 37,750.04 |
| Total ----- | 2,507 | \$107,770.79 | \$16,026.07 | \$6,143.61 | \$5,805.70 | \$135,746.20 |
| DEPENDENTS UNDER AGE 19 | | | | | | |
| April ----- | 456 | \$13,450.21 | \$2,062.66 | \$897.90 | \$698.79 | \$17,109.56 |
| May ----- | 431 | 11,286.66 | 1,786.33 | 904.67 | 746.08 | 14,723.74 |
| June ----- | 624 | 21,407.66 | 3,737.50 | 624.47 | 838.18 | 26,607.81 |
| July ----- | 768 | 25,076.24 | 3,723.00 | 597.00 | 1,251.71 | 30,647.95 |
| Total ----- | 2,279 | \$71,220.77 | \$11,309.49 | \$3,024.04 | \$3,534.76 | \$89,089.06 |

Table 14
California Physicians Service
Analysis of Physician Visits

| MEDICAL RIDERS (2 visits deductible) | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| | <i>Cases Handled</i> | <i>Office Visits</i> | <i>Hospital Visits</i> | <i>Home Visits</i> | <i>Consulta- tion, etc., Visits</i> | <i>Total Visits</i> |
| April ----- | 1,456 | 4,247 | 694 | 176 | 1 | 5,118 |
| May ----- | 1,529 | 4,771 | 615 | 191 | 5 | 5,582 |
| June ----- | 1,540 | 4,688 | 667 | 177 | 3 | 5,535 |
| July ----- | 1,548 | 4,793 | 769 | 191 | 13 | 5,760 |
| Total ----- | 6,073 | 18,499 | 2,745 | 735 | 22 | 22,001 |
| Average per case----- | | 3.05 | .45 | .12 | .004 | 3.62 |
| Life Years Exposure ----- | | | | | | 14,707 |
| Incidence of Use----- | | | | | | 41.3% |
| Doctors Calls Per Case----- | | | | | | 3.62 |
| Doctors Calls Per Member----- | | | | | | 1.5 |

Table 15
Experience During April, May, June and July, 1945
Medical Contract—Employed Members

| <i>Service</i> | <i>Male Subscribers</i> | | <i>Female Subscribers</i> | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| | <i>Cost 17,534 Members</i> | <i>Cost 1,000,000 Life Years</i> | <i>Cost 26,588 Members</i> | <i>Cost 1,000,000 Life Years</i> |
| 1. Cases of Illness----- | 2,667 | 456,057 | 5,713 | 645,569 |
| 2. Doctor Visits ----- | 7,967 | 1,362,357 | 15,946 | 1,801,898 |
| 3. Attending Physician ----- | \$22,933 | \$3,921,633 | \$53,049 | \$5,994,588 |
| 4. Consultants, Assistants and Anaesthetists ----- | 228 | 39,022 | 442 | 49,947 |
| 5. X-ray and Radium ----- | 8,602 | 1,470,901 | 12,128 | 1,370,516 |
| 6. Laboratory and Miscellaneous-- | 6,651 | 1,137,311 | 11,757 | 1,328,526 |
| Total Costs ----- | \$38,414 | \$6,568,867 | \$77,376 | \$8,743,577 |

Table 16
California Physicians Service
Experience During April, May, June and July, 1945
Medical Contract—All Members

| <i>Service</i> | <i>Number or Cost</i> | |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| | <i>44,121 Members</i> | <i>1,000,000 Life Years</i> |
| 1. Cases of Illness----- | 8,526 | 579,768 |
| 2. Doctors Visits ----- | 24,027 | 1,633,836 |
| 3. Attending Physician ----- | \$79,105 | \$5,379,140 |
| 4. Consultants, Assistants and Anaesthetists----- | 858 | 58,344 |
| 5. X-ray and Radium----- | 24,994 | 1,699,592 |
| 6. Laboratory and Miscellaneous----- | 20,270 | 1,378,360 |
| Total Costs ----- | \$125,227 | \$8,515,436 |

PER ANNUM

| | |
|---|--------|
| Doctors Visits Per Case----- | 2.8 |
| Cost of (3) and (4) Per Member----- | \$5.44 |
| Cost of X-ray, Radium, and Laboratory Per Member----- | 3.08 |
| Cost of (3) and (4) Per Case----- | 9.37 |
| Cost of X-ray, Radium, and Laboratory Per Case----- | 5.31 |

Table 17
Surgical Contract—All Members

| <i>Service</i> | <i>132,864 Members</i> | <i>Per 1,000,000 Life Years</i> |
|---|----------------------------|---|
| 1. Cases of Illness----- | 8,397 | 189,772 |
| 2. Attending Physician----- | \$348,546 | \$7,877,140 |
| 3. Consultants, Assistants and Anaesthetists----- | 53,086 | 1,199,766 |
| 4. X-ray, and Radium----- | 18,832 | 425,603 |
| 5. Laboratory and Miscellaneous----- | 17,265 | 390,189 |
| Total Costs----- | \$437,729 | \$9,892,698 |

PER ANNUM

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Costs Per Member: | |
| Physician and Assistants----- | \$9 07 |
| X-ray, Radium and Laboratory----- | .81 |
| Costs Per Case: | |
| Physician and Assistants----- | 47.77 |
| X-ray, Radium and Laboratory----- | 4.30 |

Table 18
California Physicians Service
Experience During April, May, June and July, 1945
C. P. S. Hospital Contracts

| <i>Service</i> | <i>29,232 Members</i> | <i>Number or Cost Per 1,000,000 Life Years</i> |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| 1. Cases of Illness----- | 1,551 | 159,133 |
| 2. Hospital Days----- | 8,562 | 878,461 |
| 3. Ward Care----- | \$63,840 | \$6,549,989 |
| 4. Operating and Delivery Room----- | 21,621 | 2,218,307 |
| Total Cost----- | \$85,461 | \$8,768,296 |
| Hospital Days Per Member, Per Year----- | | .878 |
| Ward Care, Cost Per Day----- | | \$7.45 |
| Special Services, Cost Per Day----- | | \$2.52 |
| Total Cost Per Hospital Day----- | | \$9.97 |
| Hospital Cost Per Member, Per Year----- | | \$8.77 |
| Hospital Cases Per Member, Per Year----- | | .16 |
| Hospital Days Per Case----- | | 5.52 |
| Hospital Cost Per Case----- | | \$55.10 |

Table 19

| <i>Membership</i> | <i>Cases of Illness</i> | <i>Hospital Days</i> | <i>Ward Care</i> | <i>Operating and Delivery Room</i> | <i>Total Costs</i> |
|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|--|------------------------|
| All Members----- | 1,551 | 8,562 | \$63,840 | \$21,621 | \$85,461 |
| Adult Male----- | 301 | 2,113 | 14,741 | 3,684 | 18,425 |
| Adult Female----- | 487 | 3,283 | 23,012 | 7,529 | 30,542 |
| Children----- | 466 | 1,039 | 7,946 | 5,242 | 13,180 |
| | All | | | | |
| | <i>Members</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> | <i>Children</i> | |
| Hospital Days Per Case----- | 5.52 | 7.02 | 6.74 | 2.23 | |
| Cost Ward Care Per Day----- | \$7.45 | \$6.98 | \$7.01 | \$7.65 | |
| Cost Special Hospital Services Per Day----- | 2.52 | 1.74 | 2.29 | 5.05 | |
| Hospital Cost Per Day----- | 9.97 | 8.72 | 9.30 | 12.70 | |
| Cost Ward Per Case----- | 41.14 | 48.97 | 47.25 | 17.05 | |
| Cost Special Service Per Case----- | 13.94 | 12.24 | 15.46 | 11.25 | |
| Hospital Cost Per Case----- | 55.10 | 61.21 | 62.71 | 28.30 | |

HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM OF SAN FRANCISCO

The Officers of the Health Service System of San Francisco have submitted a full report of the experience of the Plan for the 12-month period ending 9-30-45, and also the Annual Reports for previous years. The following tables exhibit the experience rather fully. Exhibit D is a description of the services offered.

In Type and manner of administration the Plan is more comparable to C. P. S. than to any of the other Plans herein reviewed. It enrolls Doctors who agree to abide by the rules and regulations of the System, and who are remunerated by the "Point Method," similar to that of C. P. S. A comparison of schedules E and D will reveal the respective scope of services of the two Plans. However, for purposes of interpretation, two differences should be mentioned here. The contract of C. P. S. provides Hospitalization for 21 days for each illness in any contract year with certain additional benefits, while H. S. S. of S. F. provides Hospitalization for 21 days in any twelve month period. C. P. S. excludes the first two visits with respect to medical services for any one illness or injury. H. S. S. of S. F. limits visits by or to the Doctor to maximum of five in any one month.

The membership of H. S. S. of S. F. is limited to the employees of one employer, who reside in a comparatively restricted area. The membership of C. P. S. is composed of the employees of many employers over a wider area. This is an important distinction because experience in Groups is found to reflect the employment policies of the employer and to differ appreciably in different localities. The membership of H. S. S. of S. F. may be said to be "select" in that all new subscribers have been subjected to physical examinations, in connection with their employment. This is not true of Groups in general.

Table 20
Health Service System of San Francisco
Analysis of Contributions and Disbursements per Subscriber per Month by Type of Subscriber
12-Month Period Ending September 30, 1943
Year Ending September 30, 1944

| | <i>Employee Members</i> | <i>Retired Members</i> | <i>Adult Dependents</i> | <i>Minor Dependents</i> | <i>All Subscribers</i> |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Average Monthly Membership----- | 9,918 | 424 | 2,721 | 1,850 | 14,913 |
| Average Monthly Contribution Per Subscriber----- | \$2.749 | \$3.321 | \$2.877 | \$1.747 | \$2.664 |
| Disbursements: | | | | | |
| (Average Per Month) | | | | | |
| Doctor Service ----- | \$1.667 | \$2.840 | \$1.499 | \$1.340 | \$1.629 |
| Hospitalization ----- | .537 | 1.266 | .577 | .269 | .532 |
| X-ray Laboratories ----- | .059 | .051 | .051 | .044 | .056 |
| Clinical Laboratories ----- | .032 | .024 | .031 | .050 | .031 |
| Ambulance Service ----- | .009 | .026 | .012 | .002 | .009 |
| All Medical Service Except Physiotherapy----- | \$2.304 | \$4.207 | \$2.170 | \$1.685 | \$2.257 |
| Physiotherapy ----- | .032 | .032 | .032 | .032 | .032 |
| Total Medical Service----- | \$2.336 | \$4.239 | \$2.202 | \$1.717 | \$2.289 |
| Non-Medical Expense ----- | .267 | .267 | .267 | .267 | .267 |
| Total Disbursement ----- | \$2.603 | \$4.506 | \$2.469 | \$1.984 | \$2.556 |
| Excess of Contributions over Disbursements----- | \$0.146 | --- | \$0.408 | --- | \$0.108 |
| Excess of Disbursements over Contributions----- | --- | \$1.185 | --- | \$0.237 | --- |

Table 21
Health Service System of San Francisco
From Annual Report 1943-1944
Analysis of Contributions and Disbursements by Type of Subscribers
Year Ending September 30, 1944

| | <i>Employee Members</i> | <i>Retired Members</i> | <i>Adult Dependents</i> | <i>Minor Dependents</i> | <i>All Subscribers</i> |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Average Monthly Membership----- | 9,544 | 506 | 2,534 | 1,776 | 14,360 |
| % Each Group to Total----- | 66.5% | 3.5% | 17.6% | 12.4% | 100% |
| Total Membership Contributions Excluding Penalties---- | \$320,708.70 | \$20,088.80 | \$88,918.35 | \$38,373.20 | \$468,089.05 |
| Disbursements: | | | | | |
| Doctor Service ----- | \$199,602.58 | \$14,328.90 | \$49,401.50 | \$28,716.50 | \$292,049.48 |
| Hospitalization ----- | 61,581.80 | 4,665.97 | 18,294.50 | 5,516.40 | 90,058.67 |
| X-ray Laboratories ----- | 9,437.75 | 382.50 | 2,197.90 | 1,244.38 | 13,262.53 |
| Clinical Laboratories ----- | 6,462.00 | 240.00 | 1,513.00 | 1,051.50 | 9,266.50 |
| Ambulance Service ----- | 811.46 | 106.00 | 261.50 | 55.00 | 1,233.96 |
| Physiotherapy ----- | 4,873.23 | 256.49 | 1,289.76 | 908.69 | 7,328.17 |
| Total Medical Expense----- | \$282,768.82 | \$19,979.86 | \$72,958.16 | \$37,492.47 | \$413,199.31 |
| Non-Medical Expense ----- | 32,390.69 | 1,704.77 | 8,572.58 | 6,039.77 | 48,707.81 |
| Total Disbursement ----- | \$315,159.51 | \$21,684.63 | \$81,530.74 | \$43,532.24 | \$461,907.12 |
| Excess of Contributions over Disbursements----- | \$5,549.19 | ----- | \$7,887.61 | ----- | \$6,131.93 |
| Excess of Disbursements over Contributions----- | ----- | \$1,595.83 | ----- | \$5,159.04 | ----- |

Table 22
Health Service System of San Francisco
From Annual Report 1943-1944
Analysis of Contributions and Disbursements per Subscriber per Month by Type of Subscriber
12-Month Period Ending September 30, 1944

| | <i>Employee Members</i> | <i>Retired Members</i> | <i>Adult Dependents</i> | <i>Minor Dependents</i> | <i>All Subscribers</i> |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Average Monthly Membership----- | 9,544 | 506 | 2,534 | 1,776 | 14,360 |
| Average Monthly Contributions Per Subscriber Exclud- ing Penalties ----- | \$2.800 | \$3.310 | \$2.924 | \$1.800 | \$2.716 |
| Disbursements: (Average Per Month) | | | | | |
| Doctor Service ----- | \$1.743 | \$2.360 | \$1.625 | \$1.347 | \$1.695 |
| Hospitalization ----- | .538 | .768 | .602 | .259 | .523 |
| X-ray Laboratories ----- | .082 | .063 | .072 | .058 | .077 |
| Clinical Laboratories ----- | .056 | .040 | .050 | .049 | .054 |
| Ambulance ----- | .007 | .017 | .008 | .004 | .006 |
| All Medical Service Except Physiotherapy----- | \$2.426 | \$3.248 | \$2.357 | \$1.717 | \$2.355 |
| Physiotherapy ----- | .042 | .042 | .042 | .042 | .042 |
| Total Medical Service----- | \$2.468 | \$3.290 | \$2.399 | \$1.759 | \$2.397 |
| Non-Medical Expense ----- | .283 | .283 | .283 | .283 | .283 |
| Total Disbursement ----- | \$2.751 | \$3.573 | \$2.682 | \$2.042 | \$2.680 |
| Excess of Contributions over Disbursements----- | \$0.049 | ---- | \$0.242 | ---- | \$0.036 |
| Excess of Disbursements over Contributions----- | ---- | \$0.263 | ---- | \$0.242 | ---- |

Table 23

Health Service System of San Francisco

Distribution of Patients and Cost of Doctor Service and Hospitalization for All Illnesses and Injuries as Classified Under "Logie" Standard Nomenclature of Human Disease" Year Ending Sept. 30, 1944

| <i>Disease</i> | <i>Patients</i> | <i>Total Cost</i> |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| Body as a Whole----- | 2,917 | \$52,796.00 |
| Skin----- | 1,878 | 28,647.53 |
| Bones, Joints and Muscles----- | 1,489 | 34,892.08 |
| Respiratory System----- | 2,883 | 47,252.13 |
| Cardiovascular System----- | 1,374 | 34,558.82 |
| Blood and Blood-forming Organs----- | 371 | 6,123.37 |
| Digestive System----- | 2,103 | 74,454.09 |
| Urogenital System----- | 1,065 | 64,829.02 |
| Glandular System----- | 33 | 2,389.62 |
| Nervous System----- | 522 | 12,729.66 |
| Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat----- | 1,297 | 15,541.44 |
| Examinations and Deferred Diagnoses----- | 1,224 | 7,894.39 |
| Total----- | 17,156 | \$382,108.15 |

* Includes duplications due to the same subscriber being included in more than one classification. The number of individual patients involved was 9,144.
Average monthly membership 14,360.

Table 24

Health Service System of San Francisco

Comparison by Type of Subscriber of Doctor Service Year Ending Sept. 30, 1944

| | <i>Employees Members</i> | <i>Retired Members</i> | <i>Adult De- pendents</i> | <i>Minor De- pendents</i> | <i>All Sub- scribers</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Number of Subscribers In | | | | | |
| Group----- | 9,544 | 506 | 2,534 | 1,776 | 14,360 |
| Number Using Service-- | 5,839 | 373 | 1,602 | 1,330 | 9,144 |
| Per Cent Using Service-- | 61.2 | 73.7 | 63.2 | 74.9 | 63.7 |
| Average Cost Per Patient | | | | | |
| Per Year----- | \$34.18 | \$38.42 | \$30.84 | \$21.59 | \$31.94 |
| Cost Per Member Per | | | | | |
| Month----- | 1.743 | 2.360 | 1.625 | 1.347 | 1.695 |
| Total Cost----- | \$199,602.58 | \$14,328.90 | \$49,401.50 | \$28,716.50 | \$292,049.48 |

Cost of Doctor Service and Hospitalization for Operative Cases
Year Ending Sept. 30, 1944

| | <i>Number of Patients</i> | <i>Cost</i> |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------|
| Removal of Appendix----- | 75 | \$13,302.19 |
| Other Abdominal Surgery----- | 117 | 33,876.40 |
| Hernia----- | 54 | 11,656.96 |
| Resection of Prostate Gland, etc.----- | 18 | 4,205.15 |
| Nasal Operations----- | 49 | 2,994.11 |
| Removal of Goiter----- | 20 | 2,805.97 |
| Fractures----- | 128 | 19,608.62 |
| Total----- | 461 | \$88,449.40 |
| Other Operations----- | 1,265 | 33,190.00 |
| Total Cost of Doctors Service and Hospitalization for Operations (29% of All Medical Costs)----- | 1,726 | \$121,639.40 |

Table 25

Health Service System of San Francisco
Comparative Statement Average Monthly Disbursements for Year Ending
Sept. 30, 1944, and Sept. 30, 1943

| | <i>Year Ended Sept. 30, 1944</i> | <i>Year Ended Sept. 30, 1943</i> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Doctor Service ----- | \$24,337.46 | \$24,295.15 |
| Hospitalization ----- | 7,504.89 | 7,930.20 |
| X-ray Laboratories ----- | 1,105.21 | 827.19 |
| Clinical Laboratories ----- | 772.21 | 469.48 |
| Ambulance Service ----- | 102.83 | 137.04 |
| Physiotherapy ----- | 601.68 | 478.73 |
| Total Medical Service ----- | \$34,433.28 | \$34,137.79 |
| *Non-Medical ----- | 4,058.98 | 3,985.63 |
| Total ----- | \$38,492.26 | \$38,123.42 |

* Includes Medical Director, examination of applicants for dependent membership and Administration expense.

Distribution of Cost of Doctor Service by Type of Service

| | <i>Year Ended Sept. 30, 1944</i> | | <i>Year Ended Sept. 30, 1943</i> | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| | <i>Number Calls</i> | <i>Cost</i> | <i>Number Calls</i> | <i>Cost</i> |
| Office Calls ----- | 53,375 | \$133,437.50 | 45,360 | \$112,685.66 |
| Home Calls ----- | 9,565 | 33,477.50 | 10,097 | 35,116.86 |
| Hospital Calls ----- | 5,259 | 15,777.00 | 6,740 | 20,092.61 |
| Night (Home) Calls ----- | 148 | 1,110.00 | 156 | 1,162.63 |
| Total Calls ----- | 68,347 | \$183,802.00 | 62,353 | \$169,057.76 |
| Operations ----- | | \$73,695.65 | | \$77,334.29 |
| Special Service ----- | | 34,551.83 | | 45,149.71 |
| Total ----- | | \$292,049.48 | | \$291,541.76 |

Table 26

Health Service System of San Francisco
Comparison by Type of Subscriber of Cost of Medical Service (Except Physio-
therapy) Used During Year Ending Sept. 30, 1944

| | <i>Employee Members</i> | <i>Retired Members</i> | <i>Adult De- pendents</i> | <i>Minor De- pendents</i> | <i>All Sub- scribers</i> |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Average Number Subscribers | 9,544 | 506 | 2,534 | 1,776 | 14,360 |
| Number Using Service ----- | 5,839 | 373 | 1,602 | 1,330 | 9,144 |
| Percentage Using Service --- | 61.2 | 73.7 | 63.2 | 74.9 | 63.7 |
| Average Cost Per Patient --- | \$47.59 | \$52.88 | \$44.74 | \$27.51 | \$44.39 |
| Cost Per Subscriber Per Month ----- | \$2.426 | \$3.248 | \$2.357 | \$1.717 | \$2.355 |

Table 27

Percentage Distribution of Receipts

| | <i>Year Ended Sept. 30, 1944</i> | <i>Year Ended Sept. 30, 1943</i> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Doctors ----- | 62.3% | 61.2% |
| Hospitals ----- | 19.2 | 20.0 |
| X-ray Laboratories ----- | 2.8 | 2.1 |
| Clinical Laboratories ----- | 2.0 | 1.2 |
| Ambulance ----- | .3 | .3 |
| Physiotherapy ----- | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Total Medical ----- | 88.2% | 86.0% |
| Non-Medical ----- | 10.4 | 10.0 |
| Surplus ----- | 1.4 | 4.0 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Table 28

Health Service System of San Francisco

Incidence of Illness and Cost by Age Groups of All Medical Service (Except Physiotherapy) Used by Employee Members During Year Ending Sept. 30, 1944

MALE EMPLOYEES

| Age | Average No. Sub- scribers | Per Cent. Using Service | Cost Per Patient | Cost Per Subscriber Per Month |
|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 18—29 | 252 | 51.2 | \$38.68 | \$1.650 |
| 30—39 | 1,327 | 55.6 | 33.76 | 1.565 |
| 40—49 | 1,777 | 54.6 | 42.35 | 1.928 |
| 50—59 | 1,627 | 57.9 | 47.83 | 2.308 |
| 60—61 | 288 | 57.3 | 59.58 | 2.845 |
| 62 and over | 732 | 78.1 | 55.33 | 3.603 |
| All Ages | 6,003 | 58.6 | \$44.80 | \$2.187 |

Table 29

FEMALE EMPLOYEES

| Age | Average No. Sub- scribers | Per Cent. Using Service | Cost Per Patient | Cost Per Subscriber Per Month |
|---------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 18—29 | 241 | 46.5 | \$39.67 | \$1.536 |
| 30—39 | 956 | 63.7 | 48.94 | 2.598 |
| 40—49 | 1,239 | 64.9 | 52.67 | 2.848 |
| 50—59 | 825 | 69.0 | 56.27 | 3.234 |
| 60—61 | 89 | 73.0 | 44.85 | 2.730 |
| 62 and over | 191 | 85.3 | 54.00 | 3.841 |
| All Ages | 3,541 | 65.6 | \$51.82 | \$2.832 |
| Total Members | 9,544 | 61.2 | \$47.59 | \$2.426 |

Table 30

Health Service System of San Francisco

Incidence of Illness and Cost by Age Groups of All Medical Service (Except Physiotherapy) Used by Retired Members During Year Ended Sept. 30, 1944

MALE RETIRED

| Age | Average No. Sub- scribers | Per Cent. Using Service | Cost Per Patient | Cost Per Subscriber Per Month |
|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 18—29 | 4 | 50.0 | \$18.00 | \$.750 |
| 30—39 | 18 | 72.2 | 19.69 | 1.185 |
| 40—49 | 48 | 43.8 | 48.36 | 1.763 |
| 50—59 | 13 | 76.9 | 80.29 | 5.147 |
| 62 and over | 239 | 74.1 | 54.92 | 3.390 |
| All ages | 322 | 69.3 | \$53.06 | \$3.062 |

Table 31

FEMALE RETIRED

| Age | Average No. Sub- scribers | Per Cent. Using Service | Cost Per Patient | Cost Per Subscriber Per Month |
|---------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 18—29 | 3 | 100.0 | \$6.67 | \$.555 |
| 30—39 | 13 | 92.3 | 48.27 | 3.713 |
| 40—49 | 29 | 79.3 | 55.20 | 3.648 |
| 50—59 | 10 | 80.0 | 48.53 | 3.235 |
| 62 and over | 129 | 80.6 | 54.18 | 3.640 |
| All ages | 184 | 81.5 | \$52.61 | \$3.574 |
| Total Retired | 506 | 73.7 | \$52.88 | \$3.248 |

Table 32

Health Service System of San Francisco
Incidence of Illness and Cost by Age Groups of All Medical Service (Except
Physiotherapy) Used by Adult Dependents During Year Ended Sept. 30, 1944

MALE DEPENDENTS

| Age | Average No. Sub- scribers | Per Cent. Using Service | Cost Per Patient | Cost Per Subscriber Per Month |
|-------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 18—29 | 34 | 50.0 | \$29.93 | \$1.247 |
| 30—39 | 5 | 80.0 | 18.75 | 1.250 |
| 40—49 | 9 | 55.6 | 30.00 | 1.389 |
| 50—59 | 5 | 40.0 | 65.50 | 2.183 |
| 60—61 | 1 | 100.0 | 7.50 | .625 |
| 62 and over | 48 | 62.5 | 78.40 | 4.083 |
| All ages | 102 | 57.8 | \$54.65 | \$2.634 |

Table 33

FEMALE DEPENDENTS

| Age | Average No. Sub- scribers | Per Cent. Using Service | Cost Per Patient | Cost Per Subscriber Per Month |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 18—29 | 213 | 59.6 | \$30.79 | \$1.530 |
| 30—39 | 533 | 60.6 | 43.15 | 2.179 |
| 40—49 | 687 | 63.9 | 47.86 | 2.549 |
| 50—59 | 504 | 62.5 | 41.81 | 2.178 |
| 60—61 | 79 | 100.0 | 43.68 | 3.962 |
| 62 and over | 416 | 60.8 | 50.03 | 2.536 |
| All ages | 2,432 | 63.4 | \$44.36 | \$2.345 |
| Total Adult Dependent | 2,534 | 63.2 | \$44.74 | \$2.357 |

Table 34

Health Service System of San Francisco
Incidence of Illness and Cost by Age Groups of All Medical Service (Except
Physiotherapy) Used by Minor Dependents During Year Ended Sept. 30, 1944

MALE AND FEMALE MINOR DEPENDENTS

| Age | Average No. Sub- scribers | Per Cent. Using Service | Cost Per Patient | Cost Per Subscriber Per Month |
|----------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1—4 | 311 | 74.0 | \$18.61 | \$1.147 |
| 5—9 | 599 | 80.5 | 31.33 | 2.101 |
| 10—14 | 545 | 65.5 | 29.18 | 1.593 |
| 15—17 | 321 | 81.3 | 25.99 | 1.761 |
| All ages | 1,776 | 74.9 | \$27.51 | \$1.717 |

Table 35

Comparison by Type of Subscriber of Cost of Hospitalization
Year Ending Sept. 30, 1944

| | Employee Members | Retired Members | Adult De- pendents | Minor De- pendents | All Sub- scribers |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Number of Subscribers in Group | 9,544 | 506 | 2,534 | 1,776 | 14,360 |
| Number Hospitalized | 781 | 56 | 226 | 111 | 1,174 |
| Average Days Per Patient | 8.2 | 9.9 | 8.7 | 5.1 | 8.1 |
| Total Days Hospitalized | 6,437 | 553 | 1,965 | 570 | 9,525 |
| Average Days Per Patient | 8.2 | 9.9 | 8.7 | 5.1 | 8.1 |
| Average Cost Per Patient Hospitalized | \$78.85 | \$83.32 | \$80.95 | \$49.70 | \$76.71 |
| Cost Per Patient Per Day | 9.57 | 8.44 | 9.31 | 8.68 | 9.45 |
| Cost Per Subscriber Per Month | .538 | .768 | .602 | .259 | .523 |
| Total Cost | \$61,581.80 | \$4,665.97 | \$18,294.50 | \$5,516.40 | \$90,058.67 |

ROSS-LOOS MEDICAL GROUP

Through the courtesy of Ross-Loos Medical Group its experience for the years 1939 and 1944 was made available. The nature and scope of services to the subscriber and his dependents are described in the "Foreword" to the "Report of the Ross-Loos Medical Group for the year 1939." In part it states as follows:

Nature and Scope of Services to the Subscriber

The service consists of complete medical and surgical care and attention, including professional consultations, treatments, examinations, surgical procedures, preventive care, laboratory procedures, X-ray examinations, physiotherapy treatments, drugs and dressings, hospitalization in a first class hospital for a period not to exceed 90 days in any period of twelve consecutive months, ambulance service and unrestricted physical examinations whenever the subscriber desires them.

It has always been a point of the service that exclusions are kept to the minimum and only the most prevalent of exclusions, such as insanity, chronic alcoholism, drug addiction, social diseases and like items appear in the contract. Injuries arising out of and in the course of the employment of the subscriber and compensable under the Workmen's Compensation Act are not included as part of the service.

The dependent members of the subscriber's family receive special privileges as regards fees for services rendered to them. Some of the fees are at present as follows: Office consultation or treatment, 50¢; physiotherapy treatment, 50¢; residence call, \$1.00; gastric analysis test, \$1.00; deep X-ray therapy treatment, \$1.50; blood chemistry examination, \$2.50; rabbit test for pregnancy, \$3.00; basal metabolism test, \$5.00; electro-cardiogram in office, \$7.50; electro-cardiogram in home or hospital, \$10.00; minor operation performed in office, including surgery and recovery bed, not over \$12.50; confinement case, including prenatal and postnatal care, \$20.00; major operation, \$25.00 (no charge for any calls made in hospital). All X-ray examinations at rates specified by the Industrial Accident Commission of the State of California.

Location of Offices

In addition to its main headquarters a four story office building in Los Angeles, the Group operates twelve additional offices, eleven of which are in communities well scattered over Los Angeles County and the twelfth is a down town office serving as an auxiliary to the main office. The Group also maintains associate offices in Lone Pine, Independence, Bishop and Victorville, California.

Staff

The Group has always maintained a high standard when considering applicants to the staff. In order that a doctor be considered for the staff it is necessary that he has graduated from a Class A medical school, served an internship in an accredited hospital for a period of one year and in addition thereto served a residency in an accredited hospital for a period of one year or have completed post-graduate work to the equivalent thereof. The Group does not like to consider doctors, excepting specialists, who have been more than seven years

out of college, thereby eliminating the possibility of burdening the staff with doctors who have failed to make a success in private practice and are seeking, as a last resort, a berth in a group. Specialists, of course, must have added requirements and each specialist is carefully considered by a committee with particular attention being given to his post-graduate work and subsequent practice in his specialty.

At the present writing the staff consists of 80 doctors, all of whom devote their entire time and attention to this work. There are in addition associate doctors to care for the subscribers in the areas aforementioned. Most of the usual specialists in medicine are covered and include the following: Eye, ear, nose and throat, anesthesia, roentgenology, urology, surgery, ophthalmology, pediatrics, orthopedics, proctology, dermatology, endocrinology, obstetrics, gynecology, cardiology and chest.

The Group makes a practice of employing only graduate registered nurses, registered nurses, registered laboratory technicians, accredited X-ray technicians, and trained physiotherapists. Two prescription pharmacies are operated by the Group, employing six pharmacists and it is an inviolate rule that only preparations fully accepted as classical remedies and manufactured by the foremost pharmaceutical houses are used.

Subscribers

Until quite recently it was the policy of the Group to accept as subscribers only groups of employees of a common employer. However, late in 1938, at the insistence of subscribers who has changed employment and relatives of subscribers who were employed in positions where the service was not available, it was decided to accept individuals as subscribers. The service to the individual is identical to that of the group subscriber, the only difference being that the individual is required to pass a satisfactory physical examination.

At the beginning of the year 1939 the Group had 19,348 subscribers. At the end of the year that figure was 22,728, a gain of 3,380 subscribers or 17.5%. That is somewhat of an improvement over the previous year where the gain was approximately 1,200 less or 12.4%. At the end of 1939 79.5% of the subscribers were male and 20.5% female. At the end of 1938 77.8% were male and 22.2% female. The increase in percentage of male subscribers is probably due to decreasing proportionate strength of teacher groups which are of course predominately female.

At the end of 1939 there were listed on the rolls 46,715 dependents. The average family consisted of 3.05 persons or 2.05 dependents for each subscriber. At the end of 1938 there were 41,197 dependents or 2.1 dependents per subscriber. It is interesting to note that the ratio of dependents has been steadily decreasing for the last three years, the figure at the end of 1937 being 2.2; at the end of 1938 2.1; and 1939 2.05 or a decrease of .1 for 1938 and .05 for 1939. Of the dependents at the end of the year 1939, 29.96% were male and 70.04% were female. At the end of the previous year 29.27% were male and 70.73% were female, indicating that the ratio of sex of dependents remains fairly constant.

Combining the subscriber and dependent strength it is noted that the Group is, in effect, responsible for the complete medical and surgical care and attention of a population of nearly 70,000 persons, a responsibility keenly felt by the group.

Services Rendered

The statistical data in the sheets following sets forth the nature and amount of services rendered to subscribers and their families together with the frequencies of various types of care. It is noted that in 1938 we rendered 124,054 office services, requiring the service of doctors (that is, including such items of X-ray, basal metabolism, laboratory work, etc.) to subscribers, while dependents, who numbered over twice as many, only required 100,563 services. In other words the subscribers availed themselves of 556.80 office services per thousand subscriber months as compared to 221.26 for dependents. During 1939 all services increased slightly for both subscribers and dependents, however, the ratio remained nearly the same, a fact is borne out by the report which shows that in 1939 all services to subscribers were 143,561, to dependents 124,292 or 572.31 for subscribers per thousand subscriber months and 244.08 to dependents per thousand dependent months.

Approximately 38% of the office services rendered to both subscribers and dependents consists of services of specialists. Eye, ear, nose and throat is the specialty most patronized, representing about one-fifth of the office service to the subscriber and about one-seventh of the office service to the dependent.

Attention is directed to the fact that dependents require nearly the same proportionate amount of residence calls as do subscribers. Subscribers, for instance, required 31.04 residence calls per thousand subscriber months for 1939 as against 27.26 for dependents per thousand dependent months. This seems to indicate that even the minimum fee charged dependents serves as a deterrent for using the service for minor conditions. Residence calls being normally acute conditions are considered a necessity and the small fee charged does not cause hesitancy in using the service.

The subscriber makes much greater use of the auxiliary and diagnostic mediums and the percentages which follow are quite illustrative. The following figures are for 1939 only, the difference between the years being so slight that no comparisons are needed:

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| Refractions | 50% to subscribers |
| Laboratory tests | 75% to subscribers |
| X-ray examinations | 60% to subscribers |
| Electrocardiograms | 75% to subscribers |
| Physiotherapy treatments | 70% to subscribers |

Hospitalization

During the year we hospitalized 1,155 subscribers and 1,573 dependents. Of that number 551 subscribers and 501 dependents were medical cases. Noting that we hospitalize more subscribers for medical cases than we do dependents demonstrates to a definite degree that we are liberal in our hospitalization to subscribers and are not prone to delay in this respect, whereas the dependent is willing because of the cost to wait for hospitalization until the need is imperative. The average stay in the hospital for surgical cases for

subscribers was 13.2 days and for dependents 10.7. The average stay for medical cases for subscribers was 8.3 days and for dependents 6.1. Comparing the length of stay with 1938, the subscriber's medical stay increased .1 day and surgical stay 2.2 days. The dependent's average surgical stay decreased .1 day and the medical stay was identical.

Surgery

During the year we performed 4,842 minor operations and 1,237 major operations. These figures will conflict with some that will appear later due to the fact that in the later figures procedures on private patients are also included.

The report continues with a table of services rendered to subscribers and dependents, which is reproduced here as Table 36. Table 37 shows the approximate value of the services to subscribers using the point value of similar service allowed by the California Physicians Service. The incidence has been expanded to a basis of 1,000,000 life years exposure for both men and women subscribers. The exposure coverage was determined by averaging the membership at the beginning and end of the year, and the division of exposure between male and female was determined by averaging the percentage of female subscribers at the beginning and end of the year.

The incidence of maternity and obstetrical care of subscribers can not be considered indicative of what might be expected of the general population, inasmuch as most of the subscribers were members of employed groups. The experience pertaining to dependent coverage would also be unreliable as expected incidence, because there was no way of determining what actual proportion of eligible dependents made use of the Ross-Loos Service.

With respect to the subscribers, however, the reasonable assumption may be made that the tabulated experience includes *all* of their medical care within the contract coverage.

The experience of the year 1944 has been tabulated from data furnished by Roos-Loos and expanded to 1,000,000 life years exposure. See Table 38. The monthly membership was known and the average found to be 26,382 subscribers. It is estimated that approximately 1,000 of these were absent in the armed forces and receiving no Ross-Loos service. Accordingly, all incidence and cost per member relative to 1944 experience should be increased about 4%. The proportion of male and female subscribers was not known.

Tables 39, 40, and 41, exhibit the number of services per member per year by kind of service, exclusive of Deep Therapy, Deliveries, and Refractions. The dollars values used conform as nearly as could be determined to the point value allowed for similar service by C. P. S. Relative to this method of valuation please refer to the introductory remarks of this report.

Table 36

Ross-Loos Medical

Nature and Amount of Service Rendered to Subscribers and Dependents per 1,000 of Each Classification

| <i>No. of Subs. or Deps. Months</i> | 1938 | | | 1939 | | | 1938 and 1939 | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <i>Subs.</i> | <i>Deps.</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Subs.</i> | <i>Deps.</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Subs.</i> | <i>Deps.</i> | <i>Total</i> |
| | 222,801 | 454,512 | 677,313 | 250,848 | 509,221 | 760,069 | 473,649 | 963,733 | 1,437,382 |
| Office Calls (not otherwise specified)----- | 74,300 | 60,470 | 134,770 | 85,466 | 76,467 | 161,933 | 159,766 | 136,937 | 296,703 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 333.48 | 133.04 | 198.97 | 340.71 | 150.16 | 213.04 | 337.51 | 142.09 | 206.41 |
| General Examinations----- | 2,055 | 1,957 | 4,012 | 2,348 | 2,264 | 4,702 | 4,493 | 4,221 | 8,714 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 9.23 | 4.31 | 5.92 | 9.72 | 4.45 | 6.19 | 9.49 | 4.38 | 6.06 |
| Orthopedics----- | 3,369 | 3,099 | 6,468 | 3,145 | 3,068 | 6,123 | 6,514 | 6,167 | 12,681 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 15.12 | 6.82 | 9.54 | 12.54 | 6.02 | 8.17 | 13.75 | 6.40 | 8.82 |
| Dermatology----- | 5,389 | 3,515 | 8,904 | 6,193 | 3,894 | 10,087 | 11,582 | 7,409 | 18,991 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 24.18 | 7.75 | 13.15 | 24.69 | 7.65 | 13.27 | 24.45 | 7.69 | 13.21 |
| Urology----- | 6,060 | 1,810 | 7,879 | 7,006 | 2,001 | 9,007 | 13,075 | 3,811 | 16,886 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 27.24 | 3.98 | 11.63 | 27.93 | 3.93 | 11.85 | 27.60 | 3.95 | 11.75 |
| Gynecology and Obstetrics----- | 2,358 | 7,689 | 10,047 | 2,384 | 9,222 | 11,606 | 4,742 | 16,911 | 21,653 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 10.58 | 16.93 | 14.83 | 9.50 | 18.11 | 15.27 | 10.01 | 17.55 | 15.06 |
| Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat----- | 24,723 | 14,833 | 39,556 | 29,319 | 17,171 | 46,490 | 54,042 | 32,004 | 86,046 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 110.96 | 32.64 | 58.40 | 116.88 | 33.72 | 61.17 | 114.10 | 33.21 | 59.86 |
| Surgicals, Dressings, Etc.----- | 5,791 | 2,675 | 8,466 | 7,610 | 3,909 | 11,519 | 13,401 | 6,584 | 19,985 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 25.99 | 5.99 | 12.50 | 30.34 | 7.68 | 15.16 | 28.29 | 6.83 | 13.90 |
| Pediatrics----- | ----- | 4,515 | 4,515 | ----- | 6,296 | 6,296 | ----- | 10,811 | 10,811 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | ----- | 9.93 | 6.67 | ----- | 12.36 | 8.28 | ----- | 11.22 | 7.52 |
| Total Drs.' Office Service----- | 124,054 | 100,563 | 244,617 | 143,561 | 124,292 | 267,583 | 267,615 | 224,855 | 492,470 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 556.80 | 221.26 | 331.63 | 572.31 | 244.08 | 352.40 | 555.00 | 233.32 | 342.59 |
| Refractions----- | 2,526 | 2,329 | 4,855 | 4,028 | 3,997 | 8,025 | 6,554 | 6,326 | 12,880 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 11.34 | 5.12 | 7.17 | 16.16 | 7.85 | 10.56 | 13.84 | 6.56 | 8.96 |
| Laboratory Tests----- | 13,298 | 9,704 | 22,002 | 15,412 | 10,478 | 25,890 | 28,710 | 19,182 | 47,892 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 59.68 | 19.15 | 32.48 | 61.44 | 20.58 | 34.06 | 60.61 | 19.90 | 33.32 |
| X-ray Examinations----- | 5,332 | 3,502 | 8,834 | 6,717 | 4,552 | 11,269 | 12,049 | 8,054 | 20,103 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 23.93 | 7.71 | 13.04 | 26.78 | 8.94 | 14.83 | 25.44 | 8.36 | 13.99 |
| Basal Metabolism Tests----- | 718 | 474 | 1,192 | 745 | 582 | 1,327 | 1,463 | 1,056 | 2,519 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class----- | 3.22 | 1.04 | 1.76 | 2.97 | 1.14 | 1.75 | 3.09 | 1.10 | 1.75 |

Table 36—Continued

Ross-Loos Medical

| <i>No. of Subs. or Deps. Months</i> | <i>1938</i> | | | <i>1939</i> | | | <i>1938 and 1939</i> | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <i>Subs.</i> | <i>Deps.</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Subs.</i> | <i>Deps.</i> | <i>Total</i> | <i>Subs.</i> | <i>Deps.</i> | <i>Total</i> |
| | 222,801 | 454,512 | 677,313 | 250,848 | 509,221 | 760,069 | 473,649 | 963,733 | 1,437,382 |
| Electro Cardiograms ----- | 272 | 66 | 338 | 598 | 133 | 731 | 870 | 199 | 1,069 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 1.22 | .15 | .50 | 2.38 | .26 | .96 | 1.84 | .21 | .74 |
| Physio-therapy Treatments ----- | 35,419 | 11,263 | 36,682 | 29,982 | 12,886 | 42,868 | 55,401 | 24,149 | 79,550 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 114.09 | 24.78 | 54.16 | 119.52 | 25.31 | 56.40 | 116.97 | 25.06 | 55.34 |
| Residence Calls—Night ----- | 816 | 1,177 | 1,993 | 1,137 | 1,872 | 3,009 | 1,953 | 3,049 | 5,002 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 3.66 | 2.59 | 2.94 | 4.58 | 3.68 | 3.96 | 4.12 | 3.16 | 3.48 |
| Residence Calls—Day ----- | 5,823 | 9,158 | 14,981 | 6,651 | 12,008 | 18,659 | 12,474 | 21,166 | 33,640 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 26.14 | 20.15 | 22.12 | 26.51 | 23.58 | 24.55 | 26.34 | 21.26 | 23.40 |
| Hospital Calls ----- | 18,451 | 23,389 | 41,840 | 29,588 | 28,404 | 57,992 | 48,039 | 51,793 | 99,832 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 82.81 | 51.45 | 61.77 | 117.95 | 55.78 | 76.30 | 101.42 | 53.74 | 69.49 |
| Total Hospital and Residence Calls ----- | 25,090 | 33,724 | 58,814 | 37,376 | 42,384 | 79,660 | 62,466 | 76,008 | 138,474 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 112.61 | 74.20 | 86.83 | 148.99 | 83.04 | 104.81 | 131.88 | 78.86 | 96.33 |
| Minor Operations ----- | 2,133 | 2,607 | 4,740 | 2,186 | 2,656 | 4,842 | 4,319 | 5,263 | 9,582 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 9.57 | 5.74 | 7.00 | 8.71 | 5.22 | 6.37 | 9.12 | 5.46 | 6.67 |
| Major Operations ----- | 467 | 487 | 954 | 554 | 683 | 1,237 | 1,021 | 1,170 | 2,191 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 2.10 | 1.07 | 1.41 | 2.21 | 1.34 | 1.63 | 2.16 | 1.21 | 1.52 |
| Confinements ----- | 38 | 337 | 375 | 50 | 389 | 439 | 88 | 726 | 814 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | .17 | .74 | .55 | .20 | .76 | .58 | .19 | .75 | .57 |
| Hospitalizations—Surgical ----- | 495 | 817 | 1,312 | 640 | 1,072 | 1,676 | 1,099 | 1,889 | 2,933 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 2.22 | 1.80 | 1.94 | 2.41 | 2.11 | 2.21 | 2.32 | 1.96 | 2.08 |
| Hospitalizations—Medical ----- | 501 | 473 | 974 | 551 | 501 | 1,052 | 1,052 | 974 | 2,026 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 2.25 | 1.04 | 1.44 | 2.20 | .98 | 1.38 | 2.22 | 1.01 | 1.41 |
| Total Hospitalizations ----- | 996 | 1,290 | 2,286 | 1,155 | 1,573 | 2,728 | 2,151 | 2,865 | 5,014 |
| Per 1,000 Each Class ----- | 4.47 | 2.84 | 3.38 | 4.61 | 3.09 | 3.59 | 4.54 | 2.97 | 3.49 |

Table 38
Ross-Loos Medical Group—Year 1944
Services to Subscribers

| <i>Description</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| A. Eye, Ear, Nose, and Throat | | |
| 1. Office calls, Ear, Nose, Throat | 11,282 | |
| 2. Office calls, Eye | 4,648 | |
| 3. Minor operations, Eye | 36 | |
| 4. Polypectomy | 36 | |
| 5. Sub-mucous resection | 16 | |
| 6. Myringotomy | 3 | |
| 7. Minor operation—Antrum | 66 | |
| 8. Minor operation—Throat | 2 | |
| 9. Injections | 6 | |
| 10. Visual Field | 55 | |
| 11. Audio | 3 | |
| 12. Biopsy | 2 | |
| 13. Setting Fractured Nose | 4 | |
| Total | | 16,159 |
| B. X-ray | | |
| 1. X-ray | 5,195 | |
| 2. Functional X-ray | 1,512 | |
| 3. Deep Therapy | 1,308 | |
| 4. Superficial Therapy | 1,201 | |
| Total | | 9,216 |
| C. Physiotherapy | | |
| 1. Short wave | 12,343 | |
| 2. Infra Red | 3,654 | |
| 3. Massage | 3,631 | |
| 4. Gilbert stretching | 1,707 | |
| 5. Galvanic | 1,843 | |
| 6. Elliott | 190 | |
| 7. Ultra Violet | 1,779 | |
| 8. Gold quartz | 242 | |
| 9. Long wave | 91 | |
| Total | | 25,480 |
| D. Urology | | |
| 1. Office calls | 3,542 | |
| 2. Injections | 1,267 | |
| 3. Office treatments | 1,520 | |
| 4. X-rays | 296 | |
| 5. Cystos—Simple | 139 | |
| 6. Cystos—Complete | 152 | |
| 7. I.V. Pyelograms | 8 | |
| 8. Surgery (Circumcisions—Child) | 56 | |
| 9. Spinal | 11 | |
| 10. Hydrocele | 12 | |
| 11. Stone manipulation | 4 | |
| 12. U.R. Caruncle | 2 | |
| 13. Uteral Dilatation | 20 | |
| 14. Fulg. of Polyps | 13 | |
| Total | | 7,042 |
| E. Surgeons | | |
| 1. Office calls—Gyn. | 2,494 | |
| 2. Office calls—Surgical | 5,150 | |
| 3. Minor Surgery | 426 | |
| 4. Injections | 379 | |
| 5. Dressings | 1,656 | |
| 6. Cervical Cautery | 21 | |
| 7. Rubin Tests | 12 | |
| 8. Diaphragms | 23 | |
| 9. General Exams. | 7 | |
| 10. Consultations | 10 | |
| Total | | 10,178 |

Table 38—Continued
Ross-Loos Medical Group—Year 1944
Services to Subscribers

| <i>Description</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| F. Endocrinology—Allergy | | |
| 1. Office calls ----- | 1,998 | |
| 2. Allergy tests ----- | 1,018 | |
| 3. B. M. R. ----- | 833 | |
| 4. Hypos. ----- | 3,296 | |
| 5. I. V. Injections ----- | 897 | |
| Total ----- | | 8,040 |
| G. Proctology | | |
| 1. Office calls ----- | 3,505 | |
| 2. Injections ----- | 1,575 | |
| 3. Minor surgery ----- | 507 | |
| 4. Proctoscopy ----- | 122 | |
| 5. Office treatments ----- | 2,509 | |
| 6. Hernia Injection ----- | 59 | |
| 7. Consultation ----- | 11 | |
| Total ----- | | 8,288 |
| H. Dermatology | | |
| 1. Office calls ----- | 6,944 | |
| 2. Dressings ----- | 795 | |
| 3. Injections ----- | 905 | |
| 4. Minor surgery ----- | 548 | |
| 5. CO ₂ Snow ----- | 47 | |
| 6. Patch tests ----- | 60 | |
| 7. Luetic office calls ----- | 104 | |
| 8. Autohemotherapy ----- | 47 | |
| 9. Spinal ----- | 6 | |
| Total ----- | | 9,456 |
| I. Medical | | |
| 1. Office calls ----- | 22,972 | |
| 2. Aspirations ----- | 10 | |
| 3. Injections ----- | 33 | |
| 4. Physical Exams. ----- | 20 | |
| 5. Pneumos ----- | 433 | |
| 6. Electrocardiograms ----- | 857 | |
| Total ----- | | 24,325 |
| J. Orthopedics | | |
| 1. Office calls ----- | 2,700 | |
| 2. Minor surgery ----- | 9 | |
| 3. Dressings ----- | 180 | |
| 4. Splintings ----- | 205 | |
| 5. Reductions ----- | 31 | |
| 6. General casts ----- | 192 | |
| 7. Injections—Novocaine ----- | 25 | |
| 8. Aspirations ----- | 4 | |
| 9. Manipulations ----- | 12 | |
| 10. Taping ----- | 220 | |
| 11. Elastic Bandages ----- | 127 | |
| 12. Sling ----- | 17 | |
| Orthopedics Total ----- | | 3,819 |
| K. Surgery | | |
| 1. Tonsils and adenoids, General ----- | 321 | |
| 2. Tonsils and adenoids, Local ----- | 146 | |
| 3. Mytimogotomy ----- | 23 | |
| 4. Circumcision (Adult) ----- | 10 | |
| 5. Minor surgery ----- | 105 | |
| 6. Cervical operation ----- | 54 | |
| 7. Spinal punctures ----- | 12 | |
| 8. Biopsy ----- | 33 | |
| 9. Vein Ligations ----- | 7 | |
| 10. Orthopedic surgery ----- | 3 | |
| 11. Paracentesis ----- | 1 | |
| 12. Anesthesia ----- | 437 | |
| 13. Bronchography ----- | 9 | |
| 14. Lip resection ----- | 2 | |
| Total ----- | | 1,163 |

Table 38—Continued
 Ross-Loos Medical Group—Year 1944
 Service to Subscribers

| <i>Description</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>Total</i> |
|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| L. Optometry | | |
| 1. Refractions ----- | 2,336 | |
| 2. Adjustments ----- | 1,461 | |
| 3. Dispensings ----- | 2,057 | |
| 4. Disp. Delivery ----- | 2,083 | |
| 5. Repair ----- | 1,082 | |
| Total ----- | | 9,018 |
| M. Laboratory | | |
| 1. Urinalysis ----- | 7,770 | |
| 2. Hematology ----- | 5,442 | |
| 3. Parasitology ----- | 896 | |
| 4. Serology ----- | 2,701 | |
| 5. Animal Inoculation ----- | 142 | |
| 6. Functional ----- | 290 | |
| 7. Biopsy ----- | 88 | |
| 8. Urine Chemistry ----- | 21 | |
| Total ----- | | 17,350 |
| N. Unclassified | | |
| 1. Office calls, Gyn. ----- | 133 | |
| 2. Office calls, Surgical ----- | 1,051 | |
| 3. Office calls, Medical ----- | 38 | |
| 4. Minor surgery ----- | 29 | |
| 5. Injections ----- | 42 | |
| 6. Dressings ----- | 207 | |
| 7. Cervical Cautey ----- | 1 | |
| 8. Rubin Tests ----- | 3 | |
| 9. Orthopedics ----- | 1 | |
| 10. Consultations ----- | 66 | |
| Total ----- | | 1,571 |
| O. Obstetrics ----- | | 28 |
| P. Pharmacy ----- | | 74,171 |
| Q. House Calls ----- | | 2,684 |
| R. Hospitalization | | |
| 1. Major operation ----- | 389 | |
| 2. Minor operation ----- | 82 | |
| 3. Medical ----- | 457 | |
| Total ----- | | 928 |
| S. Outside Offices | | |
| 1. Office calls ----- | 34,350 | |
| 2. General Exams. ----- | 1,104 | |
| 3. T. & A. ----- | 180 | |
| 4. Minor surgery ----- | 876 | |
| 5. Physiotherapy ----- | 8,994 | |
| 6. Hypo ----- | 9,553 | |
| 7. Drugs ----- | 27,444 | |
| 8. Laboratory ----- | 2,382 | |
| 9. B. M. R. ----- | 438 | |
| 10. House calls ----- | 2,624 | |
| 11. X-ray ----- | 24 | |
| Total ----- | | 87,965 |
| Grand Total ----- | | 316,881 |

Table 39
Ross-Loos Medical Group
1944 Experience
Laboratory and X-ray

| <i>Description</i> | <i>Incidence 1,000,000 Life Years</i> | <i>Schedule Cost Per Treatment</i> | <i>Total Cost</i> |
|---------------------------|---|--|-----------------------|
| Laboratory | | | |
| Urinalysis ----- | 295,260 | \$1.50 | \$442,690 |
| Hematology ----- | 206,796 | 5.00 | 1,033,980 |
| Parasitology ----- | 34,048 | 1.50 | 51,072 |
| Serology ----- | 102,638 | 3.00 | 307,914 |
| Animal Inoculation ----- | 5,396 | 7.50 | 40,470 |
| Functional ----- | 11,020 | 7.50 | 82,650 |
| Biopsy ----- | 3,344 | 10.00 | 23,440 |
| Urine Chemistry ----- | 798 | .50 | 399 |
| Unclassified ----- | 90,516 | 2.50 | 226,290 |
| | <hr/> 749,816 | | <hr/> \$2,219,105 |
| X-ray | | | |
| Diagnostic ----- | 266,114 | \$10.00 | \$2,661,140 |
| Superficial Therapy ----- | 45,638 | 5.00 | 228,190 |
| | <hr/> 311,752 | | <hr/> \$2,889,330 |

Table 40
Ross-Loos Medical Group
1944 Experience

| <i>Kind of Service</i> | <i>Number of Services</i> | <i>Services Per Year Per Member</i> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| A. Eye, Ear, Nose, Throat ----- | 16,159 | .61 |
| B. X-ray ----- | 9,216 | .35 |
| C. Physiotherapy ----- | 25,480 | .97 |
| D. Urology ----- | 7,042 | .27 |
| E. Surgeons ----- | 10,178 | .39 |
| F. Endocrinology—Allergy ----- | 8,040 | .30 |
| G. Proctology ----- | 8,288 | .31 |
| H. Dermatology ----- | 9,456 | .36 |
| I. Medical ----- | 24,325 | .92 |
| J. Orthopedics ----- | 3,819 | .15 |
| K. Surgery ----- | 1,163 | .04 |
| L. Optometry ----- | 9,018 | .34 |
| M. Laboratory ----- | 17,350 | .66 |
| N. Unclassified ----- | 1,571 | .06 |
| O. Obstetrics ----- | 28 | -- |
| P. Pharmacy ----- | 74,171 | 2.81 |
| Q. House Calls ----- | 2,684 | .10 |
| R. Hospitalization ----- | 928 | .04 |
| S. Outside Offices ----- | 87,965 | 3.33 |
| Total ----- | <hr/> 316,881 | <hr/> 12.01 |

Table 41

| Ross-Loos Medical Group 1944 Experience Physicians Service—Surgery | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Description | Incidence 1,000,000 Life Years | Cost Per Service | Total Cost |
| A. Minor Surgery | | | |
| 1. Eye ----- | 1,368 | \$25.00 | \$34,200 |
| 2. Polypectomy ----- | 1,370 | 15.00 | 20,550 |
| 3. Sub-mucous resection ----- | 608 | 50.00 | 30,400 |
| 4. Myringotomy ----- | 988 | 7.50 | 7,410 |
| 5. Antrum ----- | 2,508 | 15.00 | 12,540 |
| 6. Throat ----- | 76 | 10.00 | 760 |
| 7. Cystoscopy—complete ----- | 5,776 | 30.00 | 173,280 |
| 8. Circumcision ----- | 2,128 | 15.00 | 10,640 |
| 9. Hydrocele ----- | 456 | 50.00 | 22,800 |
| 10. Stone manipulation ----- | 156 | 50.00 | 7,600 |
| 11. Uteral Dilatation ----- | 760 | 25.00 | 19,000 |
| 12. Urethral Caruncle ----- | 76 | 20.00 | 1,520 |
| 13. Fulg. of Polyps ----- | 494 | 50.00 | 24,700 |
| 14. Reductions ----- | 1,178 | 50.00 | 58,900 |
| 15. Tonsils and Adenoids ----- | 12,198 | 50.00 | 609,900 |
| 16. Vein Ligation ----- | 266 | 30.00 | 7,980 |
| 17. Orthopedic ----- | 114 | 25.00 | 2,850 |
| 18. Paracentesis ----- | 38 | 10.00 | 380 |
| 19. Minor Surgery ----- | 98,118 | 25.00 | 2,452,950 |
| Total ----- | 128,672 | | \$3,498,360 |
| B. Major Surgery ----- | 14,782 | \$125.00 | 1,847,750 |
| Grand Total ----- | 143,454 | | \$5,346,110 |

Table 42

| | |
|------------------------------------|----------|
| Subscribers hospitalized : | |
| Major surgery ----- | 389 |
| Minor surgery ----- | 82 |
| Medical ----- | 457 |
| Total ----- | 928 |
| Average days per case ----- | 8.2 |
| Hospital days ----- | 7,610 |
| Average days per subscriber ----- | 288 |
| Hospital cost ----- | \$68,468 |
| Cost per day ----- | \$9.00 |
| Cost per subscriber per year ----- | \$2.60 |

PERMANENTE FOUNDATION HOSPITALS

Through the courtesy of the Officers of Permanente Foundation Hospital, the experience of the organization for the year 1944 was made available for this study. Only that experience designated "Health Plan" is here considered. This refers to the prepaid medical and hospital Plan as described in exhibit E. Its membership consisted of Shipyard Employees, and represents about 65% of the services rendered by the Foundation. The other 35%, representing services under various other contracts and for private patients, could not be included because the "exposure" could not be sufficiently established.

"Health Plan" patients were recorded to have been 67.8% of all patients discharged from the hospitals. The number of surgical operations was not segregated, and in this paper it is assumed that 67.8% of the surgery recorded was performed under the Health Plan Contract. Pharmacy dispensings were not segregated, and 66% are regarded as being "Health Plan."

The experience is exhibited in Table (43). One of the most important factors in the valuation of medical care in any group is the percentage of female members. In this experience that percentage is not known.

The group was subject to a high rate of turnover, by which is meant that the average period of membership of its subscribers was comparatively short. In this respect it may be compared with "Adel Precision Products" and contrasted with the "Health Service System of San Francisco." In other respects it is more closely comparable to "Ross-Loos Medical Group" than to any other Plan included in these studies. Two very important differences should be noted. First, the membership of Permanente was from one single employer, and however diversified, such an individual group will reflect its unity as to locality, living conditions, and particularly the policy of the employer in selecting employees. Second, the services of Permanente may be regarded as centering around the Hospital, while those of Ross-Loos center around the Clinic. No practical difference is indicated with respect to services rendered, but there may have been some differences in classification of incidence of hospitalization.

In prepaid medicine organizations that operate as a unit, either Clinic or Hospital, and that retain Physicians on a salary basis, it would not be possible to determine the actual cost of an individual medical service without elaborate accounting. However, since both the Plans of this character studied offer unrestricted use of their services as to calls on the Doctor, Laboratory tests, and X-ray, their recorded incidence provides a fairly reliable basis for estimate of the probable complete requirements.

Table 43
Permanente Foundation Hospitals
Experience—1944

| | Number | 1,000,000 Life Years |
|---|----------|-------------------------|
| Services—Calls | | |
| Number of Subscribers (Health Plan) | 64,661 | 1,000,000 |
| Clinic Calls—First | 68,401 | 1,058,183 |
| Subsequent | 210,448 | 3,255,631 |
| House Calls—Doctor | 3,949 | 61,091 |
| Nurse | 7,494 | 115,932 |
| First Aid Station Visits | 396,043 | 6,126,785 |
| Total Calls | 686,335 | 10,617,602 |
| Services—Non-Hospitalized | | |
| Treatments | 278,789 | 4,312,866 |
| Laboratory Tests | 82,806 | 1,281,009 |
| X-ray Patients (Films) | 21,596 | 334,190 |
| X-ray Therapy | 22,794 | 352,623 |
| Physical Therapy | 5,018 | 77,628 |
| Services—Hospitalized | | |
| Number Hospitalized | 7,020 | 108,599 |
| Hospital Days | 49,016 | 758,278 |
| Days Per Patient | 6.98 | 6.98 |
| Days Per Member | .76 | .76 |
| Laboratory Tests | 74,206 | 1,147,967 |
| X-ray Patients (Films) | 3,816 | 59,034 |
| Physical Therapy | 2,191 | 33,894 |
| Services—Surgical | | |
| Minor Surgery | *2,520 | 38,984 |
| Major Surgery | *1,538 | 23,793 |
| Services—Miscellaneous | | |
| Pharmacy Dispensings | *116,628 | 1,804,235 |
| Ambulance and Taxi Trips | 10,754 | 166,364 |

* Estimated.

DISCUSSION

Facilities

A review of the manner of operation of the Type of Plans described discloses that they differ in theory and practice as regards the provision of Medical Care Facilities. Type I and II rely upon the demand to create the supply. There is no guarantee nor obligation stated nor implied that there will be sufficient facilities to meet the demand. Under Type I, individual agreement, the proper facilities are either apparent or may be assumed by the patient to exist. Very often, however, this assumption is incorrect. The Physician to whom the medical care of the patient is entrusted may not have at his disposal laboratory, hospital, or special equipment facilities indicated for proper treatment. Under Type II, conditions are quite the same. Insured Plans ordinarily do not undertake to provide facilities, but assume that they will be contracted for individually as in Type I. In some instances a group may have at its disposal special clinics, and very often there will be available "company" doctors, but rarely if at all, are these a part of the Insured Plan.

Type III implies, and regularly arranges to provide, a sufficiency of certain basic facilities. Agreements are made with practicing physicians, existing clinics, and hospitals, for the fulfilment of the contractual obligations. The manner of operation is flexible enough to permit a policy of contracting clinics and hospitals. As an example, the Health Service System of San Francisco operates its own physio-therapy unit. At present, however, very little has been done in that direction, and the lack of adequate facilities is one of the major deterrents to expansion of Type III Plans into certain communities.

Type IV, in the nature of its operation, provides special physicians for its members and either a clinic or hospital or both. Since it operates as a "center," in theory it is capable of administering medical care of all kinds, and its existence depends upon its ability to do so. In practice the Plans reviewed are very zealous, as are the Plans of Type III, in providing adequate facilities and the latest improvements in medical care. This type usually operates more or less widely dispersed emergency or sub-clinics with provision for transportation to the "center" when required.

It is obvious that in the absence of sufficient facilities, Type I can function only inefficiently, and no Prepaid Plan would be feasible. It is impractical, therefore, to contemplate any Prepaid Plan publicly or privately operated unless it includes provision for adequate facilities available to the communities of its membership. The question of what would be considered standards of "adequate" facilities is apt to be a provocative one. Its resolution would require investigation with respect to each individual community or region concerned, under the supervision of Medical or Public Health authority.

However, some studies have been made concerning the existing facilities in each county. The results are set forth in Tables (44), (45), and (46). The data in Table (44) was taken from the "American Hospital Directory, 1945," and enumerates the actual facilities reported to exist. Striking inequalities in unit facilities per unit population are brought to view. It is felt, however, that these can be interpreted only in the light of standard requirements set by qualified investigation in each particular

area. The use of county boundaries is merely expedient in an approach to the subject, and investigation would undoubtedly disclose other divisions more efficacious to analysis.

The subject was approached from another viewpoint. Questions 12, 13, and 14, of the Physicians Questionnaire (page 5) were included in an attempt to elicit from the doctors practicing in each area an expression as to the adequacy of facilities. The results are set forth in Table (45). They are sufficient to indicate that inadequacies exist, and to emphasize the need for further investigation.

Table (46) was prepared to find the average foundation or capital cost of a hospital bed and concomitant average hospital facilities. The result is conservative, inasmuch as it is probably based on valuations somewhat under what the actual replacement cost would be at present day prices. It would be inappropriate to estimate the cost of needed facilities on the basis of the need for hospital beds only, as the shortage of other facilities may be proportionately much less or much greater than that of hospital beds.

At present the average capital investment per General Hospital bed together with average General Hospital facilities per bed is apparently in excess of \$4,000.00 as indicated in Table (46). There is about one General Hospital bed per 500 population as indicated by Table (44). In both tables the figures for individual counties show considerable deviation from the average.

From Tables (44) and (45) it will be seen that the probable insufficiency of facilities is more pronounced in the rural areas. At the time of these studies there were too few practicing physicians generally, due primarily to the absence of many in the armed services, and it would have been difficult to determine to what extent, in normal times, rural areas are less fortunate than urban in this respect. The statement has often been made that the lack of modern medical facilities in thinly populated districts, accounts to some degree for the reluctance of doctors to practice there. It is a reasonable supposition and accentuates the desirability of improving and augmenting medical facilities available to rural and outlying districts.

Table 44
Nongovernmental General Hospitals
By Counties With Hospital Facilities Reported

| County | Population | General Hospitals | Hospital Beds | Population per Bed | Hospital Facilities—Number of Hospitals Having: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|---|----------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|------|
| | | | | | Blood Bank | Central Supply | Clinical Laboratory | Dental Dept. | Electrocardiograph | Electrocephalograph | Metabolism | Occupational Therapy Dept. | Out Patient Dept. | Pharmacy | Physical Therapy Dept. | Medical Records Library | Social Service Dept. | X-ray Diagnostic | X-ray Therapeutic | Cancer Clinic | None |
| Alameda | 621,485 | 11 | 1,382 | 450 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| Butte | 42,054 | 1 | 64 | 657 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Calaveras | 6,385 | 1 | 12 | 532 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Contra Costa | 218,690 | 4 | 177 | 1,236 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Del Norte | 3,461 | 1 | 24 | 144 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| El Dorado | 9,961 | 1 | 30 | 332 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fresno | 194,652 | 8 | 372 | 524 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Humboldt | 44,106 | 4 | 191 | 231 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Imperial | 43,104 | 1 | 22 | 1,959 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kern | 141,541 | 5 | 218 | 649 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Kings | 34,397 | 2 | 64 | 537 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Lassen | 16,458 | 2 | 67 | 245 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Los Angeles | 3,138,797 | 49 | 5,642 | 556 | 12 | 16 | 38 | 3 | 26 | 5 | 35 | 3 | 16 | 28 | 22 | 31 | 9 | 38 | 20 | 7 | 7 |
| Madera | 25,003 | 2 | 42 | 595 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Marin | 64,669 | 2 | 139 | 465 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mendocino | 24,514 | 2 | 49 | 500 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Merced | 46,632 | 3 | 79 | 590 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Monterey | 84,802 | 6 | 226 | 375 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Napa | 39,220 | 2 | 200 | 196 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nevada | 13,693 | 4 | 79 | 173 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Orange | 153,253 | 2 | 155 | 988 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Placer | 24,910 | 1 | 28 | 889 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Riverside | 122,235 | 3 | 156 | 784 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| Sacramento | 188,168 | 2 | 502 | 375 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Benito | 11,717 | 1 | 22 | 533 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| San Bernardino | 185,081 | 4 | 372 | 498 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| San Diego | 415,875 | 7 | 593 | 701 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 |

Table 44—Continued
Nongovernmental General Hospitals
By Counties With Hospital Facilities Reported

| County | Hospital Facilities—Number of Hospitals Having: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------------|
| | Population | General Hospitals | Hospital Beds | Population per Bed | Blood Bank | Central Supply | Clinical Laboratory | Dental Dept. | Electrocardiograph | Electro- cephalograph | Metabolism | Occupational Therapy Dept. | Out Patient Dept. | Pharmacy | Physical Therapy Dept. |
| San Francisco | 685,951 | 14 | 2,957 | 232 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 7 | 11 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 12 |
| San Joaquin | 151,805 | 4 | 229 | 663 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| San Luis Obispo | 39,681 | 12 | 60 | 661 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| San Mateo | 136,574 | 2 | 177 | 772 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Santa Barbara | 74,629 | 4 | 370 | 202 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Santa Clara | 191,811 | 3 | 291 | 659 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Santa Cruz | 43,709 | 3 | 100 | 437 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Siskiyou | 35,049 | 4 | 75 | 467 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Solano | 95,615 | 1 | 60 | 1,594 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sonoma | 73,002 | 3 | 57 | 1,281 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stanislaus | 81,348 | 6 | 185 | 439 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sutter | 17,947 | 1 | 25 | 718 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tehama | 12,661 | 1 | 40 | 316 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tulare | 108,283 | 4 | 70 | 1,549 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Tuolumne | 8,360 | 1 | 23 | 364 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ventura | 75,992 | 2 | 101 | 752 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Yolo | 27,813 | 1 | 65 | 428 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Yuba | 18,140 | 1 | 36 | 504 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| State | 7,902,900 | 188 | 15,828 | 499.9 | 21 | 63 | 107 | 15 | 79 | 13 | 106 | 14 | 47 | 81 | 68 |

Counties Having No Non-Governmental Hospitals

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Alpine | 216 |
| Amador | 6,337 |
| Colusa | 8,881 |
| Glenn | 10,996 |
| Inyo | 16,978 |
| Lake | 7,440 |
| Mariposa | 3,112 |

| | |
|---------|--------|
| Modoc | 14,259 |
| Mono | 931 |
| Plumas | 9,874 |
| Shasta | 26,593 |
| Sierra | 1,753 |
| Trinity | 2,327 |

Table 45—Continued

| County | Inadequacies of Medical Care, Number of Doctors Stating Existence of: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| | Facilities for Surgery----- | Inadequate Hospital Supervision----- | Laboratory or Hospital Fee Too Costly----- | Ambulances----- | Child Health Care----- | Pathologists----- | Eye Doctors and Specialists----- | Hospital Facilities----- | Doctors * (General)----- | Laboratory----- | Psychiatrists----- | Office Space----- | Nurses----- |
| Solano----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Sonoma----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Stanislaus----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tehama----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tulare----- | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Ventura----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Yolo----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Yuba----- | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State----- | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 77 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 10 | 20 |
| Percentage of Totals to Number of Doctors Reporting----- | 9 | 9 | 1.9 | .6 | 1.3 | .3 | 1.9 | 25.0 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 3.2 | 6.5 |

Table 46

Foundation Value per Hospital Bed of Nongovernmental General Hospitals

| <i>County</i> | <i>Number Reporting</i> | <i>Valuation</i> | <i>Beds</i> | <i>Average for Bed</i> |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Alameda ----- | 7 | \$6,155,585 | 1,069 | \$5,758 |
| 2. Calaveras ----- | 1 | 30,000 | 12 | 2,500 |
| 3. Contra Costa ----- | 2 | 450,000 | 120 | 3,750 |
| 4. El Dorado ----- | 1 | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| 5. Fresno ----- | 4 | 735,574 | 305 | 2,412 |
| 6. Humboldt ----- | --- | ----- | --- | ----- |
| 7. Imperial ----- | 1 | 40,000 | 22 | 1,818 |
| 8. Kern ----- | --- | ----- | --- | ----- |
| 9. Kings ----- | 2 | 101,000 | 64 | 1,578 |
| 10. Lassen ----- | 1 | 70,745 | 47 | 1,505 |
| 11. Los Angeles ----- | 35 | 15,144,076 | 3,974 | 3,811 |
| 12. Madera ----- | --- | ----- | --- | ----- |
| 13. Marin ----- | 1 | 394,681 | 99 | 3,987 |
| 14. Mendocino ----- | --- | ----- | --- | ----- |
| 15. Merced ----- | 1 | 150,000 | 50 | 3,000 |
| 16. Monterey ----- | 1 | 35,000 | 29 | 1,206 |
| 17. Napa ----- | 2 | 672,739 | 200 | 3,363 |
| 18. Nevada ----- | 3 | 115,000 | 49 | 2,347 |
| 19. Orange ----- | 2 | 646,965 | 155 | 4,174 |
| 20. Riverside ----- | 2 | 436,465 | 126 | 3,464 |
| 21. Sacramento ----- | 2 | 2,245,834 | 502 | 4,465 |
| 22. San Benito ----- | 1 | 75,000 | 22 | 3,409 |
| 23. San Bernardino ----- | 3 | 2,262,191 | 247 | 9,159 |
| 24. San Diego ----- | 4 | 2,621,101 | 522 | 5,021 |
| 25. San Francisco ----- | 13 | 11,792,344 | 2,622 | 4,497 |
| 26. San Joaquin ----- | 2 | 250,000 | 109 | 2,293 |
| 27. San Mateo ----- | 1 | 778,739 | 141 | 5,523 |
| 28. Santa Barbara ----- | 2 | 1,414,720 | 233 | 6,072 |
| 29. Santa Clara ----- | 3 | 875,542 | 291 | 3,009 |
| 30. Santa Cruz ----- | 3 | 371,860 | 100 | 3,719 |
| 31. Siskiyou ----- | 1 | 40,000 | 15 | 2,667 |
| 32. Sonoma ----- | 2 | 80,308 | 45 | 1,784 |
| 33. Stanislaus ----- | 1 | 50,000 | 35 | 1,428 |
| 34. Tulare ----- | 3 | 125,000 | 53 | 2,358 |
| 35. Ventura ----- | 2 | 326,190 | 101 | 3,229 |
| 36. Yolo ----- | 1 | 350,000 | 65 | 5,385 |
| 37. Yuba ----- | --- | ----- | --- | ----- |
| Total ----- | 109 | \$48,836,659 | 11,424 | \$4,275 |

Incidence of Demand for Medical Care

Incidence of Medical Care will be grouped into four divisions: Medical; Laboratory, X-ray, and use of other special equipment; surgical; and Hospitalization.

For the purpose of this analysis Medical may be generally defined as any service other than practical surgery which requires the Physicians time or supervision. Laboratory and the use of X-ray, radium, or special equipment might well be thought of as belonging in this category, but will be considered separately because their use has been found to vary independently of other medical service. Medical may be grouped into one incidence heading of "Doctors Calls" an inclusive term meaning medical examinations, except as they entail laboratory, x-ray, or other special service; office calls; home calls; hospital calls; surgical calls if not included in the surgical fee; physio-therapy; and generally all Physicians services not usually regarded as surgical.

To group so many services of such great inherent possibility of variation will not produce an accurate conception of a single "call," but by far the largest part of them are of a routine character and those that are

extraordinary are considered to be too few to distort the significance of the index of their incidence, if all are considered of indential value as measured in terms of the physicians time and attention. From a standpoint of incidence a "call" may be considered to be the same phenomenon as another "call," but a monetary value assigned to it, for the purpose of determining the "cost," should be a weighted average based upon some standard of values applied to as many different kinds of service as the data at hand will permit. Some of the assumption herein employed with regard to the comparative number of various kinds of calls are made with an estimation of their value in view.

Table (1) page 6 indicates that under Type I medical care there are about 3.6 calls per illness. This is derived by adding "first calls" to "subsequent calls" and dividing by "first calls." Since each call ordinarily represents additional expense to the patient, the incidence is, as might be expected, lower than that of any prepaid Plan studied. Although it may include some unnecessary calls, it may be regarded as an absolute minimum, and is very probably much below the minimum requirements of adequate medical care.

The Type II Plans providing medical benefits that were available for study were all "three-call deductible" with reference to disease, and the experience applicable only to benefits with the same restriction.

Type III Plans in general exhibit the common characteristics of imposed restrictions, or limitations of Doctors Calls. Some Plans have in the beginning attempted to provide unlimited service but, as exemplified by the Plans described in the present study, have generally found a change of policy necessary in this respect. The Health Service System of San Francisco limits Doctors Calls to a maximum of five in any one month. California Physicians Service originally offered full coverage, now issues only "two call deductible" contracts, which limit the liability to Doctors Calls beginning with the third for any one illness.

In addition, with respect to private practice in general during the period of the experience herein presented, there was an unavoidable curtailment of medical service brought about by an insufficiency in number of practicing physicians due to the absence of many in the armed forces.

In the experience of H. S. S. of S. F. during the year ending Sept. 30, 1944, there was an average of 4.7 doctors calls per member. See Table (25). The percentage of subscribers using service was 63.7. See Table (26). It would appear, therefore, that each subscriber using service required an average of about 7.4 calls, which may be taken as the average number of calls per case.

In the experience of C. P. S. from March 1940 to July 1941, a period in which all calls were covered, the average number of calls per member per year was 5.96, See Table (9), a figure comparable to 4.7 in the paragraph above. During a period from May 1941 through June 1941, there was an average of .62 medical units per member per month. See Table (10), or about 7.44 units per member per year.

The effect of "two call deductible" limitation may be seen in Table (14). The average number of "calls" per member was about 1.5 and the average per case was about 3.62. If, for each case, the two disallowed calls be added, the sum of the total calls per case would be 5.62. A seasonal variation has been noted in the experience of C. P. S. with respect to

incidence under the "Medical Rider." The figure of 5.62 pertains to April, May, June and July. For the same months under the full coverage contract, the average number of calls per member was 5.53.

The Type IV Plans yield the most significant experience with respect to unrestricted demand upon the personal services of the Physician. In neither of the two Plans offered for study is there any limitation upon the number of Doctors Calls, and beyond a comparison perhaps of the facility with which individual staff Doctors dispose of their cases, apparently there is little administrative control that would have a limiting effect.

The incidence of Doctors Calls, therefore, as experienced in this Type of Plan, may be considered to be very near the actual demand. As such it is much higher than that experienced in other Types. The experience of the Ross-Loos Medical Group is available for the year 1939 and the year 1944, and of Permanente for the year 1944. For the 1939 Ross-Loos experience there was also data sufficient to determine the division of incidence with respect to male and female employees. This is set forth in Table (37). If from that table there be omitted those services which do not fall in the category of Doctors Calls, there remains an expression of incidence of great importance. The following table (47) has been prepared in this manner and the lines numbered corresponding to Table (37).

The total shows 8.68 services per year per adult male, and 13.82 services per year per adult female. It will be noted that these do not include Gynecology, Obstetrics, Refractions, Dentistry, X-ray, and Laboratory. Some of the Hospital Calls may well be ascribed to Surgical cases. Elsewhere it will be seen that Hospital cases generally may be divided into surgical and medical cases at a ratio of about 1 to 1. See Table (42). If this adjustment were made the incidence totals would then be 8.12 services per year per adult male, and 12.97 services per year per adult female.

A comparison may be made with the reported number of Doctors' and Nurses' services classed as Doctor's Calls, in the 1944 experience of Permanente Foundation Hospital. See Table (43). The incidence of calls is there shown to be 10.62 per adult member. The proportion of male and female exposure from which this experience was derived is not known. However, within the range of probable proportions, the incidence is evidently closely comparable to that of Ross-Loos 1939 Experience. As appears in Table (43), the average membership was 64,661, while first calls numbered 68,401 an average of 1.06 cases per member. Since there were 10.6 calls per member the average number of calls per case was about 10. This may be compared with 7.4 calls per case in the experience of H. S. S. of S. F.

The incidence of "use" or the average number of cases per member, is not determinable from the data on hand relative to Ross-Loos experience. A comparison of H. S. S. of S. F. group and the Permanente group in this report shows a spread of from 63.7% in the former to 106% in the latter, a fact which emphasizes what has previously been said concerning the wide difference in the experience of individual groups. In this connection, reference is again made to the difference in costs of the two Type II groups presented. It should be noted that the Permanente index of "use" of 106% is quite conservative, in that it is based on first "Clinic Calls," and excludes "Home Calls," many of which may have been first

calls, and all "First Aid Station Visits," which would undoubtedly include many cases of "use" not referred to the Clinic.

This experience is very impressive and must not be lost sight of in the consideration of expected incidence, but it can not be taken as an index with respect to employed groups as a whole, due, as has been stated, to the fact that it refers to a single group of a single employer. The same objection applies to the experience of H. S. S. of S. F. In conjunction with the experience of Ross-Loos, however, which refers to a more highly differentiated membership, it would appear that the experience of Permanente is not far from the industrial average.

Tables (1) (5) (19) (37) et al. seem to indicate that the incidence of all kinds of medical care of female members exclusive of maternity and diseases peculiar to the female, is about one and one-half times that of employed male members. The ratio appears to hold whether the female members are employed, unemployed, married or single. Tables (29) and (33) show that in the experience of H. S. S. of S. F. the cost per person for female dependents is no more than for female subscribers, although there is probably a much higher percentage of married women among the dependents than among employed female members. The Ross-Loos Medical Group found that the cost of medical care of a female subscriber was about 175% of the cost for a male subscriber. This included, however, certain benefits for maternity. As previously stated in this discussion, the number of Doctors Calls in the Ross-Loos 1939 experience, per year per adult male, was 8.12 and per adult female 12.97, a ratio of a little more than one and one-half to one. As against this we have the experience of H. S. S. of S. F. in Tables (28) and (29), indicating a somewhat lower ratio. In the experience of C. P. S. as shown in Table (8), the cost per adult female contract with respect to medical, was about 175% of the cost per adult male contract, Table (1) shows a ratio of about 45 to 34, less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, and this, of course, includes all female calls. Standard Insurance Rates are based on the premise that costs for women are 200% of those for men. See "Group Insurance Rates," Schedule F.

There is very little material applicable to the study of medical care requirements of children. The practice of including them with adults in the same contract has tended to obscure the incidence and cost of their medical care demand. It is quite probable too that in future a greater percentage of medical services will be devoted to children than at present. There has been a trend in modern times toward more medical supervision of the young, and these are indications that point to its extension to cover the entire growing period. The most complete experience included in these studies is that of H. S. S. of S. F. Table (26) shows that the incidence of use among children is greater than that of adults, being 74.9 as compared with 63.7 for all subscribers. The service requirement per case is much less as is disclosed by a comparison of cost per case. From Table (1) it would appear that the care of children accounts for about 22% of Doctor's calls.

Conclusions with regard to "Medical" may be summarized as follows:

Under Type I medical care, the demand for doctor's services is much less than under Prepaid Plans, and is measured between 3 and 4 "Doctor's Calls" per person per year.

The use of physicians service is limited under Type II and Type III Plans. With the "two-call deductible" limitation, the Doctor's calls per member average about 1.5 to 2 per year. Without such limitation the

average is about 6 per member per year. With calls limited to 5 within any one month, in a membership including men, women, and children, the average number of Doctor's Calls per person per year is about 4.7 and the number of calls per case about 7.4.

The experience of the Type IV Plans, studied is consistent and indicates the requirements of physicians services, unlimited but administratively supervised, to be about 10 Doctor's Calls per adult member per year, exclusive of maternity care.

The number of medical cases per member per year in individual groups ranges from about .6 to more than 1. In diversified groups the average appears to be near 1.

The total experience shows that women require about 1.5 times as much physicians service (exclusive of maternity care and care of diseases peculiar to women) as men.

In view of the meager experience relative to the use of medical service by children and the possibility of the future expansion of medical child care, no well substantiated estimate of probable requirements can be made, but such evidence as is available indicates that each child under the age of 19 would require about $\frac{1}{2}$ as much service as the adult average.

In a controlled prepaid system, consisting of a membership of men, women, and children, the expectation of unlimited demand for physicians service, as measured by Doctor's Calls per year may be placed at 8 for each man, 12 for each woman and about 5 for each child, or 25 Doctor's Calls for a family of three; the number of cases per member per year at 1; and the number of Doctor's Calls per case at about 8.

It is to be noted (with reference to Table (2) that this represents probably about twice as much physicians service as is now being received under Type I.

Table 47

**Incidence of Physician's Personal Services
(Except Surgical) from the Ross-Loos Medical Group Experience of 1939**

| <i>Kind of Service</i> | <i>Number of Services Per 1,000,000 Life Years</i> | |
|--|--|-------------------|
| | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
| 1. Office Calls (not otherwise specified) ----- | 3,392,726 | 6,521,067 |
| 2. General Examination ----- | 105,398 | 154,262 |
| 3. Orthopedics ----- | 129,739 | 221,932 |
| 4. Dermatology ----- | 277,840 | 354,002 |
| 5. Urology ----- | 378,164 | 165,837 |
| 7. Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat ----- | 1,305,184 | 1,716,246 |
| 8. Dressings ----- | 359,018 | 370,852 |
| 16. Residence Calls—Day ----- | 298,557 | 580,201 |
| 17. Residence Calls—Night ----- | 51,400 | 52,564 |
| 18. Hospital Calls ----- | 1,110,877 | 1,690,870 |
| 19. Physio-therapy ----- | 1,270,695 | 1,990,934 |
| Total ----- | 8,679,598 | 13,819,367 |
| Total (excluding $\frac{1}{2}$ of line 18) ----- | 8,124,160 | 12,973,932 |

Incidence and Cost of Laboratory and X-ray

The class of medical services treated under the general heading of "Laboratory and X-ray" includes the use of other special equipment. Much of this service is rendered in hospitals, and that part of it will be considered in the "Cost of Hospitalization," for the reason that it is included in the cost of hospitalization in much of the data at hand, as a part of "Special Hospital Services." This discussion will be limited to its diagnostic and therapeutic use in ambulatory cases by a private physician, commercial laboratory, or clinic.

None of the experience here presented relative to Type I or Type II medical care provides any clue as to the extent of the use of Laboratory, X-ray, or service involving other special equipment. Each of the Plans under Types III and IV, however, has provided statistical divisions sufficient for the purpose. These are all set forth in the tables of recorded experience in this report, but for the purpose of comparative analysis have been incorporated in the accompanying Table No. (47).

The California Physician's Service offers complete laboratory and X-ray examinations, X-ray and radium treatments, in its medical contract, and diagnostic X-ray and clinical laboratory service in its surgical contract. The medical contract is issued only to employed subscribers, and during May, June, July, and August, 1945 the cost under it, and \$20,270 for laboratory and miscellaneous. See Table (16). If expanded to one year on this basis, the cost per subscriber per year would be \$1.70 for X-ray and radium and \$1.38 for laboratory. Under the surgical contract with miscellaneous membership, the cost per member during the same period was \$.14 for X-ray and radium and \$.13 for laboratory. Expanded to one year the cost per member for X-ray and radium would be \$.42 and for laboratory \$.39. The total cost per member per year, therefore, for all these services would be \$3.89. Table (15) indicates the cost for men and women to be about the same.

The contract of the Health Service System of San Francisco limits the use of X-ray and laboratory:

"X-ray examinations to the value of \$10.00 and laboratory tests to the value of \$5.00 are given to patients *while not in the hospital*, and are limited respectively to service for any one condition, illness or injury. After twelve month period has elapsed, the service of either or both may be extended, upon approval of the Medical Director, to cover a new condition, illness or injury."

For patients in the hospital the contract stipulates what the patient must pay for if used:

"* * * the use of radium, deep X-ray therapy, * * * allergic tests, biologic tests * * *."

Its recent experience indicates costs per member per year as follows See Table (22):

| | <i>Employed Members</i> | <i>Dependent Adults</i> | <i>Dependent Children</i> | <i>All Members</i> |
|------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| X-ray ----- | \$.98 | \$.86 | \$.70 | \$.92 |
| Laboratory ----- | .67 | .60 | .59 | .65 |
| Total ----- | \$1.65 | \$1.46 | \$1.29 | \$1.57 |

The experience of the Ross-Loos Medical Group is available for 1939 and 1944. Table (39) shows a point valuation of these services and indicates that the average value of laboratory examinations is about \$2.50. X-ray examinations are considered to have a value of \$10.00 and X-ray therapy treatments \$5.00 each. Deep therapy is not included. On this basis of valuation the experience is as follows:

| | <i>1939 Male</i> | | <i>1939 Female</i> | |
|------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | <i>Service Per Member</i> | <i>Cost</i> | <i>Service Per Member</i> | <i>Cost</i> |
| X-ray ----- | .27 | \$2.72 | .49 | \$4.94 |
| Laboratory ----- | .61 | 1.52 | 1.19 | 2.97 |
| Total ----- | .88 | \$4.24 | 1.68 | \$7.91 |

The average value per employed member was \$5.02.

| <i>Male and Female—1944</i> | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | <i>Service Per Member</i> | <i>Cost</i> |
| X-ray ----- | .31 | \$2.89 |
| Laboratory ----- | .75 | 2.22 |
| Total ----- | 1.06 | \$5.11 |

The experience of Permanente Foundation Hospitals for 1944 is set forth in Table (43). On the same basis of valuation as the above, the cost for non-hospitalized patients would be determined as follows :

| | <i>Service Per Member Per Year</i> | <i>Unit Cost</i> | <i>Cost</i> |
|---------------------------|--|------------------|-------------|
| Laboratory ----- | 1.28 | \$2.50 | \$3.20 |
| X-ray (Examination) ----- | .33 | 10.00 | 3.30 |
| X-ray (Therapy) ----- | .35 | 5.00 | 1.75 |
| Total ----- | 1.96 | | \$8.25 |

Table of Comparative Costs of Nonhospitalized Laboratory and X-ray Service

| <i>Plan</i> | <i>Year</i> | <i>Cost Per Member Per Year</i> |
|-------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| C. P. S. ----- | 1940-1941 | \$4.20 |
| C. P. S. ----- | 1944 | 3.89 |
| H. S. S. of S. F. ----- | 1944 | 1.57 (limited) |
| Ross-Loos ----- | 1939 | 5.02 |
| Ross-Loos ----- | 1944 | 5.11 |
| Permanente ----- | 1944 | 8.25 |

The membership of C. P. S. was predominantly female in a ratio of about 1.5 to 1; of Ross-Loos predominantly male in a ratio of about 3.5 to 1; of Permanente, not known.

Considerable variation in cost is noted. To obtain a usable cost figure, an average cost under the unlimited coverage contracts can be taken, and there being insufficient data on which to base a relative cost estimate as between male and female subscribers, the figure can be assumed to apply to each. The average thus determined is \$5.29 per member per year.

The determining factors in the amount of use required may be contrasted with those of "Doctor's Calls." The amount of demand for Doctor's Calls" resides largely in the opinion of the member concerning his own state of health, while the extent of use of laboratory, X-ray, and other special equipment depends to a greater degree upon the professional methods of the attending physician or surgeon, and upon the availability of facilities.

Incidence and Cost of Surgery

The discussion of Surgery will be confined to the requirement and cost of the services of Surgeons, Consultants, Assistants, and Anaesthetists.

The cost exhibited in the experience of the Insured Plans is limited to the "Schedule of Operations" which in each case is a part of the Plan. Such Schedules vary in the relative amounts allowed for specific operations. Group 1 included a schedule allowing amounts up to \$225.00 for certain operations. Under Group 2 the schedule allowed amounts of about two-thirds of the corresponding amounts under Group 1, with a maximum of \$150.00 for any one operation. It can not be stated with certainty what part of the actual charges the amounts allowed under the schedule represent, probably not all under the most liberal contracts, and correspondingly less under the others. For the present purpose, however, the

payments under a schedule of operations with a \$225.00 maximum may be considered conditionally to represent the full cost for the reason that the amounts allowed are very close to what under certain conditions could be regarded as reasonable charges for ordinary operations, that is, operations without extraordinary complications that entail unusual demand for service.

Under the Plans of Type III, the point system extends to surgical services and the point values form schedules somewhat similar to those of Insured Plans. They are more flexible, however, in that they make provisions for extra points in cases of extraordinary or unusual requirements. This is in keeping with their purpose which is to fix, by previous arrangement with the Physician, the full amount of payment for services rendered; whereas, in Insured Plans, the amounts in the schedule are simply the limits of contractual liability under the Plan.

Under the Plans of Type IV the costs of the surgical services rendered is not determinable from the data at hand. The incidence, or the number of operations per member per year, is recorded. As an approach to the subject, therefore, the method used in the discussion of "Medical" is considered feasible, that is, first to determine a reasonable expectation of incidence, and then to apply to its actual or assumed average costs per case.

The accompanying Table No. (48) has been prepared to show the number of surgical cases per year per member in each of the Plans for which the experience is available. The two Insured Groups are averaged together for the purpose. The incidence with respect to both male and female exposure is given where available.

Table 48

Incidence of Surgery—Cases per Member per Year

| <i>Plan</i> | <i>Men</i> | <i>Women</i> | <i>All Members</i> |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------------|
| Insured ----- | .100 | .164 | .127 |
| C. P. S. (1945) ----- | --- | --- | .190 |
| H. S. S. of S. F. ----- | --- | --- | .120 |
| Ross-Loos (1939) ----- | .119 | .170 | .130 |
| Ross-Loos (1944) ----- | --- | --- | .143 |

It will be seen that the Insured Plans and Ross-Loos 1939 experience agree very closely as to incidence of surgery for both men and women. With respect to "all members," they are in close agreement with H. S. S. of S. F. and Ross-Loos 1944 experience. The incidence in the experience of C. P. S. is much higher. This is not entirely accounted for by the fact that the membership of C. P. S. is predominantly female, while those of H. S. S. of S. F. and Ross-Loos are predominantly male. It is partly due to seasonal variation. Experience has shown that the incidence of surgery is higher in the summer months than in winter, and the C. P. S. figure is based on its experience during April, May, June, and July. The preponderance of experience seems to indicate an incidence of .12 for male and .17 for female participants to be the most probable.

A group consisting largely of new members enrolled without selection might conceivably give rise to a much less favorable experience in the early years.

Hospitalization

No two of the Plans, the experience of which is presented herein, offer the same maximum period of hospitalization :

Insured Group 1, 10 weeks (70 days).

Insured Group 2, 31 days.

C. P. S., 21 days in any contract year for each unrelated illness with certain benefits for 245 additional days.

H. S. S. of S. F., 21 days in any 12-month period.

Ross-Loos Medical Group, 90 days.

Permanente Foundation Hospitals, 111 days.

Therefore, their experience with reference to the amount of hospitalization will not be exactly comparable without adjustment. For this purpose the tables in the accompanying section "Duration of Hospitalization" may be found useful. The number of cases hospitalized per member per year is not affected and should be comparable, with the exception of Insured Group 2, which excluded hospitalization of less than 18 hours. Table (50) has been prepared to set forth the comparative incidence taken from the recorded experience herein reviewed.

Wide variation is immediately apparent. When the memberships are analyzed and grouped into classes, however, certain similarities appear. The membership groups may be classed as industrial and non-industrial. The difference of primary importance between the two classes is in the degree of turnover. By turnover in this sense is meant the replacing of former members with new entrants, to which may be added, in the same concept, the assumption of liability toward groups of new membership without selection by medical examination. A membership that has had the benefits of prepaid or insured medical care for a considerable period may be termed "select," as distinguished from a membership newly enrolled without medical examination. Under the circumstances obtaining at the time of the experience studied, the industrial groups were in a constant state of turnover, that is, were generally "non-select." In the non-industrial groups, the membership was more stable, and coverage was extended to few or no medically unexamined new members.

In the non-industrial class are Insured Group 1, the membership of which is largely Bank and Insurance Company employees, and H. S. S. of S. F., with membership of municipal employees. In the industrial class may be placed Insured Group 2, the membership of which were employees of a manufacturing plant, and Permanente, its membership, from which this experience is derived, being employees of Richmond Ship Yards. The membership of Ross-Loos Medical Group and California Physician's Service is comprised of groups and individuals of both classes.

California Physicians Service was in the process of expansion and increased its membership, under C. P. S. Hospital Contracts, about 10 per cent in the four-month period from April to July, a rate of about 30 per cent per year. In this respect it resembles the Industrial Groups. Furthermore its membership is largely industrial. It may, therefore, be compared to Insured Group 2, and the Permanente Group.

In comparing C. P. S. with Permanente, consideration must be given to the fact that the panel of physicians connected with C. P. S. is composed of Doctors in private practice, each maintaining his own office, and

apt to lean heavily upon the hospitals for facilities and nursing not usually available in private offices. At Permanente the physicians have access to such facilities without actually entering the patient as a hospitalized case unless bed care is imperative.

The same is true, probably to a greater extent, in the Ross-Loos Medical Groups, the clinic of which is as fully equipped as a hospital with facilities for giving complete service except to patients requiring overnight care in a hospital. From this might be expected, in an equal membership, more cases hospitalized but for a shorter average duration in C. P. S. than in Permanente or Ross-Loos. Such is found to be the experience. The average duration in C. P. S. experience was about 5.5 days, in Permanente about 7.6 and in Ross-Loos 8.2. The difference is not due to a difference in the allowed duration of any one case, which is longer in C. P. S. than in either of the others.

For the comparison of the experience of C. P. S. with that of Insured Group 2, the latter must be adjusted for the exclusion of hospitalization of less than 18 hours. Reference to Tables A and B in "Duration of Hospitalization" discloses that the exclusion of hospitalization of one day would reduce the incidence one-fifth to one-third. If an adjustment upward of one-quarter be made in the incidence of Insured Groups 2, the resulting index would be .135. This, when interpreted with reference to the relative approximate percentage of female membership, will be found to agree very closely with the experience of C. P. S.

The low incidence of Ross-Loos is partly accounted for in the discussion above. There is the further factor of low turnover. The membership of Ross-Loos is more stabilized than other industrial groups in which respect it resembles the non-industrial. The contention is that in matured groups, the standard of health is raised and the need for hospitalization lowered. This is borne out by the experience of the Ross-Loos Group which in 1939 was an incidence of .055 with an average duration of 13.2 days per surgical case and 8.3 days per medical case, and in 1944 was an incidence of .035 with an average duration for all cases of 8.2.

From these considerations it would appear that the incidence of Insured Groups 2 would be one-fourth to one-half higher if hospitalization of one day duration were included, and that the incidence of Permanente Foundation Hospitals would be somewhat higher if clinical facilities were not readily available to the physicians. From this we may conclude that in an industrial membership with a high rate of turnover or a large percentage of new entrants, the incidence of hospitalization will be about .14 per member per year under conditions of private practice. In non-industrial groups with low turnover, or an otherwise select membership, the incidence of hospitalization will be about .085 per member per year under conditions of private practice. Under conditions of clinical practice the corresponding indices would be about .11 and .06 respectively. These conclusions may be stated in another way. In a non-select membership if minor cases are hospitalized, the incidence will be about .14, if only major cases, about .11. In a select membership, if minor cases are hospitalized, the incidence will be about .085, if only major cases, about .06.

The incidence thus expressed refers to a mixed membership consisting of equal numbers of men and women. Further reference to Table (50) disclosed that where the experience has been recorded separately for male

and female exposure, the incidence of hospitalization of women is about one and one-half times that of men. Table (49) has been prepared to set forth the indices of incidence of both men and women in the various divisions indicated above.

Table 49
Number of Hospitalized Cases per Member per Year

| Division | Groups | Incidence | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|-------|
| | | Men | Women |
| Select, Private Practice----- | Insured Group 1 | | |
| | H. S. S. of S. F.----- | .068 | .102 |
| Select, Group Practice----- | Ross—Loos ----- | .048 | .072 |
| Non-Select, Private Practice----- | Insured Group 2 | | |
| | C. P. S.----- | .112 | .168 |
| Non-Select, Group Practice----- | Permanente ----- | .088 | .132 |

As in other kinds of medical care, the experience relative to the hospitalization of children is too meager for reliable inference. Such evidence as is available (See Table 31) would indicate that the incidence is about equal to that of adult males.

It will be found in most exposure groups that the length of the stay in the hospital per case varies inversely with the incidence. This appears to be due to the degree of severity of the cases hospitalized. However, there are a number of social and economic factors which may have a bearing. Particularly the lack of hospital facilities in recent years has probably had the general effect of reducing the length of stay. To whatever extent this has been true it may be classed as the effect of control directly as imposed by the management of facilities the demand for which is more than the supply, and indirectly by the difficulty of obtaining such facilities. The point being made here is that in the presence of adequate hospital facilities, the average hospital duration per case may be expected to rise unless checked by efficient supervisory control.

The accompanying Table (51) has been prepared to set forth the comparative length of stay of hospitalized cases as shown in the experience herein recorded. It becomes immediately apparent that there is no great difference in the average length of stay with reference to men and women, but for children it is only about one-half that of adults. If this be made an assumption with respect to that experience not so recorded to render the information otherwise available, the table can be filled out for Ross—Loos and Permanente.

In the construction of Table (52), the incidence was taken from Table (50). The average stay per case is the same for men and women and is taken as the average of the duration of the groups in each division. The incidence of hospitalization of children is assumed to be the same as that of employed males, and the duration one-half that of an adult. An exposure consisting of adult dependents appears to give rise to an experience about equal to that of female employees.

The results shown may be considered to correspond to a maximum duration of about 30 days in Division 1 and 3, and about 90 days in Division 2 and 4. For longer or shorter maximum durations adjustment may be made proportional to factors shown in Table E, "Duration of Hospitalization."

These considerations lead to the conclusion that the amount of expected hospitalization depends primarily upon the method of administration of medical care. A second conclusion would appear to be that in a select group, the hospital requirements will be less than in a newly enrolled

medically unexamined group. This should not be made the basis for a prediction that in a given group the demand would actually decrease. The reverse might well be the trend due to augmentation of facilities and an increasing reliance on their use.

Table 50

Comparative Incidence of Hospitalization

| <i>Experience</i> | <i>Employed Male</i> | <i>Employed Female</i> | <i>Adult Dependent</i> | <i>Minor Dependent</i> | <i>All Employed Members</i> | <i>All Members</i> |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Insured Group 1----- | .058 | .094 | --- | --- | .076 | --- |
| Insured Group 2----- | .090 | .135 | --- | --- | .108 | --- |
| C. P. S. ----- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | .159 |
| H. S. S. of S. F.----- | --- | --- | .089 | .063 | .082 | .082 |
| Ross-Loos, 1939 ----- | .049 | .071 | --- | --- | .055 | --- |
| Ross-Loos, 1944 ----- | --- | --- | --- | --- | .035 | --- |
| Permanente ----- | --- | --- | --- | --- | .109 | --- |

Table 51

Comparative Duration of Hospitalization, Average Number of Days per Case

| | <i>Employed Male</i> | <i>Employed Female</i> | <i>Adult Dependents</i> | <i>Minor Dependents</i> | <i>All Members</i> |
|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Insured Group 1----- | 8.8 | 8.2 | 10.6 | 4.1 | 8.4 |
| Insured Group 2----- | 7.8 | 10.7 | -- | -- | 9.2 |
| C. P. S. ----- | 7.0 | 6.7 | 7.1 | 2.2 | 5.5 |
| H. S. S. of S. F.----- | 8.2 | 9.9 | 8.7 | 5.1 | 8.1 |
| Ross-Loos, 1939 ----- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 10.7* |
| Ross-Loos, 1944 ----- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 8.2 |
| Permanente ----- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7.0 |

* Approximate.

Table 52
Average Number of Hospital Days per Member per Year

| <i>Division</i> | <i>Group</i> | <i>Men</i> | <i>Incidence</i> | | <i>Days Per Case</i> | | <i>Average Stay (in Days) Per Member Per Year</i> | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------|---|--------------|-----------------|
| | | | <i>Women</i> | <i>Children</i> | <i>Adult</i> | <i>Child</i> | <i>Men</i> | <i>Women</i> | <i>Children</i> |
| 1. Select, Private Practice----- | Insured Group 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | H. S. S. of S. F.----- | .068 | .102 | .068 | 8.8 | 4.4 | .60 | .89 | .30 |
| 2. Select, Group Practice----- | Ross-Loos ----- | .048 | .072 | .048 | 9.4 | 4.7 | .45 | .68 | .23 |
| 3. Non-select, Private Practice----- | Insured Group 2 | | | | | | | | |
| | C. P. S.----- | .112 | .168 | .112 | 8.0 | 4.0 | .90 | 1.34 | .45 |
| 4. Non-select, Group Practice----- | Permanente ----- | .088 | .132 | .088 | 7.0 | 3.5 | .62 | .92 | .31 |

Duration of Hospitalization

For this study there were available statistics of the "Bank of America" group, for a description of which see "Insured Groups." It is well adapted to the purpose being uncontrolled in the sense of close administrative jurisdiction, a distinction which has been discussed in the comparison of the different types of voluntary plans. However, during the exposure period studied, Feb. 1, 1943 to Nov. 1, 1945, there was an existing insufficiency of hospital accommodations, and it may be assumed that this would have had the effect of limiting the length of stay to the actual requirements.

The group included an average membership of 7,345 employed members approximately half of whom were female, 2,332 dependent adults, almost all female, and 1,420 families of children between the ages of 3 and 20 inclusive. The exact number of children could not be determined and it was assumed that there were 1.6 children per family. This assumption is substantiated to some extent by the fact that the average duration per member as shown by the resulting table agrees very closely with the average period of hospitalization as indicated in Table (3).

The results are shown in Table A. Column 1, "n," is the exact number of days hospitalized. Column 2 is the number of cases. Column 3 is the number of cases on a basis of 1,000,000 life years of exposure. Column 4 is the number of "Bed Days," Column (1) times Column (3). Column 5 is the accumulated totals of Column (4) to n-70. Column 6 is the accumulated totals of Column (3).

Reference is made to Table XIII of "Hospital Service Insurance" by Arthur Hunter and Allen B. Thompson,* based on an experience of 1,926,000 life years exposure. Table B, shows the results of that study, on a basis of 1,000,000 life years exposure. The columns are arranged in the same way as in Table A.

A general comparison of the two tables reveals that, although the average amount of hospitalization per member in Table B, .645 days, is greater than that in Table A, .550 days, the amount of hospitalization of eleven days or less and of seventy days or more under Table A, exceeds that of Table B. Some workable conclusions may be drawn as follows:

(a) Since the difference in the total hospitalization per member in the two tables, is less than 1/10 of one day per year, the tables may be said to substantiate one another, and either may be considered to be reasonable representation of the expected experience in California, and therefore,

(b) Since the tables reveal considerable variation from one another relative to certain durations of hospitalization, that in the consideration of the amount of hospitalization incident to specified maximum durations, the more conservative table with respect to that specific duration may be used.

There is little need for reliance upon the experience expressed by these tables for hospitalization of short duration, for which there is considerable other experience available, much of which is detailed in the "Discussion" of Hospitalization. However, in the consideration of incidence of hospitalization of comparative duration, the table may be found useful.

It will be noticed that the figures in Column (5) and (6) are not complete due to lack of information as to how long the number of patients appearing opposite the last "n" were actually hospitalized. In order to

* Published in "Transactions of the Actuarial Society of America," Vol XLIV, part 1, May 1943

extend the tables for a complete experience, the exact period for each of these patients would have to be known, or some assumption made concerning their probable individual or combined period of hospitalization.

With this in view Table C, has been constructed as an arbitrary adjustment to Table B. The purpose was not to approximate the probable actual experience but to develop a basis for a liberal estimate of complete hospitalization. An assumption as to the duration of the hospitalization of those indicated to have been hospitalized more than 111 days was made, as shown, the duration for the final ten patients being assumed to have been for life, and to have begun at their respective quinquennial ages 10 to 55 inclusive. Their individual durations of hospitalization was then taken to be their life expectancy according to the American Experience Table of Mortality.

A similar extension, Table D, has been constructed for Table A. The figures in Column (3) opposite n-70 to n-life were found by letting the percentage of each to the total number of Column (3) cases hospitalized for n-70 or more, be the same as the corresponding percentage in Table B and C. The Column (4) in each table was then calculated by multiplying the figures in Column (3) by the day duration in Column (1). "Life" was found to be an average of 33.33 years or 12,165 days. Finally, Column (4) in both Tables C and D, was added and adjusted to produce a single factor which when divided by 1,000,000 yields the days of hospitalization per member, to be added to Column (5) in Tables A and B to adjust those columns for hospitalization of indefinite duration. The Tables A and B are, therefore, independent of the assumed extensions and any other assumption of extended duration may be applied without first correcting any of the figures in those tables.

The figures in Columns (5) of the tables represent millionths of a hospital day per member, per year. By their use the amount of hospitalization in days per member, per year for any prescribed duration can be determined.

Table E shows the results of various types of coverage according to both Tables A and B, adjusted where necessary by extensions D and C respectively. The figures in which these extensions are involved are marked (*).

Table A

| (1) n | (2) Cases | (3) Cases | Per Million Life Years Exposure | | |
|----------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | (4) Bed Days | (5) Col-4 Summation | (6) Col-3 Summation |
| 1----- | 615 | 18,635 | 18,635 | 18,635 | 18,635 |
| 2----- | 250 | 7,575 | 15,150 | 33,785 | 26,210 |
| 3----- | 146 | 4,424 | 13,272 | 47,057 | 30,634 |
| 4----- | 122 | 3,697 | 14,788 | 61,845 | 34,333 |
| 5----- | 122 | 3,697 | 18,485 | 80,330 | 38,028 |
| 6----- | 119 | 3,606 | 21,636 | 101,966 | 41,634 |
| 7----- | 102 | 3,091 | 21,637 | 123,603 | 44,723 |
| 8----- | 98 | 2,969 | 23,752 | 147,355 | 47,694 |
| 9----- | 83 | 2,515 | 22,635 | 169,990 | 30,209 |
| 10----- | 115 | 3,485 | 34,850 | 204,840 | 53,694 |
| 11----- | 91 | 2,757 | 30,327 | 325,167 | 56,451 |
| 12----- | 63 | 1,909 | 22,908 | 258,075 | 58,360 |
| 13----- | 62 | 1,879 | 24,427 | 282,502 | 60,239 |
| 14----- | 61 | 1,848 | 25,827 | 308,374 | 62,087 |
| 15----- | 45 | 1,364 | 20,460 | 328,834 | 63,451 |
| 16----- | 26 | 788 | 12,608 | 341,442 | 64,239 |
| 17----- | 28 | 848 | 14,416 | 355,858 | 65,087 |
| 18----- | 25 | 758 | 13,644 | 369,502 | 65,845 |
| 19----- | 15 | 455 | 8,645 | 370,147 | 66,800 |
| 20----- | 12 | 365 | 7,280 | 385,427 | 66,664 |
| 21----- | 18 | 545 | 11,445 | 396,872 | 67,209 |
| 22----- | 8 | 242 | 5,324 | 402,196 | 67,451 |
| 23----- | 2 | 61 | 1,403 | 405,599 | 67,512 |
| 24----- | 7 | 212 | 5,008 | 408,687 | 67,724 |
| 25----- | 5 | 152 | 3,800 | 412,487 | 67,876 |
| 26----- | 9 | 273 | 7,098 | 419,585 | 68,149 |
| 27----- | 7 | 212 | 5,724 | 425,309 | 68,361 |
| 28----- | 8 | 242 | 6,776 | 432,085 | 68,603 |
| 29----- | 4 | 121 | 3,509 | 435,594 | 68,724 |
| 30----- | 6 | 182 | 5,460 | 441,054 | 68,906 |
| 31----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 441,054 | 68,906 |
| 32----- | 2 | 61 | 1,952 | 443,006 | 68,967 |
| 33----- | 2 | 61 | 2,013 | 445,019 | 69,028 |
| 34----- | 2 | 61 | 2,074 | 447,093 | 69,089 |
| 35----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447,093 | 69,089 |
| 36----- | 3 | 91 | 3,276 | 450,369 | 69,180 |
| 37----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 450,369 | 69,180 |
| 38----- | 1 | 30 | 1,140 | 451,509 | 69,210 |
| 39----- | 1 | 30 | 1,170 | 452,679 | 69,240 |
| 40----- | 4 | 121 | 4,840 | 457,519 | 69,361 |
| 41----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 457,519 | 69,361 |
| 42----- | 4 | 121 | 5,082 | 462,601 | 69,482 |
| 43----- | 1 | 30 | 1,290 | 463,691 | 69,512 |
| 44----- | 3 | 91 | 4,004 | 467,895 | 69,503 |
| 45----- | 2 | 61 | 2,745 | 470,640 | 69,664 |
| 46----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 470,640 | 69,664 |
| 47----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 470,640 | 69,664 |
| 48----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 470,640 | 69,664 |
| 49----- | 4 | 121 | 5,929 | 476,569 | 69,785 |
| 50----- | 4 | 121 | 6,050 | 482,619 | 69,906 |
| 51----- | 1 | 30 | 1,530 | 484,149 | 69,936 |
| 52----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 484,149 | 69,936 |
| 53----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 484,149 | 69,936 |
| 54----- | 1 | 30 | 1,620 | 485,769 | 69,966 |
| 55----- | 1 | 30 | 1,650 | 487,419 | 69,996 |
| 56----- | 3 | 91 | 5,096 | 492,515 | 70,087 |
| 57----- | 1 | 30 | 1,710 | 494,225 | 70,117 |
| 58----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 494,225 | 70,117 |
| 59----- | 1 | 30 | 1,770 | 495,995 | 70,147 |
| 60----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 495,995 | 70,147 |
| 61----- | 1 | 30 | 1,830 | 497,825 | 70,177 |
| 62----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 497,825 | 70,177 |
| 63----- | 1 | 30 | 1,890 | 499,715 | 70,207 |
| 64----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 499,715 | 70,207 |
| 65----- | 1 | 30 | 1,950 | 501,665 | 70,237 |
| 66----- | 1 | 30 | 1,980 | 503,645 | 70,267 |
| 67----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 503,645 | 70,267 |
| 68----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 503,645 | 70,267 |
| 69----- | 0 | 0 | 0 | 503,645 | 70,267 |
| 70----- | 22 | 667 | 46,690 | 550,335 | 70,934 |

Table B

| (1) n | (2) Cases | (3) Cases | Per Million Life Years Exposure | | |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| | | | (4) Bed Days | (5) Col-4 Summation | (6) Col-3 Summation |
| 1----- | 22,313 | 11,585 | 11,585 | 11,585 | 11,585 |
| 2----- | 11,547 | 5,996 | 11,992 | 23,577 | 17,581 |
| 3----- | 7,153 | 3,714 | 11,142 | 34,719 | 21,295 |
| 4----- | 6,748 | 3,503 | 14,012 | 48,731 | 24,798 |
| 5----- | 6,625 | 3,440 | 17,200 | 65,931 | 28,238 |
| 6----- | 5,929 | 3,078 | 18,468 | 84,399 | 31,316 |
| 7----- | 5,951 | 3,090 | 21,630 | 106,029 | 34,406 |
| 8----- | 5,097 | 2,647 | 21,176 | 127,205 | 37,053 |
| 9----- | 4,886 | 2,537 | 22,833 | 150,038 | 39,590 |
| 10----- | 5,711 | 2,965 | 29,650 | 179,688 | 42,555 |
| 11----- | 5,247 | 2,724 | 29,964 | 209,652 | 45,279 |
| 12----- | 4,679 | 2,429 | 29,148 | 238,800 | 47,708 |
| 13----- | 4,472 | 2,322 | 30,620 | 268,986 | 50,030 |
| 14----- | 4,487 | 2,330 | 32,620 | 301,606 | 52,360 |
| 15----- | 3,906 | 2,028 | 30,420 | 332,026 | 54,388 |
| 16----- | 3,018 | 1,567 | 25,072 | 357,098 | 55,955 |
| 17----- | 2,550 | 1,324 | 22,508 | 379,606 | 57,279 |
| 18----- | 2,092 | 1,086 | 19,548 | 399,154 | 58,365 |
| 19----- | 1,937 | 1,006 | 19,114 | 418,268 | 59,371 |
| 20----- | 2,052 | 1,065 | 21,300 | 439,568 | 60,436 |
| 21----- | 2,294 | 1,191 | 25,011 | 464,579 | 61,627 |
| 22----- | 1,034 | 537 | 11,814 | 476,393 | 62,164 |
| 23----- | 740 | 385 | 8,855 | 485,248 | 62,549 |
| 24----- | 609 | 316 | 7,584 | 492,832 | 62,865 |
| 25----- | 603 | 313 | 7,825 | 500,657 | 63,178 |
| 26----- | 506 | 263 | 6,838 | 507,495 | 63,441 |
| 27----- | 486 | 252 | 6,804 | 514,299 | 63,693 |
| 28----- | 557 | 289 | 8,092 | 522,391 | 63,982 |
| 29----- | 380 | 197 | 5,713 | 528,104 | 64,179 |
| 30----- | 353 | 184 | 5,520 | 533,624 | 64,363 |
| 31----- | 290 | 150 | 4,650 | 538,274 | 64,513 |
| 32-45----- | 2,328 | 1,209 | 45,232 | 583,506 | 65,722 |
| 46-60----- | 955 | 496 | 25,675 | 609,181 | 66,218 |
| 61-70----- | 348 | 180 | 11,814 | 620,995 | 66,398 |
| 71-81----- | 435 | 226 | 17,719 | 638,714 | 66,624 |
| 82-90----- | 53 | 28 | 2,357 | 641,071 | 66,652 |
| 91-111----- | 44 | 23 | 2,210 | 643,281 | 66,675 |
| Over 111----- | 35 | 18 | 2,290 | 645,571 | 66,693 |

Table C

| n | Cases Per 1,000,000 | Bed Days Per 1,000,000 |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 112-170----- | 8 | 1,128 |
| Life (12,165 Days)----- | 10 | 121,650 |
| Total----- | | 122,778 |
| Factor----- | | 2,290 |
| Total Less Factor----- | | 120,488 |

Table D

| n | Cases Per 1,000,000 | Bed Days Per 1,000,000 |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| 70----- | 253 | 17,710 |
| 71- 81----- | 318 | 24,158 |
| 82- 90----- | 39 | 3,354 |
| 91-111----- | 32 | 3,232 |
| 112-170----- | 11 | 1,551 |
| Life (12,165 Days)----- | 14 | 170,310 |
| Total----- | | 220,315 |
| Factor----- | | 46,690 |
| Total Less Factor----- | | 174,625 |

Table E

| <i>Period Covered</i> | <i>Red Days Per Member Table A</i> | <i>Per Year Table B</i> | <i>Period Covered</i> | <i>Red Days Per Member Table A</i> | <i>Per Year Table B</i> |
|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 14 Days ----- | .432 | .502 | After 14 Days--- | *.293 | *.284 |
| 21 Days ----- | .475 | .571 | After 21 Days--- | *.250 | *.195 |
| 30 Days ----- | .502 | .604 | After 30 Days--- | *.223 | *.165 |
| 60 Days ----- | .542 | .638 | After 1 Year--- | *.166 | *.120 |
| 90 Days ----- | *.554 | .645 | | | |
| One Year ----- | *.559 | *.646 | | | |
| Complete ----- | *.725 | *.766 | | | |

Cost

Of the four divisions into which medical care has been divided for analysis, "Laboratory and X-ray" has already been treated from a standpoint of cost. "Medical," "Surgical," and "Hospitalization" have been treated from a standpoint of incidence and "use." It is the purpose of this section to apply to unit services such unit costs as may appear to be prevalent in present practice with a view to determining an approximate average cost, in each type of administrative practice, of the demand for service.

The cost of a unit of service will be found to vary greatly and to depend upon several factors the most important of which are (1) the facility with which the patient can be brought to the source of service or vice versa; (2) the degree of adequacy of hospital, laboratory and other facilities present at the point required; (3) the extent to which such service can be delegated to assistants and nurses; (4) the efficiency of the use of facilities in the sense of their constant or intermittent use; and (5) the variation in the foundation, overhead, and administrative costs per unit service. To these might be added the degree of standardization of procedure a factor which would apply in a well organized "system" to the cost already determined by the other five. It is not possible on the basis of the experience at hand to evaluate all of these factors even as they exist in the Types or Plans of medical care studied. Nor would it be of more than academic value to do so inasmuch as any newly devised system, as well as the evolution of Plans now operative, would present new complications requiring specific reconsideration.

There is, however, an arbitrary designation of unit values in use by C. P. S. and H. S. S. of S. F., the unit systems of which fix standard monetary values for unit services, as rendered by physicians, under the conditions and in the general circumstances, relative to the five factors mentioned above, obtaining in their present mode of practice. If these values be applied to the average experience previously detailed the result will be the cost of such conditional presumed experience under similar circumstances.

The actual costs of unit services in group clinical or hospital practice as experienced by Ross-Loos Medical Group and Permanente Foundation Hospitals are not available. They could be determined only by elaborate accounting beyond the practical administrative requirements of such organizations. As is the policy in the administration of Insured Groups, the experienced overall cost of contractual service rendered may be made the basis for adjustment in the rates charged, a change in the amount or scope of benefits offered, or the institution of more effective control. The monetary cost of a unit of service rendered in a clinic under group practice is probably lower than the cost of a similar service

rendered at present by private physicians or laboratories. An explanation of the difference may be sought in the five cost factors mentioned above.

The cost to the carrier of Insured Plans is of little relative importance in a discussion of cost of service unless the amounts allowed under the contract approximate the full actual charges. The amounts allowed in the contract of Insured Group 1 approach the actual cost, with reference to Surgical and Special Hospital Facilities.

There is a wide range of charges for a unit service in Private Practice. Certain average costs are indicated in the section "Type I Medical Care."

The schedules of unit values of C. P. S. and H. S. S. of S. F. differ with respect to certain services, but in general are closely commensurate. Where such unit values are assigned to services in this discussion they will be approximately those of C. P. S. which, with minor variations, are also those of H. S. S. of S. F.

In the valuation of "Doctor's Calls" it is necessary to determine as nearly as possible the average value of a single "call." In the experience of C. P. S. during 1940 and 1941, the average number of calls was found to be 5.96 per member per year and the average number of medical units per member .62 per month or 7.44 per year. This would indicate about 1.27 units per call. Since the par value of a unit was \$2.50, the cost per call was \$3.18. In the experience during the four months of 1945 shown in Table (16), there were 24,027 visits with a total cost of \$79,105, an average of \$3.33 per call. In the experience of H. S. S. of S. F. for the year ending Sept. 30, 1943 (See Table 25) there were 62,353 calls with a total cost including "special services" of \$214,207.47, an average cost for service per call of \$3.44. In the experience of the same system for the year ending Sept. 30, 1944, there were 68,347 calls with a total cost of \$218,353.83, an average of \$3.19 per call. These results agree very closely with the average fees in private practice as shown in Table (2). There the average fee for a routine office call appears to be about \$3.16, and if city and county home calls are included, about \$3.40. The extra charges for examinations and "first calls" can be thought of as reflecting repayment to the physician of amounts expended for laboratory and X-ray procedures required. The conclusion may be drawn that the average cost of a "doctor's call" is about \$3.20.

On that basis, with reference to the conclusions arrived at in the discussion of "medical," the costs per life year for physician's medical service would be:

| | |
|--|---------|
| Male, 8 calls per year at \$3.20----- | \$25.60 |
| Female, 12 calls per year at \$3.20----- | 38.40 |
| Child, 5 calls per year at \$3.20----- | 16.00 |

In the discussion of "Laboratory and X-ray" the average cost of those services per person per year was found to be \$5.29. This cost pertains to non-hospitalized cases, and is approximately the same for male lives as for female lives.

There is no experience available from which the cost of these services for children might have been determined. Since the cost of other physician's services per child appears to be about half that of an adult, the cost of laboratory and X-ray can be assumed to follow the same relation. On that basis the cost per child per year would be about \$2.65.

In the discussion of "Incidence of Surgery" the conclusion was reached that there is an expected average incidence of .12 surgical cases per male life year and .17 surgical per female life year. The only available experience in which the incidence of surgery among children is contained is that of Insured Group 1. There the indication is that, from all causes, it is about the same as for male employees.

The average cost of a surgical case from these sources is given below.

Surgical Cost per Case

| | <i>Male Employee</i> | <i>Female Employee</i> | <i>Child</i> | <i>Adult De- pendent</i> | <i>All Employees</i> | <i>All Members</i> |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Insured Group 1 ---- | \$54.98 | \$68.75 | \$33.67 | \$66.60* | \$62.94 | \$60.70** |
| C. P. S.----- | 44.41 | 53.63 | 39.80 | 71.32 | 49.56 | 51.95 |
| H. S. S. of S. F.----- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 42.70 |

* On the basis of a reduced "schedule of operations "

** Partly on the basis of a reduced "schedule of operations "

These costs include only the fees of the surgeon and charges for consultants, assistants, and anaesthetists. Operations in connection with maternity, pregnancy, or miscarriage are excluded.

The most complete data is that relative to the experience of California Physicians Service, and it is reasonable to assume that the costs per case are fairly representative of the costs generally to be expected in California medical practice. In that experience, there is a wide difference in the cost per case for employed women and adult dependents all of whom were spouses, undoubtedly a large majority female. The indication is, therefore, that the average surgical cost per case of unemployed married women is greater than that of employed women. If the incidence of surgery be applied to each cost per case an upper and lower limit of surgical cost per female life per year consistent with this experience will be derived. The actual expectation will be somewhere between these limits, depending on the percentage that each class bears to the total female membership.

On this basis the expectation of surgical cost may be stated as follows :

| <i>Participant</i> | <i>Incidence of Surgery Per Year</i> | <i>Cost Per Case</i> | <i>Cost Per Member Per Year</i> |
|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Employed Men ----- | .12 | \$44.41 | \$5.33 |
| Employed Women ----- | .17 | 53.63 | 9.12 |
| Unemployed Married Women--- | .17 | 71.32 | 12.12 |
| Child ----- | .12 | 39.80 | 4.78 |

The cost of hospitalization is divided into two parts which are (1) "bedside care," and (2) "special hospital services." Bedside care refers to room and board, nursing service, and general care of the patient. Special hospital services include anaesthetic, laboratory examinations, X-ray examinations, use of operating room, and use of other special equipment or service entailing an extra charge. The two are here treated separately because the cost of bedside care is a function of the time spent in the hospital and is directly proportional to the number of hospital days, whereas the use of special hospital services appears to be a function of the "case," and independent of the duration of hospital stay.

In some of the experience presented herein a statistical division has been made with respect to the two kinds of hospital cost, and in some it has been combined under the heading of "cost of hospitalization." Table (53), presents the segregation where available.

It will be seen with reference to Table (53), that the cost of bedside care is fairly regular, any slight variation probably being due to the degree of privacy required by the patient.

A wide variation is apparent with respect to cost of special hospital services. These costs in Insured Group 1 probably reflect a large amount of service which in C. P. S. would have been included in "Laboratory and X-ray," since much of such service can be performed in or out of the hospital, or in comparison with Ross-Loos Medical Group which would in all probability perform as much of such service in its own clinic as practicable. The greater cost per hospital day for "all members" in C. P. S. than for "all members" of H. S. S. of S. F. may be accounted for by the fact that such services are limited in the Health Service System of San Francisco and the total cost per day is lower accordingly. This is particularly obvious in the costs for children.

In C. P. S. the cost of bedside care of children is slightly higher than for adults, and although the cost of special services is a little lower, the total cost per day is much higher. This is because the cost of special services per case is divided among fewer days.

The costs of C. P. S. are more appropriate to this study than any others at hand. The normal cost of bedside care appears to be about \$7.00 per day, for adult patients. In the experience of H. S. S. of S. F. bedside care of children is more costly than that of adults, substantiating to some extent the higher C. P. S. cost for children of \$7.65 per day.

The cost of special hospital services as shown in the experience of C. P. S. may be extended to general application. Its practice in this respect may be considered to be standard, and the benefits are unlimited. The costs need no adjustment and, considered as approximations, may be applied as they are. There being no significant difference between the cost for adult dependents (spouses) and the cost for female employees, the latter may be taken as the average for all female patients.

Table 54 sets forth the results of analysis of Hospital Costs. With respect to new memberships, only those for the enrollment of which a medical examination is required with a proviso that preexisting conditions will not be treated can be considered "select." A membership enrolled as a group without medical examination is "non-select."

The costs arrived at in this discussion have been derived by the application of average unit costs in present "fee for service" practice as nearly as could be determined from the data at hand, to the incidence of demand in some cases based upon average experience and in some cases based upon "expected" experience under certain defined conditions. As such they are to be considered more in the nature of monetary measures of the statistical results than as cost estimates. It was stated in the Introduction that any "system" of medical care reaches a balance of the interrelation of Facilities, Incidence, and Cost. Within the single element of cost of unit service there are many factors, five of which were specially mentioned in the beginning of this discussion, which would have a greater effect upon a projected cost estimate than can be expressed by averages thus obtained. Once such an equilibrium has been reached, as exemplified by individual insured and prepaid Plans operative for a considerable period, a remarkable consistency of experience and cost from year to year, and even from season to season, develops. An attempt to generalize such experience and to extend such consistency toward other membership groups is apt to result in greater variation than expected. This is demon-

strated by Insured Groups which under similar contracts, the same administration, and in contiguous territories, exhibit wide differences in experience and cost. The same is true of medical care in different regions under the same Prepaid Plan.

It follows that in the contemplation of a Prepaid Medical Plan, or medical care of any mode of operation, due attention should be given to the upper and lower limits of experience incidence, demand, and cost, as well as to averages.

Table 53
Cost of Hospitalization

| | <i>Insured Group 1</i> | <i>C. P. S.</i> | <i>H. S. S. of S. F.</i> | <i>Ross- Loos</i> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Male Employees : | | | | |
| Bedside Care per day | ----- | \$6.98 | ---- | ---- |
| Special Facilities per case | \$51.05 | 12.24 | ---- | ---- |
| Total Cost per day | 5.80 | 8.72 | ---- | ---- |
| Female Employees : | | | | |
| Bedside Care per day | ----- | 7.01 | ---- | ---- |
| Special Facilities per case | 40.66 | 15.46 | ---- | ---- |
| Total Cost per day | 4.94 | 9.30 | ---- | ---- |
| Adult Dependents : | | | | |
| Bedside Care per day | ----- | 7.25 | ---- | ---- |
| Special Facilities per case | ----- | 14.79 | ---- | ---- |
| Total per day | ----- | 9.34 | \$9.31 | ---- |
| Children : | | | | |
| Bedside Care per day | ----- | 7.65 | ---- | ---- |
| Special Facilities per case | ----- | 11.25 | ---- | ---- |
| Total Cost per day | ----- | 12.70 | 9.68 | ---- |
| All Employees : | | | | |
| Bedside Care per day | ----- | ----- | ---- | ---- |
| Special Facilities per case | 45.86 | ----- | ---- | ---- |
| Total Cost per day | 5.41 | ----- | 9.57 | ---- |
| All Members : | | | | |
| Bedside Care per day | ----- | 7.45 | ---- | ---- |
| Special Facilities per case | ----- | 13.94 | ---- | ---- |
| Total Cost per day | ----- | 9.97 | 9.45 | \$9.00 |

Table 54
Cost of Hospitalization

| <i>Member</i> | <i>Cases Per Year Per Member</i> | <i>Hospital Days Per Year Per Member</i> | <i>Cost of Special Service Per Case</i> | <i>Cost of Bedside Care Per Day</i> | <i>Cost of Special Service Per Member Per Year</i> | <i>Cost Bedside Care Per Member Per Year</i> | <i>Total Hospital Cost Per Member Per Year</i> |
|------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Class 1. Male Employee ----- | .068 | .60 | \$12.24 | \$7.00 | \$8.83 | \$4.20 | \$5.03 |
| Female Employee ----- | .102 | .89 | 15.46 | 7.00 | 1.58 | 6.23 | 7.81 |
| Child Employee ----- | .068 | .34 | 11.26 | 7.65 | .76 | 2.60 | 3.36 |
| Class 2. Male Employee ----- | .048 | .45 | 12.24 | 7.00 | .59 | 3.36 | 3.85 |
| Female Employee ----- | .072 | .68 | 15.46 | 7.00 | 1.11 | 4.76 | 5.87 |
| Child Employee ----- | .048 | .23 | 11.25 | 7.65 | .54 | 1.76 | 2.30 |
| Class 3. Male Employee ----- | .112 | .90 | 12.24 | 7.00 | 1.37 | 6.30 | 7.67 |
| Female Employee ----- | .168 | 1.34 | 15.46 | 7.00 | 2.60 | 9.38 | 11.98 |
| Child Employee ----- | .112 | .45 | 11.25 | 7.65 | 1.26 | 3.44 | 4.70 |
| Class 4. Male Employee ----- | .088 | .62 | 12.24 | 7.00 | 1.08 | 4.34 | 5.42 |
| Female Employee ----- | .132 | .92 | 15.46 | 7.00 | 2.04 | 6.44 | 8.48 |
| Child Employee ----- | .088 | .31 | 11.25 | 7.65 | .99 | 2.37 | 3.36 |

Class 1—is Select, Private Practice.
 Class 2—is Select, Group Practice.
 Class 3—is Non-select, Private Practice
 Class 4—is Non-select, Group Practice.

EXHIBIT A
BANK OF AMERICA

Employees Group Hospital and Surgical Plan

If an insured employee is confined to a legally incorporated hospital as a result of disability caused by a non-occupational accident or any sickness not covered by Workmen's Compensation Law, he or she will be entitled to the following benefits:

(a) Daily benefit of Five Dollars (\$5.00) for each day such employee is confined, but not for longer than ten weeks during any consecutive twelve months period. Confinement in a hospital shall be construed to mean confinement for at least one night.

(b) Reimbursement for Special Hospital Services, actually charged by the hospital, not to exceed Thirty Dollars (\$30.00) in any twelve consecutive months. Such services shall include anesthetic, laboratory examinations, use of operating room, and X-ray examinations. X-ray or other treatments shall not be considered Hospital Services under the plan.

* On October 1, 1939, the plan was extended, to cover X-ray examinations performed outside of the hospital up to a maximum of \$15.00 for any one disability. On February 1, 1943, the plan was further extended to cover laboratory examinations performed outside of the hospital up to a maximum of \$15.00 for any one disability. On October 1, 1944, the plan was again extended to cover the cost of such Hospital Services including medicines, drugs and dressings necessarily furnished while the employee is in the hospital up to a limit of \$150.00 for all items combined. These liberalizations were made because of the favorable experience under the plan and will be continued so long as the claim experience remains reasonable.

(c) If the accidental injury or sickness necessitates ambulance transportation to or from the hospital, the Insurance Company will pay the cost of such transportation up to \$5.00 per trip. Not more than two such trips will be allowed during any one disability.

(d) The plan also provides that if by reason of accidental injury, which does not arise from and in the course of employment, the employee is physically unable to communicate with friends, the Insurance Company will defray all expenses, not to exceed Fifty Dollars (\$50.00) necessary to put the employee in communication with and in the care of friends.

Premium Payments

The cost of hospital benefits described above is .75 per month for each insured employee payable by salary deduction. An employee may select the hospital benefits set forth above without applying for surgical benefits described below.

Surgical Benefits

Any insured employee requiring a surgical operation, due to non-occupational accident or any sickness not covered by Workmen's Compensation Law, will be entitled to reimbursement for surgical fees actually charged by a legally qualified surgeon but not to exceed the maximum amount shown in the fee schedule of operations on subsequent pages of this booklet.

If two or more surgical operations are performed upon an employee at any one time or during any one continuous period of disability, whether from one or more causes, or during successive periods of disability due to the same or related cause or causes, the total amount of reimbursement hereunder for all such operations shall not exceed Two Hundred Twenty-five Dollars (\$225.00), the maximum Surgical Operation Benefits.

The Company reserves the right to determine the amount of reimbursement for the actual surgical fee charged for any surgical operation performed which is not itemized in the Schedule of Operations. An operation of equivalent gravity and severity will be used as a basis for the Company's settlement.

Premium Payments

The cost of surgical benefits described above is \$.50 per month, in addition to premium paid for hospital benefits, for each insured employee payable by salary deduction.

Benefits As They Apply to Dependents

Hospital and Surgical Benefits may be extended to the wives and children, and husbands in the case of married female employees, of all employees who have such dependents and who are insured under the plan themselves. The following regulations apply to benefits for dependents:

General Rules

(a) Dependents of new employees shall be wives under age forty-five, husbands age fifty and children between three and twenty years of age inclusive. The children must be single and gainfully employed.

(b) No dependent can be insured unless the employee is similarly insured.

(c) Insurance must cover all eligible dependents. A dependent child under three years of age becomes eligible upon attaining such age. However, the Personnel Relations Department must be notified within thirty days from the date the child reaches his third birthday, so that arrangements may be made to have the child insured. If application is made subsequent to the thirty day period evidence of the child's insurability is required.

(d) Insurance on dependent children automatically cease upon attaining age twenty-one or in event of marriage or entering gainful employment prior to age twenty-one. The Personnel Relations Department should be notified of any such change.

(e) Except as outlined below, hospital benefits will be the same amount for the spouse as for the employee. Surgical Benefits will, however, be two-thirds of the schedule effective for employees. The hospital benefits on children will be \$4.00 per day * instead of \$5.00 as on adults. The surgical benefits on children will be the same as for adult dependents, viz., two-thirds of the schedule for employees.

(f) If the employee has hospital benefits only, his dependents may have only hospital benefits. If he has both hospital and surgical benefits, the dependents must take similar coverage.

Hospital Benefits

Insured spouses will be covered for the same hospital benefits as described for employees, in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) on page 3 of this booklet. Benefits for children will be the same except that the daily hospital rate will be \$4.00 * and the Special Hospital Services will be limited to \$20.00.*

* October 1, 1944 the plan was extended to provide: (1) a daily hospital benefit of \$5.00 instead of \$4.00 for child dependents; and, (2) a maximum payment of \$60.00 for Special Hospital Services for insured spouses and children; and, (3) payment for medicines, drugs, and dressings as Special Hospital Services. X-ray examinations and laboratory examinations performed outside of the hospital will each be covered up to \$15.00 for any one disability for dependents as well as employees. These liberalizations were made because of the favorable experience under the plan and will be continued to so long as the claim experience remains reasonable.

The cost of Hospital Benefits for dependents is \$1.00 per month for each adult dependent and \$.45 per month for child dependents. All the eligible children in the family are covered by the one payment of \$.45 per month.

Surgical Benefits

An insured dependent, either adult or child, will be subject to the rules and regulations governing Surgical Benefits for employees under the plan, as set forth on page 4 of this booklet, except that the maximum amount payable for any surgical operation for a dependent will be two-thirds of the amount shown in the schedule.

The cost of Surgical Benefits is \$.75 per month for adult dependents and \$.55 per month for all eligible children.

Aggregate Benefits for Dependents

Hospital Insurance may be terminated by the Insurance Company on any insured dependent who has received \$1,000.00 of Hospital Benefits and Surgical Insurance may be terminated on any insured dependent who has received \$450.00 of such benefits.

The Plan Does Not Provide Benefits on Account of:

(a) Injury sustained or sickness contracted while the employee is in military or naval service in time of war; (b) Injury sustained or sickness contracted while the employee is north of sixtieth parallel of latitude, in the Panama Canal Zone or the insular possessions of the United States, or surgeon; (d) Maternity, pregnancy, or miscarriage; (e) Accidental bodily injury which arises from and in the course of employment or any sickness for which employee is paid benefits under any Workmen's Compensation law or act; (f) Dental service of any kind except surgical removal of impacted wisdom teeth; or (g) Insanity of a dependent.

EXHIBIT B

ADEL PRECISION PRODUCTS CORP.

Employees Group Hospital and Surgical Benefits Plan

Employee's Hospital Benefits

The Daily Hospital Benefit as shown in the outline of the plan will be paid in the event an insured employee is confined to a lawfully operating hospital for eighteen hours or more as a result of disability caused by a non-occupational accident, or any sickness not covered by a Workmen's Compensation Law. This benefit will be paid for

a period not exceeding 31 days during any one disability except that if hospital confinement is due to pregnancy, the benefit is payable for not more than fourteen days.

In addition to the Daily Hospital Benefit, an insured employee who is entitled to the Daily Hospital Benefit, will be allowed up to Twenty-Five Dollars (\$25.00) for Special Hospital Services actually charged by the hospital. Such Hospital Services include anesthesia, laboratory examinations, X-ray examinations, and operating room fees. X-ray treatments or other treatments are not included under this provision.

Successive periods of hospital confinement shall be considered a single period of confinement unless due to different causes.

Surgical Benefits

The Surgical Benefits for an insured employee or an insured dependent are provided under a specified fee schedule as shown in the Schedule of Operations (See Pages 16 and 17). For operations not listed, appropriate fees will be paid according to their equivalent gravity and severity.

A maximum of One Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$150.00) will be allowed insured employees or insured dependents for any two or more operations at any one time or during any one disability. Surgical Benefits are payable in addition to any Hospital Benefits to which the insured employee or insured dependent may be entitled.

Dependents' Hospital Benefits

The Daily Hospital Benefits of \$5 00 per day will be paid to the employee in the event an insured dependent is confined to a lawfully operating hospital for reasons other than pregnancy for eighteen hours or more. This benefit will be paid for a period not exceeding 31 days during any one disability. In addition to the Daily Hospital Benefit, the employee will be allowed up to Twenty-Five Dollars (\$25.00) for Special Hospital Services actually charged by the hospital. Such Hospital Services include: Anesthesia, laboratory examinations, X-ray examination and operating room fees. X-ray treatments or other treatments are not included under this provision.

If an employee's wife who has been continuously insured for nine months, is confined to a hospital by reason of pregnancy, the employee will be allowed \$5.00 a day for no more than ten days hospitalization.

EXHIBIT C

CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS SERVICE

Terms and Conditions of Service

Article 1. Prerequisites of Service

(a) In the event of illness or injury each member may select any doctor of medicine who is a professional member of C. P. S. When first applying for professional service, each member must notify such C. P. S. professional member that he is a C. P. S. beneficiary or family member. Failure to select a professional member or promptly to notify him of membership in C. P. S. shall each be conclusively deemed to be a waiver of all benefits hereunder.

(b) Members traveling or temporarily outside the State of California and in immediate need of any of the professional services provided herein (due to sudden emergency), are entitled to reimbursement of expenses for such services rendered by any doctor of medicine up to but not exceeding the sum which C. P. S. would have paid to a professional member for like service rendered by him in the same month.

(c) All medical and surgical services included herein are limited to a period not to exceed one (1) year for any one illness or injury (including any and all related complications).

(d) None of the services included herein are available if there is any default or delinquency in payment of monthly dues.

Article 2. Services Included

(a) *Medical Services Provided for Beneficiary Member Only:* The term "medical services" as used in the Agreement includes such non-surgical professional services as the Beneficiary Member may, as a consequence of illness or injury require.

The obligation of C. P. S. to provide "medical services" hereunder is limited to the extent stated for the following services:

(1) Each chronic ailment or condition shall receive necessary care for a maximum period of three (3) months from and after the date of the third visit by or to a professional member for each chronic ailment or condition.

(2) Professional services with respect to childbirth are excluded until the Beneficiary Member has been a C. P. S. beneficiary member for at least ten (10) successive months.

(b) *Surgical Services Provided for Beneficiary Member and Family Member:* The term "surgical services" as used in the Agreement includes all operations involving cutting or incision (including care of fractures and dislocations), if necessary for the treatment of an illness or injury.

In addition, the term "surgical services," as used in this Agreement, includes, if and while the member is a registered bed patient in a hospital, the following:

- (1) Such professional radiological (X-ray) services as may be necessary to establish diagnosis, and
 - (2) Ordinary clinical laboratory services as follows: Urinalysis, complete blood count, coagulation time and smears.
- (c) *Hospital Care Provided for Beneficiary Member and Family Members:* The term "hospital care" as used in the Agreement is subject to each of the following conditions:

- (1) "Hospital Care" as used herein, means:
 - (i) Care in room of three or more beds;
 - (ii) Meals and service of dietitian;
 - (iii) General nursing care;
 - (iv) Use of operating room, including surgical and anaesthetic supplies;
 - (v) Use of cystoscopic room and supplies;
 - (vi) Routine splints, casts and dressings;
 - (vii) Drugs and medications up to an amount not in excess of \$3.50 per hospital admission.

(2) The obligation of C. P. S. to provide hospital care, as shown defined, is limited to a period of not in excess of twenty-one (21) days during each membership year for each particular physical disability arising from a separate and distinct cause. Hospital care will be provided only while the member is necessarily confined in a hospital as a registered bed patient for the treatment of an illness or injury, and under no conditions for a rest cure or for the purpose of diagnosis.

(3) In conditions necessitating hospitalization beyond twenty-one (21) days, C.P.S. will reimburse the costs of hospital care as above defined in an amount not to exceed fifty (50) per cent of such cost for a maximum period of not to exceed three hundred and forty-five (345) days immediately following said twenty-one (21) day period.

(4) C.P.S. will defray costs of hospital emergency room charges for treatment of accidental injuries, provided use of emergency room occurs within twenty-four (24) hours following time of accident.

(5) Hospital care for childbirth will be provided under the following conditions:

- (i) The member must be in a dues-paying two-person or three or more person family, and
- (ii) The maximum cost to C.P.S. shall be fifty (\$50) dollars in each twelve months' period, and
- (iii) The member must have been a member in good standing for at least then at ten (10) consecutive months immediately preceding her need for such hospital care.

(6) C.P.S. is not responsible or liable to any member if hospitalization is unavailable as a result of epidemic, public disaster or other causes or conditions beyond its control.

(7) Members traveling or temporarily outside of the State of California are entitled to reimbursements for expenses of hospital care, subject to the conditions above set forth limiting such care.

Article 3. Services Excluded

(a) The term "Medical Services" as used in the Agreement does not include the following which are hereby excluded from the benefits of the Agreement:

(1) The cost of the first two visits by or to a professional member with respect to medical services for any one illness or injury, regardless of where said visits may occur:

(2) Eye refractions, physical therapy, cold shots;

(b) The term "Surgical Services" as used in the Agreement does not include the following which are hereby excluded from the benefits of the Agreement:

(1) Professional services with respect to childbirth (except that caesarian sections are included).

(2) Any professional service not expressly included in the definition of "Surgical Services" herein above set forth.

(c) The term "Hospital Care" as used in the Agreement does not include the following which are hereby excluded from the benefits of the Agreement: Hospitalization for pulmonary tuberculosis (after diagnosis), quarantinable diseases.

(d) Each of the terms "Medical Services," and "Surgical Services" and "Hospital Care" do not include the following which are hereby excluded from the benefits of the Agreement:

(1) Injuries or diseases for which the member is entitled to receive disability benefits or compensation or care under any Workmen's Compensation or Employers' Liability Law;

(2) Services incidence to the treatment of diseases and injuries of the jaw and their dependent tissues which customarily are performed by dentists.

EXHIBIT D

HEALTH SERVICE SYSTEM OF SAN FRANCISCO, 1942-1943

Medical Coverage and Membership Rates

The following is a reproduction of a circular of information issued to members of the Health Service System during the year under survey.

This pamphlet states the medical coverage of the System, the extent and limitation of benefits, and rates of contribution.

Membership rates as listed in the folder were in effect during the last ten months of the year (December 1942-September 1943). During the first two months of the year (October-November 1942), subscribers who now contribute \$2.80 per month paid \$2.50, and those who now contribute \$1.80 per month (minor dependents), paid \$1.50.

Choice of Doctors

From the list of accepted Staff Members, who have agreed to abide by the rules and regulations of the Health Service System, the subscriber may choose any Doctor of Medicine who is willing to treat him. When necessary, subscribers or their attending physicians may request the Medical Director to furnish a Consultant from the lists made available by the Medical Director. Any legally qualified Doctor of Medicine whose name does not appear on this list may have his name included by signing an agreement to abide by the rules and regulations adopted by this Board. Consent of the Medical Director must be secured before a patient is referred from one professional staff member to another. No patient will be rendered service by more than one doctor in any month without consent of the Medical Director.

X-ray and Laboratory Benefits Limited

X-ray examinations to the value of \$10.00 and laboratory tests to the value of \$5.00 are given to patients *while not in the hospital*, and are limited respectively to service for any one condition, illness or injury. After a twelve-month period has elapsed, the service of either or both may be extended, upon approval of the Medical Director, to cover a new condition illness or injury.

The liability of the Health Service System is limited to a total of five necessary office visits per month, irrespective of the number of doctors visited. Home visits or hospital visits are only limited to necessary calls.

Illnesses and Conditions Not Covered

Treatment will not be given for mental, alcoholic and drug addiction diseases, illnesses arising out of or induced by intoxication, or drug addiction of the patient, or in cases of attempted suicide or where care is provided under the Workmen's Compensation Act. No minor dependent is entitled to a tonsillectomy or adenoidectomy. No dependent or independent beneficiary is entitled to obstetrical services or services for complications of pregnancy.

Illnesses Partially Covered

A women member who is a municipal employee is entitled to the obstetrical services of a physician at any time, but must pay for hospitalization.

Preventive inoculations and vaccinations will be given but the patient must supply the vaccines, toxins, et cetera used.

Hospital Care Provided

When necessary and prescribed by a physician on the professional staff and approved by the Medical Director, a patient shall be hospitalized. The Health Service System will be responsible for the bills therefore for a period of not more than twenty-one (21) days in any twelve month period for adult subscribers, and for a period of not more than ten (10) days in any twelve month period for minor dependent subscribers.

The hospital Service provided by the Health Service System will be a ward bed, meals, special diet, general nursing care, floor supply of drugs, dressings, laboratory and tissue examinations, basal metabolic rate determination, electro-cardiographs, blood typing for transfusions, physiotherapy not to exceed \$10.00 in selling value, use of operating room, administration of anesthetic, plaster casts, ordinary splints, intravenous solutions.

While in the hospital during the 21 day period covered by the Health Service the patient shall be entitled, without charge, to the professional services of a roentgenologist and use of all hospital X-ray equipment and services, technician's services and facilities including films.

What Patient Must Pay For If Used

The following services if given the patient must be paid for by him: Use of operating room for extraction of teeth or dental care, dental X-ray; the use of special splints for which a rental charge is made: those drugs and medicines other than the floor supply, for which the hospital makes an additional charge to the patient: an oxygen tent or administration of oxygen therapy: the blood of a donor in blood transfusion; the use of radium, deep X-ray therapy: crutches or the use of crutches if the hospital makes a charge therefore: allergic tests, biologic tests, and orthopaedic appliances.

What Hospitalization Is Not Provided

Hospitalization is not provided for obstetrics or complications of pregnancy, venereal diseases, dental care, alcoholism, drug addiction, injuries or illness arising out of or induced by alcoholism or drug addiction, excitable nervous and mental diseases, contagious diseases quarantinable by law, illnesses or injuries resulting from attempted suicide, injuries or illnesses where the patient is entitled to care under the Workmen's Compensation Act, sanitarium treatment or care of tuberculosis, rest home or sanitarium care, other cases not admissible to an ordinary hospital. Hospitalization will not be provided for the sole purpose of diagnosis of ambulatory cases.

Private Rooms

Patients may have private room in the hospital by paying the difference between the regular ward rate and the rate charged by the hospital for the room desired.

Physiotherapy

When ordered by the attending physician, patients will be given physiotherapy treatments without charge at the Physiotherapy Department of the Health Service System only. The department is located in Room 305, Marshall Square Building, 1182 Market Street (Orpheum Theater Building). Hours are from 9 A.M. to 6 P.M. Monday through Friday, and 9 A.M. to 1 P.M. Saturdays.

Ambulance Service

Ambulance service from within the boundaries of the City and County to the hospital will be provided.

Bills for Which System Not Responsible

The Health Service System will not be responsible for any payment to doctors or hospitals who will not join the System and by rejecting the compensation schedule and rules and regulations refuse to cooperate with the city employees. The Health Service System will not be responsible for the cost of hospitalization where the member is hospitalized by a doctor not on the professional staff.

Sick Leave Report

Sick leave reports will be furnished by attending physician without charge to members of the System.

Special Nurses

Special nurses are not provided by the Health Service System.

Prescriptions

All prescriptions for medicine must be in writing and the patient must be allowed to choose his own druggist. The Health Service System does not pay for medicine.

By special arrangement with the Northern California Retail Druggists' Association, Ltd., many drug stores will give a discount on prescriptions to members of the Health Service System who show their card of membership. This applies only to medicines.

Dependents

In order to be eligible for dependent membership, a person must be wholly dependent on others for support and 50 per cent of the dependency must be on the city employee member of the Health Service System.

Dependents seeking admission to the System must submit to a medical examination. Any physical defect or pathological condition then present shall be corrected before the dependent is admitted, or such defect or condition, *whether or not found on examination*, will not be treated by the System.

No minor dependent will be admitted until attaining the age of one year.

The charge for all minor dependents shall be \$1.80 each per month and all admissible minor dependents must be enrolled if any one entered in the System.

Service to dependents and to independent beneficiaries will be limited to one year for any one condition or injury.

No minor dependent is entitled to a tonsillectomy or adenoidectomy.

No adult dependent or independent beneficiary is entitled to obstetrical service for complications of pregnancy.

EXHIBIT E**Permanente Foundation Hospital
Outline of a Health Plan for Employees of the Richmond Shipyards****Coverage**

Medical, surgical and hospital care and attention including necessary prescriptions and diagnostic services for diseases and also for accidents occurring away from work (accidents arising out of and in the course of employment are already covered under the Workmen's Compensation Act).

A. Hospital Cases

(1) Room and board for a period up to 111 days for any one disease or injury.

(2) Use of operating room, anaesthetics, drugs, dressings, X-ray and laboratory services, medicines, physiotherapy, blood transfusions, and floor nursing or private nursing, as required.

B. Surgical Operation

Whether at hospital or home.

C. Doctor Visits

Whether at hospital or home in non-surgical cases and for pre- and post-operative care.

D. Diagnostic Services

The Health Plan provides for X-rays and laboratory services for diagnostic purposes including basal metabolism, electrocardiograms, urinalysis, blood count and blood chemistries.

E. Ambulance Service

Ambulance service when necessary to or from the hospital within a radius of thirty miles from Richmond or from the Foundation Hospital in Oakland.

F. Emergency Treatment

Emergency treatment rendered at any other place than at the hospital named in this plan is included but the Foundation Hospital must be notified of such treatment as soon as possible. The cost of such emergency treatment is limited to \$100 unless a larger amount is specifically authorized.

G. Weekly Cost

Each employee fifty (50¢) cents.

The weekly cost will be deducted from your pay by your employer when authorized by you.

Arrangements have been made to keep the Health Plan in effect for Richmond Shipyard workers when they are temporarily off the pay roll because of disability, vacation, or authorized leave of absence up to three weeks following the Saturday of the week in which the last Health Plan deduction was made. If they return within the three weeks period, a deduction covering the dues in arrears will be made from their first pay check. The coverage will terminate on the Saturday (11:59) P.M. of the third week following the last Health Plan deductions, unless individual payments are made to the Permanente Field Hospital. (It should be noted that this arrangement does not apply to employees whose employment terminates.)

H. Termination of Coverage

Coverage under the Health Plan terminates at 11:59 P.M. the Saturday of the week in which employment terminates.

How the Plan Operates

Except in Emergency—Services must be applied for at the First Aid Station in each of the yards or at the Permanente Field Hospital at Cutting Boulevard and Fourteenth Street, Richmond, or at the Permanente Foundation Hospital at Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard, Oakland. In the event of an emergency the Permanente Foundation Hospital at Broadway and MacArthur Boulevard should be notified immediately, and the patient should report to the hospital as soon as possible. The Telephone Number is HUmboldt 5720—Ask for Emergency Desk.

Services Not Included

Chronic illnesses for which a subscriber has had medical advice or treatment within one year preceding his subscription date, are not included, but emergency treatment for acute stages of chronic illnesses is included even though the subscriber has had advice or treatment within the year preceding his subscription date. Injuries and illnesses which occur after the date of employment but before subscription to the plan are not covered.

The Plan does not cover—dental services or dentures, afflictions or diseases which become epidemic or which are subject to quarantine including tuberculosis, artificial limbs, childbirth, pregnancy and miscarriage, glasses, glass eyes and injuries and illnesses resulting from acts of the public enemy. (Bombing, invasion, etc.) Vitamins and Hormones will be furnished at cost. Insulin for treatment of Diabetes will be furnished for a period of 30 days.

Care for insanity will be given until the employee may be removed to an institution, but in no event will such care be given for more than thirty days.

In the event any employee is injured by any third person who is thereby liable to such employee for the expenses of medical treatment and hospitalization, and pursuant to this agreement the employee is treated for said injury, then the employee shall be responsible to Doctor for the reasonable value of said treatment, and Doctor shall be subrogated to all of the employee's rights of recovery for the value of said treatment. It is understood, however, that the employee shall not be liable to Doctor for payment for treatment under this agreement unless compensation therefore is collected from said third person.

**EXHIBIT F
GROUP INSURANCE RATES**

Table 1

Hospital Confinement Benefits Rate per \$1.00 of Daily Hospital Benefits

| <i>Percentage of Exposure on Eligible Females and Non-Caucasian Lives (Non-Caucasian Females Are Counted Twice)</i> | <i>Special Services of 5 Times Daily Benefits</i> | | | <i>Special Services of 10 Times Daily Benefits</i> | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <i>31 Day Limit</i> | <i>70 Day Limit</i> | <i>100 Day Limit</i> | <i>31 Day Limit</i> | <i>70 Day Limit</i> | <i>100 Day Limit</i> |
| Less than 11%----- | \$.110 | \$.122 | \$.128 | \$.140 | \$.152 | \$.158 |
| 11% to less than 21%----- | .126 | .140 | .147 | .161 | .175 | .182 |
| 21% to less than 31%----- | .137 | .152 | .160 | .175 | .190 | .198 |
| 31% to less than 41%----- | .148 | .165 | .173 | .189 | .206 | .214 |
| 41% to less than 51%----- | .159 | .177 | .186 | .203 | .221 | .230 |
| 51% to less than 61%----- | .170 | .189 | .199 | .217 | .236 | .246 |
| 61% to less than 71%----- | .181 | .201 | .211 | .231 | .251 | .261 |
| 71% to less than 81%----- | .192 | .213 | .224 | .245 | .266 | .277 |
| 81% to less than 91%----- | .203 | .226 | .237 | .259 | .282 | .293 |
| 91% and over----- | .214 | .238 | .250 | .273 | .297 | .309 |

Table 2

Surgical Benefits Rates per Employee Insured

| | <i>\$75.00 Maximum</i> | <i>\$100.00 Maximum</i> | <i>\$112.50 Maximum</i> | <i>\$150.00 Maximum</i> | <i>\$225.00 Maximum</i> |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Less than 11%----- | \$.20 | \$.27 | \$.30 | \$.40 | \$.70 |
| 11% to less than 21%----- | .23 | .31 | .35 | .46 | .81 |
| 21% to less than 31%----- | .25 | .34 | .38 | .50 | .88 |
| 31% to less than 41%----- | .27 | .36 | .41 | .54 | .95 |
| 41% to less than 51%----- | .29 | .39 | .44 | .58 | 1.02 |
| 51% to less than 61%----- | .31 | .42 | .47 | .62 | 1.09 |
| 61% to less than 71%----- | .33 | .44 | .50 | .66 | 1.16 |
| 71% to less than 81%----- | .35 | .47 | .53 | .70 | 1.23 |
| 81% to less than 91%----- | .37 | .50 | .56 | .74 | 1.30 |
| 91% and over----- | .39 | .52 | .59 | .78 | 1.37 |

Table 3
Medical Care Benefits (Doctor's Calls) Rates per Employee Insured

| | <i>1st 3 Calls Not Paid</i> | <i>Hosp. Only 1st Call</i> | <i>1st Call Acc. 4th Call Sick</i> | <i>1st Call Hosp. 4th Call Home or Office</i> | ^(e) <i>1st Call Hosp. 1st Call Acc. 4th Call Sick Outside Hosp.</i> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Less than 11%----- | \$.35 | \$.15 | \$.40 | \$.40 | \$.45 |
| 11% to less than 21%----- | .40 | .17 | .45 | .45 | .52 |
| 21% to less than 31%----- | .44 | .18 | .50 | .50 | .56 |
| 31% to less than 41%----- | .47 | .20 | .54 | .54 | .61 |
| 41% to less than 51%----- | .51 | .22 | .58 | .58 | .65 |
| 51% to less than 61%----- | .54 | .24 | .62 | .62 | .70 |
| 61% to less than 71%----- | .58 | .25 | .66 | .66 | .74 |
| 71% to less than 81%----- | .61 | .27 | .70 | .70 | .79 |
| 81% to less than 91%----- | .65 | .29 | .74 | .74 | .83 |
| 91% and over----- | .68 | .30 | .78 | .78 | .88 |

Table 4
Diagnostic X-rays Outside Hospital

| | <i>Accident Only</i> <i>\$25.00 Limit</i> | <i>Accident or Sickness</i> <i>\$15.00 Limit</i> | <i>\$25.00 Limit</i> |
|----------------------------|--|---|----------------------|
| Less 11% ----- | \$.05 | \$.10 | \$.15 |
| 11% to less than 21% ----- | .05 | .11 | .17 |
| 21% to less than 31% ----- | .05 | .12 | .18 |
| 31% to less than 41% ----- | .05 | .13 | .19 |
| 41% to less than 51% ----- | .05 | .14 | .20 |
| 51% to less than 61% ----- | .05 | .14 | .21 |
| 61% to less than 71% ----- | .05 | .15 | .22 |
| 71% to less than 81% ----- | .05 | .15 | .23 |
| 81% to less than 91% ----- | .05 | .16 | .24 |
| 91% and over ----- | .05 | .16 | .25 |

Table 5
Extra Premiums for Industry

The percentage extras in the table below apply to Hospital Confinement Benefits and to Medical Care Benefits. No premium extras due to industry are charged for Surgical Benefits or for Diagnostic X-rays outside Hospital. The percentage extra in the Table below is to be added to the premium determined in Table 1 and 3 for the correct percentage of female and non-Caucasian employees. The list below included some of the more common industries requiring an extra premium. There are other industries involving an occupational health hazard sufficient to require an extra.

| <i>Industry</i> | <i>Percentage Extra</i> |
|---|-------------------------|
| Breweries and Distilleries Industry ----- | 15% |
| Felt Hat Factories (refer to Home Office) | |
| If no carrotting ----- | 40% |
| Otherwise at least ----- | 70% |
| Farmers ----- | 15% |
| Hot Metal Industries ----- | 15% |
| Lime, Cement and Gypsum ----- | 15% |
| Marble and Stone Yards ----- | 15% |
| Miners and Quarries ----- | 40% |
| Refractories ----- | 15% |
| Textile | |
| Arkansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma and Texas ----- | 40% |
| Elsewhere ----- | 15% |
| Wine Manufacturers and Wine Merchants | |
| Wholesale Liquor Dealers ----- | 15% |
| Woodsmen and Loggers—Saw Mills ----- | 25% |

Section 7**PROJECTS UNDER WAY**

This report is filed six months before the sixty-seventh session of the Legislature and of necessity much of the additional research and investigation that might be performed is postponed or not undertaken because of the limitations of time. However, the Senate Interim Committee set up to study the same general subject has until the next session to make its report and it is to be expected that it will present additional data.

Also worthy of notice is the fact that at the first extraordinary session (1946) A.B. 88 was enacted whereby the State Department of Public Health is designated as the sole authorized agent of the State to make application for Federal funds and to accept such funds and provide for their expenditure under the provisions of the Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

The act also provides for the making of survey of the hospital and health center facilities and needs of the State by the State Department of Public Health and development of a program for the construction of hospitals and health centers.

It is interesting to note that the opinion of this committee, expressed earlier in this report, that a shortage of hospitals and facilities exists is also the opinion of P. K. Gilman, M.D., Chief of the Bureau of Hospital Surveys who stated in a letter to the chairman dated June 10, 1946 as follows:

"I am also taking the liberty of sending you a copy of some remarks of mine delivered to the Governor's Advisory Council on Hospital Facilities on the occasion of their organization meeting. This will serve to give you an idea of the purpose and planning of the survey and also serve to inform you of the inability, at the present time, of hospitalizing the population of California in need of such facilities."

It will be interesting to note how far the more detailed survey will substantiate that already made by this committee.

Dr. Gilman's remarks referred to above follow:

PURPOSE OF THE HOSPITAL SURVEY IN CALIFORNIA

P. K. GILMAN, M.D., Chief, Bureau of Hospital Surveys
California State Department of Public Health

There exists a growing realization that the hospital is a responsibility of the community, not of the individual. The day is past when the philanthropic person or group may feel at liberty to independently erect facilities for the care of the sick on a site selected at random with consideration given but few of the myriad factors that should, after careful and widespread study, determine where such an institution would best be located. There is also an ever-increasing demand for adequate hospital facilities for all the people. The latter are fast coming to realize the hospital is a necessity in times of illness.

In the United States our standards of service are excellent and while it is true we have more hospital beds per population unit than in any other country, these beds are by no means equally distributed. Some areas are supplied in a fairly adequate manner, many areas have inadequate facilities, and in some areas these are completely lacking. This applies equally to California as well as to the country as a whole.

The modern staffed and well equipped hospital has many functions and in any comprehensive long-range health program should rightly be considered an indispensable distribution center for all types of medical service—preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic. Furthermore, in addition to providing care to restore those disables by injury or disease, it should function as a center not only for the maintenance and improvement of health, but for the continuing education of doctors, dentists, nurses and the related professions. Again further, the education of the general public on matters pertaining to health should not be neglected.

The American Hospital Association is organized for the purpose of raising the standards of hospital care for the people of this country. The Commission of Hospital Care is an independent entity and was organized prior to the introduction of legislation in Congress concerned with hospital construction. This Commission has planned the State surveys and inventories of hospital facilities and hopes to promote a study of such facilities in cooperation with those individuals and agencies interested in improving hospital and health service in each community.

The American Hospital Association, The Commission on Hospital Care and the American Medical Association have approved the granting of Federal funds to the States as one means of remedying the shortage and unequal distribution of hospital facilities. Such funds would assist in hospital construction in areas requiring such assistance either for the expansion of existing structures or the erection of new institutions.

The Hill-Burton Bill—S.B. 191—has been introduced in the Congress of the United States and proposes Federal assistance to the States. This bill has passed the Senate but has not as yet been acted upon by the lower house although no open opposition has to date developed. This bill proposes a program to be administered by State governmental authorities through the United States Public Health Service. It provides for Federal grants for; first, state-wide surveys of all existing hospital and public health facilities to be followed by coordinated state-wide plans programing facilities needed to supplement those already existing in order to serve all persons within the individual State. It further provides for the granting of Federal funds to construct or assist in constructing those needed public and other non-profit community hospital and public health facility projects in accord with the approved state-wide construction program.

A necessary preliminary to any request for Federal funds will be the State hospital survey and subsequent planning. A result of such will be a plan and construction program on a state-wide basis of need, supplementing rather than duplicating existing facilities. The Federal funds would be supplied to construct the physical plant and have no concern with Federal health insurance.

A further condition to be met in order to qualify for these grants-in-aid is assurance by the community to receive such funds of proper maintenance of the benefitting institutions. Such guarantee might well become difficult or impossible of fulfillment as a result of improper planning and programing of new construction.

Surveys have been completed or are nearing completion throughout the country under the central direction and assistance of the Commission Care inaugurated by the American Hospital Association.

In California A. B. 88 was passed by the legislature at its recent (1946) special sessions and signed by the Governor on February 25th, 1946. This act provides for the making of a survey of the hospital and health center facilities and needs of the State by the State Department of Public Health and development of a program for the construction of hospitals and health centers. It also creates a State Advisory Council on Hospital Facilities to consult with and advise the State Department of Public Health in carrying out the purposes of the act. Further the State Department of Public Health is solely authorized to make application on behalf of this state for Federal funds and to accept such funds and provide for their expenditure under the provision of the Federal Hospital Survey and Construction Act.

The institutions to be surveyed comprise those giving active in-bed care, excluding those providing custodial care as well as Federal hospitals, and rest homes where no medical care is provided.

With proper staff comprehending the objects and mechanics of the job it is planned to profit by the experience gained during the pioneer survey in Michigan and use will be made of the schedules developed by the Commission on Hospital Care.

The actual survey was preceded by proper publicity and the cooperation obtained of the Association of California Hospitals whose members are vitally interested since the survey itself was originally proposed by the American Hospital Association, has its full support and is probably the most important project ever undertaken by the hospitals of the State.

As a direct result of the cooperation on the part of the Hospital Association, the State has been divided into survey areas corresponding to the hospital districts set up by that organization. The area chairmen of these districts have been approached and their cooperation promised as liaison officers with whom field workers may arrange contacts and appointments for visits to the institutions within the district.

At the same time an active public relations and publicity campaign has been developed to educate not only the hospital personnel as to the objects of the survey, but the medical profession and the general public. These steps have facilitated the study since the actual work has been started.

The publicity was headed by a letter signed by the Governor urging full cooperation. This went to all the hospitals to be included in the survey approximately one week before the schedules of information were sent out. About two days following the letter from the Governor, one from the president of the Association of California Hospitals followed to the same institutions requesting prompt cooperation and accedance.

When the schedules of information were sent out two or three days later each was accompanied by a letter from the Bureau of Hospital Surveys indicating the manner in which they should be completed.

In the meantime additional publicity channels to be employed have been monthly bulletins of State and County Medical Societies, State Nursing Council, Blue Cross Plans, stories released to newspapers throughout the State to stimulate the interest of all groups, including the public, in hospitals.

Upon return of completed schedules of information, their subject matter will be classified and arranged and the accumulated data transferred to punch cards at the central office of the Commission on Hospital Care in Chicago. These cards will be made in duplicate and one set returned

to the office of the California Survey, the other retained in Chicago to form part of the nation-wide statistics concerning these facilities.

Utilizing the data thus secured, material will be at the disposal of the hospital Council and Bureau of Hospital Surveys from which estimates may be made as to the adequacy of hospital facilities in the various areas of California and recommendations evolved as to where and what types of institutions are required to make available such facilities to the people of the State.

The importance of this planning can not be too strongly stressed. It must be done in a broad-minded and objective manner uninfluenced by sectional competition. In other words, the State should be viewed as a whole in order to recommend proper distribution of facilities on a strictly factual basis rather than yielding to provincial pressure.

Before any recommendations may be intelligently arrived at many factors tabulated as a result of the survey must be carefully weighed. Each of these, the more obvious as well as those less so, will need study. Among these factors may be mentioned population density, relation to urban areas together with the size and distribution of these, availability of personnel to staff the institution, use of the hospital by the residents of a particular community, income level and standards of living and distances as interpreted in terms of topography, roads, means of transportation and climate.

All these operate to determine the extent of area to be served, the number of beds needed and the degrees of support which will be accorded the institutions which competed. Thus, the draft of a state-wide hospital plan may include recommendations for the extension of and addition to certain existing facilities as well as construction of new institutions in areas devoid of such conveniences.

The survey and its attendant publicity should accomplish more than a mere accumulation of data relating to the extent of available facilities existing at the present time. Many hospitals have failed in the past and at present many more, in the struggle for existence, of necessity, render sub-standard service. These failures will not tend to decrease as exaggerated war-time conditions of population and income return to a more normal level. Since hospitals depend upon the public for their support they should be erected in response to community need. Each community must be studied on the spot if costly errors are to be avoided. In other words, it is impossible to arbitrarily lay down hard and fast rules regarding the size of a hospital community and the bed capacity and location of the hospital without taking into account many factors.

Consideration of the population served demands determination of several factors. Population trends over a sufficiently extended period will give valuable information, especially if considered in conjunction with the sickness rate and hospital habits of the area and population density as well as accessibility of tributary areas. It is conceded that with population of less than 6 per mile a hospital is not practicable but with more than this figure a hospital is practicable and necessary.

With good roads and adequate means of transportation only exceptional cases may not be safely moved up to forty miles in a level district. In mountainous areas with less direct and steeper roads and more severe weather conditions facilities should be more accessible.

Careful consideration must be given the character of the hospital as to professional standards and accessibility to people unable to pay as well as those able. Actual beds are but one need in the community. The quality of the service rendered, the availability of physicians to staff the hospital and their attitudes and customs in reference to hospitals will have influence upon the support accorded the community project or whether this support will be given similar facilities in adjacent communities.

To attract doctors to rural areas there must be provided, in addition to modern hospital facilities, an assurance of an adequate income as well as opportunities for study and research. To accomplish these conditions careful planning and cooperation on a community level are necessary. At present in the majority of rural communities the average physician spends a large part of his time in travel from patient to patient. The assembling of adequate facilities combined with office space for private physicians as well as members of the health department and allied services will increase the efficiency of those rendering the service and improve the quality of those services.

The program suggested is one which will require considerable time to carry out to its ultimate goal. It will set up for the first time a *system* of hospitals in contradistinction to a series of independent and often competing institutions. If proper planning be initiated and perpetrated, if coordinated effort from wholehearted community and State cooperation rather than competition become the pattern, not only will proper hospital facilities for the people of California result, but the standards of preventive medicine, diagnostic procedures and therapeutics will be raised and their benefits made available to all.

Since it is evident that establishing a State system of prepaid medical care must perforce wait the expansion of facilities it is nevertheless not the intention of either the medical fraternity or the commercial insurance firms to cease expanding their coverage under voluntary plans.

It is the opinion of this committee that the report to be brought in by the State Department of Public Health as outlined on the preceding pages by Dr. Gilman will contain much factual information necessary to the Legislature before it can proceed with any plans which might throw additional burdens on the hospitals of California at this time.

Section 8

PUBLIC OPINION

Since what is to be known concerning the cost and operation of prepaid health plans can only be brought to light by the expenditure of considerable time and effort, this committee has not felt that the general public is in a position to give an unqualified answer to the question:—"Do you favor a State Plan of Prepaid Medical Care?"

However, the members of this committee determined that a survey which would bring to light other matters having a bearing on the subjects pertain to our study might be of value.

Therefore, the firm, "California Associates," was employed to make a survey and tabulate the results. The survey as delivered to the committee is incorporated as the balance of this section and the foreword explains how it was conducted and the question sheet furnished the interviewers is reproduced.

The only question which may be regarded as "slanted" is that where the word "compulsory" is used—yet to avoid the word would have been to "slant" the question in a different way or to fail to bring to light the distinction between "compulsory" and "voluntary" plans.

For visual reference as to the areas covered by the survey we have interpolated in the report an outline map of California in which the outlines of the areas are delineated.

Since the copies of the survey report were prepared at a different time than that in which this report was typed the pages are not numbered but the tables are identified numerically for reference.

Significant results of the tabulations appearing in the survey report are noted below.

Coverage

327 per 1,000 families interviewed carried insurance against medical cost.

Incidence of Use

430 per 1,000 persons insured received care under the plan.

Satisfaction

925 per 1,000 persons receiving care were satisfied.

Extra Charges

487 per 1,000 persons receiving service paid additional charges 81.3% of these thought the extra charge was fair.

Compulsion

76% believed membership should be voluntary.

State Competition

50.2% of persons interviewed believed the State should promote and operate a competitive plan.

Choice of Plan

56.9% of those believing membership should be compulsory preferred free choice as between State or private plan.

Financing of Plan

348 per 1,000 favored payroll tax.

209 per 1,000 favored sales tax.

67 per 1,000 favored property tax.

244 per 1,000 favored some other method of paying for service.

Types of Healers

265 per 1,000 preferred M.D.'s only.

735 per 1,000 would include other professions as follows :

10.9% would include Osteopaths

17.1% would include Chiropractors

1.1% would include Drugless healers

The variations in the answers as determined by area, occupation, union membership, etc. are interesting and covered in detail in the following reproduction of the complete report.

STATE-WIDE PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

MADE EXPRESSLY FOR

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

(As authorized by H. R. 295)

By

KNIGHT AND PARKER
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATES

March, 1946

FOREWORD

Pursuant to a letter of instructions, dated December 8, 1945, signed by Hon. Ernest R. Geddes, Chairman of the Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee, we submit the findings of a Public Opinion Survey, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

These findings are the result of the personal interrogation of 3,460 adult persons in the State of California, properly distributed according to the attached tabulation entitled "Area Distribution."

Each person interrogated, hereinafter referred to as respondent, was interviewed by means of an individual printed questionnaire. The interviewer carefully read verbatim each question contained in said questionnaire without any explanation or other conversation, which would or could in any manner, shape or form, influence the response.

A copy of the instructions sent to and complied with by each interviewer is attached hereto. In order to insure a representative cross-section within each area, the interviewers were properly proportioned and controlled by sex, age, property ownership, union affiliation, occupation, and location of residence, such as urban and rural. Moreover, all persons interviewed were first qualified to be either a wage earner, wife of a wage earner, or husband of a wage earner, thus assuring the committee that only these persons with specific knowledge of the family status were interviewed for the purpose of obtaining opinions to form a part of this report.

In order to insure the adequacy of the cross-section, a correlation chart was maintained on several key questions, the result of which determined that the number of interviews obtained were and are a representative cross-section with a maximum possible error factor of 2% on the overall.

The questionnaire approved by the Chairman of this Committee was actually prepared by said committee, without the assistance of Knight and Parker, except that at the request and instance of the committee, a pilot run was made by Knight and Parker consisting of approximately 100 interviews and the report thereon made to the Chairman of the Committee. As a result of the said pilot run, it was determined that the questions prepared by the committee evoked answers responsive to the question; that the questions were clear and fully understood; that they were not ambiguous and did not require any explanation on the part of the interviewer in order to permit the respondent to give his reply; and that the answers would develop information of the type required by the committee for its consideration of the problem. At this point, it must be clearly understood that the committee did not desire a questionnaire which would develop information to prove a pre-conceived point. The type of information to be gathered was such as would accomplish the objectives of the committee.

These objectives are as follows:

1. To determine what percentage of the population is not now covered by some type of medical care plan and, thereby, determine the percentage of need for a State program.
2. To determine whether or not the service, care or treatment rendered under existing plans is satisfactory.
3. To find out what percentage of the public favored compulsory subscription to or membership in a medical or hospital plan.
4. To determine what percentage of the public favored the idea of the State of California promoting and operating a plan of its own in competition with existing programs or services.
5. To obtain from the people an expression as to the source of revenue for which to pay for such a State plan.
6. To determine which types of practitioners should be permitted to practice under such a plan.

All of these objectives have been accomplished as evidenced by the findings of this report and the report is hereby respectfully submitted.

KNIGHT AND PARKER

By John B. Knight
Geraldine Parker

INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

We are very glad that you will be able to assist us in our state-wide survey. Sorry about the delay in getting the material to you, but we were unavoidably delayed. The following instruction will help you in your interviewing :

1. You are being sent a **CONTROL SHEET**. The number in red in the upper right hand corner of this sheet denotes the total number of interviews you are to make. These must be scattered about in your area and must include urban, rural, and each of the occupation, age, sex and political groups as indicated on your control sheet. The numbers circled in red will indicate how many interviews you make in each group. For instance, you may be required to interview 40 men and 60 women. In this case, the numbers 40 and 60 will be circled after men and women, respectively. **THESE CONTROLS MUST BE STRICTLY ADHERED TO. PLEASE KEEP A RUNNING CHECK BY MARKING OFF IN PENCIL THE CLASSIFICATIONS OF EACH INTERVIEW AS IT IS MADE.** Send in your control sheet with the completed interviews.

As a guide to the occupation classifications, you will use the following :

1. The Proprietor-Manager-Official group will include all those people who act in an ownership or managerial capacity.
 2. The Professional group will include all the usual professions plus anyone who has had extensive study in a given field, i.e. music or other arts.
 3. Clerical Sales or Office worker group is self-explanatory.
 4. Laborers and Wage Earners group will include anyone who works with his hands in a shop, driving a bus, etc.
 5. Domestic Service group will include all maids, chauffeurs, waitresses, bartenders, cooks, etc.
2. The numbers that you find on the questionnaire are what we call code numbers and should be circled **IN RED PENCIL** to indicate the answers given by the person interviewed. See the sample form we have attached to this letter.
3. Before beginning the interview, be sure that the person you are talking to will fit into one of the three groups named at the top of the page: Wage Earner, Wife of Wage Earner, Husband of Wage Earner. If he or she is not in one of these groups, do not interview them.
- Be sure to answer every question. Read the instructions written in Capital letters preceding certain questions. For instance, note that those who answer that none of their family belongs to a medical insurance group should not be asked questions 2 through 5. All words in capitals are instructions and should not be read to the respondent.

4. DK stands for Don't Know on all the Questions.
 5. In question 8 the interviewer must refer back to question 6. If the answer in question 6 was *Compulsory*, ask question 8, if not, skip the question entirely.
 6. Questions 9 and 10. Circle choice of respondent. If the respondent makes more than one selection, be sure to circle each answer he feels to be important.
 7. In question 10, the term "other" will denote anyone in any other classification than those listed. The drugless healers will mean those not using drugs.
- Controls—Be sure to answer and check all controls—number in family, sex, age, property owner, union, occupation, location. We can not pay for incomplete interviews. We would like to have all of your interviews in our office not later than March 1. Please let us know if you have any questions. Thank you again for your help.

DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

All persons interviewed must *first* be qualified to be in one of the following classifications.

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|---|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner ----- | 68.2% | 74.6 | 63.1 | 70.1 | 58.2 | 72.6 | 73.2 | 69.3 | 72.3 | 80.5 | 68.8 | 68.8 | 65.3 |
| Wife of wage earner ----- | 30.8 | 24.6 | 35.7 | 29.9 | 40.9 | 27.4 | 24.7 | 30.7 | 27.7 | 19.5 | 29.7 | 29.4 | 34.7 |
| Husband of wage earner ----- | .5 | .8 | .8 | --- | .9 | --- | .4 | --- | --- | --- | .5 | 1.1 | --- |
| Wage earner and wife of wage earner ----- | .5 | --- | .4 | --- | --- | --- | 1.7 | --- | --- | --- | 1.0 | .7 | --- |

SUBSCRIBERS TO MEDICAL PLAN

1. Who, living in this household, subscribes, belongs to, or is taken care of under any medical or hospital group or insurance plan?

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|---------------------------------------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| None ----- | 67.3% | 57.0 | 68.5 | 64.4 | 61.8 | 63.7 | 66.9 | 78.5 | 77.7 | 54.9 | 69.7 | 65.6 | 65.3 |
| Those having plan ----- | 32.7 | 43.0 | 31.5 | 35.6 | 38.2 | 36.3 | 33.1 | 21.5 | 22.3 | 45.1 | 30.3 | 34.4 | 34.7 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner only ----- | 51.7% | 55.8 | 42.1 | 53.5 | 47.0 | 46.7 | 49.5 | 60.0 | 63.0 | 59.5 | 56.7 | 39.6 | 51.5 |
| Entire family ----- | 45.8 | 40.4 | 56.6 | 42.4 | 49.4 | 53.3 | 50.5 | 40.0 | 31.5 | 40.5 | 40.7 | 60.4 | 42.4 |
| Wage earner and wife or husband ----- | 1.3 | 3.8 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 3.0 | --- | --- | --- | 5.5 | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Miscellaneous ----- | 1.2 | --- | --- | --- | .6 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 2.6 | --- | 6.1 |

MEMBERS RECEIVING CARE

2. Which member or members of this family have received medical or hospital care under the plan?

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Those having plan ----- | (32.7%) | (43.0) | (31.5) | (35.6) | (38.2) | (36.3) | (33.1) | (21.5) | (22.3) | (45.1) | (30.3) | (34.4) | (34.7) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None ----- | 57.0 | 36.5 | 35.5 | 56.6 | 63.1 | 55.6 | 63.1 | 88.6 | 64.8 | 44.4 | 55.7 | 61.5 | 57.6 |
| Received care ----- | 43.0 | 63.5 | 64.5 | 43.4 | 36.9 | 44.4 | 36.9 | 11.4 | 35.2 | 55.6 | 44.3 | 38.5 | 42.4 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner ----- | 56.7% | 72.7 | 44.8 | 60.5 | 53.2 | 60.0 | 60.0 | 50.0 | 68.4 | 70.0 | 54.9 | 67.6 | 32.1 |
| Other members of family ----- | 26.3 | 12.1 | 22.5 | 27.9 | 32.3 | 20.0 | 34.3 | 50.0 | 21.1 | 10.0 | 28.6 | 24.3 | 32.1 |
| Both ----- | 17.0 | 15.2 | 32.7 | 11.6 | 14.5 | 20.0 | 5.7 | --- | 10.5 | 20.0 | 16.5 | 8.1 | 35.8 |

SATISFACTORY SERVICE

3. (IF TREATMENT OR CARE RECEIVED, ASK) Was the service, care or treatment entirely satisfactory?

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Those who have received care----- | (43.0%) 100.0% | (63.5) 100.0 | (64.5) 100.0 | (43.4) 100.0 | (36.9) 100.0 | (44.4) 100.0 | (36.9) 100.0 | (11.4) 100.0 | (35.2) 100.0 | (55.6) 100.0 | (44.3) 100.0 | (38.5) 100.0 | (42.4) 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 92.5% | 97.0 | 85.7 | 100.0 | 95.2 | 100.0 | 82.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 95.0 | 91.7 | 88.9 | 89.3 |
| No ----- | 6.5 | --- | 12.2 | --- | 3.2 | --- | 17.7 | --- | --- | --- | 7.6 | 11.1 | 10.7 |
| Don't know ----- | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.1 | --- | 1.6 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 5.0 | .7 | --- | --- |

ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS MADE

4. Did you have to pay the doctor or hospital anything extra?

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Those who have received care----- | (43.0%) 100.0% | (63.4) 100.0 | (64.5) 100.0 | (43.4) 100.0 | (36.9) 100.0 | (44.4) 100.0 | (36.9) 100.0 | (11.4) 100.0 | (35.2) 100.0 | (55.6) 100.0 | (44.3) 100.0 | (38.5) 100.0 | (42.4) 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 48.7% | 42.4 | 49.0 | 39.5 | 54.8 | 70.0 | 54.3 | 50.0 | 57.9 | 50.0 | 48.5 | 41.7 | 35.8 |
| No ----- | 48.2 | 54.5 | 32.7 | 58.2 | 45.2 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 50.0 | 42.1 | 50.0 | 51.5 | 58.3 | 57.1 |
| Don't know ----- | 3.1 | 3.1 | 18.3 | 2.3 | --- | --- | 5.7 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 7.1 |

FAIRNESS OF ADDITIONAL CHARGE

5. (IF HAD TO PAY EXTRA) Was the extra charge fair?

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Those paying extra charge----- | (48.7%) 100.0% | (42.4) 100.0 | (49.0) 100.0 | (39.5) 100.0 | (54.8) 100.0 | (70.0) 100.0 | (54.3) 100.0 | (50.0) 100.0 | (57.9) 100.0 | (50.0) 100.0 | (48.5) 100.0 | (41.7) 100.0 | (35.8) 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 81.3% | 85.7 | 75.0 | 100.0 | 94.1 | 84.6 | 52.6 | 100.0 | 81.8 | 90.0 | 79.0 | 66.7 | 90.0 |
| No ----- | 13.9 | 7.2 | 20.8 | --- | 5.9 | 7.7 | 42.1 | --- | 9.1 | 10.0 | 12.9 | 26.7 | 10.0 |
| Don't know ----- | 4.8 | 7.1 | 4.2 | --- | --- | 7.7 | 5.3 | --- | 9.1 | --- | 8.1 | 6.6 | --- |

FINANCIAL SOURCES FOR STATE PLAN

9. If the State should start such a plan, how should it be paid for?

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Interviews ----- | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 |
| Payroll tax ----- | 34.8% | 35.8 | 39.2 | 32.3 | 40.0 | 39.7 | 30.7 | 22.9 | 32.4 | 65.8 | 37.1 | 22.3 | 28.6 |
| Sales tax ----- | 28.9 | 45.0 | 29.7 | 22.5 | 22.7 | 20.7 | 31.1 | 45.9 | 29.4 | 11.4 | 24.0 | 55.7 | 24.9 |
| Property tax ----- | 6.7 | 2.5 | 15.5 | 7.3 | 5.5 | 13.2 | 8.5 | 5.1 | 6.7 | 1.3 | 6.4 | 1.1 | 6.9 |
| Other ----- | 24.4 | 15.8 | 22.4 | 31.3 | 27.7 | 29.8 | 31.8 | 12.7 | 23.9 | 26.6 | 23.6 | 17.9 | 23.3 |
| Don't know ----- | 5.6 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 6.2 | 5.0 | --- | 8.3 | 5.5 | --- | 7.6 | 2.2 | 16.4 |
| Refused to state ----- | .1 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | .1 | --- | --- |
| Miscellaneous ----- | 2.5 | .8 | .9 | 3.3 | 1.5 | --- | 1.2 | 5.1 | 2.1 | --- | 2.3 | 1.2 | 1.6 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

ELIGIBILITY OF VARIOUS TYPES OF HEALERS

10. If a State plan should be adopted, should it include treatment by Osteopaths, Chiropractors, Other, Drugless healers, All, None?

| | Total | Area A | Area B | Area C | Area D | Area E | Area F | Area G | Area H | Area I | Area J | Area K | Area L |
|-------------------------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| None ----- | 26.5% | 10.7 | 34.9 | 41.2 | 34.8 | 17.9 | 34.8 | 26.5 | 16.2 | 22.2 | 24.0 | 12.8 | 27.1 |
| Those who would include ----- | 73.5 | 89.3 | 65.1 | 58.8 | 65.2 | 82.1 | 65.2 | 73.5 | 83.8 | 77.8 | 76.0 | 87.2 | 72.9 |
| | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 |
| All ----- | 70.7% | 83.3 | 72.2 | 76.7 | 74.2 | 58.4 | 59.9 | 53.8 | 77.7 | 66.7 | 66.5 | 87.9 | 68.7 |
| Osteopaths ----- | 19.9 | 11.1 | 9.3 | 19.6 | 16.4 | 33.7 | 36.4 | 39.5 | 12.4 | 28.6 | 22.8 | 3.3 | 16.8 |
| Chiropractors ----- | 17.1 | 12.0 | 17.9 | 16.0 | 13.2 | 29.7 | 24.6 | 38.7 | 9.9 | 25.4 | 18.1 | 8.4 | 7.3 |
| Drugless healers ----- | 1.1 | --- | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 5.0 | --- | .8 | --- | 1.6 | 1.3 | --- | --- |
| Dentists ----- | .4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | .8 | --- | --- | 1.2 | --- | --- |
| Other ----- | 6.5 | 5.6 | 2.6 | --- | 2.4 | 16.8 | 1.1 | 2.5 | 6.9 | 1.6 | 12.2 | 1.7 | 8.0 |
| Against it ----- | .1 | --- | .7 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Don't know ----- | 2.5 | --- | 4.0 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 2.0 | --- | 1.7 | 2.5 | 1.6 | 2.2 | .8 | 8.8 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

SEX—DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

All persons interviewed must *first* be qualified to be in one of the following classifications.

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>(49.1)</i> <i>Male</i> | <i>(50.9)</i> <i>Female</i> |
|---|--------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage Earner ----- | 68.2% | 97.4 | 40.0 |
| Wife of wage earner ----- | 30.8 | --- | 59.2 |
| Husband of wage earner ----- | .5 | 2.3 | --- |
| Wage earner and wife of wage earner ----- | .5 | .3 | .8 |

SEX—SUBSCRIBERS TO MEDICAL PLAN

1. Who, living in this household, subscribes, belongs to, or is taken care of under any medical or hospital group or insurance plan?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| None ----- | 67.3% | 67.4 | 67.3 |
| Those having plan ----- | 32.7 | 32.6 | 32.7 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage Earner only ----- | 51.7 | 50.7 | 52.3 |
| Entire Family ----- | 45.8 | 46.6 | 45.5 |
| Wage earner and wife or husband ----- | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Miscellaneous ----- | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.2 |

SEX—MEMBERS RECEIVING CARE

2. Which member or members of this family have received medical or hospital care under the plan?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Those having plan ----- | (32.7%) | (32.6%) | (32.7%) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None ----- | 57.0 | 54.8 | 58.9 |
| Received care ----- | 43.0 | 45.2 | 41.1 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage Earner ----- | 56.7% | 55.7 | 57.4 |
| Other members of family ----- | 26.3 | 28.0 | 24.7 |
| Both ----- | 17.0 | 16.3 | 17.9 |

SEX—SATISFACTORY SERVICE

3. (IF TREATMENT OR CARE RECEIVED, ASK) Was the service, care or treatment entirely satisfactory?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Those who have received care ----- | (43.0%) | (45.2) | (41.1) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 92.5% | 91.1 | 94.4 |
| No ----- | 6.5 | 7.7 | 4.7 |
| Don't know ----- | 1.0 | 1.2 | .9 |

SEX—ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS MADE

4. Did you have to pay the doctor or hospital anything extra?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Those who have received care ----- | (43.0%) | (45.2) | (41.1) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 48.7% | 49.4 | 47.4 |
| No ----- | 48.2 | 48.6 | 48.3 |
| Don't know ----- | 3.1 | 2.0 | 4.3 |

SEX—FAIRNESS OF ADDITIONAL CHARGE

5. (IF HAD TO PAY EXTRA) Was the extra charge fair?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Those paying extra charge----- | (48.7%) 100.0% | (49.4) 100.0 | (47.4) 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 81.3% | 77.3 | 86.2 |
| No ----- | 13.9 | 16.0 | 11.0 |
| Don't know ----- | 4.8 | 6.7 | 2.8 |

SEX—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP

6. Do you think that subscription to or membership in a medical or hospital plan should be compulsory or voluntary?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Voluntary ----- | 76.0% | 73.9 | 78.0 |
| Compulsory ----- | 21.7 | 23.7 | 19.9 |
| Don't know ----- | 2.1 | 2.2 | 2.0 |
| Do not believe in it----- | .1 | --- | .1 |
| Refused to state----- | .1 | .2 | --- |

SEX—OPINION ON STATE-OPERATED PLAN

7. There are now available several different types of medical and hospital plans. Do you think the State of California should promote and operate a plan in competition to those in existence?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 50.2% | 53.1 | 47.3 |
| No ----- | 25.8 | 29.0 | 22.8 |
| Don't know ----- | 24.0 | 17.9 | 29.9 |

SEX—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN STATE PLAN

8. (IF COMPULSORY ANSWERED TO QUESTION No. 6) Should people be compelled to belong to or subscribe to the State Plan or should they be allowed to take their choice?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Those who believe in compulsory membership--- | (21.7%) 100.0% | (23.7) 100.0 | (19.9) 100.0 |
| Allowed to take choice----- | 56.9% | 53.4 | 60.8 |
| Should be compelled to belong----- | 42.9 | 46.4 | 38.9 |
| Don't know ----- | .1 | .2 | --- |
| Refused to state----- | .1 | --- | .3 |

SEX—FINANCIAL SOURCES FOR STATE PLAN

9. If the State should start such a plan, how should it be paid for?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|-----------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Interviews ----- | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 |
| Payroll tax ----- | 34.8% | 34.3 | 35.3 |
| Sales Tax ----- | 28.9 | 31.1 | 26.9 |
| Property tax ----- | 6.7 | 7.5 | 5.9 |
| Other ----- | 24.4 | 22.9 | 25.9 |
| Don't know ----- | 5.6 | 4.3 | 6.9 |
| Refused to State----- | .1 | --- | .1 |
| Miscellaneous ----- | 2.5 | 2.4 | 1.4 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers

SEX—ELIGIBILITY OF VARIOUS TYPES OF HEALERS

10. If a State plan should be adopted, should it include treatment by Osteopaths, Chiropractors, Other, Drugless healers, All, None?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Male</i> | <i>Female</i> |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| None ----- | 26.5% | 26.0 | 27.0 |
| Those who would include ----- | 73.5% | 74.0 | 73.0 |
| | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 |
| All ----- | 70.7% | 71.5 | 70.1 |
| Osteopaths ----- | 19.9 | 20.6 | 19.3 |
| Chiropractors ----- | 17.1 | 18.1 | 16.3 |
| Drugless healers ----- | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| Dentists ----- | .4 | .2 | .5 |
| Other ----- | 6.5 | 6.0 | 6.9 |
| Against it ----- | .1 | .1 | --- |
| Don't know ----- | 2.5 | 1.9 | 3.0 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

AGE—DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

All persons interviewed must *first* be qualified to be in one of the following classifications.

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> (21.3) | <i>30-39</i> (24.1) | <i>40-49</i> (21.8) | <i>50-Up</i> (32.8) |
|--|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner ----- | 68.2% | 69.5 | 65.4 | 67.2 | 70.3 |
| Wife of wage earner ----- | 30.8 | 29.2 | 33.8 | 32.4 | 28.6 |
| Husband of wage earner ----- | .5 | .5 | .2 | .3 | .7 |
| Wage earner and wife of wage earner -- | .5 | .8 | .6 | .1 | .4 |

AGE—SUBSCRIBERS TO MEDICAL PLAN

1. Who, living in this household, subscribes, belongs to, or is taken care of under any medical or hospital group or insurance plan?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| None ----- | 67.3% | 66.5 | 65.1 | 63.8 | 71.7 |
| Those having plan ----- | 32.7 | 33.5 | 34.9 | 36.2 | 28.3 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner only ----- | 51.7% | 56.8 | 49.2 | 47.2 | 54.4 |
| Entire family ----- | 45.8 | 40.4 | 49.1 | 50.9 | 42.2 |
| Wage earner and wife or husband ----- | 1.3 | 2.0 | .3 | 1.5 | 1.8 |
| Miscellaneous ----- | 1.2 | .8 | 1.4 | .4 | 1.6 |

AGE—MEMBERS RECEIVING CARE

2. Which member or members of this family have received medical or hospital care under the plan?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|-------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Those having plan ----- | (32.7%) | (33.5) | (34.9) | (36.2) | (28.3) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| None ----- | 57.0% | 61.1 | 59.8 | 56.3 | 52.1 |
| Received care ----- | 43.0 | 38.9 | 40.2 | 43.7 | 47.9 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner ----- | 56.7% | 60.0 | 49.6 | 50.9 | 64.2 |
| Other members of family ----- | 26.3 | 27.4 | 30.4 | 26.3 | 22.5 |
| Both ----- | 17.0 | 12.6 | 20.0 | 22.8 | 13.3 |

AGE—SATISFACTORY SERVICE

3. (IF TREATMENT OR CARE RECEIVED, ASK) Was the service, care or treatment entirely satisfactory?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Those who have received care ----- | (43.0%) | (38.9) | (40.2) | (43.7) | (47.9) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 92.5% | 91.6 | 93.0 | 94.9 | 90.5 |
| No ----- | 6.5 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 5.1 | 7.4 |
| Don't know ----- | 1.0 | 1.0 | .9 | --- | 2.1 |

AGE—ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS MADE**4. Did you have to pay the doctor or hospital anything extra?**

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Those who have received care----- | (43.0%) | (38.9) | (40.2) | (43.7) | (47.9) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 48.7% | 50.0 | 53.9 | 44.1 | 46.0 |
| No ----- | 48.2 | 47.8 | 43.5 | 52.5 | 50.0 |
| Don't know ----- | 3.1 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 4.0 |

AGE—FAIRNESS OF ADDITIONAL CHARGE**5. (IF HAD TO PAY EXTRA) Was the extra charge fair?**

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Those paying extra charge----- | (48.7%) | (50.0) | (53.9) | (44.1) | (48.0) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 81.3% | 84.8 | 80.7 | 75.0 | 83.6 |
| No ----- | 13.9 | 13.0 | 12.9 | 19.2 | 10.5 |
| Don't know ----- | 4.8 | 2.2 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 5.9 |

AGE—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP**6. Do you think that subscription to or membership in a medical or hospital plan should be compulsory or voluntary?**

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Voluntary ----- | 76.0% | 80.2 | 75.7 | 73.3 | 75.5 |
| Compulsory ----- | 21.7 | 17.9 | 22.9 | 24.2 | 21.7 |
| Don't know ----- | 2.1 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| Do not believe in it----- | .1 | --- | --- | .1 | --- |
| Refused to state----- | .1 | --- | --- | .1 | .1 |

AGE—OPINION ON STATE-OPERATED PLAN**7. There are now available several different types of medical and hospital plans. Do you think the State of California should promote and operate a plan in competition to those in existence?**

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 50.2% | 54.5 | 51.4 | 49.2 | 47.0 |
| No ----- | 25.8 | 22.4 | 26.6 | 25.6 | 27.6 |
| Don't know ----- | 24.0 | 23.1 | 22.0 | 25.2 | 25.4 |

AGE—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN STATE PLAN**8. (IF COMPULSORY ANSWERED TO QUESTION No. 6) Should people be compelled to belong to or subscribe to the State Plan or should they be allowed to take their choice?**

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Those who believe in compulsory membership ----- | (21.7%) | (17.9) | (22.9) | (24.2) | (21.7) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Allowed to take choice----- | 56.9% | 59.0 | 60.2 | 56.4 | 53.6 |
| Should be compelled to belong----- | 42.9 | 41.0 | 39.2 | 43.0 | 46.4 |
| Don't know ----- | .1 | --- | --- | .6 | --- |
| Refused to state----- | .1 | --- | .6 | --- | --- |

AGE—FINANCIAL SOURCES FOR STATE PLAN

9. If the State should start such a plan, how should it be paid for?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | <i>*100.0%</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> |
| Interviews ----- | | | | | |
| Payroll tax ----- | 34.8% | 39.6 | 36.3 | 33.3 | 31.2 |
| Sales tax ----- | 28.9 | 25.0 | 29.3 | 29.0 | 32.3 |
| Property tax ----- | 6.7 | 7.6 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 7.4 |
| Other ----- | 24.4 | 23.2 | 24.5 | 26.7 | 23.7 |
| Don't know ----- | 5.6 | 5.5 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 6.7 |
| Refused to state ----- | .1 | --- | --- | --- | .1 |
| Miscellaneous ----- | 2.5 | .8 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 1.9 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

AGE—ELIGIBILITY OF VARIOUS TYPES OF HEALERS

10. If a State plan should be adopted, would it include treatment by Osteopaths, Chiropractors, Other, Drugless healers, All, None?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>20-29</i> | <i>30-39</i> | <i>40-49</i> | <i>50-Up</i> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | <i>*100.0%</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> |
| None ----- | 26.5% | 29.7 | 27.3 | 25.5 | 24.6 |
| Those who would include ----- | 73.5 | 70.3 | 72.7 | 74.5 | 75.4 |
| | <i>*100.0%</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> | <i>*100.0</i> |
| All ----- | 70.7% | 67.9 | 70.8 | 67.8 | 74.3 |
| Osteopaths ----- | 19.9 | 21.3 | 20.5 | 21.8 | 17.5 |
| Chiropractors ----- | 17.1 | 16.4 | 18.1 | 18.3 | 16.1 |
| Drugless healers ----- | 1.1 | .8 | .7 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Dentists ----- | .4 | .6 | --- | .7 | .4 |
| Other ----- | 6.5 | 7.8 | 7.5 | 6.3 | 5.1 |
| Against it ----- | .1 | --- | --- | --- | .1 |
| Don't know ----- | 2.5 | 3.9 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.5 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

OCCUPATION—DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

All persons interviewed must *first* be qualified to be in one of the following classifications.

| | Total | Owner- Mgr. Official | Profes- sional | Clerical Sales | Wage Earner Shop | Domestic Service | House- wife | Farmer | Farm Worker |
|--|--------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| | | (15.9) | (10.3) | (18.2) | (26.8) | (3.4) | (20.5) | (2.9) | (2.0) |
| Interviews..... | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner..... | 68.2% | 87.7 | 87.3 | 82.3 | 83.9 | 81.2 | 7.2 | 72.3 | 78.0 |
| Wife of wage earner..... | 30.8 | 11.5 | 12.2 | 16.1 | 15.0 | 16.2 | 92.6 | 26.7 | 22.0 |
| Husband of wage earner..... | .5 | .4 | .3 | .8 | .4 | 1.7 | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Wage earner and wife of wage earner..... | .5 | .4 | .2 | .8 | .7 | .9 | .2 | 1.0 | ---- |

OCCUPATION—SUBSCRIBERS TO MEDICAL PLAN

1. Who, living in this household, subscribes, belongs to, or is taken care of under any medical or hospital group or insurance plan?

| | Total | Owner- Mgr. Official | Profes- sional | Clerical Sales | Wage Earner Shop | Domestic Service | House- wife | Farmer | Farm Worker |
|--------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| None..... | 67.3% | 74.8 | 64.9 | 64.9 | 62.5 | 76.9 | 67.6 | 69.3 | 86.8 |
| Those having plan..... | 32.7 | 25.2 | 35.1 | 35.1 | 37.5 | 23.1 | 32.4 | 30.7 | 13.2 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Wage earner only..... | 51.7% | 42.8 | 46.0 | 57.3 | 58.8 | 40.7 | 47.4 | 35.5 | 55.6 |
| Entire family..... | 45.8 | 55.8 | 50.0 | 38.6 | 39.5 | 59.3 | 50.0 | 64.5 | 44.4 |
| Wage earner and wife or husband..... | 1.3 | 1.4 | .8 | 1.4 | .6 | ---- | 2.2 | ---- | ---- |
| Miscellaneous..... | 1.2 | ---- | 3.2 | 2.7 | 1.1 | ---- | .4 | ---- | ---- |

OCCUPATION—MEMBERS RECEIVING CARE

2. Which member or members of this family have received medical or hospital care under the plan?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Owner- Mgr. Official</i> | <i>Profes- sional</i> | <i>Clerical Sales</i> | <i>Wage Earner Shop</i> | <i>Domestic Service</i> | <i>House- wife</i> | <i>Farmer</i> | <i>Farm Worker</i> |
|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Those having plan----- | (32.7%) 100.0% | (25.2) 100.0 | (35.1) 100.0 | (35.1) 100.0 | (37.5) 100.0 | (23.1) 100.0 | (32.4) 100.0 | (30.7) 100.0 | (13.2) 100.0 |
| None----- | 57.0% | 49.3 | 48.0 | 57.3 | 59.1 | 63.0 | 59.2 | 58.1 | 100.0 |
| Received care----- | 43.0 100.0% | 50.7 100.0 | 52.0 100.0 | 42.7 100.0 | 40.9 100.0 | 37.0 100.0 | 40.8 100.0 | 41.9 100.0 | ----- |
| Wage earner----- | 56.7% | ----- | 56.3 | 58.5 | 64.3 | 70.0 | 53.8 | 46.2 | ----- |
| Other members of family----- | 26.3 | ----- | 20.3 | 29.8 | 23.6 | 10.0 | 30.1 | 30.8 | ----- |
| Both----- | 17.0 | ----- | 23.4 | 11.7 | 12.1 | 20.0 | 16.1 | 23.0 | ----- |

OCCUPATION—SATISFACTORY SERVICE

3 (IF TREATMENT OR CARE RECEIVED, ASK (Was the service, care treatment entirely satisfactory?)

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Owner- Mgr. Official</i> | <i>Profes- sional</i> | <i>Clerical Sales</i> | <i>Wage Earner Shop</i> | <i>Domestic Service</i> | <i>House- wife</i> | <i>Farmer</i> | <i>Farm Worker</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Those who have received care----- | (43.0%) 100.0% | (50.7) 100.0 | (52.0) 100.0 | (42.7) 100.0 | (40.9) 100.0 | (37.0) 100.0 | (40.8) 100.0 | (41.9) 100.0 | ----- |
| Yes----- | 92.5% | 97.0 | 90.7 | 92.5 | 91.4 | 100.0 | 92.5 | 84.6 | ----- |
| No----- | 6.5 | 3.0 | 9.3 | 4.3 | 7.9 | ----- | 6.5 | 15.4 | ----- |
| Don't know----- | 1.0 | ----- | ----- | 3.2 | .7 | ----- | 1.0 | ----- | ----- |

OCCUPATION—ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS MADE

4. Did you have to pay the doctor or hospital anything extra?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Owner- Mgr. Official</i> | <i>Profes- sional</i> | <i>Clerical Sales</i> | <i>Wage Earner Shop</i> | <i>Domestic Service</i> | <i>House- wife</i> | <i>Farmer</i> | <i>Farm Worker</i> |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Those who have received care_____ | (43.0%) 100.0% | (50.7) 100.0 | (52.0) 100.0 | (42.7) 100.0 | (40.9) 100.0 | (37.0) 100.0 | (40.8) 100.0 | (41.9) 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes_____ | 48.7% | 66.2 | 54.0 | 46.2 | 38.6 | 30.0 | 50.5 | 53.8 | ---- |
| No_____ | 48.2 | 30.9 | 44.4 | 52.7 | 56.4 | 70.0 | 46.2 | 38.5 | ---- |
| Don't know_____ | 3.1 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 5.0 | ---- | 3.3 | 7.7 | ---- |

OCCUPATION—FAIRNESS OF ADDITIONAL CHARGE

5. (IF HAD TO PAY EXTRA) Was the extra charge fair?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Owner- Mgr. Official</i> | <i>Profes- sional</i> | <i>Clerical Sales</i> | <i>Wage Earner Shop</i> | <i>Domestic Service</i> | <i>House- wife</i> | <i>Farmer</i> | <i>Farm Worker</i> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Those paying extra charge_____ | (48.7%) 100.0% | (66.2) 100.0 | (54.0) 100.0 | (46.2) 100.0 | (38.6) 100.0 | (30.0) 100.0 | (50.5) 100.0 | (53.8) 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes_____ | 81.3% | 88.9 | 82.3 | 85.7 | 74.5 | 100.0 | 74.4 | 85.7 | ---- |
| No_____ | 13.9 | 8.9 | 14.7 | 7.2 | 15.7 | ---- | 23.4 | 14.3 | ---- |
| Don't know_____ | 4.8 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 7.1 | 9.8 | ---- | 2.2 | ---- | ---- |

OCCUPATION—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP

6. Do you think that subscription to or membership in a medical or hospital plan should be compulsory or voluntary?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Owner- Mgr. Official</i> | <i>Profes- sional</i> | <i>Clerical Sales</i> | <i>Wage Earner Shop</i> | <i>Domestic Service</i> | <i>House- wife</i> | <i>Farmer</i> | <i>Farm Worker</i> |
|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Interviews----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Voluntary----- | 76.0% | 76.2 | 80.7 | 73.1 | 74.9 | 78.5 | 79.8 | 63.0 | 64.2 |
| Compulsory----- | 21.7 | 21.4 | 17.6 | 24.3 | 22.2 | 19.8 | 18.5 | 37.0 | 34.3 |
| Don't know----- | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | --- | --- |
| Do not believe in it----- | .1 | .2 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Refused to state----- | .1 | .2 | --- | .2 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 1.5 |

OCCUPATION—OPINION ON STATE-OPERATED PLAN

7. There are now available several different types of medical and hospital plans. Do you think the State of California should promote and operate a plant in competition to those in existence?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Owner- Mgr. Official</i> | <i>Profes- sional</i> | <i>Clerical Sales</i> | <i>Wage Earner Shop</i> | <i>Domestic Service</i> | <i>House- wife</i> | <i>Farmer</i> | <i>Farm Worker</i> |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Interviews----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Yes----- | 50.2% | 46.9 | 47.4 | 49.6 | 55.1 | 54.4 | 45.6 | 58.0 | 52.3 |
| No----- | 25.8 | 31.9 | 34.0 | 27.5 | 23.7 | 17.5 | 20.9 | 23.0 | 18.5 |
| Don't know----- | 24.0 | 21.2 | 18.6 | 22.9 | 21.2 | 28.1 | 33.5 | 19.0 | 29.2 |

OCCUPATION—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN STATE PLAN

8. (IF COMPULSORY ANSWERED TO QUESTION No. 6) Should people be compelled to belong to or subscribe to the State Plan or should they be allowed to take their choice?

| | Total | Owner- Mgr. Official | Profes- sional | Clerical Sales | Wage Earner Shop | Domestic Service | House- wife | Farmer | Farm Worker |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Those who believe in compulsory membership----- | (21.7%) 100.0% | (21.4) 100.0 | (17.6) 100.0 | (24.3) 100.0 | (22.2) 100.0 | (19.8) 100.0 | (18.5) 100.0 | (37.0) 100.0 | (34.3) 100.0 |
| Allowed to take choice----- | 56.9% | 50.9 | 60.0 | 59.9 | 58.0 | 56.5 | 68.3 | 29.7 | 31.8 |
| Should be compelled to belong----- | 42.9 | 48.2 | 40.0 | 40.1 | 42.0 | 43.5 | 31.7 | 70.3 | 63.6 |
| Don't know----- | .1 | .9 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Refused to state----- | .1 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 4.6 |

OCCUPATION—FINANCIAL SOURCES FOR STATE PLAN

9. If the State should start such a plan, how should it be paid for?

| | Total | Owner- Mgr. Official | Profes- sional | Clerical Sales | Wage Earner Shop | Domestic Service | House- wife | Farmer | Farm Worker |
|-----------------------|---------|----------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| Interviews----- | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 |
| Payroll tax----- | 34.8% | 33.3 | 33.9 | 36.4 | 37.2 | 29.8 | 35.1 | 26.0 | 25.8 |
| Sales tax----- | 28.9 | 29.4 | 25.5 | 25.3 | 31.2 | 41.2 | 26.3 | 41.0 | 36.4 |
| Property tax----- | 6.7 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 5.8 | 9.6 | 5.9 | 9.0 | 18.2 |
| Other----- | 24.4 | 25.2 | 27.5 | 26.7 | 21.7 | 16.7 | 26.2 | 20.0 | 21.2 |
| Don't know----- | 5.6 | 5.0 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 4.4 | 3.5 | 7.8 | 4.0 | 1.5 |
| Refused to state----- | .1 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | .1 | ---- | ---- |
| Miscellaneous----- | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.6 | .6 | 2.0 | ---- |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers

OCCUPATION—FINANCIAL SOURCES FOR STATE PLAN

10. If a State plan should be adopted, should it include treatment by Osteopaths, Chiropractors, Other, Drugless healers, All, None?

| | <i>Total</i> | <i>Owner- Mgr. Official</i> | <i>Profes- sional</i> | <i>Clerical Sales</i> | <i>Wage Earner Shop</i> | <i>Domestic Service</i> | <i>House- wife</i> | <i>Farmer</i> | <i>Farm Worker</i> |
|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------|
| None----- | 26.5% | 26.9 | 24.3 | 30.1 | 23.7 | 23.3 | 28.2 | 26.7 | 25.4 |
| Those who would include----- | 73.5 | 73.1 | 75.7 | 69.9 | 76.3 | 76.7 | 71.8 | 73.3 | 74.6 |
| | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 |
| All----- | 70.7% | 70.5 | 71.0 | 70.5 | 72.6 | 74.2 | 66.7 | 74.3 | 76.0 |
| Osteopaths----- | 19.9 | 21.4 | 23.4 | 18.5 | 19.0 | 18.0 | 20.8 | 16.2 | 18.0 |
| Chiropractors----- | 17.1 | 17.9 | 13.6 | 15.1 | 17.6 | 14.6 | 19.0 | 23.0 | 20.0 |
| Drugless healers----- | 1.1 | 1.3 | .4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 1.0 | --- | 2.0 |
| Dentists----- | .4 | .3 | .8 | .5 | .1 | --- | .6 | 1.4 | --- |
| Other----- | 6.5 | 4.3 | 7.5 | 10.3 | 3.7 | 6.7 | 7.5 | 1.4 | --- |
| Against it----- | .1 | .3 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Don't know----- | 2.5 | 3.3 | 1.5 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 3.2 | --- | --- |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

UNION MEMBERSHIP—DISTRIBUTION OF SAMPLE

All persons interviewed must *first* be qualified to be in one of the following classifications:

| | Over- all | Union | A. F. L. | C. I. O. | Other Unions | Refused to State | Non- Union |
|---|--------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|------------------|
| | 100.0% | (24.7) 100.0% | (16.4) 100.0% | (3.9) 100.0% | (4.4) 100.0% | (.1) 100.0% | (75.2) 100.0% |
| Wage earner ----- | 68.2% | 73.9% | 75.9% | 79.4% | 61.2% | ----- | 66.5% |
| Wife of wage earner ----- | 30.8 | 25.4 | 23.3 | 20.6 | 37.4 | ----- | 32.5 |
| Husband of wage earner ----- | .5 | .2 | ----- | ----- | 1.4 | ----- | .5 |
| Wage earner and wife of wage earner ----- | .5 | .5 | .8 | ----- | ----- | ----- | .5 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—SUBSCRIBERS TO MEDICAL PLAN

1. Who, living in this household, subscribes, belongs to, or is taken care of under any medical or hospital group or insurance plan?

| | Over- all | Union | A. F. L. | C. I. O. | Other Unions | Refused to State | Non- Union |
|------------------------------------|--------------|-------|----------|----------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------|
| | 67.3% | 59.6 | 58.6 | 61.8 | 61.2 | ----- | 69.6 |
| None ----- | 32.7 | 40.4 | 41.4 | 38.2 | 38.8 | ----- | 30.4 |
| Those having plan | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | ----- | 100.0 |
| Wage earner only | 51.7 | 58.1 | 56.5 | 64.0 | 59.6 | ----- | 48.6 |
| Entire family ---- | 45.8 | 39.8 | 40.4 | 36.0 | 40.4 | ----- | 48.8 |
| Wage earner and wife or husband | 1.3 | 1.5 | 2.2 | ----- | ----- | ----- | 1.1 |
| Miscellaneous --- | 1.2 | .6 | .9 | ----- | ----- | ----- | 1.5 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—MEMBERS RECEIVING CARE

2. Which member or members of this family have received medical or hospital care under the plan?

| | Over- all | Union | A. F. L. | C. I. O. | Other Unions | Refused to State | Non- Union |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| | (32.7%) 100.0% | (40.4) 100.0 | (41.4) 100.0 | (38.2) 100.0 | (38.8) 100.0 | ----- | (30.4) 100.0 |
| Those having plan | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| None ----- | 57.0 | 61.0 | 62.0 | 50.0 | 66.7 | ----- | 55.2 |
| Received care ---- | 43.0 | 39.0 | 38.0 | 50.0 | 33.3 | ----- | 44.8 |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | ----- | 100.0 |
| Wage earner ---- | 56.7% | 64.1 | 70.2 | 52.0 | 52.6 | ----- | 54.9 |
| Other members of family ----- | 26.3 | 23.4 | 23.8 | 28.0 | 15.8 | ----- | 27.3 |
| Both ----- | 17.0 | 12.5 | 6.0 | 20.0 | 31.6 | ----- | 17.8 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—SATISFACTORY SERVICE

3. (IF TREATMENT OR CARE RECEIVED, ASK) Was the service, care or treatment entirely satisfactory?

| | Over- all | Union | A. F. L. | C. I. O. | Other Unions | Refused to State | Non- Union |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| | (43.0%) 100.0% | (39.0) 100.0 | (38.0) 100.0 | (50.0) 100.0 | (33.3) 100.0 | ----- | (44.8) 100.0 |
| Those who have received care -- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| Yes ----- | 92.5% | 95.3 | 94.0 | 96.0 | 100.0 | ----- | 91.6 |
| No ----- | 6.5 | 4.7 | 6.0 | 4.0 | ----- | ----- | 6.9 |
| Don't know ----- | 1.0 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | 1.5 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS MADE

4. Did you have to pay the doctor or hospital anything extra?

| | <i>Over- all</i> | <i>Union</i> | <i>A. F. L.</i> | <i>C. I. O.</i> | <i>Other Unions</i> | <i>Refused to State</i> | <i>Non- Union</i> |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Those who have received care -- | (43.0%) | (39.0) | (38.0) | (50.0) | (33.3) | ----- | (44.8) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | ----- | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 48.7% | 42.2 | 41.2 | 50.0 | 36.8 | ----- | 50.9 |
| No ----- | 48.2 | 51.6 | 52.9 | 41.7 | 57.9 | ----- | 47.0 |
| Don't know ----- | 3.1 | 6.2 | 5.9 | 8.3 | 5.3 | ----- | 2.1 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—FAIRNESS OF ADDITIONAL CHARGE

5. (IF HAD TO PAY EXTRA) Was the extra charge fair?

| | <i>Over- all</i> | <i>Union</i> | <i>A. F. L.</i> | <i>C. I. O.</i> | <i>Other Unions</i> | <i>Refused to State</i> | <i>Non- Union</i> |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Those paying extra charge ----- | (48.7) | (42.2) | (41.2) | (50.0) | (36.8) | ----- | (50.9) |
| | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | ----- | ----- | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 81.3% | 72.6 | 65.6 | 75.0 | 100.0 | ----- | 83.5 |
| No ----- | 13.9 | 15.7 | 25.0 | ----- | ----- | ----- | 13.5 |
| Don't know ----- | 4.8 | 11.7 | 9.4 | 25.0 | ----- | ----- | 3.0 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP

6. Do you think that subscription to or membership in a medical or hospital plan should be compulsory or voluntary?

| | <i>Over- all</i> | <i>Union</i> | <i>A. F. L.</i> | <i>C. I. O.</i> | <i>Other Unions</i> | <i>Refused to State</i> | <i>Non- Union</i> |
|----------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | ----- | 100.0 |
| Voluntary ----- | 76.0% | 72.2 | 70.5 | 74.8 | 76.2 | ----- | 76.9 |
| Compulsory ----- | 21.7 | 26.6 | 28.4 | 23.7 | 22.4 | ----- | 20.4 |
| Don't know ----- | 2.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.4 | ----- | 2.5 |
| Do not believe in it | .1 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | .1 |
| Refused to state-- | .1 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | .1 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—OPINION ON STATE-OPERATED PLAN

7. There are now available several different types of medical and hospital plans. Do you think the State of California should promote and operate a plan in competition to those in existence?

| | <i>Over- all</i> | <i>Union</i> | <i>A. F. L.</i> | <i>C. I. O.</i> | <i>Other Unions</i> | <i>Refused to State</i> | <i>Non- Union</i> |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Interviews ----- | 100.0% | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | ----- | 100.0 |
| Yes ----- | 50.2% | 58.8 | 58.0 | 62.6 | 58.5 | ----- | 47.8 |
| No ----- | 25.8 | 21.1 | 21.7 | 22.1 | 18.4 | ----- | 27.1 |
| Don't know ----- | 24.0 | 20.1 | 20.3 | 15.3 | 23.1 | ----- | 25.1 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—ATTITUDE TOWARD COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN STATE PLAN

8. (IF COMPULSORY ANSWERED TO QUESTION No. 6) Should people be compelled to belong to or subscribe to the State Plan or should they be allowed to take their choice?

| | <i>Over- all</i> | <i>Union</i> | <i>A. F. L.</i> | <i>C. I. O.</i> | <i>Other Unions</i> | <i>Refused to State</i> | <i>Non- Union</i> |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Those who believe in compulsory membership --- | (21.7%) 100.0% | (26.6) 100.0 | (28.4) 100.0 | (23.7) 100.0 | (22.4) 100.0 | ----- ----- | (20.4) 100.0 |
| Allowed to take choice ----- | 56.9% | 54.7 | 57.0 | 35.5 | 60.6 | ----- | 57.3 |
| Should be com- pelled to belong-- | 42.9 | 45.3 | 43.0 | 64.5 | 39.4 | ----- | 42.3 |
| Don't know ----- | .1 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | .2 |
| Refused to state--- | .1 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | .2 |

UNION MEMBERSHIP—FINANCIAL SOURCES FOR STATE PLAN

9. If the State should start such a plan, how should it be paid for?

| | <i>Over- all</i> | <i>Union</i> | <i>A. F. L.</i> | <i>C. I. O.</i> | <i>Other Unions</i> | <i>Refused to State</i> | <i>Non- Union</i> |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Interviews ----- | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | ----- | *100.0 |
| Pay roll tax ----- | 34.8% | 39.5 | 40.3 | 42.5 | 35.6 | ----- | 33.2 |
| Sales tax ----- | 28.9 | 27.4 | 29.4 | 20.5 | 27.4 | ----- | 29.8 |
| Property tax ----- | 6.7 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 8.7 | 8.2 | ----- | 6.5 |
| Other ----- | 24.4 | 22.8 | 21.5 | 31.5 | 21.9 | ----- | 24.9 |
| Don't know ----- | 5.6 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 1.6 | 5.5 | ----- | 6.1 |
| Refused to state--- | .1 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | .1 |
| Miscellaneous --- | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 3.4 | ----- | 1.7 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

UNION MEMBERSHIP—ELIGIBILITY OF VARIOUS TYPES OF HEALERS

10. If a State plan should be adopted, should it include treatment by Osteopaths, Chiropractors, Other, Drugless healers, All, None?

| | <i>Over- all</i> | <i>Union</i> | <i>A. F. L.</i> | <i>C. I. O.</i> | <i>Other Unions</i> | <i>Refused to State</i> | <i>Non- Union</i> |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| None ----- | 26.5% | 24.2 | 23.1 | 22.7 | 29.9 | ----- | 27.7 |
| Those who would include ----- | 73.5 | 75.8 | 76.9 | 77.3 | 70.1 | ----- | 72.3 |
| | *100.0% | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | *100.0 | ----- | *100.0 |
| All ----- | 70.7% | 71.6 | 71.6 | 78.8 | 67.0 | ----- | 70.3 |
| Osteopaths ----- | 19.9 | 20.3 | 20.9 | 16.2 | 23.3 | ----- | 20.1 |
| Chiropractors ----- | 17.1 | 18.2 | 20.8 | 13.1 | 15.6 | ----- | 16.6 |
| Drugless healers--- | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | ----- | 1.1 |
| Dentists ----- | .4 | .2 | ----- | ----- | 1.0 | ----- | .5 |
| Other ----- | 6.5 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 6.1 | 8.7 | ----- | 6.9 |
| Against it ----- | .1 | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | .1 |
| Don't know ----- | 2.5 | 2.1 | 2.2 | ----- | 3.9 | ----- | 2.7 |

* Totals to more than 100% because of multiple answers.

INSTRUCTIONS TO INTERVIEWERS

By *KNIGHT AND PARKER*

(All Persons Interviewed Must First Be Qualified to Be in One of the Following Classifications)

Wage Earner--- Wife of Wage Earner--- Husband of Wage Earner---

1. Who, living in this household, subscribes, belongs to, or is taken care of under any medical or hospital group or insurance plans?

Wage earner only--- Entire family--- None---

Ask Questions 2 Through 5 Only of Those Covered

2. Which member or members of this family have received medical or hospital care under the plan?

Wage earner--- Other members of family--- Both--- None---

3. (IF TREATMENT OR CARE RECEIVED, ASK) Was the service, care or treatment entirely satisfactory?

Yes--- No--- DK---

4. Did you have to pay the doctor or hospital anything extra?

Yes--- No--- DK---

5. (IF YES) Was the extra charge fair?

Yes--- No--- DK---

6. Do you think that subscription to or membership in a medical or hospital plan should be compulsory or voluntary?

Compulsory--- Voluntary---

7. There are now available several different types of medical and hospital plans. Do you think the State of California should promote and operate a plan in competition to those in existence?

Yes--- No--- DK---

8. (IF COMPULSORY TO QUESTION 6) Should people be compelled to belong to or subscribe to the State Plan--- or should they be allowed to take their choice ---?

9. If the State should start such a plan, how should it be paid for?

Payroll tax--- Sales tax--- Property tax--- Other---

10. If a State plan should be adopted, should it include treatment by Osteopaths---, Chiropractors---, Other---, Drugless healers---, All---, None---?

How many in the family including the wage earner and the dependents? -----

Sex: Male--- Female---

Age: 20-29--- 30-39--- 40-49--- 50-up---

Property Owner--- No---

Union: C.I.O.--- A.F.L.--- Other--- Non-Union---

Occupation:

Owner-Mgr. Official -----

Wage Earner Shop-----

Professional -----

Domestic Service -----

Clerical Sales -----

Housewife -----

Farmer -----

Farm Workers -----

Urban--- Rural---

Area ----- Address -----

Your Name -----

Section 9

RECOMMENDATIONS

MATERNAL AND CHILD WELFARE

The State Department of Public Health now being engaged in a survey of Hospital and Medical Facilities existing or needed in this State it is recommended that suitable legislation be introduced whereby the State Department of Public Health shall amplify its report to include an estimate of those particular facilities needed to provide adequate Maternity Care, for the Women of California and Pediatric Services up to the second year of life for children born in this State to the end that in this most crucial time in the medical history of women and children proper care shall be the right of all.

ACTUARIAL RECORDS

It is recommended that suitable legislation be introduced providing that full actuarial records be kept in the administration of the recently enacted Unemployment Compensation Disability Benefits Act and that a full time actuary be employed to make quarterly and yearly actuarial reports to the Governor and to the Legislature in order that the incidence of disease, accidents and illnesses among those in subject employment may be more accurately studied.

UNIFORM REPORTING AND CONTINUING STUDIES OF HEALTH CARE PROBLEM

Under the existing voluntary plans providing insurance against the costs of medical care and hospitalization a wealth of statistical information may be obtained through a uniform procedure in the payment of claims and recording of policy holders.

The studies of this committee have indicated that patterns of incidence or morbidity as among classifications of policy holders or in areas are tending to become established.

When complete records are kept it is evident that departures from normal expectancies will indicate better or poorer health or limitation or liberalization of benefits, all of which are and should be the concern of the Legislature.

It is therefore recommended that suitable legislation be introduced providing, first, that the Insurance Commissioner require all Voluntary and Commercial Insurance Plans, profit or nonprofit, providing Medical and/or Hospital Benefits to make quarterly reports to the State Department of Public Health and, secondly that the State Department of Public Health publish the actuarial and medical data obtained from such reports in order that the Medical Profession and the Insurance Carriers may have the benefit of studies to be made concerning the health of the people as reflected by all possible means of obtaining information.

It is further recommended that such legislation provide that the State Department of Public Health after the publication of such bulletins and studies sponsor Health Conferences which shall be attended by representatives of the Medical Societies, the Insurance Companies and members of proper Legislative Committees.

Such conferences shall have no power to legislate but may, by resolution, call upon the Legislature for the introduction of any laws or regulations deemed to be necessary or desirable for the health of the people.

CONTINUATION OF COMMITTEE AND SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

This report has stated, and the committee finds, that the problem remains of providing medical care for those who can not financially afford the needed protection.

Since the Legislature has adopted the Unemployment Disability Benefits Act (effective, as to benefits payable, May 21, 1947) and since this committee has recommended above that the State Department of Public Health report on legislation needed to provide adequate Maternity Care for the women of California and Pediatric Services up to the second year of life for children born in this State we have a starting point from which further study may be made leading to provision for Prepaid Medical Care.

This committee, therefore, recommends that at the beginning of the fifty-seventh session of the Legislature, or at any intervening extraordinary session of the fifty-sixth session, the Assembly Health Care Investigating Committee be reconstituted and authorized to file a report and, in continuing its investigations, to hold hearings during the Constitutional Recess at which various interested parties be given an opportunity to criticize or add to the report herein filed.

By this means this committee acknowledges that the present report is not the final work on this important subject. But we are now in a position to base further studies on the work already covered and explore other channels which may be presented.

Section 10**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- (1)—Outline of presentation and exhibits in support of A.B. 449. (The Peoples Health Act) by California C.I.O. Council Research Dept. March 2, 1945.
- (2)—Medical Care for the American People, Final Report of the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care.
- (3)—Health Insurance for California, Report of the Social Security and Manpower, and Research Department, California State Chamber of Commerce.
- (4)—State Relief Administration Study of 1935.
- (5)—Medical Care and Costs in California Families in Relation to Economic Status, 1937. (Margaret C. Klem)
- (6)—Incidence of Illness and the Receipt and Cost of Medical Care among Representative Family Groups, 1933. (Klem, Falk, Sinai)
- (7)—Report of the Senate Committee to Investigate the High Cost of Medical Care, 1935.

TEXT OF H. R. 295

As printed on pp. 118, 119 of Assembly Journal for June 16, 1945
and adopted in the Assembly the same day.

**RELATIVE TO THE CREATION OF THE ASSEMBLY HEALTH CARE
INVESTIGATING INTERIM COMMITTEE**

WHEREAS, The health of the people of the State of California is a matter of continuing concern to the Legislature; and

WHEREAS, There has been presented at this Fifty-sixth Regular Session of the Legislature numerous measures relating to making the health, medical, hospital and other care of the people of the State, including the raising of revenues to provide such care, a function of the State Government; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature is in need of further information as to the need for the care to be provided, the types of care to be provided, the classes of persons for whom the care should be provided, the administration of the care, the cost of the care, and the existing and possible sources of revenue which may be used to provide the care; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, as follows:

1. The Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee is hereby created and appointed and authorized and directed to ascertain study and analyze all facts relating to the health of the people of the State of California, the adequacy of existing sources to maintain and improve the health of the people, any additional means for maintaining and improving the health of the people, the need for the provision of health care for the people, or any classes thereof, by the State Government or any agency thereof, the cost of providing for health care by the State Government or any agency thereof, and the existing and possible sources of revenue which may be used to provide such care, including but not limited to the operation, effect, administration, enforcement and needed revision of any and all laws in any way bearing upon or relating to the subject of this resolution, and to report thereon to the Assembly at any regular or special session, including in the reports its recommendations for appropriate legislation.

2. The committee shall consist of seven Members of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker thereof. The chairman shall be selected, and vacancies occurring or existing in the membership of the committee shall be filled, by the Speaker.

3. The committee is authorized to act during this session of the Legislature, including any recess, and after final adjournment until the commencement of the next regular session, with authority to file its final report not later than the first day of July, 1946.

4. The committee and its members shall have and exercise all of the rights, duties and powers conferred upon Investigating Committees and their members by the provisions of the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly and of the Standing Rules of the Assembly as they are adopted and amended from time to time, which provisions are incorporated herein and made applicable to this committee and its members.

5. The committee has the following additional powers and duties:

- (a) To cooperate with and secure the cooperation of county, city, city and county, and other local law enforcement agencies in investigating any matter within the scope of this resolution and to direct the sheriff of any county to serve subpoenas, orders and other process issued by the committee.
- (b) To report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature, to the Governor, and to the people from time to time, not later than the first day of July, 1946.
- (c) To do any and all other things necessary or convenient to enable it fully and adequately to exercise its powers, perform its duties, and accomplish the objects and purposes of this resolution.
- (d) To meet at the State Capitol, or at any other place within this State or within the United States.

6. The sum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby made available from the Contingent Fund of the Assembly for the expenses of the committee and its members and for any charges, expenses or claims it may incur under this resolution, to be paid from the said Contingent Fund of the Assembly and disbursed, after certification by the chairman of the committee, upon warrants drawn by the State Controller upon the State Treasurer.

MOTION TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT

Mr. Thomas moved that 1,000 additional copies be ordered printed, as separate documents, of the Assembly Health Care Investigating Interim Committee.

Mr. Sam L. Collins seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Mrs. Lyda C. Sibley, relative to impeachment, was received, and ordered referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

By Mr. Geddes:

The following communication was received, read, ordered printed in the Journal, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy:

POMONA VALLEY REAL ESTATE BOARD
POMONA, CALIFORNIA, July 17, 1946

Hon. Ernest R. Geddes, Assemblyman
1445 Alameda Street, Pomona, California

DEAR SIR: At a regular monthly meeting of the Pomona Valley Real Estate Board on this date, the following resolution was unanimously adopted: Your earnest consideration is urged, and in the interest of fair play, your support of this resolution is requested.

Resolution

In as much as the administration of rent control throughout California has been so arbitrarily handled, the movement for State control of rents is requested with the proviso that all questions affecting rents in towns of 25,000 or more population be handled by a fairly representative, unpaid board of local citizens, appointed by the city council, and endorsed by the Assemblymen from the respective district. And it should be further provided that in counties where there are no towns of this size, the committee should be selected by the supervisors in lieu of the city council.

Respectfully,

POMONA VALLEY REAL ESTATE BOARD
By EDWARD T. LAWS, Vice President
By EARL A. MOSS, Secretary

By Mr. Stephenson:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

SACRAMENTO COUNTY FAIR AND NIGHT HORSE SHOW,
GALT, CALIFORNIA, July 21, 1946

Dwight Stephenson,
Sacramento, California

DEAR DWIGHT: Will you please on the behalf of the Directors of the Sacramento County Fair invite the Members of the Legislature to the Sacramento County Fair on Thursday, July 25th?

We have a wonderful exhibition of livestock and agricultural products, as well as a race card of 10 races each afternoon. A 10 event horse show each evening starting Wednesday evening.

We want all the Members of the Legislature to be present. Tickets will be arranged.

Very truly,

E. KENEFICK, Secretary-Manager

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Senate Resolution No. 4

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to notify the Assembly that the Senate elected the following statutory officers:

| | | |
|-------------------------|-------|------------------------------|
| President pro tempore | ----- | Jerrold L. Seawell |
| Secretary of the Senate | ----- | Joseph A. Beek |
| Sergeant-at-Arms | ----- | Joseph F. Nolan |
| Minute Clerk | ----- | John F. Lea |
| Chaplain | ----- | Rev. Dr. Clarence A. Kircher |

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS**

The following bills were introduced, and read the first time :

Assembly Bill No. 1: By Mr. Hollibaugh—An act in relation to the regulation, control, and stabilization of rents for, and the eviction of tenants of, residential housing accommodations during an emergency, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

Assembly Bill No. 2: By Mr. Hollibaugh—An act to establish in the Division of Real Estate of the Department of Investment a Rent Administrator and prescribing his powers and duties; to provide for appointment of Rental Arbitration Boards and prescribing their powers and duties; to provide for the regulation, control and stabilization of rents and rental agreements upon their release from control by the Federal Government, and for the regulation of proceedings for the recovery of possessions of rental properties, and certain other incidents of the landlord-tenant relationship within defense-rental areas, and to provide a method for the orderly readjustment of rents during the period of transition from present controls by the Federal Government until a normal relationship between supply of various classes of rental properties and demand therefor make unnecessary the administration of further control.

Referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

Assembly Bill No. 3: By Mr. Hollibaugh—An act making an appropriation for the support of the Rent Administration and the administration of the Emergency Fair Rent Act.

Referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

Assembly Bill No. 4: By Messrs. Stream, Boyd, Erwin, Middough, Stewart, and Watson—An act in relation to the regulation, control and stabilization of rents and the eviction of tenants in housing accommodations during an emergency, and prescribing the powers and duties of the governing bodies of cities and counties with respect thereto.

Referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

MOTION

Mrs. Niehouse moved that the men Members of the Assembly, the members of the desk force, members of the press, attaches, and visitors, be permitted to remove their coats, if they so desire, because of the unusually warm weather.

Mr. Ralph C. Dills seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEES

Speaker Lyon announced the appointment of Messrs. Allen, Debs, Boyd, Johnson, and Collins, Sam L., as a Select Committee to wait upon Governor Earl Warren and extend to him an invitation to address a Joint Convention of the Senate and Assembly at 11.30 a.m., and to escort him to the Assembly Chamber, and to the rostrum.

Speaker Lyon announced the appointment of Messrs. Doyle, Thomas, and Butters as a Select Committee to wait upon the Senate, and extend an invitation to the Senate to meet in Joint Convention with the Assembly in the Assembly Chamber, at 11.30 a.m., for the purpose of hearing an address by His Excellency, the Hon. Earl Warren, Governor of California.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bills were introduced, and read the first time :

Assembly Bill No. 5: By Mr. Sam L. Collins—An act to declare an emergency in respect to the renting of housing accommodations, to regulate, control, and stabilize rents, and to regulate the eviction of tenants of housing accommodations, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Assembly Bill No. 6: By Messrs. Fourt, Waters, Armstrong, Crichton, Doyle, King, Maloney, McCollister, Middough, and Wollenberg—An act in relation to the regulation, control and stabilization of rents and the eviction of tenants in housing accommodations during an emergency, creating a Temporary State Housing Rent Commission, prescribing its powers and duties and making an appropriation therefor.

Referred to Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

Assembly Bill No. 7: By Messrs. Fourt, Waters, Armstrong, Crichton, Doyle, King, Maloney, McCollister, Middough, and Wollenberg—An act to declare an emergency in respect to the renting of housing accommodations, to regulate, control, and stabilize rents, and to regulate the eviction of tenants of housing accommodations, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

MOTION TO TEMPORARILY SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. Sam L. Collins moved that the Rules be temporarily suspended for the purpose of permitting visitors to enter on the floor of the Assembly, and to be seated with the members during the Joint Convention.

Mr. Stream seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Select Committee appointed to wait upon the Senate appeared at the bar of the Assembly, and reported it had discharged its duties, and that the Senate would accept the invitation to sit in Joint Convention.

RECESS

At 11.30 a.m., the Speaker announced that the Assembly would be at recess to meet with the Senate in Joint Convention.

IN JOINT CONVENTION

· ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO

Monday, July 22, 1946

At 11.30 a.m., the Senate and the Assembly met in Joint Convention.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Speaker Lyon announced the arrival in the Assembly Chamber of the Hon. Frederick F. Houser, Lieutenant Governor of California and President of the Senate, and President pro tempore of the Senate, the Hon. Jerrold L. Seawell, and invited them to the rostrum, accompanied by an escort of Assemblymen.

Speaker Lyon invited the Members of the Senate and their guests, upon arrival in the Assembly Chamber, to be seated.

SENATE ROLL CALL

Hon. Frederick F. Houser, President of the Senate, directed the Secretary of the Senate to call the roll of Senators.

The roll was called, and the following answered to their names:

Senators Biggar, Breed, Brown, Burns, Carter, Crittenden, Cunningham, DeLap, Desmond, Denel, Dillinger, Dilworth, Donnelly, Dorsey, Fletcher, Gordon, Hatfield, Hulse, Jespersen, Judah, Keating, Mayo, McBride, Mixter, Parkman, Powers, Quinn, Rich, Seawell, Shelley, Slater, Sutton, Swing, Tenney, Ward, and Weybret—36.

The President declared a quorum of the Senate present.

ASSEMBLY ROLL CALL

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, directed the Chief Clerk of the Assembly to call the roll of Assemblymen.

The roll was called, and the following answered to their names:

Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—73.

The Speaker declared a quorum of the Assembly present.

REPORT OF ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON ESCORT

The Assembly Committee on Escort, consisting of Messrs. Allen, Debs, Boyd, Johnson, and Collins, Sam L., appointed to wait upon His Excellency, Governor Earl Warren, to inform him that the Joint Convention was now in session, and to escort him to the Joint Convention, appeared at the bar of the House, and announced the presence of His Excellency, Hon. Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California.

PRESENTATION OF THE GOVERNOR

Hon. Charles W. Lyon then presented Governor Warren to the Joint Convention.

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR

Governor Warren then proceeded to address the Joint Convention as follows:

MESSAGE TO THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE

By Governor Earl Warren, on Monday, July 22, 1946

I have called you into special session, as I invariably do in times of public emergency, to have the benefit of your counsel and the legislative action appropriate to the circumstances. This is the sixth time I have so convened the Legislature in the past three and a half years. On each occasion, you have responded with legislation designed to accomplish the desired purpose. I have no doubt that in this instance you will be able to relieve the distress that many of our citizens will face in the very near future.

It is a fortunate circumstance that so many of you planned to be in Sacramento this past weekend for the statutory party conventions, and I hope this has minimized the inconvenience of being summoned on such short notice. At all events, I welcome you back to the State Capitol, and offer my full cooperation in solution of the problems that confront us.

The reason for the session as stated in the Proclamation is to protect the public against unreasonable rent increases and unwarranted evictions at a time when the housing shortage in California offers tenants no alternative to paying any rental that is demanded of them. They have no choice. There is no place for them to move. If they are evicted from their homes, they must land in the streets. An understanding State Government can not permit such conditions to exist.

This situation has been occasioned by the fact that on June 30th, last, the Federal Price Control Act of 1942 and the rules and regulations thereunder, including the rent regulations for housing, hotels, and rooming houses, ceased to be operative because of a difference of opinion between the Congress and the President. That difference of opinion apparently has not been reconciled, and there is no assurance that it will be reconciled prior to July 31st, the date upon which indiscriminate rent increases and evictions could become effective in this State. In such circumstances, the fear and uncertainty in the minds of all tenants, as well as the actual distress of those who are unjustly evicted from their living quarters, must be relieved prior to that date.

There is no power in the Governor to do so. It can only be done by legislation.

I presume that you do not welcome the idea of unceremoniously catapulting the State into a program of rent control which has been carried on by the Federal Government since 1942. I will be frank to say that I also share that feeling. The Federal Government has undertaken the job. It has built an organization to accomplish it. It has encountered the manifold problems involved in such a program. It should continue to shoulder the responsibility as long as it is necessary to protect the public, because it is a National byproduct of the war and will continue to be so until the National housing program, which has developed so many bottlenecks, produces enough houses to balance supply and demand.

But we are not free agents to do as we choose. Our responsibility as State officers compels us to see that our people are protected. If the Federal Government does not do it, we must do it.

California is more sensitive to this situation than any other State of the Union. During the war our population increased by more than two million people. This represents 600,000 new families. During this period of unprecedented growth, home construction was at a standstill, and at the present time practically every community in the State is congested to a degree that hampers our progress. Returning veterans are forced to move in with relatives or live in substandard quarters. Workmen can not move from one community to another in search of or to accept jobs.

The life of our State has become strait-jacketed in many respects. This condition may continue to exist for a considerable period of time, and as long as it does continue, we must protect our people, not only against the unfairness of some landlords, but also against the bidding for houses by some tenants who either through necessity or the desire for better quarters would offer more rent than is presently paid or than could reasonably be charged.

Either of these practices is inflationary, and would undoubtedly result in oppressing those who would be dispossessed of their homes.

I believe the great majority of landlords, realizing the predicament of most tenants, have acted with due regard for the welfare of others, but oppressive treatment by even a small percentage of them under present conditions could bring about chaos, bitterness, and suffering.

In this respect, our situation is no different from others where general laws must be enacted to protect society against the practices of the few.

I suggest to you that the following two kinds of action are necessary in order to relieve the stress:

1. To temporarily freeze all housing rentals at a specified level and prevent evictions except for statutory causes.

2. To establish an agency of the State Government charged with the responsibility of making rent control effective by regulating and wherever necessary adjusting rents to do justice to both landlords and tenants.

The starting point of our consideration of this problem should be the situation as it was on June 30th, last, when Federal rent control ceased to exist. That condition should be restored, until and unless we have adequate information to justify departure from it. I have no such information at the present time and any suggestion for change would therefore be arbitrary. I have no doubt that many inequalities exist, but any percentage change in all rents would not cure these inequities. On the contrary, in many instances it would aggravate them.

Any rent control agency established by you should have the power to adjust, and I would expect it to adjust, such inequities as exist today as well as those that might develop in the future. Such an agency however could not be established until 90 days after the adjournment of this session, because Section 1 of Article IV of the Constitution provides that no new agency of Government can be created or the duties of an existing agency enlarged by urgency legislation which takes effect immediately.

I am advised by the Attorney General and the Legislative Counsel, however, that the legislation freezing rents and preventing evictions can become effective immediately. This will act as a deterrent and can serve as a stopgap, but it can not accomplish effective rent control. Only an agency with powers to supervise, regulate, adjust and enforce can do justice to the situation.

These suggestions that I am making to you are based upon the assumption that the Federal Government will not re-establish rent control. However, if it does so, and I sincerely hope that it will, none of this State legislation in my opinion is necessary. I would, therefore, suggest that all the proposed legislation provide that it shall be operative only until the Federal Government shall re-establish rent control.

This is a real emergency. It has come upon us suddenly. The deadline for action is July 31st. I know that you will approach it with a determination to do whatever is essential to forestall the chaos that will otherwise occur on that date as a result of the rent increase and eviction notices served earlier this month.

A word of commendation should be given to those communities which, faced with a critical situation, have taken action of a temporary nature during the last few weeks. The stopgap ordinances that were quickly enacted in these communities had a wholesome effect and I am sure prevented much confusion. I am also thankful to the Mayors and the Chairmen of Boards of Supervisors for their advice on the subject.

Whatever you do to exercise a fair and reasonable control over rentals and evictions during this period of congestion and housing shortage will contribute to the fight that must be made on every front against the spectre of inflation. It will protect our people against hardship until the resumption of home building in our State restores a normal balance of supply and demand in the field of housing.

There is one other subject related to our housing problem that is of sufficient importance and urgency to justify enlargement of the call for its consideration at this special session.

At the special session held in January, 1946, the Legislature, realizing the importance of making surplus Federal housing available immediately to veterans and their families, passed two appropriation measures, Chapter 29, appropriating \$7,500,000 to assist cities, counties, and districts, and Chapter 46, appropriating \$250,000 to assist the State University and colleges.

These appropriations were considered adequate at the time on the basis of an original allocation by the Federal Government of 7,500 temporary dwelling units to California.

Since the Legislature adjourned the Federal Government has made an additional allocation of 7,500 dwelling units, and, on the basis of applications already received, the moneys previously appropriated will be insufficient to assist the local agencies and educational institutions in using the additional units to be made available. The Department of Finance informs me that present funds will be exhausted before the next regular session of the Legislature, and that an additional \$2,500,000 will be necessary for this purpose. I am today enlarging the call to include this subject, and I recommend that you consider the need for these additional appropriations.

I thank you for your cheerful response to the call, and I wish you every success in your work.

REQUEST BY LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, then presented Lieutenant Governor Frederick F. Houser to the Joint Convention who requested that all Members of the Senate return to the Senate Chamber so that the business of the day could be concluded.

ADJOURNMENT OF JOINT CONVENTION

At 11.48 a.m., there being no further business, upon motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, seconded by Mr. Johnson, the Speaker of the Assembly declared the Joint Convention adjourned sine die.

IN ASSEMBLY

At 11.50 a.m., the Assembly reconvened.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the Rules be temporarily suspended for the purpose of introduction and consideration of concurrent resolutions, at this time.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 2: By Mr. Field—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of Glendale, State of California, voted for and ratified by the electors of such city at a special municipal election held therein on May 7, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Field asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 2, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 2—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of Glendale, State of California, voted for and ratified by the electors of such city at a special municipal election held therein on May 7, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fount, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollihaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—65.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3: By Mr. Johnson—Relative to approving amendment to the charter of the City of Berkeley, a municipal corporation in the County of Alameda, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the thirtieth day of April, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Dickey asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3—Relative to approving amendment to the charter of the City of Berkeley, a municipal corporation in the County of Alameda, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the thirtieth day of April, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—65.

NOES—None.

Notice of Motion to Reconsider Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3

Mr. Johnson gave notice that on the next legislative day he would move to reconsider the vote whereby Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3 was this day adopted.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 4: By Mr. Thompson—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of San Jose, a municipal corporation of the County of Santa Clara, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a general municipal election held therein on May 20, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Thompson asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 4, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 4—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of San Jose, a municipal corporation of the County of Santa Clara, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a general municipal election held therein on May 20, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick,

Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—65.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolutions were offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 5: By Messrs. McCollister, Gannon, Fourt, Hollibaugh, Call, Allen, Clarke, Dickey, Emlay, Kraft, Leonard, and Thurman—Relative to the allowance of veterans' preference credits in State civil service examinations.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. McCollister asked for unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 5, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

Mr. Lowrey withheld unanimous consent.

Resolution ordered printed.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 6: By Mr. Middough—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of Long Beach, State of California, ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the ninth day of July, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Middough asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 6, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 6—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of Long Beach, State of California, ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the ninth day of July, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—65.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 7: By Mr. Maloney, and the San Francisco Delegation—Relative to welcoming the National Shrine Convention.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Maloney asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 7, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 7—Relative to welcoming the National Shrine Convention.

Resolution read, and adopted.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

It was announced that the following committees would hold meetings:

On Tuesday evening, July 23d, at 8 p.m.:

Judiciary.

Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO USE ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

Mr. Field asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy be permitted to use the Assembly Chamber for a meeting on Tuesday evening, July 23d, at 8 p.m.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 13

Creating an Assembly (Second Extraordinary) Session Legislative Process Committee and defining its powers and duties

WHEREAS, The Legislature has been convened in extraordinary session to consider and act upon a wide range of subjects; and

WHEREAS, Many of the legislative proposals involve problems within the jurisdiction of more than one standing committee of the Assembly, and the adequate consideration of such measures requires the cooperation of such several committees in order to avoid duplicating the work of one such committee by another, and much delay in the legislative process could be avoided if it were possible to eliminate such duplication of effort and provide a means for expediting the consideration of such measures; and

WHEREAS, There is need of a committee equipped to ascertain facts and secure information upon assigned topics from time to time during the session, a committee acting in aid of and in collaboration with the several standing committees of the Assembly; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, as follows:

1. There is hereby created a Special Committee designated the "Assembly Legislative Process Committee," which committee shall during this Special Session of the Fifty-sixth Legislature and any recess thereof take such steps as may be necessary to coordinate the work of the various standing committees of this session in considering questions before such session, in order that there may be no duplication of work or effort, and the committee shall make such studies as may be necessary, ascertain such facts and information, and secure such statistics for the use of the members and committees of the Assembly as may be of aid to them in considering and acting upon legislative proposals at this session.

2. The committee shall consist of the chairmen of the following Assembly committees: Rules, who shall be chairman of the committee, Ways and Means, Governmental Efficiency and Economy, Judiciary, Revenue and Taxation, Public Morals, Education, Transportation and Commerce, and five Members of the Assembly to be appointed by the Speaker thereof.

Vacancies occurring or existing in the membership of the committee shall be filled by the appointing power.

3. The committee is authorized to act during this session of the Legislature, including any recess, but not after final adjournment.

4. The committee and its members shall have and exercise all of the rights, duties and powers conferred upon Investigating Committees and their members by the provisions of the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly and of the Standing Rules of the Assembly as they are adopted and amended from time to time, which provisions are incorporated herein and made applicable to this committee and its members, except that the members of the committee shall serve without compensation and shall not be allowed mileage.

Until the adoption of Joint Rules at this session, the Joint Rules of the last preceding regular session are incorporated herein, and made applicable to this committee and its members.

5. The committee has the following additional powers and duties:

(a) To cooperate with and secure the cooperation of county, city, city and county, and other local law enforcing agencies in investigating any matter within the scope of this resolution and to direct the sheriff of any county to serve subpoenas, orders and other process issued by the committee.

(b) To report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature and to the people from time to time and at any time, not later than herein provided.

(c) To do any and all other things necessary or convenient to enable it fully and adequately to exercise its powers, perform its duties, and accomplish the objects and purposes of this resolution.

6. The sum of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) or so much thereof as may be necessary is hereby made available from the Contingent Fund of the Assembly for the expenses of the committee and its members and for any charges, expenses or claims it may incur under this resolution, to be paid from the said Contingent Fund and disbursed, after certification by the chairman of the committee, upon warrants drawn by the State Controller upon the State Treasurer.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 13, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Miller, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—62.

NOES—None.

Appointment of Special Committee

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution No. 13, the Speaker announced the appointment of Messrs. Collins, Sam L., Chairman; Doyle, Vice Chairman; Wollenberg, Field, Fourn, Call, Sawallisch, Johnson, Burns, Crichton, Dickey, Miller, and Haggerty as such Select Committee.

COMMUNICATIONS

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from G. W. Patrick of Palo Alto, relative to rent control, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Owners and Lessees Apartment House Association, Inc., of San Francisco, signed by the President, Charles A. Christen, relative to rent control, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Dr. Leo Cohn of Los Angeles, relative to an eviction, was received, and referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

GUESTS EXTENDED PRIVILEGE OF ASSEMBLY FLOOR

On request of Speaker Lyon, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Edith W. Van

Water, Former Republican National Committeewoman of California, of Long Beach, and her sister, Mrs. Lottspeach of Tennessee.

On request of Speaker Lyon, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Miss Kay Johnson of San Francisco.

On request of Mr. Debs, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Captain and Mrs. Robert Hager of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Carey, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Danny Whelan and Joseph Donovan of Oakland.

On request of Mr. Lyons, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Councilman Ed J. Davenport of Los Angeles.

On request of Speaker Lyon, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Frank H. Hilton, Pat Lonergan of Portland, and Jack Bain of Milwaukee, Oregon.

On request of Mr. Doyle, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Attorney W. E. Turner of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Geddes, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Lora Marie Bennett of Azusa and Roy O. Day of Pomona.

On request of Mr. Fourt, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Fred Newcomb of Ventura.

On request of Mr. Kilpatrick, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Davis Astrander, Ed Lybeck, and Isaac Kushner of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Burkhalter, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Emily C. Burnett, Mrs. Opal Alexander, and Albert S. Brown of Glendale.

On request of Mr. Watson, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Estilla Eastman, and Earle Stanley, Assemblyman-elect of Orange County.

On request of the San Francisco Delegation, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Miss Margaret Mirian Krsak of San Francisco.

On request of Mr. Berry and the San Francisco Delegation, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Joseph P. Byrne, and Elizabeth Kelley of San Francisco.

On request of Mr. Burkhalter, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Chas. Randall of Hollywood.

On request of Mr. Boyd, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to DeWitt V. Hutchings, Owner-Manager of Riverside Inn, and Wm. C. Robinson of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Dunn, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Adah Dodge, Mrs. Claudia Zumwalt, and Mrs. Frona Ernst of Alameda.

On request of Mr. Crichton, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to F. J. Cracchilo of Fresno, and Joseph Cracchilo of St. Louis, Missouri.

On request of Mr. King, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Winthrop Clarke of Visalia.

On request of Mr. Beck, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to George Ballard of San Bernardino.

On request of Mr. Bennett, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to William Moseley Jones of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Gannon, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Olive W. Vallentyre and Josephine Hang of Sacramento.

On request of the Alameda Delegation, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Ralph Hoyt, Dr. Wilfred Robinson, Harry Bartell, Mrs. Randall F. Dickey, Marilyn Dickey, Elaine Thorgerson, Thos. A. Caldecott and C. H. McCaslin, all of Alameda.

On request of Mr. Crowley, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Henry Meehan of Suisun, Patsy, Barbara, Deenis and Ronnie Meehan of Fairfield.

On request of Mr. Middough, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Lorne Middough and Jay H. Ayers of Long Beach.

On request of Mr. Stewart, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to A. F. Mahaffey of Pasadena.

On request of Mr. Thorp, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. W. G. Durbin, Mrs. James F. Poore, Mrs. Fred Schneider of Sacramento, and Miss Margaret Spencer of San Francisco.

On request of Mr. George D. Collins, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Ernest Draper Howard of San Francisco.

On request of Mr. Evans, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Harry S. Fehner of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Butters, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to F. W. Baker of El Centro.

On request of Mr. Massion, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to L. A. Latterner of Los Angeles.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.28 p.m., on motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, the Speaker declared the Assembly adjourned until 9.30 a.m., Tuesday, July 23, 1946.

CHARLES W. LYON, Speaker

GERALDINE B. HADSELL, Minute Clerk

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE
FIFTY-SIXTH (SECOND EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION

ASSEMBLY DAILY JOURNAL

SECOND LEGISLATIVE DAY
SECOND CALENDAR DAY

IN ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO
Tuesday, July 23, 1946

The Assembly met at 9.30 a.m.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

ROLL CALL

The roll was called, and the following answered to their names:

Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hagerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—70.

Quorum present.

PRAYER

The following prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. Torrance Phelps:

Immortal God:

We pray that we may have faith to believe in Thy presence in this world, manifest in the laws which protect us and provide for our welfare;

Faith to believe that if we pursue righteousness and establish a just world, we will have all needful things;

Faith to believe that a better world of justice and abundance for all can emerge from the chaotic happenings of this generation, and faith to rid our minds of anxiety and fears of tomorrow.

We pray, too, for power to be calm and courageous in the face of unforeseen dangers that may arise as we are doing our daily duties;

For power to greet with goodwill and magnanimity those who harden their hearts against us, and for power to cheerfully bear suffering, criticism or hard knocks;

For faith to leave in Thy hands the welfare of all our dear ones;

For faith to believe in the ultimate triumph of liberty, goodness, and justice over evil, strife, and darkness.—Amen.

READING OF THE JOURNAL DISPENSED WITH

On motion of Mr. Weber, further reading of the Journal of the previous legislative day was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR THE DAY

The following members were granted leaves of absence for the day, because of legislative business elsewhere:

Mr. Erwin, on motion of Mr. Stewart.

Mr. Thurman, on motion of Mr. Leonard.

The following members were granted leaves of absence for the day, because of illness:

Mr. Knight, on motion of Mr. Watson.

Mr. Burns, on motion of Mr. Heisinger.

The following member was granted leave of absence for the day, because of personal business elsewhere, and desired to waive his per diem:

Mr. Dekker, on motion of Mr. Hawkins.

The following member was granted leave of absence for the day:

Mr. Werdel, on motion of Mr. Doyle.

The following member was granted leave of absence for the day, because of legislative business elsewhere:

Mr. O'Day, on motion of Mr. Maloney.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT GRANTED TO PRINT PRESS RELEASE
IN JOURNAL**

By unanimous consent, Speaker Lyon ordered the following press release read, and printed in the Journal:

INTERNATIONAL NEWS SERVICE REPORTS

FC34 Trenton, N. J., July 23—(INS)—New Jersey joined the parade of States with rent control laws today but alleged loopholes in the legislation drew fire from Democratic Party, labor and veterans' organizations.

The bill became law last night when Gov. Walter E. Edge signed it immediately after it had been passed at a special day-long session of the Legislature.

MESSAGES FROM THE GOVERNOR**Proclamation**

WHEREAS, The Legislature of the State of California convened on July 22, 1946, in extraordinary session pursuant to my Proclamation dated July 18, 1946, and is now in session; and

WHEREAS, On account of extraordinary occasions which have arisen and now exist, it is deemed desirable and necessary to submit additional subjects to the Legislature for consideration; now, therefore,

I, EARL WARREN, Governor of the State of California, by virtue of the power vested in me by law, hereby amend and supplement my Proclamation dated July 18, 1946, by adding the following additional purposes thereto, and thereby permitting the Legislature to legislate upon the following subjects, in addition to the subjects specified in the original Proclamation:

3. To consider and act upon legislation to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, to make the act applicable to any college or university operated by the State or by any State agency, and to make an additional appropriation in augmentation of the appropriation made by that act.

4. To consider and act upon legislation relating to the salaries of members of the board of supervisors of counties of the third class.

5. To consider and act upon legislation to validate the organization, boundaries, governing officers or boards, acts, proceedings and bonds of public bodies.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of California to be affixed this twenty-second day of July, 1946.

[SEAL]

EARL WARREN, Governor of California

ATTEST: FRANK M. JORDAN, Secretary of State

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

SACRAMENTO, March 12, 1946

*Mr. Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly,
Assembly Chamber, State Capitol, Sacramento 14, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: On April 23, 1945 you transmitted to Governor Warren Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 41, relative to "Living War Memorials," which was adopted by the California Legislature on April 20, 1945.

On December 6, 1945, Governor Warren appointed this committee and the personnel is as follows:

MR. GARRETT W. McENERNEY II, Attorney at Law, Hobart Building, San Francisco, California;

MR. R. C. SAMUELSON, Pasadena Star News, Pasadena, California;

MR. JAMES R. NEEDLES, Director of Athletics, University of San Francisco, Room 410, 564 Market Street, San Francisco 4, California;

MR. SAM HAYES, National Broadcasting Company, Radio City, Hollywood 28, California;

MR. WILEY K. PETERSON, Principal, Maricopa Unified Schools, Maricopa, California; and

MR. W. O. HUNTER, Director of Athletics, University of Southern California, University Park, Los Angeles 7, California.

At that time, Governor Warren requested that the committee meet and select a permanent chairman and organize its work in conformity with similar commissions set up in other States.

On February 6, 1946, the commission met in Hollywood and elected officers. Mr. McEnerney was elected Chairman, and Mr. Samuelson was elected Secretary of the California State Committee.

This letter is to advise you that Governor Warren has complied with the recommendation contained in Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 41.

Sincerely,

BEACH VASEY, Legislative Secretary

cc Mr. Joseph A. Beek, Secretary of the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered:

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 14

Resolved, That the following named persons be and they are hereby appointed to the positions hereinafter set forth, with the compensation set opposite their names payable weekly, and the Controller is hereby directed to draw his warrants in favor of the respective persons for the said respective amounts, and the Treasurer is hereby directed to pay the same; said compensation to be upon a seven-day week basis:

| <i>Commencing Monday, July 22, 1946</i> | <i>Per day</i> |
|---|----------------|
| Chief Clerk, Arthur A. Ohnimus..... | \$20 00 |
| Minute Clerk, Geraldine B. Hadsell..... | 15 00 |
| Sergeant-at-Arms, Wilkie Ogg..... | 15 00 |
| Chaplain, Rev. Torrance Phelps..... | 5 00 |
| Assistant Chief Clerk, Harold Lewright..... | 15 00 |
| Engrossing-Enrolling Clerk, Marion Hendricks..... | 9 00 |

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins, asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 14, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney,

Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Kilpatrick, King, Leonard, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Niehouse, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—56.

NOES—None.

By Messrs. Emlay, Berry, Thomas, Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyon, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Mrs. Niehouse, Messrs. Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg:

House Resolution No. 15

Relative to Assemblyman Michael J. Burns

WHEREAS, Upon convening in extraordinary session, the Members of this Assembly immediately noticed the absence of their friend and colleague Michael J. Burns from his accustomed place, and having learned that his absence is due to an illness which will prevent him from attending the present sessions; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members of this Assembly hereby express to Mike their sincere regret that he is ill, and wish him a speedy and complete recovery; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Assemblyman Michael J. Burns.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Emlay asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 15, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

By Mr. Thomas:

House Resolution No. 16

Relative to an investigation of the requirement by the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners of standards of admission to practice chiropractic not required by law

WHEREAS, The attention of this House has been directed to a purported practice of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners in requiring higher standards of admission than required by statute in a case wherein there is no authority in the said board therefor; and

WHEREAS, It is purported that this practice consists of requiring 4,000 hours of instruction in the prescribed subjects rather than 2,400 hours as prescribed by law; and

WHEREAS, The Assembly Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy is charged by this House with the duty of investigating the administration of each agency of the State Government in order to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy investigate the efficiency of the administration of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners, particularly with respect to the compliance by said board with legal requirements for the admission of applicants to the practice of chiropractic; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy and to the Chairman of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Thomas asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 16, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO PRINT IN JOURNAL

Mr. Thomas asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the following opinion of the Legislative Counsel be ordered printed in the Journal:

Opinion of Legislative Counsel

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO 2, CALIFORNIA, July 2, 1946

Honorable Vincent Thomas

722 Twentieth Street, San Pedro, California

Chiropractic—Hours of Study—#6704

DEAR MR. THOMAS: We have your request of June 29, 1946, asking how many hours of study are required to enable an applicant to take an examination for a license to practice chiropractic.

Deering Act 4811 (Stats. 1923, p. LXXXVIII), Section 5, reads in part:

"Except in the cases herein otherwise prescribed, each applicant shall be a graduate of an incorporated chiropractic school or college which teaches a course of not less than 2,400 hours, extending over a period of three school terms of at least six months each, and must give satisfactory proof of having attended not less than 90 per cent of said 2,400 hours * * *."

Then follows a schedule of the required hours of instruction in each of the prescribed subjects. The exceptions referred to are contained in Sections 8 and 9 of the act and relate to persons practicing chiropractic or graduated from a chiropractic college prior to January 1, 1922, members of the board, and persons entering the State from other States on a reciprocal registration.

In determining whether any additional education requirements can be imposed, it is necessary to consider the nature of the act. It is an initiative measure approved by the people November 7, 1922, and contains no provision authorizing the Legislature to amend. Consequently, the Legislature can not change its terms, and the enforcement officials have only such powers as the act itself gives them.

Section 4 defines the powers of the State Board of Chiropractic Examiners. They are:

"* * * (b) To adopt from time to time such rules and regulations as the board may deem proper and necessary for the performance of its work, * * *"

(c) To examine applicants and to issue and revoke licenses to practice chiropractic, as herein provided.

(d) To summon witnesses and to take testimony as to matters pertaining to its duties * * *.

(e) To do any and all things necessary or incidental to the exercise of the powers and duties herein granted or imposed."

There is no authority given to prescribe standards of education of candidates or of the colleges in which chiropractic is taught. In fact the act expressly limits the board's powers to *do the things incidental to the exercise of the powers and duties granted or imposed by the act itself.*

The minimum qualification is that expressed in Section 5, and it appears that no higher standard can be imposed without violating that section.

In *Berkeley Chiropractic College vs. Compton* (1929), 97 Cal. App. 790, it was held that the board had no authority to exceed the provisions of the act by examining into the quality of the instruction given. Since the board has no authority over the quality of the instruction, it seems equally clear that the quantity of education is that prescribed by the act and any additional amount of instruction can only be required by vote of the people.

Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 22 of the 1945 Session (Res. Ch. 147, Stats. of 1945) authorizes the amendment or repeal of initiative measures by the Legislature after approval by vote of the people. If this amendment is approved, the act could be

amended either to permit the board to prescribe additional qualifications or the Legislature itself could prescribe the qualifications. This amendment would then be submitted to the voters for approval, and if approved would become the law.

Very truly yours,

FRED B. WOOD, Legislative Counsel
By JOSEPH L. KNOWLES, Deputy

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1: By Mr. Lyon—Relative to qualifications of Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Speaker Pro Tempore Presiding

At 9.54 a.m., Hon. Thomas A. Maloney, Speaker pro tempore of the Assembly, presiding.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered :

By Mr. Beal :

House Resolution No. 17

Relative to city and county building codes

WHEREAS, Codes of building regulations of cities and counties were adopted at a time when there was a plentitude of building materials; and

WHEREAS, During the present dearth of materials for the construction of buildings there is a higher public interest in securing the construction of needed buildings rather than in the insistence upon a standard of construction not necessary for the immediate protection of the public; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the legislative bodies of the cities and counties of this State are hereby memorialized to relax and modernize their respective building codes to permit a wider range of design and use of materials in the construction of homes, thus to relieve some of the difficulties which have slowed progress in the use of new methods and of new materials and in the construction of needed housing; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk is instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the legislative body of each city and each county of this State.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Beal asked for unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 17, at this time, without reference to committee.

Mr. Lyons withheld unanimous consent.

Resolution referred to Committee on Rules.

By Messrs. Clarke, Fourt, Armstrong, Watson, Crichton, Weber, Call, Emlay, Thompson, Geddes, Leonard, Butters, Stream, Beck, Burke, Collins, Sam L., Carey, Heisinger, Price, King, and Denny :

House Resolution No. 18

Relative to memorializing and petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass H. R. 6932 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session, providing for promotion of agricultural marketing services and agricultural research

WHEREAS, The Congress of the United States has now before it for consideration H. R. 6932 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, Second Session, which has for its objective the providing for further research into basic laws and principles relating to agriculture and to improve and facilitate the marketing and distribution of agricultural products; and

WHEREAS, A scientific approach to the problems of marketing, transportation, and distribution of agricultural products through research, study, experimentation, and cooperation among Federal and State agencies, farm organizations, and private industry is of inestimable value to the achieving of a prosperous agriculture, and this scientific approach will be promoted by said bill; and

WHEREAS, Efficient farm production and the current problems of improved packing, refrigeration, transportation, marketing, and distribution require coordination and correlation between official agencies of the Federal and State Governments for the benefit of producers, handlers and consumers, as envisaged by said bill; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That it urgently represents to the Congress of the United States that the passage of H. R. 6932 is a matter of prime importance, and it hereby memorializes the Congress to enact said bill or a measure comparable in purpose and objective and containing due and adequate consideration for the right of each State to recommend and engage in research on marketing and distribution problems of local and statewide significance; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Clarke asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 18, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was offered:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8: By Messrs. Dickey, Dunn, Sheridan, Carey, Johnson, and Sherwin—Relative to approving a certain amendment to the charter of the City of Oakland, a municipal corporation in the County of Alameda, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the fourth day of June, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Dickey asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8—Relative to approving a certain amendment to the charter of the City of Oakland, a municipal corporation in the County of Alameda, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the fourth day of June, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A. Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Leonard, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan,

Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—61.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9: By Mr. Crowley—Relative to approving the charter of the City of Vallejo, State of California, ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held on the nineteenth day of February, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Crowley asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 9

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9—Relative to approving the charter of the City of Vallejo, State of California, ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held on the nineteenth day of February, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Leonard, Lyons, Maloney, Masson, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Middough, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, and Mr. Speaker—62.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 10: By Mr. Rosenthal—Relative to requesting the Governor to include the subject of commercial rent control in the Proclamation for the special session of the Legislature.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered :

By Mr. Sam L. Collins :

House Resolution No. 19

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the State Controller be and he is hereby directed and ordered to draw his warrant on the proper fund in favor

of the following Member of the Assembly for the amount set opposite his name, and the State Treasurer is hereby directed and ordered to pay the same :

| District | Name | Address | Distance from county seat | Distance from county seat, more-- | Distance from county seat, less-- | Mileage one way | Total mileage | Amount at 5 cents per mile |
|----------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 19 | Bernard R. Brady, | San Francisco, San Francisco County | 90 | -- | -- | 90 | 180 | \$9.00 |

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 19, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Leonard, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McColister, McMillan, Middough, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Werdel, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—62.

NOES—None.

By Messrs. Watson and Collins, Sam L. :

House Resolution No. 20

WHEREAS, For many years the people of Orange County presented an annual event known as the Balboa Tournament of Lights which attracted world-wide attention as a marine spectacle of unusual artistic conception and execution; and

WHEREAS, This event, which was the widespread subject of favorable comment among people of taste and discrimination, had to be discontinued during the war years because those active in sponsoring and conducting it were all serving in various branches of the armed forces, notably the Navy and the Coast Guard; and

WHEREAS, With the return from the war duties of these patriots of maritime interests this event is to be revived and will be conducted on August 17, 1946; now therefore be it

Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California, That it commends the people of Orange County, and others who support them in presenting this unusual spectacle, for their initiative in conceiving and developing an affair of this nature; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be and he is hereby directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Balboa Tournament of Lights Association.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Watson asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 20, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bills were introduced, and read the first time :

Assembly Bill No. 8: By Messrs. Maloney and Burke—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled

“An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately,” approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans’ housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

Assembly Bill No. 9: By Mr. Rosenthal—An act to provide for the temporary suspension of proceedings for the removal or eviction of tenants of residential housing accommodations during an emergency, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Assembly Bill No. 10: By Mr. Rosenthal—An act to provide for the temporary stabilization of rents for residential housing accommodations during an emergency, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

**WITHDRAWAL AND RE-REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 1
BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

Mr. Call asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that Assembly Bill No. 1 be withdrawn from the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, and re-referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

**NOTICE OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT
RESOLUTION NO. 3 WAIVED**

Mr. Johnson waived his notice of motion to reconsider the vote whereby Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3 was adopted.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3 ordered transmitted to the Senate.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2: By Mr. Middough—Relative to urging the President of the United States to approve legislation relinquishing the claim of the United States to certain tide and submerged lands.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Middough asked for unanimous consent to take up Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, at this time, without reference to committee, print or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

Mr. George D. Collins withheld unanimous consent.

Resolution referred to Committee on Rules.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered :

By Mr. Kilpatrick :

House Resolution No. 21

Relative to the Oregon Legislative Committee Investigating the California Penal System

WHEREAS, A committee of members of the Oregon Legislature are now visiting the State of California for the purpose of observing the practices and programs of the California Penal System ; and

WHEREAS, Senator Frank H. Hilton, Representative Jack Bain, and Representative Pat Lonergan of the Oregon Legislature have honored this House by their visit ; and

WHEREAS, It is appropriate that the State of California assist to the fullest extent possible these representatives from our sister State ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the various officers, departments, and agencies of the State Government and of the political subdivisions thereof, as well as the Assembly Interim Committee on County and City Jails, are hereby requested to furnish every facility to the Committee of the Oregon Legislature ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk is instructed to send a copy of this resolution to each of the members of the Oregon Committee.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Kilpatrick asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 21, at this time, without reference to committee. Resolution read and adopted.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE
OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following bills were introduced, and read the first time :

Assembly Bill No. 11: By Messrs. Davis, Geddes, and Stewart—An act to declare an emergency in respect to the renting of housing accommodations, to regulate, control, and stabilize rents, and to regulate the eviction of tenants of housing accommodations, providing for the use of court commissioners, making an appropriation therefor, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

Assembly Bill No. 12: By Messrs. Sherwin, Geddes, Dunn, Collins, George D., Maloney, Wollenberg, Call, Gaffney, Gannon, Johnson, Leonard, Robertson, and Stewart—An act to provide for the stay of proceedings for the recovery of the possession of housing accommodations and to prescribe the effect thereof, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

RECESS

At 10.18 a.m., on motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, the Assembly recessed until 2 p.m.

REASSEMBLED

At 2 p.m., the Assembly reconvened.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

**INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY
BILLS (RESUMED)**

The following resolutions were offered :

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3: By Messrs. Middough, Geddes, Stewart, Allen, Armstrong, Burke, Burkhalter, Call, Davis, Debs, Doyle,

Emlay, Gannon, McCollister, Mrs. Niehouse, Messrs. Robertson, Sherwin, and Stream—Relative to liquidation of Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and the seizure of the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association by James H. Fahey.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4: By Messrs. Lowrey, Clarke, Boyd, Brown, Crowley, Emlay, Geddes, Heisinger, King, and Thorp—Relative to memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States in relation to the importation of almonds.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

COMMUNICATIONS

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

The following telegram was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

BREA, CALIFORNIA, July 23, 1946

*Assemblyman Sam L. Collins
Sacramento, California*

Have served overseas four years with Army of United States. Return to Japan in August for another year. Mother and sister renting residence, Brea, California, nine years, face eviction by selfish landlord July 31st. Neighbors in similar situation. Absolutely no vacancies available and building materials unobtainable at figures we can afford. This is time for action.

CHAS. M. WHEELER, Lieutenant Colonel
Army, United States

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered:

By Messrs. Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyon, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Mrs. Niehouse, Messrs. Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg:

House Resolution No. 22

Relative to the enlistment of Charles V. Irwin in the United States Marine Corps

WHEREAS, Charles V. Irwin has served this Assembly as Page and Assistant Sergeant-at-Arms through two regular and three extraordinary sessions; and

WHEREAS, This red-headed, happy-go-lucky youngster has won the affection of the Members of this Assembly by reason of his cheerful willingness to do whatever he is called upon to do; and

WHEREAS, On July 19, 1946, said Charles V. Irwin enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and this Assembly will therefore lose a valued attache and the members will be separated from a valued friend; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the members thereof wish Charles V. Irwin the greatest success and happiness in his career as a Marine with the confidence that he will live up to the highest traditions of that distinguished calling; and be it further

Resolved, That said Charles V. Irwin is hereby given this parting admonition:

That *Semper fidelis*, the motto of the United States Marine Corps, when the chips are down and the guns are blazing means just exactly what it says; but, in the peaceful times of duty, whether on sea or shore, at home or abroad, it has an entirely different meaning, which is "Don't volunteer for anything."

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Allen asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 22, at this time, without reference to committee Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

RECESS

At 2.09 p.m., on motion of Mr. Beck, the Assembly recessed until 2.12 p.m. to hear remarks from Charles V. Irwin, Sergeant-at-Arms, who has just enlisted in the Marine Corps.

REASSEMBLED

At 2.12 p.m., the Assembly reconvened.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered:

By Messrs. Stephenson, Collins, Sam L., Middough, Gaffney, and Burke:

House Resolution No. 23

Relative to extending good wishes to Virginia Geddes upon the occasion of her marriage to Lieutenant Robert Waldo Dukes

WHEREAS, Alice Virginia Geddes, daughter of our fellow Member, Assemblyman Ernest R. Geddes, was a visitor at the First Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Session of the Legislature of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, Alice Virginia Geddes because of her personality and interest in the affairs of the Legislature has won the friendship of all with whom she became acquainted; and

WHEREAS, Alice Virginia Geddes and Lieutenant Robert Waldo Dukes, formerly of the United States Navy Air Corps, were married on the nineteenth day of July, 1946; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members of this Assembly extend to Mr. and Mrs. Dukes felicitations and sincere wishes for a long and happy married life and a share of the good things of life; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Lieutenant and Mrs. Robert Waldo Dukes.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Stephenson asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 23, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

House Resolution No. 24

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the State Controller be and he is hereby directed and ordered to draw his warrant on the proper fund in favor of the following Member of the Assembly for the amount set opposite his name, and the State Treasurer is hereby directed and ordered to pay the same:

| District | Name | Address | Distance from county seat | Distance from county seat, more | Distance from county seat, less | Mileage one way | Total mileage | Amount at 5 cents per mile |
|----------|---------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 10 | Harold F Sawallisch | Richmond, Contra Costa County | 62 | 22 | -- | 84 | 168 | 8 40 |

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 24, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emley, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Werdel, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—63.

NOES—None.

**NOTICE OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW ALL BILLS FROM
THEIR COMMITTEES**

Mr. Johnson gave notice that on the next legislative day he would request unanimous consent for the purpose of moving to withdraw all bills from their committees if no action is taken in committee hearings tonight, and have them placed before a Committee of the Whole.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. Maloney announced that a message had just reached him to the effect that Assemblyman Burns, who has been ill, has improved in health.

GUESTS EXTENDED PRIVILEGE OF ASSEMBLY FLOOR

On request of Mr. Field, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Watson of Glendale.

On request of Messrs. Kraft and Stream, and Mrs. Niehouse, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mr. and Mrs. H. Beachy, Mrs. Alice Fisher of La Jolla, Vincent Goodfrey, Howard Cramer, Assemblyman-elect; Ray Frazier, Mrs. Lillian Johnson, Mrs. Edna Von Gunden, Miss Catherine Chambers, and Miss Dorothy Odom of San Diego.

On request of Mr. Maloney, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Theodore (Teddy) Deems of Sacramento.

On request of Messrs. Anderson and King, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Rev. George Munyer of Challenge.

On request of Mr. Gaffney and the San Francisco Delegation, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to W. W. Stevens of San Francisco, and C. E. Geoble of Sacramento.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.26 p.m., on motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, the Speaker declared the Assembly adjourned until 10 a.m., Wednesday, July 24, 1946.

CHARLES W. LYON, Speaker

GERALDINE B HADSELL, Minute Clerk

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE
FIFTY-SIXTH (SECOND EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION

ASSEMBLY DAILY JOURNAL

THIRD LEGISLATIVE DAY

THIRD CALENDAR DAY

IN ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO

Wednesday, July 24, 1946

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

ROLL CALL

The roll was called, and the following answered to their names:

Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—75.

Quorum present.

PRAYER

The following prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. Torrance Phelps:

God of Hope:

May we behold mankind forever marching forward to unexplored frontiers with bright expectations.

May we remember our forefathers who sailed forth upon an uncharted sea with the ideal and hope of the discovery of a new and better country. May we recall the dauntless men and women who crossed a continent of prairie and mountains, and made the frontier and the desert blossom as the rose.

Now, as we approach a great dramatic moment in history, let us covet their faith, their audacity, and their creative imagination. Let us see that our frontier is not that of the desert and of the wilderness, but that of policy and ideal which shall make city and country teeming areas of healthy and intelligent citizens.

May we labor for our generation as did the pathfinders and trail blazers of the yesteryears, so that every social frontier of this Commonwealth shall become a garden of beauty and happiness.—AMEN.

READING OF THE JOURNAL DISPENSED WITH

On motion of Mr. Middough, further reading of the Journal of the previous legislative day was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR THE DAY

The following members were granted leave of absence for the day, because of illness:

Mr. Burns, on motion of Messrs. Clarke and Heisinger.

Mr. Knight, on motion of Mr. Watson.

The following member was granted leave of absence for the day, because of personal business elsewhere, and desired to waive his per diem:

Mr. Werdel, on motion of Mr. Doyle.

EXPLANATIONS OF ABSENCE

The morning roll call in yesterday's Journal does not record me as being present. I was in Sacramento all day attending to legislative business, and owing to the shortness of the session, it adjourned before I concluded the conference in which I was engaged and returned to the Assembly Chamber.

RAUP MILLER

In reading the Assembly Journal of Monday, July 22d, I observe that I am not recorded as being present.

I was delayed in arriving in Sacramento due to an automobile accident. I was in the Assembly Chamber while the Governor was delivering his message and immediately thereafter I was called in conference on legislative business, thereby missing the remaining roll calls during Monday's session.

The Monday's session adjourned at 12.28 p.m.

HAROLD SAWALLISCH

MEMBERS EXCUSED TO ATTEND COMMITTEE MEETINGS

At 10.05 a.m., Mr. Wollenberg asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on Ways and Means be excused for the purpose of holding a committee meeting in the Post Office, at this time.

At 10.06 a.m., Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent that the members of the Committee on Rules be excused for the purpose of holding a committee meeting at his desk, at this time.

COMMUNICATIONS

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Medearis of San Diego, relative to rent control, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Frank Nelson Taylor Cummings of Los Angeles, Engineer Economist, relative to suggestions for protecting the public against unsportsman business interests, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from John E. Porter of Los Angeles, relative to rent control, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By Speaker Lyon:

A communication from Claud M. Dunn, Referee of the State Department of Industrial Relations, relative to rent control legislation, was

received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By Speaker Lyon :

A communication from Mrs. S. Van Heckeren of San Francisco, relative to the old age pension, was received, and referred to the Committee on Social Welfare.

By Speaker Lyon :

A communication from Dudley Atkins, Jr., of Altadena, relative to rent control, was received, and referred to the Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered :

By Mr. Lowrey :

House Resolution No. 25

Relating to a State Fish and Game Warden for the County of Glenn

WHEREAS, The lands of Glenn County abound in game animals and upland game birds, and its waters teem with fish that may not be taken without a license ; and

WHEREAS, For some months there has been no State Fish and Game Warden designated to serve in Glenn County and protect fish and game of the county by enforcement of the provisions of the Fish and Game Code ; and

WHEREAS, The Sheriff of the County of Glenn and all other local officials have been doing their utmost to bring violators of the provisions of the Fish and Game Code to justice, but due to the magnitude of the enforcement problem, have been unable to do so to the detriment of the people of the county and of the remainder of the State who repair to the county to enjoy the sports of hunting and fishing ; and

WHEREAS, The District Attorney of Glenn County, the Sheriff of Glenn County, and the State Senator and Assemblyman within whose district Glenn County is situated have requested the Fish and Game Commission to appoint or transfer a State Fish and Game Warden to Glenn County, to patrol the county and enforce the provisions of the Fish and Game Code, but to no avail ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That it does hereby express its belief that a State Fish and Game Warden is needed in the County of Glenn, and its hope that the Fish and Game Commission will promptly designate one to serve in the said county ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to send a copy of this resolution to the president and each member of the Fish and Game Commission.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Lowrey asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 25, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

By Messrs. Fourt, Pelletier, and Hollibaugh :

House Resolution No. 26

Relative to the Assembly Interim Committee on State and Local Taxation and further defining the powers and duties thereof

WHEREAS, One of the purposes for which the Legislature has been convened is the consideration of legislation relating to subventions to local agencies for housing facilities for veterans and families of service men ; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable that the Assembly be advised, through a committee of its members, as to all facts and matters relating to or bearing upon the policy which should be pursued by the State in making subventions to local agencies and particularly the policy which should be pursued in making subventions of the nature above referred to ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California :

1. That in addition to the powers conferred upon the Assembly Interim Committee on State and Local Taxation, created by House Resolution No. 154, adopted June 16, 1945, said committee is authorized and directed to ascertain, study, and analyse all facts relating to or in any way bearing upon any of the subjects mentioned in the recitals of this resolution and to report thereon to the Assembly.

2. In performing the duties and exercising the powers conferred upon it by this resolution said committee, its subcommittees, and its members shall have and exercise all of the powers, rights, privileges, and duties conferred upon it or them pursuant to said House Resolution No. 154, and, in addition, are authorized to leave the State of California in the performance of their duties to accomplish the objects and purposes of this resolution.

3. Any and all money made available to said committee by said House Resolution No. 154 of the Regular Session of 1945, or by House Resolution No. 118 of the Fifty-sixth (First Extraordinary) Session, adopted February 19, 1946, or otherwise, are available for expenditure by said committee and its members in carrying out the objects and purposes of this resolution.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Hollibaugh asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 26, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burkhalter, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Hawkins, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—60.

NOES—None.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS

The following resolution was offered:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5: By Messrs. Price, Geddes, Boyd, Collins, Sam L., and Watson—Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the inundation of State Highways 77 and 192 by the waters impounded by Prado Dam in Riverside County, California, and remedial legislation in connection with this and similar situations.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Price asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5—Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the inundation of State Highways 77 and 192 by the waters impounded by Prado Dam in Riverside County, California, and remedial legislation in connection with this and similar situations.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosen-

thal, Sawallisch, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—66.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 23, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 1
Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 2
Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3
Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 4

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 6
Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 7
Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

Above resolutions ordered enrolled.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 27

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the State Controller be and he is hereby directed and ordered to draw his warrant on the proper fund in favor of the following Member of the Assembly for the amount set opposite his name, and the State Treasurer is hereby directed and ordered to pay the same:

| District | Name | Address | Distance from county seat | Distance from county seat, more | Distance from county seat, less | Mileage one way | Total mileage | Amount at 5 cents per mile |
|----------|---------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 57 | Albert Dekker | Los Angeles, Los Angeles County | 447 | -- | -- | 447 | 894 | \$44 70 |

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 27, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Mid-dough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Wollen-berg, and Mr. Speaker—65.

NOES—None.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Ways and Means

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred:

Assembly Bill No. 8

Has had the same under consideration, and reports the same back with the recom-mendation: Do pass.

WOLLENBERG, Chairman

Above reported bill ordered to second reading.

SECOND READING OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT)

Assembly Bill No. 8—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled “An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately,” approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans’ housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Bill read second time.

Resolution to Suspend Constitutional Provision

The following resolution was offered :

By Mr. Maloney :

Resolved, That Assembly Bill No. 8 presents a case of urgency, as that term is used in Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution, and the provision of that section requiring that the bill be read on three several days in each house is hereby dispensed with, and it is ordered that said bill be read the third time, considered engrossed, and placed upon its passage.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O’Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker
—62.

NOES—None.

Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution was declared suspended.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 8

Assembly Bill No. 8—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled “An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately,” approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans’ housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Bill read third time.

Motion to Set Special Order

Mr. Maloney moved that Assembly Bill No. 8 be made a special order of business for Wednesday, July 24, 1946, at 11 a.m.

Motion carried.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 23, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1
Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3
Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4
J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS

The following resolution was read:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1—Relative to Joint Rules of the Legislature.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1, at this time, without reference to committee or file.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1—Relative to Joint Rules of the Legislature.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Evans, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCallister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Waters, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—60.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to Senate.

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was read:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3—Relative to distribution of legislative printing.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3, at this time, without reference to committee or file.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 3

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3—Relative to distribution of legislative printing.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Burke, Burkhalter, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier,

Robertson, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—58.
NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was read :

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2—Approving an amendment to the charter of the City of Napa, a municipal corporation in the County of Napa, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at the special municipal election held therein on the twenty-eighth day of May, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Crowley asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2, at this time, without reference to committee or file.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 2—Approving an amendment to the charter of the City of Napa, a municipal corporation in the County of Napa, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at the special municipal election held therein on the twenty-eighth day of May, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—64.
NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was read :

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the County of Alameda voted for and ratified by the electors of said county at a special county election held therein on the fourth day of June, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Dickey asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4, at this time, without reference to committee or file.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the County of Alameda voted for and rati-

fied by the electors of said county at a special county election held therein on the fourth day of June, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, Pelletier, Robertson, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. McCollister asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 5, at this time, without reference to committee or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 5—Relative to the allowance of veterans' preference credits in State civil service examinations.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—69.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

Hon. Lorne D. Middough Presiding

At 10.45 a.m., Hon. Lorne D. Middough, Member of the Assembly from the Seventieth District, presiding.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was offered:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6: By Messrs. Debs, Burkhalter, Crichton, Gaffney, Berry, Brady, O'Day, and Collins, George D.—Relative to fixed base air carriers.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Debs asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6—Relative to fixed base air carriers.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—64.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

MOTION TO PRINT 2,000 COPIES OF REPORT OF CALIFORNIA LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATION

Mr. Allen moved that 2,000 copies of the Report of the Assembly Legislative Committee on Administrative Regulation entitled "Summary of California Statutory Provisions Conferring Quasi-Legislative Functions Upon State Administrative Agencies" be printed.

Mr. Sam L. Collins seconded the motion.

The roll was called, and the motion carried by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—69.

NOES—None.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was read:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5—Relative to the inclusion of certain lands within the State Park System.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, at this time, without reference to committee or file.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5—Relative to the inclusion of certain lands within the State Park System.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger,

Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg—66.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was offered :

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11: By Messrs. Miller, Thompson, Sherwin, Kraft, Middough, Mrs. Niehouse, Messrs. Erwin, and Wollenberg—Relative to the establishment of a 40-hour work week for public employees.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Miller asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11, at this time, without reference to committee, print or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 11

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11—Relative to the establishment of a 40-hour work week for public employees.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

CONSIDERATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

The hour of 11 a.m. having arrived, Assembly Bill No. 8 was taken up.

Assembly Bill No. 8—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans' housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Bill read third time.

MOTION TO RECESS

Mr. Sam L. Collins moved that the Assembly do now recess until 11.25 a.m. for the purpose of holding a meeting of the Committee on Rules in the Post Office.

Motion carried.

RECESS

At 11.03 a.m., the Speaker declared the Assembly at recess until 11.25 a.m.

REASSEMBLED

At 11.25 a.m., the Assembly reconvened.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

Hon. Lorne D. Middough Presiding

At 11.26 a.m., Hon. Lorne D. Middough, Member of the Assembly from the Seventieth District, presiding.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 8

Assembly Bill No. 8—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans' housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Bill read third time.

Motion to Amend

Mr. Hawkins moved the adoption of the following amendment:

Amendment No. 1

On page 3, lines 24 and 25, of the printed bill, strike out "two million five hundred thousand dollars (\$2,500,000)", and insert "ten million dollars (\$10,000,000)".

Amendment read.

Point of Order

Mr. Heisinger arose to the following point of order: That Mr. Davis is not speaking to the amendment.

Ruling by Speaker

Acting Speaker Middough ruled the point of order well taken.

Point of Order

Mr. Beal arose to the following point of order: That Mr. Allen is not speaking to the question.

Ruling by Speaker

Acting Speaker Middough ruled the point of order not well taken.

Speaker Presiding

At 12.18 p.m., Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Hawkins to Assembly Bill No. 8.

Point of Order

Mr. Bennett arose to the following point of order: That Mr. Hawkins has exceeded his time.

Ruling by Speaker

Speaker Lyon ruled the point of order not well taken.

The question being on the adoption of the amendment offered by Mr. Hawkins to Assembly Bill No. 8.

Roll Call Demanded

Messrs. Hawkins, Emlay, and Heisinger demanded a roll call.

The roll was called, and the amendment offered by Mr. Hawkins to Assembly Bill No. 8 refused adoption by the following vote:

AYES—Anderson, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burkhalter, Collins, George D., Crowley, Debs, Dekker, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Evans, Fletcher, Gaffney, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Kilpatrick, Massion, McMillan, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Thomas, and Watson—31.

NOES—Allen, Armstrong, Burke, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Denny, Dickey, Erwin, Field, Fourt, Geddes, Haggerty, Johnson, King, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, McCollister, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Price, Sawallisch, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—39.

Explanation of Vote

At the time the vote was taken on the amendment offered by Mr. Hawkins to Assembly Bill No. 8, I was in the Governor's Office.

FRED H. KRAFT

The question being on the passage of Assembly Bill No. 8.

Motion to Amend

Mr. Emlay moved the adoption of the following amendment:

Amendment No. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the printed bill, after "agency.", insert "The California Polytechnic School is a college within the meaning of this act."

Amendment read.

Amendment Withdrawn

Mr. Emlay withdrew his amendment.

The question being on the passage of Assembly Bill No. 8.

Urgency Clause

Urgency clause read, and adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—73.

NOES—None.

The roll was called, and the bill passed by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephen-

son, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—73.
NOES—None.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

Above resolution ordered enrolled.

INTRODUCTION, FIRST READING, AND REFERENCE OF ASSEMBLY BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bills were introduced, and read the first time:

Assembly Bill No. 13: By Messrs. Beal and Emlay—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans' housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Ways and Means.

Assembly Bill No. 14: By Messrs. Fourn, Hollibaugh, Waters, Allen, Anderson, Massion, Beal, Burkhalter, Debs, Doyle, Kraft, McCollister, McMillan, Mrs. Niehouse, and Mr. Stewart—An act to add Section 4.5 to an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of the temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and the use of public park and recreation property by local agencies as sites for such temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and validating such use of public park property by local agencies, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

Motion to Place Rush Order on Printing of Assembly Bill No. 14

Mr. McCollister moved that a rush order be placed upon the printing of Assembly Bill No. 14.

Motion carried.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 12: By Mr. Call—Relative to approving a certain amendment to the charter of the City of Redwood

City, a municipal corporation in the County of San Mateo, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at the general municipal election held therein on the ninth day of April, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Call asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 12, at this time, without reference to committee, print, or file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 12

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 12—Relative to approving a certain amendment to the charter of the City of Redwood City, a municipal corporation in the County of San Mateo, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at the general municipal election held therein on the ninth day of April, 1946.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Leonard, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—72.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

RECESS

At 12.40 p.m., on motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, the Assembly recessed until 2.30 p.m.

REASSEMBLED

At 2.30 p.m., the Assembly reconvened.

Hon. Thomas A. Maloney, Speaker pro tempore of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following resolution was read:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6—Relative to adjournment sine die of the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session of the Legislature of the State of California.

Referred to Committee on Rules.

Hon. Albert C. Wollenberg Presiding

At 2.56 p.m., Hon. Albert C. Wollenberg, Member of the Assembly from the Twenty-first District, presiding.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Legislative Procedure

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4

And reports the same correctly engrossed.

PELLETIER, Chairman

Above reported resolutions ordered on file for adoption.

Committee on Rules

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Rules, to which was referred:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2

Has had the same under consideration, and reports the same back with the recommendation: Be adopted.

SAM L. COLLINS, Chairman

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. Middough asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, at this time, without reference to file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 2

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2—Relative to urging the President of the United States to approve legislation relinquishing the claim of the United States to certain tide and submerged lands.

Resolution read.

Roll Call Demanded

Messrs. Berry, Brady, and Dekker demanded a roll call.

The roll was called, and Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dills, Clayton A., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Geddes, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Kraft, Massion, McCollister, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg—53.

NOES—Berry, Brady, Collins, George D., Dekker, and Heisinger—5.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

Explanation of Vote

I voted "no" on Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 because of the fact that the matter of the ownership of the lands referred to are now under consideration by the Supreme Court of the United States. Therefore we should not act until the decision is handed down.

S. L. HEISINGER

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**Committee on Rules**

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Rules, to which was referred:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3

Has had the same under consideration, and reports the same back with the recommendation: Be adopted.

SAM L. COLLINS, Chairman

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. Middough asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3, at this time, without reference to file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 3

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3—Relative to liquidation of Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and the seizure of the Long Beach Federal Savings and Loan Association by James H. Fahey.

Resolution read.

Motion to Re-refer

Mr. Evans moved that Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3 be re-referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Sam L. Collins seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**Committee on Rules**

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Rules, to which was referred:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4

Has had the same under consideration, and reports the same back with the recommendation: Be adopted.

SAM L. COLLINS, Chairman

REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. Lowrey asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4, at this time, without reference to file, and that the same be considered engrossed.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4—Relative to memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States in relation to the importation of almonds.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Weber, and Wollenberg—55.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered:

By Messrs. Weber, Heisinger, and Collins, Sam L.:

House Resolution No. 28

Relative to allocation of space in the State Capitol and proposed Capitol Annex

WHEREAS, The present office facilities, arrangements, and locations of the Legislature, its officers, committees, and members are entirely inadequate and unsatisfactory; and

WHEREAS, To remedy this situation a reconstruction of the State Capitol and construction of an Annex thereto are contemplated; and

WHEREAS, It is most undesirable that the offices and legislative rooms of the Legislature be intermingled throughout the building with offices of the Executive Branch of the Government, it being a necessary requirement in the separation of powers in the Government that the physical offices and equipment as well as the function of the Legislative Branch be separated from the other branches of Government; and

WHEREAS, It is both desirable and necessary that the building space used by the Legislature, its committees and members, be under the control of the Legislature; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That any reconstruction of the Capitol and the construction of an Annex thereto accomplish a complete separation of the offices used by the Legislature and those used by the other branches of Government; that entire sections of the Capitol be reserved to the use and control of the Legislature, such sections to include sufficient floor space to provide room adequate to carry on the business of the Legislature, as may be determined by the Legislature, and to include adequate, suitable, and convenient rooms for the use of the members of the press, and that assignments of space in those sections be reserved to the Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable and adequate offices in the State Capitol be retained for the use and control of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and Secretary of State, each of whom has extensive functions to perform in connection with the legislative process; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the State Board of Public Works, and to the Joint Committee on Remodeling the Capitol.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Weber asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 28, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**Committee on Military Affairs**

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred:

Assembly Bill No. 14

Has had the same under consideration, and reports the same back with the recommendation: Do pass.

McCOLLISTER, Chairman

Above reported bill ordered to second reading.

RESOLUTION TO SUSPEND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Fourt:

Resolved, That Assembly Bill No. 14 presents a case of urgency, as that term is used in Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution, and the provision of that section requiring that the bill be read on three several days in each house is hereby dispensed with, and it is ordered that said bill be read the second and third times, considered engrossed, and placed upon its passage.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg—67.

NOES—None.

Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution was declared suspended.

CONSIDERATION OF ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 14

Assembly Bill No. 14—An act to add Section 4.5 to an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and the use of public park and recreation property by local agencies as sites for such temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and validating such use of public park and recreation property by local agencies, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Bill read second time.

Urgency Clause

Urgency clause read, and adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg—67.

NOES—None.

Assembly Bill No. 14—An act to add Section 4.5 to an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and the use of public park and recreation property by local agencies as sites for such temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and validating such use of public park and recreation property by local agencies, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Bill read third time.

The roll was called, and the bill passed by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day,

Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg—67.
 NOES—None.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Rules

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Rules, to which was referred:

House Resolution No. 12

Has had the same under consideration, and reports the same back with amendments with the recommendation: Amend, be adopted as amended.

SAM L. COLLINS, Chairman

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 12

House Resolution No. 12

WHEREAS, There has been published by the State Printing Department a book entitled The California Legislature written by Joseph Allan Beek, Secretary of the Senate; and

WHEREAS, This book contains a wealth of information presented in a manner to be easily understood by the students of our public schools and the facts and comments on our legislative system which have been favorably commented upon by statesmen and educators generally; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby requested to order printed for the use of the Members of the Assembly such number of said books as shall be necessary to supply the demand, all to be paid for from the Legislative Printing Fund.

Resolution read.

Committee Amendments

The following amendment was offered by the Committee on Rules:

Amendment No. 1

In the third paragraph of the resolution, after "Assembly", strike out "such number of said books as shall be necessary to supply the demand," and insert "a number of such books as is necessary to provide each Member of the Assembly with 15 copies of said book,".

Amendment read and adopted.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 12, as amended, at this time.

Consideration of House Resolution No. 12, as Amended

House Resolution No. 12

WHEREAS, There has been published by the State Printing Department a book entitled The California Legislature written by Joseph Allen Beek, Secretary of the Senate; and

WHEREAS, This book contains a wealth of information presented in a manner to be easily understood by the students of our public schools and the facts and comments on our legislative system which have been favorably commented upon by statesmen and educators generally; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby requested to order printed for the use of the Members of the Assembly a number of such books as is necessary to provide each Member of the Assembly with 15 copies of said book, all to be paid for from the Legislative Printing Fund.

Resolution read, as amended, and adopted.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered:

By Messrs. McCollister, Waters, and Fourn:

House Resolution No. 29

Relative to commending Assemblyman Harrison W. Call

WHEREAS, Harrison W. Call has long been a distinguished Member of the Assembly of California, representing the Twenty-seventh Assembly District of California, and

has from the beginning of his service here taken an extraordinarily vigorous part in the work of this body; and

WHEREAS, Harrison W. Call, as Chairman of the Judiciary Committee during a period when extensive changes were being made in the judiciary laws of this State, so skillfully guided the work of the committee that the burden upon this Assembly was immeasurably lightened, and

WHEREAS, Harrison W. Call has also expended his great energies in behalf of legislation to provide homes and education for veterans, and has sponsored other legislation of benefit to the public health and welfare; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Assemblyman Harrison W. Call be commended for his diligent and effective service to the people of his district and of the State of California, and the Members of this Assembly by this resolution express their appreciation to Harrison W. Call for his splendid contribution to the work of this body, and extend to him their hearty good wishes for the future; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Assemblyman Harrison W. Call as an expression of the respect and esteem of his colleagues in the Assembly of the State of California.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Maloney asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 29, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

By Messrs. O'Day, Maloney, Brady, Gaffney, Berry, Collins, George D., Emlay, Carey, Lyon, Robertson, Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gannon, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Mrs. Niehouse, Messrs. Pelletier, Price, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, and Wollenberg:

House Resolution No. 30

Expressing the regret of the Assembly at the retirement of Gerald P. Haggerty from membership in the Assembly

WHEREAS, When the Legislature convenes in January, 1947, for its Fifty-seventh Regular Session there will be missing from the San Francisco Delegation our good friend and colleague, the Honorable Gerald P. Haggerty; and

WHEREAS, Although the wise and helpful services of Gerald P. Haggerty will not be available for the deliberations of the Assembly, and in the meetings of the Assembly Committees on Finance and Insurance, of which he has been Vice Chairman, Crime and Correction, Fish and Game, Revenue and Taxation, Transportation and Commerce, and the Rules Committee, nevertheless, he continues in public service as a member of the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members of the Assembly do hereby express their regret at the loss of the fellowship of the Honorable Gerald P. Haggerty and their appreciation of his services at the Regular and Special Sessions of the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Legislatures and extend to him their cordial good wishes for prosperity and a continued career of outstanding public service; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit to the Honorable Gerald P. Haggerty a suitably engrossed copy of this resolution.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. O'Day asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 30, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day passed:

Senate Bill No. 8

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bill was read the first time:

Senate Bill No. 8—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans' housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Military Affairs.

Speaker Presiding

At 3.50 p.m., Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day passed:

Senate Bill No. 2
Senate Bill No. 7
Senate Bill No. 9

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bill was read the first time:

Senate Bill No. 2—An act making an additional appropriation for legislative printing, binding, etc., to take effect immediately.

Resolution to Suspend Constitutional Provision

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

Resolved, That Senate Bill No. 2 presents a case of urgency, as that term is used in Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution, and the provision of that section requiring that the bill be read on three several days in each house is hereby dispensed with, and it is ordered that said bill be read the second and third times, and placed upon its passage.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution was declared suspended.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 2

Senate Bill No. 2—An act making an additional appropriation for legislative printing, binding, etc., to take effect immediately.

Bill read second time.

Urgency Clause

Urgency clause read, and adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

Senate Bill No. 2—An act making an additional appropriation for legislative printing, binding, etc., to take effect immediately.

Bill read third time.

The roll was called, and the bill passed by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—67.

NOES—None.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bill was read the first time:

Senate Bill No. 7—An act to validate the organization, boundaries, governing officers or boards, acts, proceedings, and bonds of public bodies, to take effect immediately.

Resolution to Suspend Constitutional Provision

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Gaffney:

Resolved, That Senate Bill No. 7 presents a case of urgency, as that term is used in Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution, and the provision of that section requiring that the bill be read on three several days in each house is hereby dispensed with, and it is ordered that said bill be read the second and third times, and placed upon its passage.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—68.

NOES—None.

Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution was declared suspended.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 7

Senate Bill No. 7—An act to validate the organization, boundaries, governing officers or boards, acts, proceedings, and bonds of public bodies, to take effect immediately.

Bill read second time.

Urgency Clause

Urgency clause read, and adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—68.

NOES—None.

Senate Bill No. 7—An act to validate the organization, boundaries, governing officers or boards, acts, proceedings, and bonds of public bodies, to take effect immediately.

Bill read third time.

The roll was called, and the bill passed by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—68.

NOES—None

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bill was read the first time:

Senate Bill No. 9—An act to validate the formation, organization and existence of sanitary districts, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Resolution to Suspend Constitutional Provision

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Butters:

Resolved, That Senate Bill No. 9 presents a case of urgency, as that term is used in Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution, and the provision of that section requiring that the bill be read on three several days in each house is hereby dispensed with, and it is ordered that said bill be read the second and third times, and placed upon its passage.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—65

NOES—None.

Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution was declared suspended.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 9

Senate Bill No. 9—An act to validate the formation, organization and existence of sanitary districts, declaring the urgency thereof to take effect immediately.

Bill read second time.

Urgency Clause

Urgency clause read, and adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McColister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—65.

NOES—None.

Senate Bill No. 9—An act to validate the formation, organization and existence of sanitary districts, declaring the urgency thereof to take effect immediately.

Bill read third time.

The roll was called, and the bill passed by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Boyd, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lyons, Massion, McColister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—65.

NOES—None.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day passed:

Senate Bill No. 6

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bill was read the first time:

Senate Bill No. 6—An act to amend Section 4232 of the Political Code, relating to compensation for public service in counties of the third class.

Resolution to Suspend Constitutional Provision

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Dickey:

Resolved, That Senate Bill No. 6 presents a case of urgency, as that term is used in Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution, and the provision of that section requiring that the bill be read on three several days in each house is hereby dispensed with, and it is ordered that said bill be read the second and third times, considered engrossed, and placed upon its passage.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn,

Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—68.
NOES—None.

Article IV, Section 15, of the Constitution was declared suspended.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL NO. 6

Senate Bill No. 6—An act to amend Section 4232 of the Political Code, relating to compensation for public service in counties of the third class.

Bill read second time.

Urgency Clause

Urgency clause read, and adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—68.
NOES—None.

Senate Bill No. 6—An act to amend Section 4232 of the Political Code, relating to compensation for public service in counties of the third class.

Bill read third time.

The roll was called, and the bill passed by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Beck, Bennett, Boyd, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—68.
NOES—None.

Bill ordered transmitted to the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day passed:

Senate Bill No. 3

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

FIRST READING AND REFERENCE OF SENATE BILLS (RESUMED)

The following bill was read the first time:

Senate Bill No. 3—An act to declare an emergency in respect to the renting of housing accommodations, to regulate, control, and stabilize rents, and to regulate the eviction of tenants of housing accommodations, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately.

Referred to Committee on Judiciary.

**OPINIONS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL ORDERED PRINTED IN
JOURNAL BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

By unanimous consent, the Speaker ordered the following opinion of the Legislative Counsel printed in the Journal:

Opinion of Legislative Counsel

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO 2, CALIFORNIA, July 24, 1946.

*Honorable Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

Necessity for State Legislation if Federal Rent Control Law is Enacted

DEAR MR. LYON: In answer to your question on this subject it is our opinion, based upon the information we have received as to the provisions relating to rent control in the bill now pending before Congress, that no State legislation relating to control of rents or evictions will be necessary in California if the Congressional measure is passed and signed by the President of the United States.

The Congressional bill will become effective immediately upon signature by the President, and contains a provision, which we are informed was not changed by the conference amendments, that it is operative as of June 30, 1946. The Federal law and regulations will therefore become applicable notwithstanding the fact that notices for increased rents or for eviction may have been served.

We are informed that the measure contains the following provision:

"While maximum rents are in effect under this act with respect to housing accommodations in any defense rental area, such housing accommodations shall not be subject to rent control by any State or local government."

Yours very truly,

FRED B. WOOD, Legislative Counsel
By LAWRENCE G. ALLYN, Deputy

Motion to Request Detailed Opinion from Legislative Counsel

Mr. Johnson moved that the contents embodied in the above opinion of the Legislative Counsel be re-referred to the Legislative Counsel for a detailed opinion on said matter, so that it may be placed on record permanently by being printed in the Journal.

Motion carried.

By unanimous consent, the Speaker ordered the following opinion of the Legislative Counsel printed in the Journal:

Opinion of Legislative Counsel

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO 2, CALIFORNIA, July 24, 1946.

*Honorable Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. LYON: Pursuant to your request we have examined Assembly Bills Nos. 13 and 14.

In our opinion each of these bills is within the scope of the Proclamation convening this extraordinary session, as amended and supplemented.

Very truly yours,

FRED B. WOOD, Legislative Counsel
By C. H. LANGSTAFF, Chief Deputy

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day passed:

Assembly Bill No. 8

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

Above bill ordered enrolled.

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 5

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

Above resolution ordered enrolled.

**MOTION TO RECALL SENATE BILL NO. 8 FROM COMMITTEE
ON MILITARY AFFAIRS**

Mr. McCollister moved that Senate Bill No. 8 be recalled from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Motion carried.

Motion to Re-refer Senate Bill No. 8

Mr. McCollister moved that Senate Bill No. 8 be re-referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Substitute Motion to Strike From File

Mr. Maloney moved, as a substitute motion, that Senate Bill No. 8 be stricken from the file.

Motion carried.

RESIGNATION ANNOUNCED

Mr. Sawallisch announced his resignation from the standing Committee on Rules and from the Interim Committee on Legislative Process.

CHANGES IN COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Speaker Lyon announced the appointment of Mr. Weber to the standing Committee on Rules, vice Mr. Sawallisch.

Speaker Lyon announced the appointment of Mr. Weber to the Interim Committee on Legislative Process, vice Mr. Sawallisch.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered:

By Messrs. Lyon and Maloney:

House Resolution No. 31

Memorializing Congress and certain Federal Governmental departments to take steps to alleviate the shortage of buildings and office space in California

WHEREAS, There is at present an existing shortage of available buildings and office space in this State which is seriously retarding this State's Program for the Rehabilitation of Veterans in Business and Professional Fields; and

WHEREAS, This shortage is having a critical effect in retarding the social and economic readjustments in this State necessitated by the termination of the war; and

WHEREAS, This acute shortage can not be materially alleviated by new construction until the challenge of fulfilling the Veterans' Emergency Housing Program has been successfully achieved; and

WHEREAS, It appears that various Federal Governmental departments and agencies are occupying building space in this State in excess of their minimum requirements, which space if released would tend to relieve the serious conditions created by the aforementioned shortage; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of California does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to take such steps as it may deem proper to have Federal Governmental departments and agencies vacate any building and office space occupied by them in this State in excess of their minimum requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to each Senator and Representative from California; to the Secretary of the United States Senate; to the Secretary of the House of Representatives; to the Secretary of War; to the Secretary of the Navy; to the Surplus Property Administrator; to the Federal Loan Administrator and to the Army-Navy Liquidation Deputy Commissioner.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Maloney asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 31, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

By Mr. Dunn:

House Resolution No. 32

Relative to "California Government, Politics and Administration" by Winston W. Crouch and Dean E. McHenry

WHEREAS, There has recently been published by the University of California Press a book entitled "California Government, Politics and Administration" by Winston W. Crouch and Dean E. McHenry, professors of political science in the University of California, Los Angeles; and

WHEREAS, This publication is a convenient and comprehensive reference book covering all phases of State, county, and municipal government, which considers separately and in relation to each other the State Constitution, the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Branches of the State Government and includes discussion of the operation of initiative, referendum, and recall as well as public finance, civil service, schools and libraries, public health and hospitals, conservation, employment agencies, law enforcement and prisons, and public works; and

WHEREAS, Ready access to copies of this publication will be of inestimable value to the Members of the Legislature; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be and is hereby instructed to purchase eighty (80) copies of the book entitled, "California Government, Politics and Administration," one (1) copy each to be delivered to each of the Members of the Assembly and one (1) copy to the Chief Clerk of the Assembly; and be it further

Resolved, That the Controller be and he is hereby authorized and directed to draw his warrant in favor of The University Press in a sum not to exceed two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) and the State Treasurer is hereby directed to pay the same.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Dunn asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 32, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beck, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fourn, Gaffney, Geddes, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, King, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—60.

NOES—None.

By Messrs. Weber, Doyle, McMillan, Beck, and Johnson:

House Resolution No. 33

Relating to a study of the rules and assistance in organization of the Assembly by the Assembly Legislative Process Committee

WHEREAS, The next regular session of the Legislature will convene within a few months; and

WHEREAS, There is need for study and consideration of needed revision of the Rules of the Assembly; and

WHEREAS, It is desirable that steps be taken prior to the convening of that session to provide for the organization of the Assembly and the assignment of members to committees; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Assembly Legislative Process Committee created by House Resolution No. 43, adopted January 22, 1945, is hereby directed to study and report to the Assembly such needed revision of the Rules and procedures of the Assembly as it may deem desirable; and be it further

Resolved, That the Assembly Legislative Process Committee is directed to take such action as may be appropriate to assist in the organization of the Assembly for the next regular session and the assignment of the Members of the Assembly to the several standing committees.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Weber asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 33, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

Hon. Gardiner Johnson Presiding

At 4.37 p.m., Hon. Gardiner Johnson, Member of the Assembly from the Eighteenth District, presiding.

By Mr. Fletcher :

House Resolution No. 34

Relative to commending Assemblyman Lorne D. Middough

WHEREAS, While a Member of the Assembly of the State of California, Lorne D. Middough, as representative of the Seventieth Assembly District, has taken an active and progressive interest in problems relating to juvenile delinquency, crime prevention and control, and the correction, supervision, custody and treatment of offenders, particularly juvenile offenders; and

WHEREAS, Considerable advancement in the laws of this State on the foregoing subjects may be attributed to the work of Assemblyman Middough in this behalf; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Middough has also vigorously sponsored needed amendments to the school laws of this State; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members of this Assembly commend Lorne D. Middough upon his conscientious service to the people of his district and to the State of California, and by this resolution express to him their appreciation of his extensive public services and the contribution he has made to the work of this Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Mr. Middough as the expression of the warm regard and esteem of his colleagues in the Assembly.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 34, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

By Mrs. Niehouse, and Messrs. Kraft and Field :

House Resolution No. 35

Relative to commending Assemblyman Charles W. Stream

WHEREAS, Our esteemed friend and colleague, Charles W. Stream, of the Eightieth Assembly District of California, has seen fit to retire from membership in this Assembly, a decision which we all regret; and

WHEREAS, During his service in this Assembly, we have had the pleasure of congratulating him upon the occasion of his fiftieth wedding anniversary, and upon his seventy-fifth birthday; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the Members of this Assembly now heartily congratulate and commend Assemblyman Charles W. Stream upon the many years of service to the people of his district and of the State of California, and thank him for his full participation in the work of this Assembly through his chairmanship of committees, and other service well performed; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit to Assemblyman Charles W. Stream a suitably prepared copy of this resolution, that he may have with him this tangible evidence of the esteem and warm good wishes of his colleagues in this Assembly as he enjoys a well earned rest and the somnolent ease of Chula Vista.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Kraft asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 35, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

Appointment of Select Committees

Acting Speaker Johnson announced the appointment of Messrs. Watson and Brady as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Middough to the rostrum.

Acting Speaker Johnson announced the appointment of Mrs. Niehouse and Mr. Kraft as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Stream to the rostrum.

By Mr. Stream, Mrs. Niehouse, and Mr. Waters :

House Resolution No. 36

Relative to commending Assemblyman Fred H. Kraft

WHEREAS, Fred H. Kraft, a Member of this Assembly representing the Seventy-eighth Assembly District of the State of California, has rendered outstanding public service to the people of his district and of this State ; and

WHEREAS, As Chairman of the Assembly Committee on Public Health, and in other important activities, Fred H. Kraft has worked diligently and effectively to further the work of this Assembly ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Fred H. Kraft be congratulated and commended upon his splendid public service, and the Members of this Assembly extend to him their hearty thanks for his participation in the work of this Assembly ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Assemblyman Fred H. Kraft, as a token of the esteem and good wishes which he takes with him from his colleagues in the Assembly of the State of California.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mrs. Niehouse asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 36, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

Appointment of Select Committee

Acting Speaker Johnson announced the appointment of Messrs. Mason and Butters as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Kraft to the rostrum.

By Mr. Debs :

House Resolution No. 37

Relative to commending Assemblyman Everett G. Burkhalter

WHEREAS, Our esteemed colleague, Everett G. Burkhalter, is concluding his service as a Member of this Assembly ; and

WHEREAS, During his terms of office, representing the Forty-second Assembly District of California, Everett G. Burkhalter has performed outstanding public service to the people of the State of California, through his work as Chairman of the Assembly Interim Committee on Charitable Institutions, and through other activities which contributed greatly to the successful work of this Assembly ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Assemblyman Everett G. Burkhalter is commended upon his splendid public service to the people of the State of California, and the Members of this Assembly extend to him their thanks for his full cooperation ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Assemblyman Everett G. Burkhalter as an expression of esteem from the Members of the Assembly of the State of California.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Debs asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 37, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

By Messrs. McCollister and Johnson :

House Resolution No. 38

Relative to commending Assemblyman Jacob M. Leonard

WHEREAS, Jacob M. Leonard is withdrawing from this Assembly upon completion of his fifth term of office here, representing the Thirty-fourth Assembly District of California ; and

WHEREAS, During his several terms of office, Jacob M. Leonard has given earnest, able, and effective service to the people of this State, and has participated fully in furthering the work of this Assembly ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Assemblyman Jacob M. Leonard be commended for the fine work he has done as a Member of this Assembly, and that the Members of this Assembly hereby extend to Jacob M. Leonard hearty good wishes upon his return to private life ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly present to Assemblyman Jacob M. Leonard a suitably prepared copy of this resolution as an expression of the esteem and regard of his colleagues in the Assembly of the State of California.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Maloney asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 38, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

Appointment of Select Committee

Acting Speaker Johnson announced the appointment of Messrs. Geddes and Stephenson as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Leonard to the rostrum.

By Messrs. Fourt, Maloney, Collins, Sam L. Lyon, and Johnson :

House Resolution No. 39

Relative to commending Assemblyman Frank J. Waters

WHEREAS, Assemblyman Frank J. Waters, representing the Fifty-eighth Assembly District, is withdrawing from membership in this body at the conclusion of this his fourth term of office ; and

WHEREAS, Frank J. Waters has consistently devoted himself to the work of this Assembly, successfully filling such important posts as Chairman of the Assembly Finance and Insurance Committee, and has given earnest, able, and effective service to the people of this State ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Assemblyman Frank J. Waters be commended upon the public service he has performed for the people of his district and of the State of California, and the Members of this Assembly extend to him their appreciation of his diligent and effective contribution to the work of this body ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit to Frank J. Waters a suitably prepared copy of this resolution as a token of the lasting esteem and good wishes of his colleagues in the Assembly of the State of California.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 39, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

Appointment of Select Committee

Acting Speaker Johnson announced the appointment of Messrs. Doyle and Bennett as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Waters to the rostrum.

By Mr. Price:

House Resolution No. 40

Relative to commending Assemblyman Douglas P. Armstrong

WHEREAS, Douglas P. Armstrong, representing the Seventy-third District, is concluding his second term as a Member of this Assembly; and

WHEREAS, During his service here Assemblyman Armstrong won the respect and friendship of the Members of this Assembly by his sincere purpose and earnest devotion to his duties, and the courteous and cooperative manner in which he entered into the work of this body; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Assemblyman Douglas P. Armstrong is hereby commended upon the splendid public service he has rendered the people of his district and of the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Assemblyman Armstrong as an expression of appreciation for his work in this body, and the cordial good wishes which his colleagues in the Assembly of the State of California extend to him as he retires from this Assembly to carry on the duties of Chairman of the Republican County Central Committee of San Bernardino County, and to private practice of law.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Price asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 40, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

Appointment of Select Committee

Acting Speaker Johnson announced the appointment of Messrs. Emley and Heisinger as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Armstrong to the rostrum.

By Mr. Crichton:

House Resolution No. 41

Relative to commending Assemblyman Harold F. Sawallisch

WHEREAS, Harold F. Sawallisch, representing the Tenth Assembly District of California, is concluding his fourth term as a Member of this Assembly; and

WHEREAS, Harold F. Sawallisch has been extremely active in the work of this Assembly as Chairman of the Public Morals Committee, and in other important services which he has faithfully and efficiently performed; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Assemblyman Harold F. Sawallisch be commended for the fine service he has given the people of the Tenth Assembly District, and there is extended to him the thanks of this Assembly for the splendid part he has taken in the work of this body; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Assemblyman Sawallisch as an expression of the warm regard and good wishes of the Members of the Assembly of the State of California.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Crichton asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 41, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

Appointment of Select Committee

Acting Speaker Johnson announced the appointment of Messrs. Clarke and Thorp as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Sawallisch to the rostrum.

By Messrs. Waters, Collins, Sam L., and Lyon :

House Resolution No. 42

Relative to commending Assemblyman Walter J. Fourt

WHEREAS, Assemblyman Walter J. Fourt, representing the Thirty-eighth Assembly District, has not sought reelection to his present office; and

WHEREAS, Although Walter J. Fourt has been a Member of this Assembly but two terms, he has from the beginning of his service here taken such an active and vital part in the work of this Assembly that we naturally think of him as having been a member for a much longer time; and

WHEREAS, Walter J. Fourt came to this Assembly well endowed with native ability and a long experience in public service which began when, as a veteran of World War I, he entered the practice of law at Ventura, California, where he became city attorney, and also served as Deputy District Attorney for Santa Barbara County; and

WHEREAS, During his membership in this Assembly he has successfully accomplished such tasks as guiding an extensive penal reform and reorganization program, including much of the work done for the Youth Correction Authority, and, as Chairman of the Revenue and Taxation Committee, and a member of the Interim Committee on State and Local Taxation, has had a large part in the vital issues of taxation during these war years, and has also been active in military and veterans affairs, taking a keen interest in the welfare of those who, like himself, have served in the armed forces of the United States; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Walter J. Fourt is commended for his statesmanlike conduct as a Member of this Assembly, and for the industry and ability which has enabled him to establish this outstanding record of service to the people of his district and of the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of this Assembly is requested to transmit a suitably prepared copy of this resolution to Assemblyman Walter J. Fourt as a token of the warm regard and esteem in which he is held by his colleagues in this Assembly.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Waters asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 42, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

Hon. Charles W. Stream Presiding

At 5.15 p.m., Hon. Charles W. Stream, Member of the Assembly from the Eightieth District, presiding.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

It was announced that the Committee on Judiciary would hold a meeting at 9 a.m., Thursday morning, July 25th.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Legislative Procedure

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 24, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 1—Relative to Howard Hughes;

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 3—Approving amendment to the charter of the City of Berkeley, a municipal corporation in the County of Alameda, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the thirtieth day of April, 1946;

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 7—Relative to welcoming the National Shrine Convention;

And reports that the same have been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Secretary of State on the twenty-fourth day of July, 1946, at 5 p.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

Speaker Pro Tempore Presiding

At 5.20 p.m., Hon. Thomas A. Maloney, Speaker pro tempore of the Assembly, presiding.

GUESTS EXTENDED PRIVILEGE OF ASSEMBLY FLOOR

On request of Mr. Allen, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Cody Coleman and Mrs. Peggy Coleman of Sacramento.

On request of Mr. Rosenthal, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Diana Rosenthal and daughter, Elizabeth Victoria Rosenthal, of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Debs, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Lorene Debs and son, David Marsh Debs, of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Beck, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Mrs. Helen Zezulak.

On request of Mr. Maloney, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Fred Helbing and Charles Christian of San Francisco.

On request of Mr. Haggerty and the San Francisco Delegation, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Daniel J. O'Neill of San Francisco.

On request of Mr. Gaffney and the San Francisco Delegation, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Cpl. Charles A. Kilsby of the Marine Corps.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.22 p.m., on motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, the Speaker pro tempore declared the Assembly adjourned until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 25, 1946.

CHARLES W. LYON, Speaker

GERALDINE B. HADSELL, Minute Clerk

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE
FIFTY-SIXTH (SECOND EXTRAORDINARY) SESSION

ASSEMBLY DAILY JOURNAL

FOURTH LEGISLATIVE DAY
FOURTH CALENDAR DAY

IN ASSEMBLY

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO
Thursday, July 25, 1946

The Assembly met at 10 a.m.

Hon. Thomas A. Maloney, Speaker pro-tempore of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

ROLL CALL

The roll was called, and the following answered to their names:

Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—73.

Quorum present.

PRAYER

The following prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. Torrance Phelps:

Eternal God:

As we face a future of many trying problems, may we find our hope in the presence in our midst of the powerful and world-transforming principles of our religion.

Let us perceive how they converted the barbarian in the Dark Ages, and instituted orderly society, with knowledge and culture wherever they were taught.

May we realize that we owe our progress and our democracy to the religious principle of respect for the soul and its inalienable rights.

Let us see that the humanitarian efforts to alleviate suffering, and to abolish poverty, and establish the kingdom of abundance have sprung from the spirit of the tender-hearted Man of Galilee.

May we see that the vision and possibilities of Universal Peace were born, when the angels sang of good will, above the Manger of Bethlehem.

Above all, may we have a part in private life when we return to our homes in promoting the organizations which proclaim and diffuse these beneficent principles and which offer us every earthly blessing and heavenly consolation.—AMEN.

READING OF THE JOURNAL DISPENSED WITH

On motion of Mr. Weber, further reading of the Journal of the previous legislative day, was dispensed with.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR THE DAY

The following members were granted leaves of absence for the day, because of illness:

Mr. Burns, on motion of Mr. Clarke.

Mr. Knight, on motion of Mr. Middough.

The following members were granted leaves of absence for the day, because of personal business elsewhere, and desired to waive their per diem:

Mr. Werdel, on motion of Mr. Doyle.

Mr. Boyd, on motion of Mr. Davis.

Mr. Beck, on motion of Mr. Lowrey.

Mr. Fourn, on motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins.

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE

Due to personal business, I was unable to attend the session on July 24, 1946. I desire to waive my per diem for that day.

ALLEN G. THURMAN

COMMUNICATIONS

By Speaker pro tempore Maloney:

A communication from C. C. Heacock of Hollywood, relative to OPA controls and the elimination of said controls, was received, and referred to Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy.

By the Chief Clerk:

The following communication was received, read, and ordered printed in the Journal:

PORTERVILLE, CALIFORNIA, July 22, 1946

*Arthur A. Ohnimus
Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. OHNIMUS: The Senate and Assembly Journals came, and I am so pleased to have them. They recall many happy weeks spent in Sacramento with dear friends—memories I shall always cherish.

With the Legislature now in special session, I am thinking a great deal about all you good people. Will you please convey to all our friends my very kindest wishes.

Thanking you again, I am
Sincerely,

MRS. LESS GUTHRIE

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**Committee on Legislative Procedure**

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 2—Approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of Glendale, State of California, voted for and ratified by the electors of such city at a special municipal election held therein on May 7, 1946;

And reports that the same has been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Secretary of State on the twenty-fifth day of July, 1946, at 8 a.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered:

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 43

Resolved, That Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, be and he is hereby authorized and empowered to receipt for any warrants that may be due members, officers, or other attaches of the Assembly, after the close of the session, or that may be drawn upon the Contingent Fund of the Assembly.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 43, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CHIEF CLERK RELATIVE TO ENGROSSED COPY OF HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 22

Mr. Allen moved that the Chief Clerk be instructed to order a suitably engrossed copy of House Resolution No. 22, adopted on July 23d, and send it to Charles V. Irwin.

Motion carried.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered:

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 44

Resolved, That Frank N. Killam, Chief of the Bureau of Buildings and Grounds, be and he is hereby directed to leave the Assembly Chamber and all of the committee rooms and other rooms used by the Assemblymen and officers of the Assembly in such condition that they will be available for use of the Assembly at any time; and it is further directed that no persons other than the members, officers and attaches of the Assembly be permitted to occupy or use the offices, committee rooms and other rooms now occupied by the Assembly without permission as hereinafter provided, and that the desks, furniture, and other equipment of the Assembly be at the disposal of the Chief Clerk of the Assembly pursuant to adjournment of this session until the Assembly shall reconvene, and that no person except Members of the Assembly be permitted to occupy any of the Assembly's offices or make use of Assembly equipment without permission of the Chief Clerk, approved by the Speaker or Chairman of the Committee on Rules; and be it further

Resolved, That any request for use of the Chamber or committee rooms shall be made to the Chief Clerk at least seven days prior to the requested date for the use of the Assembly Chamber or committee rooms.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 44, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 45

Resolved, That the Controller be and he is hereby authorized and directed to draw his warrants on the Contingent Fund of the Assembly in the sum of six hundred dollars (\$600), in favor of Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly, and the State Treasurer is hereby directed to pay the same, for postage, telephone service, telegraph service, supplies, traveling expenses, and other incidental expenses in connection with completing the work of the Second Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Legislature. Vouchers and receipts of all expenditures to be furnished to the Controller.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 45, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Dills,

Ralph C., Doyle, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, Pelletier, Robertson, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—53.

NOES—Denny—1.

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 46

WHEREAS, The Members of the Assembly will desire to have shipped to their various places of residence their bill files, stationery and other printed matter at the end of the Second Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Legislature; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sergeant-at-Arms, Wilkie Ogg, be authorized to procure such boxes, packing and other materials as are necessary for the purpose of shipping same, properly packed, to said members, and the State Controller is hereby authorized to draw his warrants on the Contingent Expense Fund of the Assembly in favor of said Wilkie Ogg, in the sum not to exceed three hundred fifty dollars (\$350) and the State Treasurer is hereby directed to pay the same; and be it further directed that Wilkie Ogg furnish to the Controller vouchers and receipts for all expenditures made by him.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 46, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Davis, Debs, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, Pelletier, Robertson, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—53.

NOES—Denny—1.

Hon. Fred Emlay Presiding

At 10.17 a.m., Hon. Fred Emlay, Member of the Assembly from the Thirty-third District, presiding.

By Mr. Sam L. Collins:

House Resolution No. 47

Resolved, That Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk of the Assembly, is hereby directed to take charge of arranging and preparing the bills, books and all other records of the Assembly, and filing the same with the Secretary of State, as provided by law, subsequent to adjournment of this Second Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Legislature, and shall have charge of correcting, comparing and proof-reading and otherwise preparing the Journal of the Assembly of this Second Extraordinary Session, such proof-reading, comparing and indexing of the Assembly Journals shall be performed by the State Printer under the direction of the Chief Clerk of the Assembly, making the information therein contained readily available for the use of the Members of the Legislature, State officers and the general public, as a permanent record of the business transacted during this Second Extraordinary Session. He shall also have charge of compiling, preparing and having printed after adjournment, a Final Calendar of the legislative business of the Second Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Legislature, said Calendar to comprise a history of all bills introduced and their authors, the numbers that shall have become law; those that have been refused passage; and any and all such information as will provide a complete history of the session's business and a guide for the information of subsequent sessions of the Legislature.

When the Final Calendar is prepared, said Arthur A. Ohnimus, Chief Clerk, is directed to forward one copy of the Final History to each public library in the State, which may apply for same, and one copy to each Member of the Assembly, and one copy of the complete unbound chapters to each Member of the Assembly; and be it further

Resolved, That the State Controller is hereby authorized and directed to pay weekly compensation in such amounts and to such persons as may be certified to him by the

Chief Clerk as being entitled to the same, and such sums shall be payable from the unexpended balance of the fund provided for the payment of officers and attaches of the Assembly.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 47, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Carey, Clarke, Collins, Sam L. Crichton, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Dickey, Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Fourt, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thurman, Waters, Weber, and Wollenberg—57.

NOES—Denny—1.

By Messrs. Call, Heisinger, and Erwin :

House Resolution No. 48

Relative to the establishment of an appropriate season for taking of wild ducks

WHEREAS, The determination of the proper season for the taking of wild ducks in this State depends upon numerous factors peculiar to the State of California, including :

(a) The existence of growing crops on lands upon which hunting of wild ducks takes place ;

(b) The probability of relatively warm weather until late in the year ;

(c) The matter of depredations by wild ducks of growing crops ; and

(d) The natural habits and migratory periods of wild ducks ; and

WHEREAS, It is understood that the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service in the Department of Interior of the United States proposes to establish the duck season in California at the period of October 15th to December 9th, inclusive ; and

WHEREAS, The climate and conditions in California are comparable with those generally prevailing in the southern States of the United States in which it is understood that the duck season is to be established as one month later ; and

WHEREAS, The establishment of the duck season at the period of November 15th to January 9th, inclusive, would provide for the taking of ducks when the growing crops have been harvested and when the weather is cool enough to prevent very much spoilage of the meat, and would be in conformity with the natural habits of such wildfowl ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the season for taking wild ducks in California should be established by the Fish and Wild Life Service in the Department of the Interior at the period of November 15th to January 9th, inclusive ; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States and to the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Heisinger asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 48, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

MOTION TO INFORM THE CHIEF OF THE BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS DIVISION RELATIVE TO ASSEMBLY CHAMBER FURNITURE

Mr. Debs moved that the Chief Clerk be instructed to talk with the Chief of the Building and Grounds Division and request that needed repair work on the chairs, desks, and other furniture in the Assembly Chamber be completed before the next Regular Session of the Legislature in January.

Mr. Sam L. Collins seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

**MOTION TO REQUEST THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMITTEE ON RULES TO CHECK ON ABOVE MATTER**

Mr. Weber moved that the Legislative Process Committee of the Committee on Rules be empowered to check on the above matter before January, 1947, for the purpose of assuring the desired result embodied in the motion by Mr. Debs.

Motion carried.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Legislative Procedure

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Bill No. 8—An act to amend Sections 2 and 8 of, and to add Section 3.5 to, an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to housing for veterans and providing for State aid to local agencies including colleges and universities, for establishing temporary and emergency veterans' housing, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately;

And reports that the same has been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Governor on the twenty-fifth day of July, 1946, at 10.30 a.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 4—Relative to approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of San Jose, a municipal corporation of the County of Santa Clara, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a general municipal election held therein on May 20, 1946;

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 5—Relative to the allowance of veterans' preference credits in State civil service examinations;

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 6—Approving certain amendments to the charter of the City of Long Beach, State of California, ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the ninth day of July, 1946;

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 8—Approving a certain amendment to the charter of the City of Oakland, a municipal corporation in the County of Alameda, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held therein on the fourth day of June, 1946;

And reports that the same have been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Secretary of State on the twenty-fifth day of July, 1946, at 10.30 a.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 9—Approving the charter of the City of Vallejo, State of California, ratified by the qualified electors of said city at a special municipal election held on the nineteenth day of February, 1946;

And reports that the same has been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Secretary of State on the twenty-fifth day of July, 1946, at 10.30 a.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

APPOINTMENT OF SELECT COMMITTEE

Acting Speaker Emlay announced the appointment of Messrs. Thomas and Fletcher as a Select Committee to escort Assemblyman Stream to the rostrum.

Acting Speaker Emlay requested the Assembly to be at ease for a few minutes for the purpose of hearing farewell remarks from the Hon. Charles W. Stream who, at the age of 75 years, has announced his retirement from membership in the Assembly of the California Legislature.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMMITTEE MEETING

It was announced that the Committee on Judiciary would meet immediately upon recess in Room 432 for the purpose of considering Senate Bill No. 3.

RECESS

At 10.33 a.m., on motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, the Assembly recessed until 1.15 p.m.

REASSEMBLED

At 1.15 p.m., the Assembly reconvened.

Hon. Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, presiding.

Chief Clerk Arthur A. Ohnimus at the desk.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day adopted:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2
Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4
Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6
Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 12

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

Above resolutions ordered enrolled.

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day passed:

Assembly Bill No. 14

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

Above bill ordered enrolled.

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate amended, and on this day adopted, as amended:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11

And respectfully requests your honorable body to concur in said amendments.

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

**CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS BY
UNANIMOUS CONSENT**

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11—Relative to the establishment of a 40-hour work week for public employees.

The question being: Shall the Assembly concur in the following amendment to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11?

Amendment No. 1

On page 1, line 5, of the printed resolution, strike out lines 5 to 8, inclusive.

The roll was called, and the Assembly concurred in Senate amendment to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11 by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—73.

NOES—None.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11 ordered enrolled.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered :

By Mr. Sam L. Collins :

House Resolution No. 49

Relating to the continuance of the Assembly Legislative Process Committee created by House Resolution No. 13 of the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Legislative Session

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, As follows :

1. In order to effectuate and complete the functions and duties imposed upon it and in order to enable it to coordinate and assist in the work of any Interim Committee which may be created or the powers of which may have been enlarged at this extraordinary session, the Assembly Legislative Process Committee created by House Resolution No. 13 of the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session, adopted July 22, 1946, is continued as an Assembly Interim Committee, and is authorized to act during this session of the Legislature, including any recess, and after final adjournment until the commencement of the next regular session, with authority to file its final report not later than the fifteenth legislative day of the next regular session.

2. The committee shall have the membership and all the rights, powers and duties possessed by the committee and its members pursuant to House Resolution No. 13, and, in addition thereto, the committee and its members shall have and exercise all of the rights, duties and powers conferred upon Investigating Committees and their members by the provisions of the Joint Rules of the Senate and Assembly and of the Standing Rules of the Assembly as they are adopted and amended from time to time, which provisions are incorporated herein and made applicable to this committee and its members. In the event that any of the provisions of House Resolution No. 13 are in conflict with the provisions of the Joint Rules, the provisions of the Joint Rules shall control over the provisions of House Resolution No. 13.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 49, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote :

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Haggerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—73.

NOES—None.

By Messrs. Thomas, Evans, and Burkhalter :

House Resolution No. 50

Relative to the investigation of the denial of taxicab franchises to veterans

WHEREAS, There have returned from many fronts men who have served in the armed forces with great courage and distinction and who now desire to engage in furnishing taxicab service in their several communities, thereby becoming gainfully employed and rendering a necessary service to the communities ; and

WHEREAS, These men have been denied franchises by many communities and the governing bodies of such communities have continuously vacillated in the solution of the problem ; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That the California Legislative Committee on Administrative Regulation created by House Resolution No. 278 of the Fifty-sixth Session of the Legislature, is hereby requested and directed immediately to include in its studies and investigations the regulation of taxicab services and the granting and denial of franchises therefor, including the need, if any, of State regulation thereof, and to make such recommendations in regard thereto as it may deem proper.

Resolution read.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Thomas asked for unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 50, at this time, without reference to committee.

Mr. Sam L. Collins withheld unanimous consent.

Motion to Suspend Rules

Mr. Evans moved that the Rules be temporarily suspended for the purpose of considering House Resolution No. 50, at this time.

The roll was called, and the motion carried by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Brady, Brown, Burkhalter, Clarke, Crichton, Crowley, Debs, Dills, Ralph C., Evans, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Kraft, Leonard, Lowrey, Maloney, Niehouse, Price, Sawallisch, Stephenson, Stream, Thomas, and Weber—23.

NOES—Butters, Collins, Sam L., McCollister, Middough, Miller, Sherwin, Waters, and Mr. Speaker—8.

The question being the adoption of House Resolution No. 50.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**Committee on Rules**

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Rules, to which was referred:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6

Has had the same under consideration, and reports the same back with amendments with the recommendation: Amend, be adopted, as amended.

SAM L. COLLINS, Chairman

Above reported resolution ordered on file for adoption.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6—Relative to adjournment sine die of the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session of the Legislature of the State of California.

Resolution read.

Consideration of Committee Amendments

The following amendment was proposed by the Committee on Rules:

Amendment No. 1

On page 1, line 7, of the resolution, strike out "5.00 p.m., July 24, 1946.", and insert "2 p.m., July 25, 1946."

Amendment read and adopted.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, as amended, at this time.

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6—Relative to adjournment sine die of the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session of the Legislature of the State of California.

Resolution read, as amended.

The roll was called, and the resolution adopted by the following vote:

AYES—Allen, Anderson, Armstrong, Beal, Bennett, Berry, Brady, Brown, Burke, Burkhalter, Butters, Call, Carey, Clarke, Collins, George D., Collins, Sam L., Crichton, Crowley, Davis, Debs, Dekker, Denny, Dickey, Dills, Clayton A., Dills, Ralph C., Doyle, Dunn, Emlay, Erwin, Evans, Field, Fletcher, Gaffney, Gannon, Geddes, Hagerty, Hawkins, Heisinger, Hollibaugh, Johnson, Kilpatrick, King, Kraft, Leonard,

Lowrey, Lyons, Maloney, Massion, McCollister, McMillan, Middough, Miller, Niehouse, O'Day, Pelletier, Price, Robertson, Rosenthal, Sawallisch, Sheridan, Sherwin, Stephenson, Stewart, Stream, Thomas, Thompson, Thorp, Thurman, Waters, Watson, Weber, Wollenberg, and Mr. Speaker—73.

NOES—None.

Resolution ordered transmitted to the Senate.

COMMITTEE FROM THE SENATE

Senators Carter, Dillinger, and Weybret appeared before the bar of the Assembly and announced that the Senate had concluded its business, and was ready to adjourn sine die.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolution was offered :

By Messrs. O'Day and Haggerty :

House Resolution No. 51

WHEREAS, In the last few months there have been reports of continued unrest at the Preston School of Industry at Ione, which have resulted in numerous escapes of inmates from the institution ; and

WHEREAS, There have been three mass escapes in as many nights this week ; and WHEREAS, The escapes of these inmates have terrorized the people in the immediate vicinity of the institution, and created a public demand for action to be taken by the proper authorities to curb further escapes ; and

WHEREAS, This Assembly created a Special Committee to Investigate Conditions at Preston during the first half of the Fifty-sixth Biennial Session of the Legislature because of information given to the Assembly at that time by Members of the Assembly ; and

WHEREAS, This Special Committee submitted a report recommending certain improvements at the institution for the benefit of the morale of the inmates and the public welfare, and was assured by the authorities that correctional measures would be taken at the school ; and

WHEREAS, It appears that present conditions are responsible for the numerous escapes of inmates, and that further remedial action is necessary to prevent further escapes and disorders at the school ; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Assembly of the State of California hereby directs its Interim Committee on Governmental Efficiency to appoint a subcommittee to make an immediate investigation of conditions at the Preston School of Industry at Ione with special emphasis on the underlying causes for the series of escapes from the institution ; and be it further

Resolved, That the findings of the committee be transmitted immediately to His Excellency, Earl Warren, Governor of California, and to the California Youth Authority, and to the Speaker of the Assembly for such appropriate action as may be deemed necessary ; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of the findings of the committee be given to the press by the chairman of the committee.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. O'Day asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 51, at this time, without reference to committee Resolution read.

Demand for Previous Question

Messrs. Kilpatrick, Johnson, Stream, Brady, and Stewart demanded the previous question.

Demand for previous question sustained.

The question being on the adoption of House Resolution No. 51.

Resolution adopted.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

SENATE CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: I am directed to inform your honorable body that the Senate on this day concurred in Assembly amendments to:

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6

J. A. BEEK, Secretary of the Senate
By C. V. TAYLOR, Assistant Secretary

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Judiciary

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Judiciary, to which was referred:

Senate Bill No. 3

Respectfully reports the same back without recommendation, and with the recommendation that the Assembly convene as a Committee of the Whole for a thorough and complete study of the bill.

CALL, Chairman

Above reported bill ordered to second reading.

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were offered:

By Mr. King:

House Resolution No. 52

Relative to adjournment in respect to the memory of W. T. Baldwin

The Members of the Assembly of the State of California learn with profound regret of the death on July 24, 1946, of W. T. Baldwin, former Mayor of the City of Oroville, and Butte County pioneer.

From the time of his graduation from the University of California, W. T. Baldwin was engaged continuously in such public service as teaching school, serving on boards of education, or filling the office of Justice of the Peace. He was elected tax collector of Butte County and served two terms. Later he became Chairman of the Oroville City Council and as Mayor of the city actively promoted many civic improvements. During his last term of office the city charter was written, and adopted by the voters.

W. T. Baldwin was a member of the Masonic Lodge 103, Free and Accepted Masons, and a member of the Sacramento Consistory and Ben Ali Temple, Order of the Mystic Shrine. Perhaps no better example of his love and understanding of his fellowmen can be found than in his work as a member of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. As a member of the Chico Lodge in early days he gladly endured a horse and buggy drive of three hours each way in order to attend the meetings. In 1924 he organized the Oroville Lodge, which honored him by taking as their lodge designation the number 1484, the street number of his home on Hammon Avenue in Oroville, California. In 1929 he was honored by appointment as one of five men selected from the entire Nation to serve the Elk's Lodge on its "Good of the Order Committee."

At the time of his death W. T. Baldwin had attained the age of 83 years. He is survived by his wife, four of his five children, six grandchildren, and four great grandchildren; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That by this resolution the Members of this Assembly express their profound regret upon learning of the death of W. T. Baldwin, and extend to his surviving family deep sympathy in their bereavement; and be it further

Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit to the widow of W. T. Baldwin, Mrs. Rosalie Hupp Baldwin, to his daughters, Mrs. Irene McAdams and Mrs. Rae Boyle, and to his sons, Donald and Herbert Baldwin, a suitable copy of this resolution as evidence of the recognition taken by this Assembly of the lifelong public service of W. T. Baldwin to the people of Oroville, of Butte County, and of the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That when this Assembly this day adjourns, it do so out of respect to the memory of W. T. Baldwin.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. King asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 52, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read, and adopted unanimously.

By Mr. Sam L. Collins :

House Resolution No. 53

Resolved, That each and every officer, attache and employee of the Assembly for the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session, is hereby stricken from the pay roll upon completion of work on Thursday, July 25, 1946.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Sam L. Collins asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 53, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

By Mr. Stream :

House Resolution No. 54

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a Committee of Five to wait upon His Excellency, the Governor of the State of California, and inform him that the Assembly has concluded its labors, is ready to adjourn, and awaits his further pleasure.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Stream asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 54, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

Appointment of Select Committee

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution No. 54, the Speaker announced the appointment of Messrs. Stream, Clarke, Doyle, Sherwin, and Bennett as such Select Committee.

By Mr. Maloney :

House Resolution No. 55

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a Committee of Five to wait upon the Senate and inform it that the Assembly has concluded its labors and ask if it has any further message to deliver to this body.

Request for Unanimous Consent

Mr. Maloney asked for, and was granted, unanimous consent to take up House Resolution No. 55, at this time, without reference to committee.

Resolution read and adopted.

Appointment of Select Committee

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution No. 55, the Speaker announced the appointment of Messrs. Maloney, Gaffney, Burkhalter, Emlay, and Middough as such Select Committee.

ANNOUNCEMENT

In commemoration of the founding of the first newspaper in California, August 15, 1846, a newspaper Centennial Exhibition and Exposition is being planned at the State Exposition Building in Los Angeles. Each Assemblyman is requested to help his own district show its own journalistic, economic, industrial and other development through the past century by helping his own district newspapers to participate in the show.

Notify your own newspapers to contact John Long of the C.N.P.A., Ross Marshall, Los Angeles Herald, or Louis Venator, State Exposition Building, Los Angeles 7.

REPORTS OF SELECT COMMITTEE

The Select Committee appointed to wait upon the Governor reported that it had performed its duties.

The Select Committee appointed to wait upon the Senate reported that it had performed its duties.

MOTION TO EXPRESS APPRECIATION TO C. WILLIAM QUEALE

Mr. Sam L. Collins moved that a sincere expression of appreciation be accorded C. William Queale for his unselfish and able service on the desk during this Second Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Regular Session, at personal sacrifice, and without compensation.

Motion carried unanimously.

MOTION TO EXPRESS APPRECIATION TO OFFICERS AND ATTACHES

Mr. Sam L. Collins moved that sincere expressions of appreciation be accorded all elected officers of the Assembly and appointed attaches for their unselfish service, at personal sacrifice, during this Second Extraordinary Session of the Fifty-sixth Regular Session.

Motion carried unanimously.

OPINIONS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL ORDERED PRINTED IN JOURNAL

In accordance with the request for unanimous consent granted to Mr. Johnson yesterday, Wednesday, July 24th, the following opinions from the Office of the Legislative Counsel were ordered printed in the Journal:

Opinions of Legislative Counsel

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA, July 24, 1946

Necessity for State Legislation if Federal Rent Control Law is Enacted, No. 7776

*Honorable Gardiner Johnson, Member of the Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: In answer to your question on this subject, it is our opinion, based upon the information we have received as to the provisions relating to rent control in the bill now pending before Congress, that no State legislation relating to control of rents or evictions will be necessary in California if the Congressional measure is passed, and signed by the President of the United States.

The Congressional bill will become effective immediately upon signature by the President, and contains a provision, which we are informed was not changed by the conference amendments, that it is operative as of June 30, 1946. The Federal law and regulations will therefore become applicable notwithstanding the fact that notices for increased rents or for eviction may have been served.

We are informed that the measure contains the following provision:

"While maximum rents are in effect under this act with respect to housing accommodations in any defense rental area, such housing accommodations shall not be subject to rent control by any State or local government."

Yours very truly,

FRED B. WOOD, Legislative Counsel
By LAWRENCE G. ALLYN, Deputy

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO 2, CALIFORNIA, July 24, 1946

Necessity for State Legislation if Federal Rent Control Law is Enacted, No. 7776

*Honorable Gardiner Johnson, Member of the Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Supplementing our letter of July 24, 1946, Section 18 of the proposed act reads in part:

"(2) All regulations, orders, price schedules, and requirements under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, which were in effect on June 30, 1946, shall be in effect in the same manner and to the same extent as if this act had been enacted on June 30, 1946 * * *."

Consequently, the regulation of the OPA requiring that a certificate be obtained by the landlord before beginning an eviction proceeding, except in the cases specified in the regulations in effect at that time, will be again effective. Even though such regulations might not be legally retroactive, they will again become operative upon the adoption of the act.

Sections 789 and 790 of the Civil Code provide for a 30 day notice and Section 790 reads:

"After such notice has been served, and the period specified by such notice has expired, but not before, the landlord may re-enter, or proceed according to law to recover possession.

Consequently, even if the regulations should be held not to be retroactive, they will not permit the bringing of the action after adoption of the Federal act without the required certificate, and as no action which was based upon a 30 day notice could have been begun prior to that date, all actions for eviction would again become subject to the control of the administrator.

Very truly yours,

FRED B. WOOD, Legislative Counsel
By JOSEPH L. KNOWLES, Deputy

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, to which were referred:

Assembly Bill No. 2
Assembly Bill No. 4

Assembly Bill No. 6
Assembly Bill No. 10

Respectfully reports the same back without further action.

FIELD, Chairman

Committee on Rules

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Rules, to which were referred:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 10
House Resolution No. 17
Assembly Joint Resolution No. 3

Respectfully reports the same back without further action.

SAM L. COLLINS, Chairman

Committee on Ways and Means

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred:

Assembly Bill No. 13

Respectfully reports the same back without further action.

WOLLENBERG, Chairman

Committee on Judiciary

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Judiciary, to which were referred:

Assembly Bill No. 1
Assembly Bill No. 5
Assembly Bill No. 7

Assembly Bill No. 9
Assembly Bill No. 11
Assembly Bill No. 12

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1

Respectfully reports the same back without further action.

CALL, Chairman

Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Governmental Efficiency and Economy, to which were referred:

Assembly Bill No. 3

Communications relative to rent control

Respectfully reports the same back.

FIELD, Chairman

Above communications ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

Committee on Judiciary

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Judiciary, to which were referred:

Communications relative to rent evictions
Communication relative to impeachment

Respectfully reports the same back.

CALL, Chairman

Above communications ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

Committee on Military Affairs

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred:

A communication and resolution from Langenbach Post 948, V. F. W., Marysville.
Respectfully reports the same back.

McCOLLISTER, Chairman

Above communication and resolution ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

Committee on Social Welfare

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Social Welfare, to which was referred:

A communication from Mrs. S. Van Heckeran relative to old age pensions.
Respectfully reports the same back.

NIEHOUSE, Chairman

Above communication ordered filed with the Secretary of State.

RESIGNATIONS ANNOUNCED

Mr. Johnson announced his resignation from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Stream announced his resignation as Chairman and member of the Committee on Conservation and Planning.

CHANGES OF MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Speaker Lyon announced the appointment of Mr. Weber to the Committee on Ways and Means, vice Mr. Johnson, resigned.

Speaker Lyon announced the appointment of Mr. Weber as member and Chairman of the Committee on Conservation and Planning, vice Mr. Stream, resigned.

OPINIONS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL ORDERED PRINTED IN JOURNAL BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

By unanimous consent, the following opinions of the Legislative Counsel were ordered printed in the Journal:

Opinions of Legislative Counsel

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO 2, CALIFORNIA, July 22, 1946

*Honorable Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. LYON: Pursuant to your request we have examined Assembly Bills Nos. 1 to 7, inclusive.

In our opinion each of these bills is within the scope of the Proclamation convening this extraordinary session.

Very truly yours,

FRED B. WOOD, Legislative Counsel
By C. H. LANGSTAFF, Chief Deputy

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL
SACRAMENTO 2, CALIFORNIA, July 22, 1946

*Honorable Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly
State Capitol, Sacramento, California*

DEAR MR. LYON: Pursuant to your request we have examined Assembly Bills Nos. 8 to 12, inclusive.

In our opinion each of these bills is within the scope of the Proclamation convening this extraordinary session, as amended and supplemented.

Very truly yours,

FRED B. WOOD, Legislative Counsel
By C. H. LANGSTAFF, Chief Deputy

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**Committee on Legislative Procedure**

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 12—Approving a certain amendment to the charter of the City of Redwood City, a municipal corporation in the County of San Mateo, State of California, voted for and ratified by the qualified electors of said city at the general municipal election held therein on the ninth day of April, 1946;

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2—Relative to urging the President of the United States to approve legislation relinquishing the claim of the United States to certain tide and submerged lands;

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 4—Relative to memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States in relation to the importation of almonds;

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5—Relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the inundation of State Highway 77 and 192 by the waters impounded by Prado Dam in Riverside County, California, and remedial legislation in connection with this and similar situations;

And reports that the same have been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Secretary of State on the twenty-fifth day of July, 1946, at 1.55 p.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Joint Resolution No. 6—Relative to fixed base air carriers;

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 11—Relative to the establishment of a 40-hour work week for public employees;

And reports that the same have been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Secretary of State on the twenty-fifth day of July, 1946, at 1.55 p.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, SACRAMENTO, July 25, 1946

MR. SPEAKER: Your Committee on Legislative Procedure has examined:

Assembly Bill No. 14—An act to add Section 4.5 to an act entitled "An act to provide for the acquisition of temporary and emergency housing facilities for veterans and families of servicemen by joint action of the State and local agencies, providing for the operation of such facilities, making an appropriation, and declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately," approved February 15, 1946, relating to temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and the use of public park and recreation property by local agencies as sites for such temporary and emergency housing for veterans, and validating such use of public park and recreation property by local agencies, declaring the urgency thereof, to take effect immediately;

And reports that the same has been correctly enrolled, and presented to the Governor on the twenty-fifth day of July, 1946, at 1.55 p.m.

PELLETIER, Chairman

MOTION TO APPROVE JOURNALS

Upon motion of Mr. Sam L. Collins, the Journals for Monday, July 22; Tuesday, July 23; Wednesday, July 24; and Thursday, July 25, were approved as corrected by the Minute Clerk.

GUESTS EXTENDED PRIVILEGE OF ASSEMBLY FLOOR

On request of Mr. Bennett, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Rev. J. J. Sheppard of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Kilpatrick, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Doris Ostrander of Los Angeles.

On request of Mr. Middough, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Richard E. Stengle of Sacramento.

On request of Mr. Brady and the San Francisco Delegation, the privilege of the floor of the Assembly Chamber for this day was unanimously extended to Ray Williamson of San Francisco.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

At 2 p.m., Thursday, July 25, 1946, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, the Honorable Charles W. Lyon, Speaker of the Assembly, announced that the time for final adjournment of the Fifty-sixth (Second Extraordinary) Session of the Legislature of the State of California had arrived, and therefore declared the Assembly adjourned sine die, out of respect to the memory of the late W. T. Baldwin.

CHARLES W. LYON, Speaker

GERALDINE B. HADSELL, Minute Clerk

RECAPITULATION

ASSEMBLY BILLS APPROVED BY THE GOVERNOR, CHAPTERED, AND FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The following bills were approved by the Governor, chaptered, and filed with the Secretary of State. Unless otherwise specified, all bills become effective 90 days after adjournment sine die of the Legislature, or on October 24, 1946.

| <i>Assembly Bill No.</i> | <i>Chapter No.</i> |
|--------------------------|--------------------|
| 8----- | 1 |
| 14----- | 2 |
| Total----- | 2 |

SENATE BILLS REMAINING ON ASSEMBLY FILE WITHOUT FURTHER ACTION

| |
|--------------|
| 3 |
| Total----- 1 |

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS CHAPTERED, AND FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE

| <i>Assembly Concurrent Resolution No.</i> | <i>Resolution Chapter No.</i> | <i>Assembly Concurrent Resolution No.</i> | <i>Resolution Chapter No.</i> |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1----- | 1 | 7----- | 3 |
| 2----- | 4 | 8----- | 9 |
| 3----- | 2 | 9----- | 7 |
| 4----- | 5 | 11----- | 19 |
| 5----- | 8 | 12----- | 20 |
| 6----- | 6 | | |
| Total----- | 11 | | |

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTIONS CHAPTERED, AND FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE

| <i>Assembly Joint Resolution No.</i> | <i>Resolution Chapter No.</i> | <i>Assembly Joint Resolution No.</i> | <i>Resolution Chapter No.</i> |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 2----- | 15 | 5----- | 17 |
| 4----- | 16 | 6----- | 18 |
| Total----- | 4 | | |