

RESOLUTION No. 386.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA, CALIFORNIA, CANVASSING THE SPECIAL ELECTION HELD IN SAID CITY, ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1934, FOR THE PURPOSE OF VOTING ON WHETHER OR NOT ORDINANCE No. 234, OF THE ORDINANCES OF CHULA VISTA SHOULD BE REPEALED.

WHEREAS, a protest having been filed with the City Council of Chula Vista, California, at its regular meeting held November 7, 1934, against Ordinance No. 234 of the Ordinances of Chula Vista, becoming effective, the Clerk of the said city having certified the protest was sufficient, and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the said City of Chula Vista, at the said regular meeting of November 7, 1934, by a vote of more than two-thirds of all its members, duly and regularly pass and adopt Resolution No. 383, declaring that the public interest and necessity demanded that a special election be called to be held on Tuesday, December 11, 1934; and

WHEREAS, it appears that a notice of said election was duly and regularly given and that said election was duly and regularly held as required by law; and that in all respects said election was held and conducted, and the votes cast thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and declared, in the time, form and manner as required by law; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Chula Vista has met at the Council Chamber of said City, in the City Hall, on Monday, the 17th day of December, 1934, to canvass the returns of said election:

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of Chula Vista does resolve, find, determine and declare as follows:

SECTION 1. That said special election was held and conducted in said City of Chula Vista, on Tuesday, the 11th day of December, 1934, in time, form and manner as required by law: That 2300 ballots were furnished election board.

SECTION 2. That the proposition submitted at said election was as follows:

"Shall Ordinance No. 234, of the Ordinances of the City of Chula Vista, California, granting a lighting franchise to the San Diego Consolidated Gas and Electric Company, for poles and wires on the streets of Chula Vista, California, be repealed?"

SECTION 3. That there were two consolidated election precincts for said special election; that the total number of votes cast at said election, was 987; that the total number of votes cast for and against said proposition at each consolidated election precinct was as follows:

	Yes.	No.	Total Cast.
Consolidated Voting Precinct A,	193	285	479
Consolidated Voting Precinct B,	227	281	508

That the total vote cast in favor of the said proposition at said election was 420; that the total vote cast against said proposition at said election was 566

SECTION 4. That the City Council of the City of Chula Vista does hereby find, determine and declare that more than one-half of the qualified voters voting on said proposition at said election, voted against said proposition, as hereinbefore more fully stated, and that said proposition was defeated; that Ordinance No. 234, above mentioned, was not repealed and remains in full force and effect.

Passed, adopted and approved this 17th day of December, 1934.

Attest:

B. S. Immov
City Clerk of the City of
Chula Vista, California.

J. N. Rife,
Mayor of the City of
City of Chula Vista, California.

State of California,) ss:
County of San Diego,) ss:
City of Chula Vista.)

I, C. S. TIMMONS, City Clerk of the City of Chula Vista, California, do hereby certify that the whole number of members of the City Council of the City of Chula Vista is five; that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by said City Council and approved by the Mayor of said City, at a regularly adjourned meeting thereof, duly held on the 17th day of December, 1934, and that it was so adopted by the following vote, to-wit:

AYES: Councilmen Boltz, Rife, Howe, Lyons, Brown.

NOES: Councilmen None.

ABSENT: Councilmen None.

C. S. Timmons
City Clerk of the City of
Chula Vista, California.

Editor, The Sun:—In our fight in Chula Vista against granting a long term contract to the San Diego Consolidated Gas and Electric Company, we were defeated by only 16 votes.

A very questionable victory by the opposition, when one takes into consideration what the opposition was composed of, namely: the Gas and Electric Co., with its tremendous resources; the Sweetwater Water Corporation, the two banks and the Building and Loan; the Chamber of Commerce; the local newspaper, and four of the five city councilmen.

I am still convinced that we were on the right track! and we shall continue along that tack until the city of Chula Vista owns its own electric light plant and distribution system. Only by doing so can the city of Chula Vista give to its residents present and future cheap rates and at the same time make it possible for these residents to earn their daily bread by working in factories along our waterfront—factories that will be induced to come here because we can supply them with power rates so cheap that we can meet any competition from that source.. To this end it is the purpose of our organization to place before the people on initiative petition demanding an election for a municipal electric plant and distributing system. Along this line many citizens of National City have asked me to speak to them on the question of municipal ownership. It may be possible to attack this problem from two fronts at the same time.—VINCENT L. HOWE, City Councilman of Chula Vista.