

Vote NO on No. 1

Election April 11, 1933

**Arguments Against
Amendment No. 1**

Read and Meditate

VOTE NO ON NO. 1

Unemployed citizens, do you want the city's unemployed relief fund cut down?

Charter Amendment No. 1 will cut off \$1,500,000 now being contributed by city employees to that fund and it makes absolutely no provision in its stead for the 60,000 persons now on relief. This amendment also rejects an offer by city employees to contribute \$2,400,000 for unemployed relief during the coming year. **Vote No on No. 1.**

Merchants and storekeepers, do you want the purchasing power of your customers reduced?

Charter Amendment No. 1 takes at least \$2,500,000 out of trade now going into your retail and neighborhood stores and gives it to the big bankers, the big corporations, and the big estates whose absentee owners live outside of San Francisco and who will spend this sum elsewhere. **Vote No on No. 1.**

Workingmen and women, do you want your wages still further reduced?

Charter Amendment No. 1 cuts wages as much as 20% and threatens a further cut of 25% next year. This will be an example and encouragement to your employer to further cut your wages and reduce employment still more. **Vote No on No. 1.**

The opposition of city employees to this wage cut is not merely selfish obstinacy. When no funds were available for unemployment relief, the city employees voluntarily came forward with an annual contribution of \$1,500,000. This year they offered to tax themselves \$2,400,000 for unemployed relief, but that offer was rejected for this amendment which does nothing for the unemployed. This amendment purports to save the taxpayers \$2,750,000 but actually the wealthiest 10% of the taxpayers, who need aid the least, get 90% of the benefit. The hard pressed 90% of the tax payers, the small home owners, get only 10% of the benefit. And the destitute unemployed are stripped of all relief. In other words this amendment helps a very few very rich people at the expense of the great number of very poor and utterly destitute. **Vote No!**

There is a broader objection to this amendment. San Francisco has been one of the best cities in the nation during this depression because it has resisted wage-cuts better than elsewhere. The bigger proportionate payroll has kept business going better here than in most other cities. **That condition ought not to be reversed.**

The whole policy of cutting wages is wrong. It aggravates the present crisis instead of helping matters. It reduces the purchasing power of the people. They buy less in the stores. The merchant, making less profit, cuts wages, lays off help, and buys less goods from the manufacturer. The manufacturer, in turn, cuts wages, lays off help, and buys less raw material and so the whole industrial world goes around in a vicious circle sucking down a constantly increasing

number of people into the whirlpool of poverty and destitution. Naturally real estate values and rentals are also destroyed in this mad process. It must be stopped! **Vote No on No. 1.**

It is important, of course, to balance the city budget. That cannot be done, however, if wages and prices and property values are all to be sent spiralling down in a continuous tailspin. Every reputable economist agrees with the Commission on Social Trends appointed by President Hoover that our machine industry is easily able to produce an abundance for all, that the real problem is to so distribute the income from industry, that the mass of workers can enjoy their share of that abundance. In short the industrial budget must be balanced, the buying power of the workers must be increased to equal their productive power. This policy involves raising wages and reducing the hours of labor until the actual cash demand for goods in the market requires everyone to be employed in their manufacture and distribution. That would end the terrible condition of idle men standing hungry and ragged before idle factories and warehouses filled with food and clothing. Business and employment would be evenly prosperous and reasonable taxes would bother no one. This charter amendment opposes this policy. **Vote No on No. 1.**

Finally, this amendment is untimely. The history of all depressions shows that they do not last more than from three to four years. When the bottom is reached there follows a sharp upswing in business activity and prices. This depression has already lasted three and one-half years. The upturn is due. The controlled increase of the currency already begun by President Roosevelt and the other measures of economic rehabilitation he proposes, mean increasing prices, restored confidence, resumption of business and returning prosperity. This charter amendment proposes the opposite policy of cutting wages, reducing the standard of living, and adding misery to misery until all are sunk in the morass. No one can get out of the quicksands of poverty by pulling others in. But those on the sound bank of decent living conditions can pull others out of the quicksands of poverty. The city employees are helping keep the heads of the unemployed above the engulfing sands. This amendment would plunge them all beneath the surface. **Vote No!**

Vote No because this charter amendment No. 1 takes \$2,400,000 away from unemployed relief and gives it to the wealthiest 10% of the tax payers who do not need relief.

Vote No on No. 1 because it takes most of this money out of the channels of trade in San Francisco and gives it to those who will spend it elsewhere.

Vote No on No. 1 because it blocks the policy of increasing the purchasing power of the workers which is the only way prosperity can be restored.

FOOD BARGAIN STORES

By R. W. Hankins, President

580 Market Street

San Francisco, Calif.

1733

VOTE

YES CHARTER I

AMENDMENT NUMBER

SALARY DEDUCTIONS

This amendment is submitted by the Board of Supervisors upon the suggestion of Mayor Angelo J. Rossi, to the end that during the existing economic emergency the burden of the taxpayers may be lightened.

Briefly, the amendment provides that during the present, or any other emergency, the Board of Supervisors by a three-fourths vote, and with the approval of the Mayor, may make deductions from the salaries of all officers and employees of the city whose compensation exceeds One Hundred Dollars per month. The deductions range from three per cent on compensations from One Hundred and One Dollars to One Hundred and Twenty-five Dollars, to twenty per cent on the compensations of those in the higher branches. It is estimated that these deductions will effect a saving in the 1933-34 budget of approximately \$2,700,000. The amendment also provides that salaries may be further reduced by unanimous consent of the Board with the approval of the Mayor in an amount not to exceed twenty-five per cent of the present amounts, should the emergency warrant, on and after July 1st, 1934.

It is believed that the amendment is fair to the taxpayer and fair to the employees of the city. It affects all officers and employees irrespective as to whether they are elected or appointed.

The amendment does not affect mandatory allowances to Parks, Libraries, Schools and Playgrounds, except in so far as the deductions in salaries may be reflected in the present Charter allowances to these departments.

The amendment has received the endorsement and approval of the following organizations:

Civic League of Improvement Clubs and Associations
Building Owners' & Managers' Association
San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
Conference of Taxpayers' and Civic Organizations for Consideration of Proposed Retrenchment Charter Amendments
Property Owners' Division, Real Estate Board
San Francisco Real Estate Board
Junior Chamber of Commerce

New Charter Citizens' Committee
Taxpayers' Retrenchment League
Per Diem Men's Association
Executive Committee, City and County of San Francisco Officials and Employees Relief Fund for the Unemployed.
Carmen's Union (Division 518)
Park Employees Association
San Francisco Section, Northern California Hotel Association
San Francisco Police Department
San Francisco Fire Department
Southern Civic Clubs

Vote "YES" -- Amendment 1 -- April 11th

Respectfully,
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS.

Authorized March 13, 1933.

J. S. DUNNIGAN, Clerk

