

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 1

LEGISLATIVE ANNULMENT OF REGULATIONS Constitutional Amendment

(Committee Substitute for House Joint Resolution No. 82 Amended)

SUMMARY

(As it will appear on the November 4, 1980 General Election Ballot)

This proposal would permit the legislature to annul, by adopting a resolution, regulations adopted by state agencies. Annulment of regulations by resolution was authorized by the First State Legislature in 1959; however, in 1980 the Alaska Supreme Court held that the constitution permits the legislature to annul a regulation only by passing a bill, which requires three readings of the bill and a roll call vote which is recorded. The procedures for adopting resolutions are governed by legislative rules and require only the approval of the resolution by voice vote of a majority of both houses. A bill passed by the legislature annulling a regulation could be vetoed by the governor or repealed by referendum. A resolution annulling a regulation could not.

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR
AGAINST

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>18</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>2</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>36</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

(As required by law)

This proposal would add a new section, section 22, to Article II of the state constitution. If adopted, the proposal would authorize the legislature to annul or set aside a regulation which has been adopted by a state department or agency. In order to annul a regulation, the legislature could adopt a concurrent resolution by approval of the resolution by majority vote of the membership of each house of the legislature. The resolution specifies the date on which the annulment of a regulation would take effect.

FULL TEXT OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

SECTION 22. ANNULMENT OF REGULATIONS. The legislature by a concurrent resolution approved by a majority vote of the membership of each house may annul a regulation adopted by a state department or agency. The annulment of the regulation is effective on the date the concurrent resolution is approved by both houses unless the concurrent resolution specifies a different date.

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 1

The legislature, when it writes a law, cannot foresee all of the possible details involved in carrying it out. The appropriate administrative agency is therefore allowed to write regulations which spell out who does what, when, where, and how. If the agency does no more than this no problem is created.

Unfortunately agency regulations are not always consistent with the intent the legislature had in passing the law. Sometimes an agency will get carried away and put out regulations that cause an unnecessary burden for the citizens. The First State Legislature realized this and provided a simple solution. The legislature could, by a concurrent resolution passed by a majority of each house, annul an administrative regulation. Such a resolution is not subject to the governor's veto.

The Alaska Supreme Court recently held, in a 3-2 decision, that the legislature must use a bill rather than a resolution to annul administrative regulations. But a bill is subject to

the governor's veto. The governor can hardly be expected to approve a bill overruling his subordinates, who put out the regulation in the first place. The present governor has already vetoed one such bill.

The court ruling gives agency regulations equal standing with laws, *even though no single person elected by the voters has approved them.*

Our government is wisely based on dividing power among the three branches: legislative, executive and judicial. The current situation gives entirely too much power to the executive branch. Your approval of this constitutional amendment will restore the better balance under which the state operated from 1961 to 1980.

— **Charles H. Parr**
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee
Alaska State Legislature

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 1

This is still another proposal by the legislature to free itself from the checks and balances of our constitution. Under the constitution, the legislature has all the power it needs to make laws and annul administrative regulations. This proposal does not aid the public in any way. What it does is allow the legislature to exercise its power to annul regulations in disregard of the constitutional requirements that each bill have a single subject, that each bill have three readings in each house, and that there be a recorded vote of the ayes and nays on final passage. It would also free the legislature from the executive veto and it would allow it to ignore the prohibition against special and local legislation.

The Alaska Supreme Court has recently ruled that the legislature must abide by the constitution's checks and balances on its power whenever it exercises that power, including when it acts to annul regulations. This amendment is intended to overrule the court's decision and erode the constitution's safeguards. It aids legislators, not the public, and it should be rejected.

— **Katherine D. Nordale**
Delegate to the Alaska
Constitutional Convention,
1955-1956

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 2

DISQUALIFICATION OF LEGISLATORS Constitutional Amendment

(Second House Committee Substitute for Senate Joint Resolution No. 2)

SUMMARY

(As it will appear on the November 4, 1980 General Election Ballot)

This is a proposal to eliminate the prohibition which exists during his term of office and for one year thereafter against a legislator's taking a state office or position of profit, during his term of office and for one year thereafter, the salary or emoluments of which were increased while he was a member. It retains the prohibition against taking an office which was created while he was a member.

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR
AGAINST

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>18</u>	Nays <u>1</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>1</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>27</u>	Nays <u>8</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>5</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

(As required by law)

This proposal would amend Article II, section 5 of the state constitution, relating to the disqualification of legislators from holding another office or position of profit. The proposal redefines the present disqualification on nomination, election or appointment of a legislator to an office or position of profit which has been created during the legislator's term of office. If the proposal is approved, a legislator would be barred only from holding a state office or position of profit which was created during the legislator's term of office during the term for which the legislator serves and for one year after the end of that term. The proposal deletes present language which bars a legislator from holding an office or position of profit if the salary or benefits of that office were increased while he was a member of the legislature, and removes extraneous language relating to a legislator standing as a candidate for statewide elective office or for a position in the United States Congress.

FULL TEXT OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(Underlining indicates material to be added. Brackets indicate material to be deleted.)

SECTION 5. **DISQUALIFICATIONS.** No legislator may hold any other office or position of profit under the United States or the State. During the term for which elected and for one year thereafter, no legislator may be nominated, elected, or appointed to any other State office or position of profit which has been created [OR THE SALARY OR EMOLUMENTS OF WHICH HAVE BEEN INCREASED,] while he was a member. [THIS SECTION SHALL NOT PREVENT ANY PERSON FROM SEEKING OR HOLDING THE OFFICE OF GOVERNOR, SECRETARY OF STATE, OR MEMBER OF CONGRESS.] This section shall not apply to employment by or election to a constitutional convention.

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 2

This proposal would eliminate the discrimination against legislators that presently prohibits them from working for the State for three and five years respectively from the date of their legislative membership. In these days of cost-of-living adjustment and collective-bargaining contracts a legislator has nothing to do with setting or even proposing the individual salaries of state employees. Even if he did and was vehemently opposed to a salary increase, lobbying his colleagues

and always voting against a pay raise, he would still be disallowed taking even a menial or temporary job with the State for a prohibitive number of years if the salary was increased against his opposition.

— **Bill Ray**, Senator
Alaska State Legislature

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 2

Presently, it is unconstitutional for a legislator to accept a position with state government while he is serving in the legislature and for one year afterward, if the legislature has increased the pay for that position during his term of office.

Ballot Proposition No. 2 proposes to amend the constitution to delete this prohibition.

That means that a legislator could be the key vote on a bill to increase the salary of a state position, cause the increase, resign his seat the next day and accept the position for which the pay has been increased.

The arguments in favor of the resolution apparently result from actual experience. On at least two occasions, governors have appointed former legislators to positions in a manner thought to be in violation of the current language of this section. In one case the Supreme Court specifically found that such an appointment was improper.

It is said that governors are frequently persons who have either served in the legislature or worked closely with the legislature; that the people with whom they have a relationship of trust are in the legislature; and that therefore those persons should be available to be appointed to high government positions. It is also argued that legislators develop extensive expertise, depending upon their committee assignments, and that they therefore would be excellent candidates for certain government positions relating to the same subject matter.

While much of this may be true, it is still not good public

policy to amend the state constitution as proposed in Ballot Proposition No. 2.

Significant examples of the use and abuse of power can be found in any year of the Alaska legislature going back to the first Territorial legislature in 1913. Based on that experience, it is *not* inconceivable that a key legislator could do exactly that which (many believe) the drafters of the constitution wished to prohibit: that is, be the "swing vote" on major legislation relating to the pay of state employees and officials, or be the "swing vote" on another bill that has been tied to such a pay bill by political agreement, and then immediately fill the position for which the pay has been increased.

This is the kind of government and politics that Alaskans don't want. It may well be that the resolution should not be passed for *other* reasons. The constitution drafters were very careful in 1955 to strike a balance between the executive branch and the legislative branch. Perhaps a governor should be required to look beyond the friends and allies he has among legislators to other communities in the state: business, labor, the professions. It may well be that the drafters of the constitution wished state officials to have a broader viewpoint than that which results from serving in the legislature.

This amendment really only is meant to remove a relatively minor inconvenience, yet it invites serious abuse.

It should be defeated.

— **Fred Brown**, Representative
Alaska State Legislature

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 3

INTERIM AND SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES Constitutional Amendment

(Senate Committee Substitute for House Joint Resolution No. 80)

SUMMARY

(As it will appear on the November 4, 1980 General Election Ballot)

This proposal would amend the state constitution to permit the legislature to adopt procedures for establishing interim and special committees by legislative rule, which, unlike a bill, may be adopted without three readings or a roll call vote and is not subject to veto by the governor or repeal by referendum. This proposal would also allow interim and special committees to meet during legislative sessions and would allow the legislature to vest such a committee with the power to share with the governor the authority to approve or disapprove budget revisions, including authorizations for receiving and spending federal or other non-state funds.

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR
AGAINST

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>15</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>3</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>32</u>	Nays <u>3</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>5</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

(As required by law)

This proposal, if adopted, would amend Article II, section 11 of the state constitution, relating to interim committees of the state legislature. The proposal authorizes the legislature to establish special committees, and directs that the establishment of interim and special committees of the legislature shall be as provided by the joint rules of the legislature. The proposal also authorizes the legislature to establish an interim committee to approve state budget revisions jointly with the governor, including revisions authorizing receipt and expenditure of federal and other program receipts, as defined by law. Finally, the proposal authorizes legislative interim and special committees to meet during legislative sessions, as well as between sessions.

FULL TEXT OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

(Underlining indicates material to be added.)

SECTION 11. INTERIM COMMITTEES. There shall be a legislative council, and the legislature may establish other interim or special committees, as provided in the joint rules of the legislature. The legislature may establish an interim committee to approve jointly with the governor, as provided by law, state budget revisions, including revisions authorizing the receipt and expenditure of federal and other program receipts as defined by law. The council and other interim or special committees may meet during and between legislative sessions. They may perform duties and employ personnel as provided by the legislature. Their members may receive an allowance for expenses while performing their duties.

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 3

The Alaska Constitution vests the "legislative power of the State" in the legislature, and Sections 13-16 of Article II spell out the major legislative powers: the authority to enact bills into law, and to reconsider and enact bills overriding the governor's veto. Of the 150 to 250 bills enacted into law annually, some 40 to 60 are appropriation bills, including perhaps the most important — the General Appropriation or Budget Bill.

All appropriation bills when passed by the legislature contain the following elements:

- (1) amounts appropriated
- (2) fund sources from which the amounts are appropriated
- (3) departments or agencies to which appropriated
- (4) purposes for which appropriations are made

Since the four elements are stated for each appropriation within an Act, it is not possible to change any of the elements during the course of the budget year without in effect "amending" the appropriation as passed by the legislature.

How, then, can provision be made for necessary changes or revisions to the State budget during the course of the budget year? One way would be to call the legislature into periodic special sessions or have it meet year-round so that the legislature would always be available to pass laws accomplishing the various revisions to the State budget. Another

way would be to follow the pattern set by some twelve other states — establish an interim committee of the legislature to approve, jointly with the governor, state budget revisions.

Alaska has, in fact, been operating under the governor/legislative committee approach for approval of budget revisions since 1971. The problem is that the Alaska Constitution, though providing for interim committees of the legislature, is silent on the question: Can the legislature delegate responsibility to one of its committees to jointly approve with the governor revisions to the budget? The proposed constitutional amendment if approved would clearly authorize continued use of the existing budget revision system.

The amendment would also clearly state the legislature's right to establish "special" as well as interim committees, and to have the special or interim committees meet during as well as between legislative sessions. In actual practice, the legislature has been managing its affairs in this manner for several years.

Approval of this amendment is recommended by your legislative committee who urge you to VOTE FOR the proposition.

— **Jim Duncan**, State Representative
Chairman, Legislative Budget and
Audit Committee

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 3

If there is need to change a major section of the Constitution of the State of Alaska, it should be done through the established procedures of initiatives, referendums, legislative bills or a Constitutional Convention called by the people with the delegates selected by the people. The question "Shall there be a Constitutional Convention" will be on the ballot November of 1982. Proposition No. 3 is of such major importance that it should wait until then and be discussed in an open atmosphere so the "people" can have full knowledge of the pros and cons before voting on the issue.

Proposition No. 3 would establish a super-power council of legislators and greatly diminish the effectiveness of the full body of legislators who conduct business in session for the betterment of the whole State and its people. Proposition No. 3 would divide elected officials into a group who could work full time as legislators and a group who must work in private life to support families. The average citizen would be virtually prohibited from becoming a citizen-legislator unless he or she was willing to give up regular employment and family life for most of the year. The citizens of the State would be treated unequally according to which legislator could work as a legislator full time or part time.

These proposed Constitutional changes as contained in Proposition No. 3 would circumvent the scrutiny of legitimately introduced bills, and diminish the open hearings conducted through the standing committees. The changes would also do away with open debate on the House or Senate floor,

have rules (not laws) adopted without reading into official records, delete roll call votes on any action taken, and take away the Constitutionally-established principle of separation of powers by deleting veto power of the Executive Office and the public's right of repeal by referendum.

Proposition No. 3 would increase state employees and give full-time employment to individuals currently employed as temporary hires. There would be virtually no control over the number of interim and special committees to study and evaluate anything and everything any legislator may dream of and would increase vested interest groups.

If Proposition No. 3 is approved, a small group would take the power away from the full body of legislators in establishing budget revisions, increasing or decreasing as that group desires with little or no public knowledge. It would do away with the established procedures to approve or disapprove supplemental appropriations and allow single legislators to grant monies to individuals or groups — a practice that is currently going on in an unethical manner, if not illegally.

Proposition No. 3 greatly expands the constitutional limits of interim and special committees. If you believe in democracy and not rule by a small group of power-hungry individuals, I urge you not to approve this question.

— **Terry Martin**, Representative
Alaska State Legislature

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 4

APPOINTMENT AND CONFIRMATION OF MEMBERS OF BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS Constitutional Amendment

(Committee Substitute for House Joint Resolution No. 20 Amended)

SUMMARY

(As it will appear on the November 4, 1980 General Election Ballot)

This proposal would expand the legislature's power over the appointment and confirmation of members of state boards and commissions by giving it the power to provide for the appointments to be made other than by the governor and the power to require confirmation of members of all boards or commissions in addition to those which are at the head of principal departments or regulatory or quasi-judicial agencies.

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" adopts the amendment.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the amendment.

FOR
AGAINST

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>17</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>3</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>40</u>	Nays <u>0</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

(As required by law)

This proposal, if adopted, would amend Article III, section 26 of the state constitution. The proposal provides that the governor would have authority to appoint members of all state boards and commissions. Where no provision is made for confirmation of officials by Article III of the state constitution, the legislature would, by law, determine which state board and commission members would be subject to legislative confirmation. The proposal specifies that confirmation of a member of a board or commission by the legislature requires approval by a majority of the members of the legislature acting in joint legislative session. The proposal also provides for removal of a member of a board or commission as provided by law.

FULL TEXT OF PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

SECTION 26. CONFIRMATION AND TERM OF OFFICE. Unless otherwise provided by law, the governor shall appoint the members of all state boards and commissions, and the members may be removed as provided by law. Unless confirmation is otherwise provided for in this article, the legislature shall determine which state board and commission members are subject to confirmation by the legislature. Confirmation of board and commission members subject to confirmation under this section shall be by a majority of the members of the legislature in joint session.

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 4

Hundreds of boards and commissions regulate and control Alaskans' lives and activities. These board and commission members are appointed by the Governor and do not stand for election. In 1955, our constitutional drafters did not envision the hundreds of state boards and commissions we now have in Alaska. We need confirmation powers in the Legislature to provide public input and representation into the appointment process.

This proposal would expand the Legislature's confirmation powers to conform generally to the United States constitu-

tional provision on confirmations. For those officials whose confirmation is not specifically provided for in Article III of the State Constitution, the Legislature could, by law, provide for legislative confirmation. This would provide the Legislature the flexibility to provide for confirmation review or disapproval of the Governor's appointments to various boards and commissions.

— **Terry Gardiner**
Speaker of the House
Alaska State Legislature

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 4

This amendment would radically depart from the separation of powers by revising the state constitution to expand the legislature's powers over the appointment of members of boards and commissions, powers the Alaska Supreme Court has said the legislature does not now have.

Under the constitution, the legislature has the power to confirm the governor's appointments to boards and commissions which are at the heads of principal departments (the Board of Education) or of regulatory or quasi-judicial agencies (the Public Utility Commission and the Human Rights Commission). It does not allow the legislature to vest the power of appointment in itself or in others, and it does not allow the legislature to make appointments to commissions which

are neither regulatory nor quasi-judicial subject to its confirmation. The proposed amendment does.

The separation of powers between the three branches of government protects us all from the tyranny of each. So long as no branch has the power both to make law and to carry it out (or appoint those who carry it out), the people will remain more powerful than those who govern. Legislators, bureaucrats, and judges should be kept within their prescribed functions. Let's keep them there, and vote against this amendment.

— **Thomas W. Findley**
Attorney-at-Law

**STUDY THE
BALLOT PROPOSITIONS
CAREFULLY**

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 5

ALASKA GENERAL STOCK OWNERSHIP CORPORATION (AGSOC)

Initiative No. 79-02

SUMMARY

(As it will appear on the November 4, 1980 General Election Ballot)

This measure establishes a general stock ownership corporation (AGSOC) in Alaska. It will be a private corporation owned by Alaskans. Shares will be distributed without charge to Alaska residents who wish to become stockholders. The corporation will not be subject to income tax and this is expected to enhance its financial success. Shareholders will be subject to taxes on their share of the corporation's taxable income, whether or not it is distributed to them, and may not deduct corporate losses, if any. The corporation will borrow money for investment and repay loans from income.

BALLOT FORM:

A vote "FOR" approves the initiative.

A vote "AGAINST" rejects the initiative.

FOR
AGAINST

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

(As required by law)

This initiative, if approved, would authorize the formation of general stock ownership corporations. The law proposed by this initiative would set out requirements for the incorporation of a general stock ownership corporation, and requirements for voting, holding meetings, establishing quorums, amending the articles of incorporation, and for voluntary and involuntary dissolution of a general stock ownership corporation. A general stock ownership corporation would be allowed to issue only one class of stock. It would be required to issue at least one share to each person who is a resident of the state on the effective date of the chartering legislation and who continues to be a resident until the date of issuance of the shares, unless a person elects not to receive the share or shares. No share of stock in a general stock ownership corporation could be transferred to a person who is not a resident on the date of transfer or to a person who would own more than 10 shares of stock after the transfer. Limits would be placed upon the ability of the shareholder to encumber his shares of stock.

A general stock ownership corporation would be required to submit copies of the articles of incorporation and bylaws to the legislature, which could then disapprove any provision of the articles of incorporation or bylaws by concurrent resolution. If disapproved by the legislature, a provision would be suspended and would be of no effect unless approved by a majority of the shares voting on the issue at the next meeting of the shareholders. A corporation would not be permitted to make political contributions, endorse candidates or ballot issues or spend money lobbying the legislature. A general stock ownership corporation would be required to notify the public of its intention to issue stock, and each eligible person would register to receive his share or shares. By applicable federal tax provisions, a corporation would be required to distribute at least 90 percent of its taxable income annually to its shareholders; if it did not, it would be subject to an additional federal tax.

Annual meetings of the shareholders would be held and special meetings could be called. The corporation would be required to notify shareholders of meetings and each share of stock as of the record date, not more than 90 days or less than 60 days before a meeting, could be voted. One-third of the shares entitled to vote, represented in person or by mailed ballot, would constitute a quorum, but a shareholder could not vote by proxy. The business of the corporation would be managed by the Board of Directors. Directors would be elected by shareholders and could be removed from office by the shareholders. Shareholders would have the right to examine the records of the corporation, amend the bylaws and articles of incorporation, nominate a candidate for director, and place issues on the ballot. The sale or mortgage of assets other than in the regular course of business would require the approval of the holders of at least two-thirds of the shares voting. When a sale or exchange of substantially all of the assets of the corporation is completed, a dissenting shareholder could demand payment of the fair value of his shares as of the day before the date on which the vote was taken.

This initiative also would create the Alaska General Stock Ownership Corporation (AGSOC) which would be formed in accordance with provisions dealing with general stock ownership corporations. Incorporators of AGSOC would be appointed by the Governor, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate. The incorporators would select nine persons to act as the initial board of directors and submit their names to the Governor, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the President of the Senate for approval. All shareholders of AGSOC would be residents of the state and, if a shareholder should cease to be a resident or if his shares should pass by operation of law to a nonresident within five years of the date of issuance, the corporation would purchase the shares at book value. A special fund of the state would be established not to exceed \$5,000,000 subject to legislative appropriation to guarantee loans made to AGSOC for initial costs of the corporation.

STATEMENT IN FAVOR OF BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 5

Booms and Busts

Alaska's economy has been one of booms and busts. Billions of dollars have left Alaska during the booms, and hard times have followed for Alaskans. The profits have gone mostly to outsiders who owned the large companies that exploited the Alaska resources. Because the profits left the State, our economy has not been able to grow and diversify. If a way were found to keep profits in Alaska, that money would help build an economy strong enough to withstand the boom-and-bust cycles.

We Can Share

Alaskans have not shared in the profits because we were not the owners. But, we could participate in the financing and ownership of new projects through an Alaska General Stock Ownership Corporation (AGSOC). AGSOC is a way for us, acting together *independently of the State government*, to participate in the ownership and profits of major projects in Alaska. It can help smooth out the bumps in our economy by assuring Alaskans a share of the profits from its corporate activities. It can help build a stronger Alaska, keeping profits in the State and providing jobs for Alaskans, too.

Alaska for Alaskans

AGSOC is a private corporation owned and controlled by Alaskans. It has no special relationship with the State. Every Alaska resident can participate in AGSOC by receiving a share of stock free of charge. AGSOC will borrow money to invest

in Alaska projects. Thus, as the corporation grows the value of its shares will grow and the ownership of Alaskans in Alaska will grow.

AGSOC: What It Is Not

AGSOC is not a socialistic or state corporation. It has no special relationship to the State, but is treated the same as other corporations. AGSOC is controlled by its shareholders, not by the State. Although AGSOC intends to make profits for Alaskans, it is not a get-rich-quick scheme nor a giveaway. The free shares will gain value only as the corporation invests in profitable projects and repays its debts. AGSOC can make us participants in the development of our state, but it cannot guarantee success. If AGSOC should fail, shareholders are *not* liable for its debts. AGSOC will not distribute the state's oil wealth and will not reduce the amounts which can be distributed under other plans.

Let's Give It A Chance

AGSOC is a new idea, although a similar corporation already exists and is working successfully in British Columbia. AGSOC holds the potential to better our lives through ownership of Alaskan projects. There is no risk to individual Alaskans, and no state funds are spent by this initiative.

— Mike Gravel

United States Senator
For AGSOC Educational Committee

STATEMENT AGAINST BALLOT PROPOSITION NO. 5

You should vote AGAINST Proposition No. 5 because —

AGSOC invites a raid on the State Treasury. The AGSOC initiative would set up a State-chartered corporation that has no capital assets, no proved management, and no clear business goals. Because AGSOC wouldn't have any going operations or any equity capital, the corporation would not be able to borrow money from banks or other private lenders. Therefore, AGSOC's management would begin as nothing more than a lobby to get money from the State Treasury.

AGSOC could cause you to pay higher federal income taxes. AGSOC promoters claim the corporation is exempt from federal income taxes. This is only a half-truth. AGSOC wouldn't have to pay federal taxes on its earnings; its Alaskan shareholders — you and I — would have to pay them instead.

As an AGSOC shareholder, you would be liable for taxes on your share of the company's earnings, even if it didn't pay enough dividends to cover your added tax bill. If AGSOC lost money, though, you wouldn't be able to deduct your share of its losses.

AGSOC shareholder rights are severely restricted. Your right to sell your AGSOC shares, borrow against them, or leave them to your children would be limited. Since no shareholder would be allowed to own more than ten shares or to use proxy voting in electing directors, AGSOC's initial management would probably be assured of permanent control.

AGSOC would not create jobs. Even if AGSOC succeeded in its lobbying for State funding, the company's lack of proved management would limit its investments to buying

control of going businesses. Instead of creating new jobs or development projects in Alaska, AGSOC's main effect would be to push existing private capital out of the State.

AGSOC is not necessary. Any group of Alaskans can set up a tax-exempt small business corporation, a mutual fund, or a real estate investment trust, without a ballot initiative. These organizations have every tax advantage of a General Stock Ownership Corporation, but they have more business flexibility, and their shareholders have more freedom to dispose of their shares.

There are better ways to spread Alaska's oil wealth. There are safer, more direct, and more efficient means than AGSOC for spreading the wealth. One example is the 1980 Legislature's action to eliminate or refund state income taxes.

Another plan that would be more practical than AGSOC is the Portfolio of Alaska Citizens Enterprises (PACE), which would distribute rights in North Slope oil royalties directly to Alaska citizens. (PACE was proposed by Governor Hammond and House Speaker Gardiner in the 1980 Legislature, and will be taken up again by the 1981 Legislature.)

AGSOC just doesn't make sense. Under federal law any state is eligible to set up a General Stock Ownership Corporation, but no other state has even seriously considered starting one. It doesn't make sense for Alaska to be first, when there is little to gain and the risks are so great, to the State Treasury and to you as a shareholder.

— Arlon R. Tussing

Economic Consultant

Arguments printed on this page are the opinions of the authors and have not been checked for accuracy by any official agency.

BONDING PROPOSITION A

FISHERIES

(Chapter 91, Session Laws of Alaska 1980)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$7,718,800 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for fisheries facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$7,718,800 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for fisheries facilities?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>14</u>	Nays <u>6</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>34</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$7,718,800 for the purpose of completing hatchery development and the purchase of one or more patrol vessels to be based in Western Alaska.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Hatcheries	\$3,500,000
(A) Completion of Ship Creek hatchery	1,250,000
(B) Completion of Trail Lakes hatchery	2,000,000
(C) Completion of Beaver Falls hatchery	250,000

Amounts allocated for specific projects listed in this section may be reallocated among the projects by the commissioner of transportation and public facilities and the division of budget and management, Office of the Governor.

2. Patrol vessel	\$4,218,800
-------------------------	--------------------

The amount appropriated for the project listed in this section may not be reallocated or reappropriated.

BONDING PROPOSITION B

WATER, SEWAGE, AND SOLID WASTE FACILITIES (Chapter 97, Session Laws of Alaska 1980)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$33,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for water and sewer systems, solid waste facilities and village safe water facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$33,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for water and sewer systems, solid waste facilities, and village safe water facilities?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>15</u>	Nays <u>5</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>30</u>	Nays <u>4</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>6</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$33,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for water and sewer systems, solid waste facilities and village safe water facilities. Bond proceeds would be appropriated among the following projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Village safe water and solid waste construction projects		\$10,000,000
	(A) Chefornek	
	(B) Circle	
	(C) Copper Center	
	(D) Eagle Village	
	(E) False Pass	
	(F) Kokhanok	
	(G) Nelson Lagoon	
	(H) Newtok	
	(I) Pedro Bay	
	(J) Portage Creek	
	(K) Ruby	
	(L) St. Michael	
	(M) Stony River	
	(N) White Mountain	
	(O) Central	
	(P) Huslia	
	(Q) Ambler	
	(R) Kasigluk	
	(S) Aniak	
	(T) Klukwan	
2. Urban water and sewer and solid waste facility construction grants	Statewide	\$23,000,000

Amounts appropriated for specific projects listed in this act may be reappropriated among the projects by law.

BONDING PROPOSITION C

ENERGY CONSERVATION, CODE UPGRADE, AND REMOVAL OF ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

(Chapter 98, Session Laws of Alaska 1980)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$18,787,500 for the purpose of paying the cost of energy conservation, code upgrade, and architectural barrier removal for state facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$18,787,500 for the purpose of paying the cost of energy conservation, code upgrade, and architectural barrier removal for state facilities?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate (20 members): Yeas 13 Nays 6 Absent or Not Voting 1
House (40 members): Yeas 32 Nays 4 Absent or Not Voting 4

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$18,787,500 for the purpose of paying the cost of energy conservation, code upgrade, and architectural barrier removal for state facilities. Bond proceeds would be allocated among the following projects in the estimated amounts set out after each:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Energy conservation projects	Statewide	\$10,000,000
2. Life and safety code upgrades	Statewide	5,800,000
3. Sitka armory — code upgrade	Sitka	687,500
4. Architectural barrier removal	Statewide	2,300,000

Amounts allocated for specific projects listed in this act may be reallocated among the projects by the commissioner of transportation and public facilities and the division of budget and management, Office of the Governor.

BONDING PROPOSITION D

CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

(Chapter 99, Session Laws of Alaska 1980)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$28,350,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for correctional facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$28,350,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for correctional facilities?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>14</u>	Nays <u>5</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>1</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>30</u>	Nays <u>3</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>7</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$28,350,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of construction of capital improvements for correctional facilities. Bond proceeds would be allocated among the following projects in the estimated amounts set out after each:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Expansion of correctional center	Eagle River	\$5,536,000
2. Upgrading and construction of addition to correctional center	Juneau	4,998,000
3. Expansion of correctional center	Fairbanks	4,952,000
4. Construction of regional jail facility	Nome	6,989,000
5. Construction of pre-trial addition to correctional center	Anchorage	3,873,000
6. Contingency for correctional facilities projects		2,002,000

BONDING PROPOSITION E

CULTURAL FACILITIES

(Chapter 114, Session Laws of Alaska 1980)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$20,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of cultural facilities; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$20,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of cultural facilities?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>14</u>	Nays <u>5</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>1</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>25</u>	Nays <u>11</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>4</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$20,000,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of cultural facilities in the State.

**IF YOU NEED ASSISTANCE
AT THE POLLS ON
ELECTION DAY, PLEASE
ASK THE OFFICIALS
ON DUTY. THEY ARE
THERE TO HELP!**

BONDING PROPOSITION F

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (Chapter 118, Session Laws of Alaska 1980)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$156,992,700 for the purpose of paying the cost of highway, ferry, airport, port, harbor, and local service roads and trails construction and improvements; public transportation; and planning transportation projects; and providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$156,992,700 for the purpose of paying the cost of highway, ferry, airport, port, harbor, and local service roads and trails construction and improvements; public transportation; and planning transportation projects?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>15</u>	Nays <u>5</u>	Absent or not voting <u>0</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>29</u>	Nays <u>4</u>	Absent or not voting <u>7</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$156,992,700 for the purpose of paying the cost of (1) highway, ferry, airport, port, harbor, and local service roads and trails construction and improvements; (2) public transportation; and (3) planning for transportation projects.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Federal-aid Highways		\$28,993,200
(A) Transportation planning		3,500
(B) Public transportation		8,800,000
(C) Central region highways		5,418,000
(D) Interior region highways		4,822,900
(E) Southeast region highways		1,613,300
(F) Western region highways		977,500
(G) Southcentral region highways		4,933,000
(H) Statewide highways		2,425,000

Amounts allocated for specific federal-aid highway projects listed in this section may be reallocated among the projects listed by the commissioner of transportation and public facilities and the division of budget and management, Office of the Governor.

2. State Highways		\$18,942,000
(A) Stikine to Evergreen — reconstruct	Wrangell	1,629,000
(B) City streets	Kotzebue	2,269,000
(C) North Slope Highway culverts		2,600,000
(D) Wooley Lagoon Road upgrade	Nome-Teller	400,000
(E) Dexter Bypass upgrade	Nome-Teller	500,000
(F) Gilmore trail repaving	Fairbanks	1,530,000
(G) East Northern Lights/Lake Otis/ Boniface/Tudor/Debarr	Anchorage	7,090,000
(H) Saint Marys' — Pitka Point road		1,219,000
(I) Johnson road — realign and resurface	Fairbanks	1,705,000

Amounts allocated for specific state highway projects listed in this section may be reallocated among the projects by the commissioner of transportation and public facilities and the division of budget and management, Office of the Governor.

BONDING PROPOSITION F (cont.)

3. State Highways	\$25,748,000
(A) Halibut Road paving, Davidoff Street to marine highway terminal	1,600,000
(B) Kotzebue to Chicago Creek road, environmental and access reconnaissance study	500,000
(C) Construction of road between Holy Cross to Yukon River; planning and engineering	300,000
(D) Paving road from Dillingham to airport	1,288,000
(E) Construct Shungnak to Dahl Creek haul road	3,000,000
(F) Chickaloon road	1,000,000
(G) Butte road	1,000,000
(H) Circle — Eagle to Birch Creek road study	187,000
(I) Central bicycle trail	88,000
(J) Near Island bridge	5,000,000
(K) Circle Hot Springs airport to Graveyard Creek Road, realignment and re-surfacing	620,000
(L) Alakanuk road, planning and engineering, rights-of-way, utilities	450,000
(M) Unalakleet road	500,000
(N) Road paving, reconstruct airport to Louse Town Slough road and bicycle trail	2,500,000
(O) Mountain View Drive — reconstruct from E. 5th to Commercial Drive	1,500,000
(P) Hiland Drive — gravel upgrade	1,000,000
(Q) Bragaw construction, O'Malley to Huffman	1,750,000
(R) Hillside Drive paving and grade improvement, O'Malley to Abbott	1,000,000
(S) Steese bicycle path	90,000
(T) Local service roads and trails	1,000,000
(U) Main Tree Street — Valleyview	350,000
(V) Skylane — Mt. View Drive — surfacing	650,000
(W) Portage — Whittier Bud car rail project	375,000

Amounts appropriated for specific state highway projects listed in this section may be reappropriated among the projects by law.

4. Aviation	\$5,204,300
(A) Central region aviation	1,767,300
(B) Interior region aviation	455,900
(C) Southeast region aviation	591,800
(D) Western region aviation	302,300
(E) Homer airport	180,000
(F) Chignik Lagoon runway	400,000
(G) Big Lake airport runway	100,000
(H) Levelock runway	425,000
(I) Skagway runway	982,000

Amounts allocated for specific aviation projects listed in this section may be reallocated among the projects by the commissioner of transportation and public facilities and the division of budget and management, Office of the Governor.

5. Aviation	\$7,190,000
(A) Nuiqsut airport — Phase I	2,100,000
(B) Circle Hot Springs airport	390,000
(C) Emmonak airport — Phase I	3,500,000
(D) Hoonah airport	1,200,000

Amounts appropriated for specific aviation projects listed in this section may be reappropriated among the projects by law.

BONDING PROPOSITION F (cont.)

6. Marine Transportation		\$9,568,200
(A) Central region		4,200,000
(B) Southeast region		568,200
(C) Passenger terminal buildings, Auke Bay, Sitka, Petersburg		3,650,000
(D) Prince Rupert ferry terminal building		1,000,000
(E) Ferry terminal shelters at Clark's Bay, Metlakatla, Angoon, Kake		150,000

Amounts allocated for specific marine transportation projects listed in this section may be reallocated among the projects by the commissioner of transportation and public facilities and the division of budget and management, Office of the Governor.

7. Ports and Harbors		\$41,050,000
(A) Homer harbor		6,100,000
(B) Near Island harbor development		2,000,000
(C) Ketchikan boat harbor		1,300,000
(D) Petersburg boat harbor		3,750,000
(E) Hoonah boat harbor		1,900,000
(F) Sitka boat harbor		1,400,000
(G) Seward boat harbor/port development		4,500,000
(H) Auke Bay floating breakwater		3,500,000
(I) Nome port facility		5,000,000
(J) Cordova boat harbor		4,000,000
(K) Sand Point dock		3,500,000
(L) Port Lions boat harbor		1,100,000
(M) Dillingham port facility/dry marina		3,000,000

Amounts allocated for specific ports and harbors projects listed in this section may be reallocated among the projects by the commissioner of transportation and public facilities and the division of budget and management, Office of the Governor.

8. Ports and Harbors		\$10,297,000
(A) Unalaska port development		3,500,000
(B) Yakutat port development		3,000,000
(C) Kasaan boat harbor		250,000
(D) Bethel small boat harbor		500,000
(E) Lateral stability, terminal 1, Anchorage		982,000
(F) Anchorage small boat harbor/dry marina		2,000,000
(G) Salcha River boat launching/mooring facility		65,000

Amounts appropriated for specific ports and harbors projects listed in this section may be reappropriated among the projects by law.

9. Local Service Roads and Trails		\$10,000,000
--	--	---------------------

The amount appropriated for local service roads and trails projects in this section may not be reallocated or reappropriated.

BONDING PROPOSITION G

EDUCATION FACILITIES, TEACHER HOUSING, LIBRARY FACILITIES AND UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FACILITIES

(Chapter 121, Session Laws of Alaska 1980)

Providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds in the amount of \$63,651,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for education facilities, teacher housing, library facilities, and University of Alaska facilities; providing for an effective date.

BALLOT QUESTION:

Shall the State of Alaska issue its general obligation bonds in the principal amount of not more than \$63,651,000 for the purpose of paying the cost of capital improvements for education, teacher housing, library, and University of Alaska facilities?

Bonds Yes
Bonds No

VOTE CAST BY MEMBERS OF THE 11TH STATE LEGISLATURE ON FINAL PASSAGE

Senate	(20 members):	Yeas <u>15</u>	Nays <u>3</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>2</u>
House	(40 members):	Yeas <u>28</u>	Nays <u>2</u>	Absent or Not Voting <u>10</u>

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS AGENCY SUMMARY

This proposal, if approved, would provide for the issuance of general obligation bonds of the State in the amount of \$63,651,000 to provide funds for the cost of construction of the following projects:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Amount</u>
1. Library facilities	Statewide	\$ 500,000
2. Teacher housing	Statewide	\$ 1,000,000
3. University of Alaska facilities		\$ 37,270,000
(A) University Center, Phase I	Juneau	3,500,000
(B) Sewer connection	Sitka Community College	75,000
(C) Marine Center — Phase I	Seward	1,000,000
(D) Library and classroom building	Matanuska-Susitna Community College	3,500,000
(E) Applied science building	Anchorage Community College	5,000,000
(F) Arts, theater, bookstore, and classroom building	Anchorage	5,200,000
(G) Purchase adult basic education building	Anchorage Community College	220,000
(H) Classroom, shop	Kenai	5,600,000
(I) Adult Learning Center	Kodiak Community College	2,300,000
(J) Rasmusson Library, Phase II	Fairbanks	8,500,000
(K) Central receiving	Fairbanks	1,300,000
(L) Utilities modification	Statewide	800,000
(M) Handicapped barrier removal	Statewide	275,000

BONDING PROPOSITION G (cont.)

4. Education facilities	\$ 24,881,000
(A) Southeast Island regional educational attendance area schools	856,000
(B) Bartlett high school	1,500,000
(C) Kodiak Island Borough schools	500,000
(D) Lake-Peninsula regional educational attendance area schools	1,000,000
(E) Southwest regional educational attendance area schools	2,072,000
(F) Lower Kuskokwim regional educational attendance area schools	2,415,000
(G) Saint Marys' school	2,000,000
(H) Northwest regional educational attendance area vocational technical school	1,500,000
(I) Bering Straits regional educational attendance area schools	1,934,000
(J) Yukon/Koyukuk regional educational attendance area schools	500,000
(K) Iditarod regional educational attendance area schools	900,000
(L) Lower Yukon regional educational attendance area schools	750,000
(M) Kuspuk regional educational attendance area schools	1,900,000
(N) Chatham regional educational attendance area schools	1,251,000
(O) Haines school	1,332,000
(P) Karluk school	960,000
(Q) Metlakatla school	2,000,000
(R) Wrangell school	1,500,000
(S) Holy Cross school	11,000

Amounts appropriated for specific projects listed in this act may be reappropriated among the projects by law.