

14
The candidates for the Supreme Court and for the Court of Appeals were asked:

WHAT IS THE MOST SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENT THAT NEEDS TO BE MADE IN THE JUDICIAL PROCESS?

NON PARTISAN

SUPREME COURT

8 Year Term

Elect Two

ELIZABETH BURCH

Dearborn Age: 55

OCCUPATION: Attorney

EDUCATION: U. of M. - A.B., Detroit College of Law, LLB;

BACKGROUND: Have practiced law for 19 years.

Restoration of faith in the judicial process by reducing dockets and shortening time to trial; by trying innovative rather than adversary approaches to settlement of disputes, especially domestic; by strict enforcement of high standards of behavior for judges and a responsive complaint process for violation of those standards.

MARY COLEMAN

Battle Creek Township Age: 66

OCCUPATION: Chief Justice 1979 - present. Justice Supreme Court 1973-79.

EDUCATION: B.A. University of Maryland; J.D. George Washington University.

BACKGROUND: Probate-Juvenile Judge 1961-72. Private Practice previously. Michigan, District of Columbia Bars. Married Circuit Judge Creighton Coleman. Two daughter (MDs). Trustee Albion College. Professional and civic associations.

To achieve improved service to the people and realize the constitutional mandate of One Court of Justice, the burden of financing-state courts should shift from local taxpayers to the state. Wayne County/Detroit courts should be reorganized like the remainder of the state. We are in the 1980's.

MICHAEL K. HEGARTY

Hartland Township Age: 47

OCCUPATION: Attorney

EDUCATION: University of Detroit High School, University of Notre Dame, A.B. and J.D.

BACKGROUND: Past President Livingston Bar, Member: Michigan and American Bar Associations, American Trial Lawyers, American Judicature Society; Former: M.E.S.C. Appeal Board; Mackinac Island Park Com., Livingston Commissioner.

Abolish excessive delays in Circuit Court. Crash programs don't work. They don't give sufficient notice of trial date for preparation. Establish systematic disposal of dockets state-wide to utilize courtrooms and judges efficiently. Afford clients and lawyers opportunity to address cases so prompt, fair hearing can be had in all circuits.

CHARLES L. LEVIN

Incumbent justice of the State Supreme Court; age 54; Detroit. Attorney; Appeals Court judge 1966-72; elected to Supreme Court 1972. BA and LLB, U.M. Justice Levin did not receive a questionnaire. The League apologizes for this oversight.

JOSEPH B. SULLIVAN

Grosse Pte. Park Age: 58

OCCUPATION: Circuit Judge, Wayne County — EDUCATION: University of Detroit Law School, J.D., 1957; University of Detroit, Ph.B., 1947.

BACKGROUND: Partner, Sullivan, Sullivan, Ranger & Ward; Executive Secretary to Mayor, City of Detroit; Assistant Attorney General, Head of Criminal Division; Detroit Charter Commission; Wayne County Clerk.

The majority of Supreme Court cases are undecided for more than one year. The Supreme Court needs to be held accountable in the same fashion as trial judges to cut court delay. The docket must be controlled more tightly, with special review of cases undecided for more than four months.

NONPARTISAN

COURT OF APPEALS

6 Yr. Term

DISTRICT 2

Vote for 2

Vote in this race if you live in the following counties: Genesee, Hillsdale, Huron, Ingham, Jackson, Lapeer, Lenawee, Macomb, Monroe, Oakland, St. Clair, Sanilac, Shiawassee, and Tuscola.

S. JEROME BRONSON

Franklin Village Age: 50

OCCUPATION: Judge, Michigan Court of Appeals (1968-present)

EDUCATION: U of M; LLB Wayne State University.

BACKGROUND: Private practice, 1955-64; Oakland County Prosecutor, 1964-68. Member: American Judicature Society; Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency; Tau Epsilon Rho (Secretary). Awards: Michigan Psychological Association; Prosecuting Attorneys Assoc.; Wayne Law Alumni.

ANSWER:

Although our Constitution requires "one Court of Justice", the lack of state funding has jeopardized the courts' ability to insure equal justice. We must insist that Governor and Legislature stop treating the judiciary like an unwanted stepchild and live up to their obligation to provide one court of justice.

ROBERT J. DANHOF

East Lansing Age: 54

OCCUPATION: Judge, Michigan Court of Appeals 1969-present; Chief Judge 4 yrs.

EDUCATION: Hope College, BA; U. of M., JD.

BACKGROUND: U.S. Attorney: Western District of Mich., Legal Advisor to Governor 1964-68. Delegate, Mich. Constitutional Convention 1961-62; Chairman Committee on Judicial

Branch. Member: Criminal Justice Commission, Legislative Commission on Courts, Chairman Mich. Judicial Coordinating Committee.

ANSWER:

The Judiciary is one of three branches of state government. However, financing of the courts is primarily dependent on local funds. In order to provide the one court of justice mandated by the State Constitution it is vital that the state assume the financing of the court system.

JOHN J. MURRAY

Warren Age: 50

OCCUPATION: Chief Assistant City Attorney, City of Warren, Employed 1967.

EDUCATION: University of Detroit, LLB JD 1953.

BACKGROUND: Requested by the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers of Washington, D.C. to lecture on litigating Federal Grant Conditions.

ANSWER:

Courts should enforce the law as written if the statute is constitutional. Courts should not construe the Constitution to correct all social ills, but leave the legislative branch to pass laws. Local control of government as set forth in Article 7 of Michigan Constitution should be zealously protected by Courts.

BALLOT PROPOSALS

A

Yes ☐
No ☐

A PROPOSAL TO MAKE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS RESPONSIBLE FOR SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND PROGRAMS, TO REDUCE LOCAL PROPERTY TAX MAXIMUMS FOR OPERATIONAL PURPOSES, TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROPERTY TAX RELIEF FOR SENIOR RETIREES, AND REQUIRE THE STATE TO RAISE REVENUES NECESSARY FOR EQUAL PER-PUPIL FUNDING OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

The proposed amendment would:

1. Make local school boards responsible for school personnel and programs.
2. Reduce current maximum property tax for county, township and educational operations from 50 to 24.5 mills and allocate millage.
3. Allow state 30.5 mill school property tax on non-homesteads.
4. Eliminate property taxes on \$25,000.00 of home assessments of retirees 65 and older.
5. Require general state taxation for equal per-pupil school financing at highest state support level.
6. Limit local school tax to 7 mills or 1% income tax by vote of electors.
7. Exclude additional school financing from other revenue and spending limits of constitution and require millage reduction by class.

Should this amendment be adopted?

BACKGROUND: There will be a limit of 13 mills (now 15 mills) on property tax millage to fund counties, townships, community colleges, special education, vocational education and intermediate school districts. With a vote of the people this could be raised by 11.5 mills. Thus the total property tax millage will not exceed 24.5 mills. Operational millage for schools will be removed from local property tax.

Replacement of revenues lost to local school districts will come from the state. It is expected that replacement funds will come from an increase of 1.3 to 2.0 percent in the personal income tax. In addition, a property tax of no more than 30.5 mills is authorized on all commercial, development and industrial property to be shared statewide.

The Constitutional rollback now affecting total property assessment of a unit of government, will be changed to refer to a class of property (e.g., agriculture, residential, commercial).

PRO: Proponents argue that the proposed method of school

financing would encourage quality education and equality of opportunity throughout the state. Since the Legislature has the constitutional responsibility for providing free elementary and secondary schools, basic support should not be left to the decisions of the local taxpayers. The proposal would provide substantial tax relief for homeowners and farmers, and retired people. The income tax is considered to be a fairer, more progressive tax than the property tax. Local control of programs, services and personnel would be included in the Constitution.

CON: Opponents fear that the minimum legally required funding would be neither equitable nor adequate. The legislature might not grant larger amounts, particularly in times of fiscal stress. The equal dollars per child formula is not sensitive to the differing costs of education from one school district to another. The proposal places unnecessary restrictions on the taxing powers of some local units of government. While property taxes will be reduced, some circuit breaker relief will be lost, and the overall tax burden for many middle and upper class taxpayers is likely to increase.

B

Yes ☐
No ☐

PROPOSAL TO REDUCE THE LEGAL DRINKING AGE.

The proposed amendment would reduce the legal drinking age from 21 to 19 years of age. Should this amendment be adopted?

BACKGROUND: 1972: Michigan's comprehensive Age of Majority went into effect granting 18 year olds the right to possess and consume alcoholic beverages along with the right to vote and enter into contracts.

1978: In April, the Legislature passed a law raising the drinking age from 18 to 19 years, to become effective December 3, 1978. In November, voters approved a Constitutional amendment, proposed by citizen initiative petition, to raise the drinking age to 21.

The Amendment was challenged in Court on the grounds that it deprived 19 and 20 year olds of their rights. A Federal District Court ruled that the 21 year drinking age was constitutional because the public had the right to raise the drinking age "if there is a rational basis to support it."

Since 1976 three states have raised the drinking age from 18 to 19, one from 18 to 20, and two (including Michigan) went to 21. Nine other states are considering proposals to go from 18 to 19; three states to 20; and six states to 21 years of age. Two

(Continued on Page 15)