

Yes & No Check List For Tuesday Election

ON TUESDAY there will be an election in which Alabamians will either re-write or refuse to re-write certain sections of the Alabama Constitution.

The vote will undoubtedly be scandalously light, as is the folkway in constitutional elections. The antis will thus have an advantage.

Our belief is that some of these 10 amendments should be overwhelmingly adopted and others overwhelmingly rejected.

Amendment No. 1

Yes—This is the amendment to modify the antique cumulative provision of the poll tax law. It is one of the few tax reductions likely to be seen by living persons that is resisted by large numbers of people. Certainly it wouldn't do to entrust the sales tax or income tax to a referendum.

As the law stands, voters must pay \$1.50 each year between the ages of 21 and 45 for the privilege of voting. If, say, a woman did not decide to vote until she was 35, she would have to pay the tax cumulatively from age 21—which would be \$21. \$21 is not a small item in the budgets of many.

If Amendment No. 1 is adopted Tuesday, the same woman would have to pay only \$3.

The most unassailable, if not compelling, argument in favor of the amendment is that there is an inequity in the fact that some must pay \$36 for the lifetime privilege of voting while a growing element of Alabamians are entirely exempt. Every war veteran is exempt from payment of any poll tax whatever and when it is considered how much of the population has veteran status, it is immediately recognized how large the exempt class is.

The hesitant citizen will find strong reassurance in the fact that only five states now have a poll tax, these being Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, Virginia.

And of these five, Alabama is the only one with the burdensome back-payment provision.

The tax ought to be entirely abandoned, but the issue Tuesday is only modification.

A second fact that should offer reassurance to the hesitant is that every

needless expense of certain elections when there is only one candidate. It applies to legislators in special elections. Where only one candidate qualifies, what's the point in a hollow and expensive election? It applies only to legislators, but the point is illustrated by last week's election of City Commissioner Birmingham, who was unopposed.

Amendment No. 3

No—The hide of this amendment should be nailed to the barn door. It provides for the partial socialization of Franklin County. It would permit the use of public funds to finance new industries. It's wrong in principle, but even if it were not, this advantage in seeking new industries should not be conveyed to Franklin with competing counties excluded.

Amendment No. 4

No—This would permit Talladega County officials to raise school and road taxes without the bother of an election.

Amendment No. 5

No—This is a companion piece to Amendment No. 3 and should be repelled with a bang. It would yield to the City of Russellville the same socialization authority as the County of Franklin, in which it is located.

Amendment No. 6

Yes—This would allow school districts in Lawrence County to hold elections on special school taxes.

Amendment No. 7

Yes—This would allow Mobile County to raise taxes and go in debt for public improvements if authorized by the voters.

Amendment No. 8

Yes—A special election in Marshall County on school taxes.

Amendment No. 9

Yes—Same as No. 8, affecting Chambers County.

Amendment No. 10

No—This would set it up for the legislators of Chambers County to fix and