

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|---------|
| Amount budgeted | \$4,450 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | 4,450 |
| Reduction | None |

ANALYSIS

The proposed expenditures of the Commission on Uniform State Laws are \$7,520 or 62.8 percent below estimated expenditures for 1952-53 and 29.6 percent below expenditures for 1951-52. The decrease in proposed expenditures for 1953-54 is due to the termination of a temporary position of deputy counsel II which was authorized for the 1952-53 Fiscal Year in order to give the commission legal help to represent it in matters relating to the submission of a Uniform Commercial Code at the 1953 Session of the Legislature.

We recommend approval of the amount requested.

SUPREME COURT

ITEM 20 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 18
Budget line No. 7

For Support of the Supreme Court From the General Fund

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested | \$456,270 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year | 451,012 |
| Increase (1.2 percent) | \$5,258 |

Summary of Increase

| | Total increase | INCREASE DUE TO | | Budget page | Line No. |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Work load or salary adjustments | New services | | |
| Salaries and wages | \$5,038 | \$5,038 | --- | 18 | 49 |
| Operating expense | --- | --- | --- | 18 | 64 |
| Equipment | 220 | 220 | --- | 18 | 71 |
| Total increase | \$5,258 | \$5,258 | --- | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Amount budgeted | \$456,270 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | 456,270 |
| Reduction | None |

ANALYSIS

The increase of \$5,258, or 1.2 percent over the amount requested for the 1952-53 Fiscal Year is due to normal salary adjustments and price increases. An increase in work load is not indicated for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year.

Approval of the amount budgeted is recommended.

JUDICIAL COUNCIL

ITEM 21 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 19
Budget line No. 7

For Support of the Judicial Council From the General Fund

| | |
|---|----------|
| Amount requested | \$85,842 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year | 93,363 |
| Decrease (8.8 percent) | \$7,521 |

Judicial Council

Summary of Increase

| | Total increase | INCREASE DUE TO | | Budget page | Line No. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Work load or salary adjustments | New services | | |
| Salaries and wages ----- | -\$3,180 | -\$3,180 | --- | 19 | 49 |
| Operating expense ----- | -3,750 | -3,750 | --- | 19 | 65 |
| Equipment ----- | -591 | -591 | --- | 19 | 72 |
| Total increase ----- | -\$7,521 | -\$7,521 | --- | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------|
| Amount budgeted ----- | \$85,842 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ----- | 85,842 |
| Reduction ----- | None |

ANALYSIS

The Judicial Council is composed of 11 members of various state courts appointed by the Chief Justice to serve a term of two years each. The principal function of the council is the study of court procedures and equalization of the work of judges by making assignments of judges to courts with heavy dockets. The Chief Justice is chairman of this council.

A significant decrease appears in the amount proposed for printing for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year. The amount of \$3,510 is estimated to be expended in the 1952-53 Fiscal Year and only \$810 is proposed for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year. The decrease of \$2,700 is due to the publication of the biennial report in the current fiscal year. The next publication will not be issued until the 1954-55 Fiscal Year.

Approval of the amount requested is recommended.

EXTRA COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES OF ASSIGNED JUDGES

ITEM 22 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 20
Budget line No. 13

For Additional Support of the Judicial Council From the General Fund

| | |
|---|----------|
| Amount requested ----- | \$30,000 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ----- | 30,000 |
| Increase ----- | None |

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------|
| Amount budgeted ----- | \$30,000 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ----- | 30,000 |
| Reduction ----- | None |

ANALYSIS

The Constitution provides that the Judicial Council shall equalize the work of the judges and expedite judicial business. The assignment of judges between the courts constitutes means for integrating the entire system of superior courts into a single system.

The cost to the State for the assignment of judges depends on the court to which the judge is assigned and the differential in salary. There still exists great inequities in the number of cases disposed of by superior court judges. The Judicial Council is conducting a study of actual court districts to determine at the earliest possible date the work loads of the

various courts. This study is likely to result in a decrease in this expenditure.

Approval of the amount budgeted is recommended.

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

ITEM 23 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 21
Budget line No. 7

*For Support of the District Court of Appeal, First Appellate District,
From the General Fund*

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested | \$208,672 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year | 207,668 |
| <hr/> | |
| Increase (0.5 percent) | \$1,004 |

Summary of Increase

| | Total increase | INCREASE DUE TO | | Budget page | Line No. |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Work load or salary adjustments | New services | | |
| Salaries and wages | \$651 | \$651 | --- | 21 | 35 |
| Operating expense | --- | --- | --- | 21 | 49 |
| Equipment | 353 | 353 | --- | 21 | 56 |
| <hr/> | | <hr/> | | | |
| Total increase | \$1,004 | \$1,004 | --- | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Amount budgeted | \$208,672 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | 208,672 |
| <hr/> | |
| Reduction | None |

ANALYSIS

This court has jurisdiction over appeals from superior courts in Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Monterey, San Benito, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz Counties. The increase of 0.5 percent over the amount requested for the Fiscal Year 1952-53 is due to normal salary adjustments and price increases. An increase in work load is not indicated for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year.

We recommend approval of the amount requested.

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

ITEM 24 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 22
Budget line No. 7

*For Support of the District Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,
From the General Fund*

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested | \$321,063 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year | 317,817 |
| <hr/> | |
| Increase (1.0 percent) | \$3,246 |

Summary of Increase

| | Total increase | INCREASE DUE TO | | Budget page | Line No. |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Work load or salary adjustments | New services | | |
| Salaries and wages | \$2,396 | \$2,396 | --- | 22 | 39 |
| Operating expense | 850 | 850 | --- | 22 | 50 |
| Equipment | --- | --- | --- | 22 | 57 |
| <hr/> | | <hr/> | | | |
| Total increase | \$3,246 | \$3,246 | --- | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$321,063
 Legislative Auditor's recommendation ----- 321,063

Reduction ----- None

ANALYSIS

This court handles appeals from the superior courts of Los Angeles, Ventura, San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties. There are nine justices assigned to this court.

The increase of 1.0 percent in the budget is due to normal salary adjustments and price increases.

Approval of this budget is recommended.

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

ITEM 25 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 23
 Budget line No. 7

*For Support of the District Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District,
 From the General Fund*

Amount requested ----- \$114,233
 Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ----- 112,467

Increase (1.6 percent) ----- \$1,766

Summary of Increase

| | Total increase | INCREASE DUE TO | | Budget page | Line No. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Work load or salary adjustments | New services | | |
| Salaries and wages ----- | \$1,926 | \$1,926 | --- | 23 | 40 |
| Operating expense ----- | 114 | 114 | --- | 23 | 52 |
| Equipment ----- | -274 | -274 | --- | 23 | 59 |
| Total increase ----- | \$1,766 | \$1,766 | --- | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$114,233
 Legislative Auditor's recommendation ----- 114,233

Reduction ----- None

ANALYSIS

This court has jurisdiction over appeals from superior courts of 35 northern counties. The increase of 1.6 percent over the amount requested for the Fiscal Year 1952-53 is due to normal salary adjustments and price increases. An increase in work load is not indicated for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year.

We recommend approval of the amount requested.

DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

ITEM 26 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 24
 Budget line No. 7

*For Support of the District Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District,
 From the General Fund*

Amount requested ----- \$119,950
 Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ----- 119,671

Increase (0.2 percent) ----- \$279

Summary of Increase

| | Total increase | INCREASE DUE TO | | Budget page | Line No. |
|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
| | | Work load or salary adjustments | New services | | |
| Salaries and wages----- | \$372 | \$372 | --- | 24 | 29 |
| Operating expense----- | —312 | —312 | --- | 24 | 43 |
| Equipment----- | 219 | 219 | --- | 24 | 49 |
| Total increase----- | \$279 | \$279 | --- | | |

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Amount budgeted----- | \$119,950 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation----- | 119,950 |
| Reduction----- | None |

ANALYSIS

This court has jurisdiction over appeals from superior courts in 10 counties. Court sessions are on a rotating basis of every four months held at San Diego, San Bernardino and Fresno. No increased work load is anticipated. The 0.2 percent increase in the budget is due to normal salary adjustments and price increases.

Approval of this budget is recommended.

GOVERNOR

ITEM 27 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 25
Budget line No. 7

For Support of the Governor's Office From the General Fund

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Amount requested----- | \$348,118 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year----- | 344,705 |
| Increase (1.0 percent)----- | \$3,413 |

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Amount budgeted----- | \$348,118 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation----- | 348,118 |
| Reduction----- | None |

ANALYSIS

The amount of \$348,118 requested for the support of the Governor's Office for the Fiscal Year 1952-53 represents an increase of \$3,413 or 1.0 percent over estimated expenditures for the current year, all of which is for salaries and wages. The appropriation for support for the current year has been augmented by \$10,851 from the Salary Increase Fund and \$16,825 from the Emergency Fund. The latter allocation was required to cover the cost of four clerical positions established during the year and increases in operating expenses over the amount originally budgeted.

The budget proposes to continue in the budget year the level of service provided by the augmented budget with the exception that one of these positions established during the current year is being dropped. The amount requested for equipment provides for the replacement of five typewriters, plus \$250 for miscellaneous.

The total expenditures for support in this item do not reflect the full cost of this office as expenditures for automobile operation, salary of a chauffeur, and the cost of certain cars are paid by the Highway Patrol.