

0:00 – Woman: Senator Farr, last night you attended a dinner for President Lyndon B. Johnson in San Francisco. That wound up a very historic week, didn't it?

Senator: It certainly was a very interesting and historical week in California and throughout the nation, I think that two of the most interesting things, one was of course the great victory in the civil rights struggle in the

0:30 - United States Senate, which ended on Friday night, on the 19<sup>th</sup> of June, just one year after President John F. Kennedy had called the, on the Congress to act and act forcedly with respect to granting civil rights that have been long due and, have not been, had not been granted to the people of this country, and I think that it was significant that it was on the date a year after President Kennedy's request and also 100 years after the freeing of the slaves in Texas

1:00 – and many of the southern negroes celebrate June 19 as what they call “Juneteenth” day in which picnics and other celebrations are held to recognize the freedom of the slaves in Texas, so this was a most historical piece of legislation, I'm sure that the House of Representatives will, quickly clear up the few things that need to be cleared up in the House, that the bill will be on the president's desk by the Fourth of July. The other decision, which is not so favorable,

1:30 - one that we in State government look upon with a great deal of dismay, is the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the federal apportionment in the state apportionment cases, the decision came down, Reynolds Vs. Sims, involve the state of Alabama and six other states, and the decision of the Supreme Court requires that the legislatures of these states reapportion their states senates. Now many states have a plan whereby the senate is

2:00 - uh, senators represent geographical areas within the state and the assemblymen represent the population and California has a system, similar to that the assemblymen represent one-eightieth of some seventeen and a half million people, whereas the senators represent not less than one or more than three counties, and if the decision of the United States Supreme Court should be applied in CA, it would have a very vast affect upon our state's senate, and control of the senate would move away from

2:30 - Northern California to Southern California, and the voice of rural California would be but a voice in the wilderness. I might say that a third thing of historical significance is happening this week in Yosemite Valley which is, marks the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary by Abraham Lincoln of the legislation passed by the Congress of the United States designating the Yosemite Valley and Mariposa Big Trees as the first state park in the nation. And

3:00 - later on as you know, many people know, that the state of California ceded this land back to the federal government and both Yosemite Valley and Mariposa Big Trees are now a part of Yosemite National Park, but it was 100 years ago on the 30<sup>th</sup> of June that Abraham Lincoln signed the bill and the centennial celebration is being held at Yosemite on June 26<sup>th</sup>.

Man: Senator, the California legislature adjourned last month. Now, you mentioned you went to see Lyndon Johnson in a dinner last week. What else

3:30 - does a member of the legislature do when the legislature is not in session?

Senator: Well one of the important functions of a legislator between sessions is to serve on fact finding committees and the duties of these fact-finding committees are, as the name implies, to go out and ascertain the facts on which to base legislation in the coming and future sessions. I serve on a fact-finding committee on natural resources, of which I'm chairman, also on a fact-finding committee on education, the fact-finding committee on judiciary, a member of

4:00 – the California commission on the revision of the constitution, and as a member of the joint legislative committee on uniform state laws.

Man: Now, as chairman of the natural resources committee, what are some of the things that you do?

Senator: Well, this week we're having hearings in San Diego, on the California boating plan, and this is a plan that has been worked out by Leads, Hill, and Jewett, consulting engineers, for a long-range plan for California boat harbors, both on the coast and the inland areas of this

4:30 - state. Boating is becoming the, one of the greatest recreational activities in the state, and it's very important that we do provide adequate boating facilities so that people from one county to another can take their boats and be sure of proper boating facilities and it's also, California's very much concerned with harbors of refuge, along with the federal government, to see that there are adequate harbors that boating people can get in in the time of storm, and one of things I intend to bring attention to the national resources committee is the need for

5:00 – a breakwater in Monterey.

Woman: Senator Farr, as a member of the Constitutional vision committee, tell me what that committee does.

Senator: Well, it's a commission set up by the California legislature to revise our state constitution. Our constitution is one of the second longest constitutions of any state in the country, it has, contains some 75,000 words, it's ten-times longer than the federal constitution, and it has many things in the constitution that

5:30 – shouldn't be there that should be, and the statutory law, for example, the number of rounds that one may engage in a professional boxing or wrestling are in our state constitution, and it's the feeling of many people in California who are interested in good government that the time is long overdue, that we revise our constitution, and that's the purpose of this commission.

Man: Now wasn't the original constitution of California written right here in Monterey county?

Senator: Yes, our original constitution was drafted in Monterey, at Colton Hall, which I'm told was then the largest

6:00 - building in the state, and the constitutional convention met at Colton Hall on September 3, 1849. There were 48 delegates and they were all relatively young men, their average age being 36, the oldest delegate was 53, and most of these people were not native Californians, only seven of them being native Californians. One of them was General Mariano Vallejo, who later became a member of our California state senate for whom the city of Vallejo is named. I might say we have the

6:30 - constitutional convention of 1849 and then the second constitution of 1879, and now we are trying to revise that constitution and make a workable document for the people of California.

Man: You mentioned some of the people that attended that original convention. Who are some of the people serving on this present constitution revision commission?

Senator: Well, the revision commission is made up of a group of distinguished citizens of California, including Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, the president emeritus of University of California, three past presidents of our California state

7:00 – bar, the brother of Congressman Teague, Mr. Milton Teague of Santa Paula, members of the AF of LCIO leadership, California Teachers' Association, League of Women Voters, the state chamber of commerce, and many people connected with political science at our various institutions in California. I think it's a very hard working, conscientious group of people who are working on the constitution revision commission, there are six legislators

7:30 – that are members of the commission and some fourteen other ex-official legislative members that meet with the commission and they meet about every three or four weeks.

Man: Well how's the revision coming along?

Senator: Well I think it's coming along pretty well, they started in on the initiative and referendum and recall provisions, and they're now looking into the legislative provisions, and this constitution won't come out in just one piece, they will get a portion of the constitution together to submit it to the legislature, the legislature approves it, then be submitted to the people for approval

8:00 – and I think little by little, piecemeal we will someday get a good and workable constitution.

Man: Will the Supreme Court redistricting decision in Reynolds vs. Sims requiring the state legislators to have both houses elected popularly affect your work with this revision commission?

Senator: Well I think that the, both the legislature and the revision commission will be terribly concerned with this decision, and in as much as the, much of the time of the revision

8:30 - commission has been devoted to the legislature, they will now have to see whether or not the California senate will have to be re-apportioned, there's a case going on in Los Angeles, brought by Mayor Yorty of that city, to force the California state senate to be re-apportioned. If the decision of the United States Supreme Court should be, the decision adopted by the lower court, and should this be sustained on appeal, then of course our senate will have to be re-apportioned which means that many

9:00 – of the seats of northern California senators will be taken away in favor of senators in Southern California, and the power of the senate will move from Northern California to Southern California, which already controls the assembly, so Southern California will have control and Los Angeles will have control of both houses of the legislature, and the voice of rural California and Monterey, California, will be greatly diluted if this decision of the Supreme Court is applied.

Woman: Senator Farr, what were the words of the Supreme Court

9:30 – in this recent re-apportionment decision?

Senator: Well I couldn't read the whole decision, but I think the, uh, Chief Justice Warren's language, I think this is particularly important, and what she states, and I'm quoting from Reynolds vs. Sims, "We hold, that as a basic constitutional standard, the Equal Protection clause requires that the seats in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned on a population basis. Simply stated," I'm, this is a quote,

10:00 - "An individual's right to vote for state legislators is unconstitutionally impaired when its weight is, in a substantial fashion, diluted when compared with the votes of citizens living in other parts of the state. This is based on the Equal Protection clause of the constitution."

Man: It has been suggested that under this decision, since both houses of the legislature will be elected popularly, that at least one of the houses might as well be abolished, how do you feel about that?

Senator: Well I do not feel we should go to

10:30 – a unicameral legislature such as the state of Nebraska has, they have only one house of the legislature there, I feel that with a bicameral legislature you'll still have a senate, the members of which will serve longer terms than the members of the assembly, and there'll be fewer members of senate than there will be of the assembly, and if you have a bicameral legislature as we now have, legislation will have to be heard before committees in both houses, both the assembly and the senate, they'll have to be heard on the floor of both houses, and therefore you get more consideration

11:00 – that’s given to each piece of legislation than you do in a unicameral legislature.

Man: Well some have advanced the idea that possibly there could be an amendment to the United States constitution which would abrogate the Supreme Court decision.

Senator: That is something that is certainly being considered and being discussed by a number of people and during the first week of August I will be attending the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, which I am legislative chairman. I know that the commissioners

11:30 – who are lawyers, law school deans, professors, judges and legislators will be very much concerned because this decision affects almost every state in the union, and I’m sure one of the subjects that will be discussed by those people, whether formally or informally, will be the matter of a constitutional revision, and it’s very difficult, it would have to be passed by two-thirds of members of both houses of congress and ratified by three-quarters of the

12:00 – states, and I wouldn’t say it was impossible but I say it’s a pretty difficult thing to get accomplished, particularly in this field where the great populations live in the cities and they like the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, people living in metropolitan areas.

Man: If California is going to be dominated by Southern California, why not just divide the state in two?

Senator: Well that’s been suggested, too, in fact that was thought to be a possible solution during our North, uh,

12:30 - Northern California-Southern California water fight. One of the difficulties here is that a, to get the state divided into two states, we’d have to have approval of both houses of the legislature and any such measures would be killed in the assembly, which is controlled by Southern California, and furthermore it would have to be passed by the Congress of the United States and by the people of California. But I must say the people of California have ratified the present plan of apportionment in our senate on three separate occasions. They have turned down a

13:00 - constitutional amendment requiring re-apportionment of the state senate, has been turned down despite the fact that sixty-five percent of our population lives in Southern California.

Man: Well will that have any effect on the Supreme Court?

Senator: Well, the Supreme Court’s made a statement that even though the state may have ratified a plan, that that is not sufficient, and I could again quote from one of these apportionment cases in which the court said, “Individuals constitutionally protected right to cast an equally weighted vote cannot be

13:30 - denied, even by a vote of a majority of a state's electorate. If the apportionment plan adopted by the voters fails to measure up to the requirements of the Equal Protection clause," so it would seem from that language in the decision, even though the people have ratified the plan, the Supreme Court is not going to be satisfied with it.

Man: Senator, this Friday the senate Judiciary Committee, a committee composed completely of lawyers, is going to meet on this problem. Isn't that true?

Senator: Yes, we're going to meet in Sacramento

14:00 – and Senator Reagan, the chairman of the committee, is, feels very strongly about this decision. As a matter of fact, he said in these words, and I quote them, that “this decision contains the very seeds for destruction of the democratic process, since it abolished the checks and balances of government, and sets the legislature back fifty years. Now this matter will be gone into Friday, and I hope to bring back some constructive suggestions to the people of Monterey County, and they will be on this program next Tuesday.

14:30-14:40 – [silence]