

1968 Legislative Report

By THOS. L. PITTS

Secretary-Treasurer
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

FOREWORD

The 1968 session of the California Legislature has been marked with some success from Labor's viewpoint. This is particularly true in the area of blocking vicious assaults on benefits and rights which have been built into State law on behalf of working people over the years.

Our first aim has been to maintain clear, fast communication with those most vitally interested in pending legislation. The response has been most gratifying. State councils, central labor councils, building trades councils, locals and other affiliates repeatedly have come through quickly and strongly to assist when needed. Such cooperation, time and again, has demonstrated the value of united action in common cause.

We have stressed the value of direct contact with the Assemblymen and Senators by their own constituents. The actions of the session again illustrate this. Make no mistake, labor has been under constant attack. Its spokesmen throughout California have responded vigorously to this pressure with outstanding results.

We have emphasized issues rather than personalities. Our thrust has been toward individual bills and votes without partisan concern. Efforts have been directed toward keeping the working people of California fully informed of legislation affecting them, and to "tell the story like it is."

Though we did not achieve all that we desired in the workmen's compensation program, we did make gains. In the last hours of the session, the workmen's compensation legislation was one of the main measures before both Houses. Senator Short introduced amendments sponsored by the California Labor Federation to increase workmen's compensation benefits to \$100.00 per week. The amendments lost by voice vote, but because of the efforts of your labor representatives, the benefit amount was raised from the original employer proposal of \$84.00 to \$87.50; and a raise from \$80.00 to \$87.00 for disability insurance, plus increased death benefits and burial expenses. As other amendments were added, we had to oppose some of the technical language of the bill. Since we were unsuccessful in getting all of this language stricken from the legislation, our objective for the next legislative session will be to try to get this corrected.

The workmen's compensation and the disability insurance programs were approved by both houses. Their enactment is tied to the maneuvering between the two houses over the question of adjournment. Final Assembly action took place after a proclamation by Acting Governor Hugh Burns, adjourned the Legislature sine die. The Assembly continued working two additional days, taking favorable action on the legislation and then recessed until September 9.

The odds were against labor from the start, with serious obstacles to face, including the make-up of the leadership of both Houses, and the committee appointments. But, with solid, united backing by Labor, and by letting the legislators know where Labor stood on the vital issues, the

Assemblymen and Senators were more aware this session of Labor's position than ever before.

Our sincere thanks goes to those in the central labor councils, building trades councils and state councils for one of the finest unified efforts on the part of the labor movement in California in making this a decisive year for Labor at the Legislature.

SOCIAL INSURANCE

It was the announced policy of both the Assembly Committee on Finance and Insurance and the Senate Committee on Insurance and Financial Institutions that all bills covering these matters be heard, taken under submission and considered together in executive session. This procedure resulted in AB 1045 as a bill on Workmen's Compensation and AB 2034 on Disability Insurance. These and other related items will be discussed further in this report.

From the beginning of the session, the California Labor Federation actively campaigned to secure substantially increased benefit payments. While the amounts we favored were higher than those finally enacted, we supported the greatest raise obtainable at every point.

Both AB 1045 and AB 2034 were given final approval in each house. Together they constitute the center of a procedural disagreement between the Assembly and the Senate, unrelated to the merits of the bills themselves, as described in the Foreword.

Workmen's Compensation

The workmen's compensation program is one of the oldest in existence in the United States. Of the State programs, California's likewise is one of the oldest and the present law is based upon an enactment in 1917 establishing the principle of liability without fault for injury occurring upon the job, generally applicable to all employers but with statutory limits as to the nature and amount of compensation benefits to be obtained by injured workmen.

The plight of the industrially injured has too long been overlooked and substantial improvements must be made.

The measure to come out of the 1968 session of the Legislature aimed at improving the workmen's compensation program was AB 1045.

As finally approved, AB 1045 will increase from \$70.00 to \$87.50 the maximum temporary benefits paid workers injured on their jobs. This was a compromise between \$91.00 originally favored by the Assembly and \$84.00 in the Senate version.

Other increases were in death benefits from \$17,500 to \$20,000 for dependents generally, \$20,000 to \$23,000 for surviving widows with dependent children, from \$600 to \$1,000 for burial expenses generally, and from \$300 to \$700 for disaster service workers.

Amendments dealing with alleged cumulative injuries

go far beyond the need to return the law to its status prior to recent California Supreme Court decisions. These the Federation opposed and if they are enacted into law will attempt to have them appropriately modified in the next session of the Legislature. In effect, they cause the statute of limitations to begin running in an industrial injury simply by an individual obtaining medical treatment, without regard to whether or not he had knowledge the disability was work connected.

We want to call Labor's attention to House Resolution 559, introduced by Assemblyman Bob Moretti (D-North Hollywood), calling for an appropriate study by a committee of compensating injured workmen for permanent disabilities solely on the basis of actual wage loss. There is no question that the Federation will be watching this committee very closely.

Disability Insurance

The long deferred raise in disability insurance benefits was enacted in AB 2034 by Assemblyman George Zenovich (D-Fresno). This boosts maximum weekly disability benefits from \$80.00 to \$87.00.

Other measures affecting disability insurance included:

SB 755, introduced April 1, 1968, by Senator Robert S. Stevens (R-Los Angeles).

Until its amendment in the Assembly July 23, SB 755 was a fairly simple technical bill dealing with the amendments of voluntary plans with respect to any changes that might occur during the course of the session.

The amendments of July 23, however, completely transformed it into a highly substantive and controversial bill which would have in effect destroyed the standards established by the Legislature and affirmed by the California Supreme Court in *Pitts vs. Perluss*.

In order to qualify under the legislative requirements, voluntary plans must meet specific standards established by the Department of Employment, one of the principal standards being a protection against adverse selection against the State plan.

These amendments would have in effect hamstrung the Director of Employment not only from enforcing the law as established by the Legislature, but apparently would have required him to permit any type of voluntary plan to remain in effect until January 1, 1970, regardless as to how disruptive such voluntary plan may be.

This attempt to override the action of the Legislature and the decision of the California Supreme Court without amending the legislative standards would have obviously been disruptive of the solvency and soundness of the State plan and might well have led to destruction prior to the January 1, 1970, date.

SB 755 was strongly opposed by the California Labor Federation, and because of the work done in contacting the members of the Assembly, the bill was re-referred to the Committee on Ways and Means where it failed to be voted out before the Legislature ended its deliberations.

AB 176 by Assemblyman Charles Warren (D-Los Angeles), which was supported by the California Labor Federation, proposed to freeze wage credits for women during periods of pregnancy in determining the benefit rights relative to disability insurance. AB 176 passed the Assembly 46 to 3, but it was still in the Senate Insurance and Financial Institutions Committee at the end of the session.

Unemployment Insurance

One of the primary objectives that the 1935 Legislature intended to achieve by the enactment of a system of unemployment insurance is set forth in Section 100 of the California Unemployment Insurance Code to provide

“... benefits for persons unemployed through no fault of their own, and to reduce involuntary unemployment and the suffering caused thereby to a minimum.”

Of all the groups of workers who require such protection, the most needy are the men, women and children engaged in California's vast, seasonal agricultural industry working at bare subsistence wages. Labor has consistently sought to bring them under the program and this effort has been bitterly opposed at every turn by the huge corporate “farmers” of our state. This session was no exception.

AB 182 by Assemblywoman Yvonne Brathwaite (D-Los Angeles) was introduced to bring agricultural workers under provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Code.

An urban legislator and a “freshman,” Mrs. Brathwaite nevertheless skillfully steered AB 182 through a strongly opposed passage in two Assembly committees and a favorable vote in that house. Before final action could be taken, Assemblymen Veysey and Ketchum offered amendments to dilute the bill. These attempts were turned down in the face of the author's determined opposition.

On the first roll call, AB 182 was four votes short. Mrs. Brathwaite then “worked the floor” and contacted absentees to bring a 42 to 31 victory out of the fire.

The bill was sent to the Senate, where it was assigned to the Committee on Insurance and Financial Institutions. After a hearing, AB 182 was taken under submission and further discussed in closed executive session. There the matter rested when the Senate departed the Capitol.

This represents some progress, however, in the face of tremendous opposition from the combined forces of the multi-million-dollar California agri-business.

Other bills which passed the Legislature on Unemployment Insurance are:

AB 562, introduced by Assemblyman William T. Bagley (R-San Rafael), provides that the reserve account of a base period employer shall not be charged on account of benefits paid a claimant who, during the base period, was a student hired by the employer on a temporary basis during a vacation period who left his employment because of the end of his vacation.

AB 601, introduced by Assemblyman Newton R. Russell (R-Burbank), provides that an individual terminated due to his absence from work because of incarceration who is convicted shall be deemed to have left his work voluntarily without good cause. It also authorizes reconsideration of rulings made prior to conviction, or other final disposition of complaint, as to termination for such cause during benefit year or extended duration period.

AB 974, introduced by Assemblyman George N. Zenovich (D-Fresno), includes, for purposes of determining remuneration to be excluded from “wages” for ascertaining employer contributions, remuneration paid to an employee for services constituting employment under the Unemployment Insurance laws of another state which the employer has reported to such other state as wages for contribution purposes.

ANTI-UNION LEGISLATION

Governor Reagan in his State-of-the-State message in 1967, set the stage for introduction of anti-union legislation during his term of office. Attempts in the 1967 session to pass the bills containing his recommendations were successfully thwarted.

However, in his State-of-the-State message to a Joint Session of the Legislature on January 9, 1968, the Governor stated:

“To insure proper protection for those millions

of our citizens who are members of organized labor, I will again call for legislation guaranteeing each member the right to a secret ballot on all matters affecting policy of his union."

The bill drafted to carry out the Governor's recommendation was AB 542.

AB 542 was introduced on February 14, 1968, by Assemblyman Charles J. Conrad (R-Sherman Oaks), with co-authors of Assemblymen John Stull (R-Encinitas), E. Richard Barnes (R-San Diego), Stewart Hinckley (R-Redlands), Ray E. Johnson (R-Chico), William M. Ketchum (R-Bakersfield), Paul Priolo (R-Los Angeles).

AB 542 would have required a cumbersome, delaying procedure of written secret ballot voting in strike sanctions, collective bargaining agreements and other union activities. It would have imposed bureaucratic restrictions on labor relations which would have been heavily weighted in favor of management against its employees.

In his press release informing of the introduction of AB 542 and urging passage, Governor Reagan called legislative approval "necessary to insure union members greater control over the affairs of their unions, and to end minority control of some unions."

Conrad stated in his release on the bill that, "The bill is intended to supplement federal law."

AB 542 twice came up in the Assembly Committee on Industrial Relations. Throughout the session, the California Labor Federation worked in firm opposition to the proposal. At the committee meeting on April 1, the author asked the bill be put over but no new date was set at that time. Again on June 24 it was on the committee file. Then the author still felt the proposal did not have sufficient support to move and he asked that the matter be referred to interim study, ending the effort to have AB 542 enacted for this session.

SB 700, by Senator William F. Coombs (R-Rialto), was introduced under the vague title of "relating to economic productivity." Its blatant anti-labor character immediately came to light under the scrutiny of the California Labor Federation.

In its committee hearing, sponsorship of the California Newspaper Publishers Association behind SB 700 was revealed. It was an effort to undercut the collective bargaining process with their Printing Trades employees.

SB 700 would have made it unlawful to use "strike, boycott, picket or . . . collective bargaining agreement or other means" to cause an employer to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value for services "not needed by such employer or not necessary in the production of the product or operation of the employer's business."

Going even further, it attempted to make any contract provisions "contrary" to the terms of the bill unenforceable "as against public policy."

It made a mockery of true collective bargaining. Its provisions could have been a source of deep, damaging labor strife throughout California for generations.

Backers of the bill openly declared that this was an attempt to have the State become a party in their collective bargaining process, opposed to the employee groups.

Although directed toward the printing trades crafts, SB 700 would have had an adverse effect on every labor organization affiliated with the Federation.

At the hearing in Senate Business and Professions Committee, Senator John McCarthy endeavored to confuse the issues being presented by Labor's spokesmen. However, the committee chairman, Senator Alan Short, agreed that SB 700 would set a precedent for future collective bar-

gaining agreements in California by injecting official State participation.

At the conclusion of the testimony, a motion to send the bill out "do pass" was made. When the question was put to the committee, only two of the committee members voted in favor of the motion.

A motion was then made that the bill be sent to the Rules Committee to be referred to the proper interim committee, thus ending consideration for the 1968 session, a favorable result attributable directly to strong, united Labor opposition.

AB 1101, by Assemblyman W. Craig Biddle (R-Riverside), was a proposal relating to trespassing on railroad property which carried clear anti-labor implications, bringing opposition by the Federation.

Amendments were added purportedly to meet Labor's objection. Though cleverly drawn, they failed to do so. The language remained vague and open to the original criticism. We know of no justification for the proposal in the first instance and hold it is an unconstitutional intrusion on a guaranteed right of free speech. This unnecessary piece of legislation cleared both houses and was signed by the Governor on August 8.

AB 1024, by Assemblyman Pete Wilson (R-San Diego), was urgently opposed by the Federation on behalf of professional working musicians throughout the state.

Along with AB 954 by Assemblyman William Campbell (R-Hacienda Heights), AB 1024 proposed to permit the use of school bands at privately promoted profit-making events. This practice is now against the law. Opposition to the change was based on the injustice of exploiting tax supported organizations in competition to wage-earning musicians.

Faced with determined Labor opposition at the first committee hearing, Assemblyman Campbell dropped his AB 954 and combined forces with Assemblyman Wilson to push AB 1024. Numerous amendments were proposed to divide those objecting to the proposal, without success. AB 1024 squeezed through the Assembly by a 41-29 vote, barely enough for passage, much altered but not improved.

In this form, it came before the Senate Governmental Efficiency Committee, where it was heard and the matter referred for interim study.

SB 425 by Senator H. L. Richardson (R-Pasadena), AB 1463 by Speaker Jesse Unruh (D-Los Angeles) and AB 1464 by Assemblyman Leon Ralph (D-Los Angeles) dealt with different subjects, but the action on them serves to point up an important aspect in developing a legislative program.

All three, as introduced, had provisions which attracted wide support. All three also had incidental features which posed serious threats to California Labor. Because of this, vigorous opposition was maintained by the Federation until extensive amendments were achieved, taking out the offensive portions.

SB 425 attempted to deal with the problem of pre-emption, defining in what areas state law would have exclusive jurisdiction and in which local ordinances would prevail. Its original language would have opened the door to enactment of "right-to-work" ordinances and other anti-labor regulations by county and city boards.

The California Labor Federation succeeded, with the cooperation of the author, in securing amendments to SB 425 which clearly excluded any and all activities of labor organizations from provisions of the bill. With these amendments, Labor had no direct concern with SB 425 and it proceeded through the legislative process. However, after passage by the Senate it arrived in the Assembly

Criminal Procedures Committee where it remained for the balance of the session.

AB 1463 and AB 1464 were two of six bills in a bi-partisan package on job training and employment opportunities. However worthy the original "thrust" of these proposals, their original language seriously imperiled California's outstanding apprenticeship training program. The Federation, against tremendous pressure, forcefully pointed out this glaring weakness.

After numerous hearings on the subject in both houses and before four committees, several amendments were agreed upon to eliminate the objectionable features while preserving the more desirable objectives in the two bills.

Following this mutually acceptable conclusion, AB 1463 and AB 1464 were passed and sent to the Governor for signature.

Hot Cargo and Secondary Boycott

SB 951, as introduced on April 15 by Senator John Harmer (R-Glendale), was a harmless little bill on industrial relations. Suddenly, on June 12, it was amended by associating Senator Hugh Burns, President Pro Tem of the Senate, as a co-author and it became the notorious "Hot Cargo and Secondary Boycott" proposal of the 1968 session.

The California Labor Federation instantly rallied its forces to do battle with this pernicious legislation. On June 18, hearing was held before Senate Labor Committee.

Appearing in opposition to the bill were representatives of the Federation and United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

Employer and agricultural lobbies were out in force for the bill, with Senator Burns carrying the presentation before the committee.

After thorough debate, Senator Lou Cusanovich (R-Sherman Oaks) moved the committee take the bill "under submission." With only Senator Harmer opposed, this was approved.

SB 951 was suddenly set for committee hearing again by its authors on July 2. Again Labor solidified its forces behind representatives of the Federation in opposing this proposal to emasculate workers in their struggle to improve working conditions.

After Senator Burns again made the pitch for a "do pass" recommendation, such a motion was offered by Senator George Deukmejian (R-Long Beach). Before a vote could be taken, Senator Cusanovich again acted to bottle up the measure when he offered a counter motion to hold the bill in committee. This suggestion was supported by Chairman Nick Petris (D-Oakland) and Senator Alfred Song (D-Monterey Park).

Thus the abortive attempt to put a prohibition against "hot cargo and secondary boycott" action by aggrieved Labor groups died for the session.

Pay Delay

AB 1163, introduced by Assemblyman William M. Ketchum (R-Bakersfield), and AB 1555, introduced by Assemblyman Mike Cullen (D-Long Beach), were companion anti-labor bills to provide for extension of the period in which workers could receive their final pay for seasonal and part-time work.

Hard-won, traditional protections afforded workers in agriculture, motion picture production, building trades and other fields would have been dangerously relaxed if these bills had been enacted. Their passage was urgently supported by the California Conference of Employers.

Both were defeated in the Assembly after a prolonged

legislative battle which extended over four days and into the evening of the fourth. This result was achieved by the solid opposition of Labor, organized and coordinated by the Federation.

A floor fight became necessary when, on May 13, the bills were powered out of the Assembly Industrial Relations Committee as a package.

The first skirmish came when opposition to the pair drew bi-partisan support and AB 1163 was defeated. Heated debate and numerous roll calls left this measure substantially short of the needed 41 votes. The final tally was 34-32.

After the result was announced, Assemblyman Ketchum served notice of reconsideration. However, two days later the author accepted defeat of the bill, waived his motion to reconsider and declared his support for AB 1555.

Meanwhile, amendments were offered to AB 1555 in order to soften the opposition and to divorce it from AB 1163. These were opposed by Labor as unacceptable. One speaker on the floor characterized the proposed amendments as "not a divorce but an abortion" of the twin pay-delay proposals. The amendments were decisively beaten with 21 "aye" and 40 "no" votes.

Again after numerous calls of the House and other legislative maneuvering, the vote on AB 1555 was announced as 39 to 36, two votes short of the required 41, at 7:45 on the evening of May 22, with the negative votes sustaining Labor's position.

Immediately, Assemblyman Cullen served notice he would seek reconsideration the next day. This was granted by a 41 to 24 vote but the bill was then re-referred to the Industrial Relations Committee. There it failed by a 4-2 count to get a "do pass" out of the committee and so died for the 1968 session.

Labor Commissioner

When the present Labor Commissioner took office with the change of administration, he instituted procedures which put up delaying roadblocks in the processing of wage claims. This was an about face from established practice of over 40 years. Instead of prompt affirmative service, working men and women have been subjected to extended delays of three and four months duration.

The volume of protests prompted the Commissioner not to correct his policy, but to seek legislation to sanction his reversal. On the last day for unrestricted introduction of bills, Senator Clark L. Bradley (R-San Jose) put SB 1272 in the hopper to accomplish this.

From its introduction, the Federation strongly opposed SB 1272. This opposition resulted in not one but two firm defeats for the bill on the Senate floor. Senator Milton Marks focused the argument against the measure when he stated the issue was "whether or not the purpose of the Labor Commissioner's office shall be carried out as intended." Debate on SB 1272 clearly demonstrated its purpose was to sanction the recent departure from practice established since the creation of the office.

Senator Alfred Song described the bill as "unnecessary and unjust," stating there was "no real need for this particular bill."

Senator George Moscone, leader in the floor fight on the bill, pointed out it "deteriorates the concept of collective bargaining" and would deprive the "blue collar worker of a forum."

The first vote on the bill came July 1, when it was refused passage 19 to 20. The author secured reconsideration, spent two weeks trying to muster support and brought it forth again July 18 when it was decisively rejected again 17 to 19. An identical bill failed in the previous session and this

year's action emphasized the determination to preserve the wage earners' rights.

Professional Strikebreakers

AB 426 was initiated by the California Labor Federation to outlaw the use of professional strikebreakers, such as those allegedly hired by the billion dollar Hearst Corporation's Herald-Examiner, to undercut the wages and working conditions of union workers. It was introduced in the Legislature by Assemblyman Edward E. Elliott (D-Los Angeles).

This measure provided:

1. It would be illegal for an employer to knowingly utilize any professional strikebreaker in a strike or lockout.
2. It would be illegal for any professional strikebreaker to knowingly offer himself for employment in a strike or lockout.
3. Defined a "professional strikebreaker."

An extended hearing was conducted on April 22 in the Assembly Industrial Relations Committee on the merits of the bill.

Assemblyman Elliott, principal author and veteran of 21 years in the Legislature, led the testimony for the supporters of the bill, followed by spokesmen from Labor.

Following these presentations, opponents of AB 426 briefly stated their position for continuing to permit use of professional strikebreakers in strikes and lockouts. As is customary, supporters of AB 426 then made detailed rebuttal.

Up to this point, the hearing before the complete committee membership had proceeded in the established order before a "standing room only" crowd gathered to hear the pros and cons.

Then, those present were "treated" to a unique demonstration of the power of the gavel.

First Chairman Walter Powers suggested the committee take some action, stating they had to make way for another committee in the hearing room. In quick succession, Assemblyman David Roberti moved the bill be sent to the Assembly with a "do pass" recommendation, seconded by Assemblyman Alan Sieroty; then Assemblyman John Briggs made a substitute motion, which the Chairman seemed shocked to hear, to move the bill "out without recommendation." No vote was taken on either of these, but the Chairman heard a motion by Assemblyman Bill Greene which was not audible even to the first row of spectators. This was a motion to take the bill "under submission." It is astounding, however, that the Chairman did not even permit the members of the Committee to express opposition by a "no" vote to the inaudible motion that he ruled had been passed.

Again, without an apparent vote, the Chairman declared the latter motion carried and the meeting adjourned simultaneously.

Thus the 80 members of the Assembly were denied the right to vote on the issue. Forty-four members of that House — three more than needed for passage — had previously committed themselves in writing to vote for AB 426. Assemblyman Powers' performance was effective, if crude, as he ruthlessly gavelled AB 426 to death.

Women and Minors

AB 1357 by Assemblyman Bill Greene (D-Los Angeles), represented an attempt to expand the erosion of the women's eight-hour law which began with the passage of the Morretti Act.

AB 1357 would have extended the exemption from the eight-hour law to the laundry industry. It cleared the Assembly Industrial Relations Committee but met Labor opposition head-on on the floor, with Assemblyman Dave Roberti

leading the debate against. On the roll call, it was soundly defeated. However, the record is not available since the author immediately moved to have the record expunged and the matter returned to committee.

SB 232 by Senator Grunsky, relating to the equal pay law, has been signed into statute by the Governor as Chapter 325. This measure had the backing of the California Labor Federation and is a valuable addition to the Labor Code.

It prohibits payment of unequal wages to employees of opposite sex who work under the same circumstances, rather than simply prohibiting payment to female employees of wages less than that paid to male employees working under the same circumstances. Further, it prohibits the reduction of wages of any employee in order to comply with the equal pay provisions.

The bill was threatened when Senator Burns made the unusual motion to have it "laid on the table" when it came before the Senate for a vote. This was defeated 14 to 18, and on the roll call for approval it secured 23 "ayes" and 14 "noes."

Assemblyman Davis carried the bill in the Assembly, where it was approved 49 to 10. Throughout the process the California Conference of Employers worked to kill SB 232. It was signed by the Governor on June 20.

SB 1065 by Senator Howard Way (R-Exeter), dealing with minimum wage rates for women and minors working in California, was stopped in the Senate Labor Committee, representing an important victory for Labor.

The bill was introduced with the support of the California Agricultural Council to demolish the minimum wage floor for women and minors. Traditionally, California has followed a flexible method of determining minimum wages by Wage Boards, based on experience and research. The bill would have imposed a rigid statutory system to set minimum wages. The Federation noted, in opposing the bill, that regulations involving agricultural labor are subject to judicial review currently pending in at least four cases in California courts.

In presenting the case against SB 1065, we labeled it a "sham" for which there was no justification and asked the committee to reject it. In voting against a motion to put the bill out with a "do pass" recommendation, Senator Lou Cusnovich performed a valuable service to California Labor.

Incidentally, while the emphasis was on agricultural workers by the proponents of the bill, we pointed out that its anti-labor provisions were not restricted to that field of employment but went far beyond it.

AB 756 by Assemblyman Victor V. Veysey (R-Brawley) and AB 1232 by Assemblyman Kent H. Stacey (R-Bakersfield) also proposed weakening of wage and hour legislation as it applies to women and minors. Both were opposed by the California Labor Federation, and on May 6, both were taken under submission by the Assembly Committee on Industrial Relations, neither progressing beyond that point.

AB 756 would have required wage boards to take into consideration extraneous factors when making recommendations to the Industrial Welfare Commission on wages, hours and working conditions for women and minors.

AB 1232 would have stripped the Industrial Welfare Commission of its authority in the fixing of minimum wages for women and minors.

Public Employees

Probably no committee of the Legislature handles a wider variety of detailed bills during a session than the Assembly Committee on State Employment, Retirement and Veterans Affairs. This is the "policy committee" for such legislation as the Public Employees Retirement System,

State Teachers Retirement System, public employee organizations, Cal-Vet Loans and related subjects.

It is obvious that we cannot deal in detail with all the bills in which we took an active interest before this committee. For purposes of this summary we will direct our attention to a few bills which emphasize some of the more critical problems in dealing with legislation on behalf of public employees.

Probably the most significant legislation in this field was SB 1228, relating to public employee organizations and their relations with employers.

The Federation sponsored AB 283 by Assemblyman John Burton (D-San Francisco) as containing its proposals for improving employer-employee relations with public agencies in California. Several other bills, both parallel to and contrary to AB 283, were heard over several weeks time and taken under submission. After continuing negotiation, the committee came up with a consensus measure which was sent to the floor in AB 1182. In this form, it passed the Assembly 71 to 4.

On the Senate side, AB 1182 cleared the Senate Committee on Local Government and was referred to Finance. The latter committee, as the session drew to a close, had an overburdened schedule. With AB 1182 resting there, its supporters amended its provisions into SB 1228 as insurance against the entire subject being lost in the rush.

This alliance between Senator George Moscone (D-San Francisco), author of SB 1228, and Assemblyman George Milias, chairman of the committee which devised AB 1182, proved productive. On July 31, the Assembly approved SB 1228 62 to 1. The next day, the Senate passed it 23 to 12. Even after that, supporters had to maintain vigilance since a notice for reconsideration was served. However, the next day this was dropped and the bill proceeded to the Governor.

The measure is a broad one but essentially it provides that recognized employee organizations shall have the right to represent their members in employment relations with public agencies. Other provisions establish procedures for resolution of disputes.

AB 127, sponsored by the California Labor Federation, was introduced and carried by Assemblyman Edward Elliott (D-Los Angeles). This sought to resolve the long standing dispute with the Regents of the University of California over voluntary payroll deductions for union dues.

AB 127 would have clarified the obligation of the University to provide this service to its employees, in conformity with established procedures for all other public employers in the State. Throughout the session, the Federation met the persistent opposition of the Regents and later that of the State Controller's office. After clearing several hearings before two Assembly committees, it passed that house on April 29 with a 57 to 10 margin.

In the Senate, it was given a "do pass" by the Governmental Efficiency Committee but was held in Senate Finance by the lack of one vote.

SB 458 by Senator Richard Dolwig (R-San Mateo), co-authored by Assemblywoman March K. Fong (D-Oakland), late in its career became an anti-labor bill affecting teachers and other public school employees. Amendments adopted in the Assembly July 15, combined with the original language, made this virtually a "right-to-work" measure in the field of public school employer-employee relations. Labor opposition, led by the California Labor Federation and California Federation of Teachers, worked to defeat SB 458 on the Senate floor during its final day in session. By a vote to 15 to 9, the Senators refused to concur in the Assembly version, killing the bill.

State Purchasing

SB 411 by Senator George Moscone (D-San Francisco), AB 173 by Assemblyman John Burton (D-San Francisco), AB 661 by Assemblymen John Burton (D-San Francisco) and Carl Britschgi (R-Redwood City) and SB 602 by Senator Alfred E. Alquist (D-San Jose) et al were introduced to provide protection for California business in bidding on public supplies against out-of-state bidders.

In backing these bills, the Federation determined the present 5 per cent preference for California business is inadequate and ineffective. This puts California industry in unfair competitive position with suppliers in other states having sub-standard labor conditions.

Evidence developed in support of these bills had the immediate affirmative result of stopping the certain award to the Kingsport Press in Tennessee for 1½ million California textbooks. This plant is operated by strikebreakers and has been for years. In conjunction with this proposed legislation, the Federation spearheaded a drive to have the State Department of General Services reverse its direction and bring this valuable contract back to California. The printing trades, along with central labor councils and local unions throughout the state joined in the important effort, again offering a strong united front.

SB 411 and AB 173 were held in committee. AB 661 cleared two committees and the Assembly, with a 62 to 5 vote. It was before the Senate Governmental Efficiency Committee when the session ended.

SB 602 was sent to the Governor August 1, after the Senate concurred in Assembly amendments.

The thrust of all these bills is to assist industry and labor in California to meet unfair competition from beyond our borders. The results have been positive, despite well-financed opposing pressures, particularly in focusing attention on the State's relationship to bids from the anti-labor Kingsport Press.

Consumer Protection

AB 544 by Assemblyman Floyd Wakefield (R-Huntington Park), as introduced February 14, provided for an exemption from weighing at time of sale for pre-packaged items of processed meats that were not of predetermined uniform size or weight.

Amended on April 19, all of the original language was deleted and the new text had the following provisions:

1. Excepted, in the case of meat or meat products, the manufacturer, processor, packer, wholesaler, or jobber of individual packages or container, or lots of packages or containers, from responsibility for the accuracy of net weight stated on the packages or containers for longer than three weeks from the date of packaging.

2. Imposed the responsibility upon the retailer of the package or container after the above three week period, provided he had the package, or container for no less than two weeks of the subject period.

3. Declared that no primal cut of meat or carcass of meat packaged and delivered by the manufacturer, processor, packer, wholesaler, or jobber, which is not intended for direct sale to the consumer, need be marked by him with the net weight of the commodity.

From its inception, the representatives of the Western Federation of Butchers led Labor's opposition to AB 544.

In the face of the forceful objections to the bill, AB 544 had two hearings in the Assembly Governmental Efficiency and Economy Committee, but failed to muster sufficient support to get out of committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

SB 576 by Senators Rodda, Short, Mills and Moscone added well deserved on-the-job protection for California motion picture projectionists.

It has been signed into law by the Governor as Chapter 399. It exempts motion picture machine operators working for wages in licensed theaters from arrest for exhibiting obscene matter. There is a history of such arrests and prosecutions in censorship cases where the projectionists had no control over the film to be shown. This resulted in unwarranted harrassment in the course of legitimate employment.

It was essential this bill be kept simple and to the single point. In this regard, Assemblyman Alan Sieroty gave a valuable assist in the Assembly Criminal Procedures Committee. The capable work done by the theatrical groups in presenting SB 576 before legislative committees along with Federation spokesmen, resulted in its seemingly easy course on the floor of each house.

The Senate gave its approval 24 to 0, and the Assembly cleared it 50 to 2. Governor Reagan signed SB 576 June 27.

SB 393 by Senator Ralph Dills (D-San Pedro) and nine others, illustrates the cooperation which can be achieved between labor and industry in common cause.

This bill was introduced to relieve the motion picture industry of the business inventory tax on films produced and still "in the can." The objective was to provide important tax savings, discourage out-of-state warehousing and to provide an added incentive against "runaway" productions.

All crafts involved in the theatrical industry joined with management to support SB 393 and both benefited. Passage of this measure meant employment in the crafts concerned would be on the uprise and Labor's representatives worked hard, long and effectively to secure passage of this tax relief.

Since it carried an appropriation, SB 393 required 27 votes in the Senate and 54 in the Assembly. It passed the Senate 27 to 6 on April 24. In the Assembly, the proposal was the subject of several extended hearings in Revenue and Taxation Committee. On the floor, amendments were added, and it passed there 54 to 18. Upon its return to the Senate for concurrence in Assembly amendments, SB 393 was sent to the Governor July 23 by a 27-11 tally, and on August 1 it was signed into law.

Civil Rights

SB 293 by Senator Lawrence E. Walsh (D-Los Angeles) and SB 319 by Senator John G. Schmitz (R-Tustin) were both attempts to eliminate open housing provisions in State law and to virtually repeal the Rumford Fair Housing Act. Both these regressive measures were opposed by the California Labor Federation. Under tremendous pressure from the Federation and the labor councils, neither was able to muster support to be reported out of the Senate Governmental Efficiency Committee for action on the floor.

SB 293 did have two hearings in committee, where amendments were approved, but these failed to materially

improve a bad bill. Its third hearing on June 19 resulted in SB 293 being held in committee. Several members of the committee expressed a desire to study recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling on open housing relative to provisions of the bill.

Conclusion

After the 128th legislative day of the session, the conclusion remains clouded. Each house ended its deliberations under separate and conflicting resolutions. The Senate acted under the sine die adjournment proclamation of the Acting Governor; the Assembly worked two additional days and recessed under its own resolution which declared that proclamation a "nullity." Both will return for veto proceedings on September 9.

Section 3(a), Article IV provides:

"At the end of each regular session the Legislature shall recess for 30 days. It shall reconvene on the Monday after the 30-day recess, for a period not to exceed 5 days, to reconsider vetoed measures."

Section 8(c), Article IV, further provides:

"No statute may go into effect until the 61st day after adjournment of the regular session at which the bill was passed, or until the 91st day after adjournment of the special session at which the bill was passed . . ."

This section exempts statutes calling elections, providing for tax levies or appropriations and urgency measures.

It is quite possible the Governor, at the request of the Legislature, will probably add certain items for a Special Session to be called during the Veto Session.

Thus, only the future will determine the effective date of enacted legislation.

SB 335, as introduced by Senator James Q. Wedworth (D-Inglewood) was an obnoxious bill providing that management and administration of sardines, anchovies, jack and Pacific mackerel would be brought under the control of the Fish and Game Commission.

Working very closely with representatives of the SIU, the Federation was able to kill the vicious provisions of the bill. While SB 335 did pass both houses and was sent to the Governor, its final form was all new compared to the original language. In the enacted version it appropriated \$25,000 for support of the California Advisory Commission on Marine and Coastal Resources as a budget augmentation.

SJR 7 was introduced by Senators John Schmitz (R-Tustin), John L. Harmer (R-Glendale) and Jack Schrade (R-San Diego) to add California to the stragglng number of states approving the notoriously reactionary "Liberty Amendment" to the Federal Constitution.

This regressive proposal would completely alter the national government's approach to its people and their welfare. It represents as dangerous a threat to progress in the United States as any other single factor. After hearing arguments against it by the California Labor Federation on May 15, the Senate Governmental Efficiency Committee buried the resolution.



1968 California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO Tabulated Vote on 18 Assembly Roll Calls

		R	W	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Badham	(R)	7	8	R	W	W	W	NV	W	NV	W	R	R	W	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R
Bagley	(R)	4	8	NV	W	NV	W	NV	W	R	NV	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	NV	R	NV
Barnes	(R)	4	9	NV	W	NV	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	NV	R	R	NV	NV	R
Bear	(D)	14	3	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R
Bee	(D)	14	3	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	NV	R	W	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R
Belotti	(R)	12	5	R	W	R	R	W	W	R	R	R	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R	R
Beverly	(R)	8	9	R	NV	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R
Biddle	(R)	5	9	NV	W	W	W	W	W	NV	W	NV	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	NV
Brathwaite	(D)	11	2	R	R	NV	NV	R	NV	R	W	W	NV	R	R	NV	R	R	R	R	R
Briggs	(R)	9	7	R	W	W	W	W	NV	R	W	R	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R	R
Britschgi	(R)	11	4	R	W	NV	R	W	W	R	R	R	W	NV	NV	R	R	R	R	R	R
Brown	(D)	10	3	R	R	R	NV	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	NV	R	NV	R	NV	NV
Burke	(R)	6	8	NV	W	W	W	W	W	R	NV	NV	R	W	W	NV	R	W	W	R	R
Burton	(D)	10	4	NV	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	NV	W	NV	NV	R	R
Campbell	(R)	5	8	NV	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	NV	R	R	NV	NV	NV	R
Chappie	(R)	10	2	R	W	R	NV	NV	R	R	NV	NV	W	NV	R	R	NV	R	R	R	R
Collier	(R)	7	9	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	R	W	W	R	W	NV	R	R	NV
Conrad	(R)	10	8	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R
Cory	(D)	7	6	NV	NV	NV	W	NV	W	R	W	W	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R	R
Crandall	(R)	9	9	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R
Crown	(D)	10	3	NV	R	NV	R	NV	NV	R	R	R	W	R	W	NV	W	R	R	R	R
Cullen	(D)	4	9	R	R	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	NV	R	NV	NV	NV	NV
Davis	(D)	12	2	R	NV	W	R	R	R	R	NV	R	W	R	NV	R	R	R	NV	R	R
Deddeh	(D)	15	1	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R	NV
Dent	(R)	6	10	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	NV	W	NV	R	R	R
Duffy	(R)	6	7	R	R	W	R	W	W	R	NV	W	W	W	NV	R	W	NV	NV	NV	R
Dunlap	(D)	11	4	NV	R	R	R	R	NV	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	W	R	R	NV	R
Elliott	(D)	13	3	R	R	NV	R	NV	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Fenton	(D)	10	5	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	NV	W	R	NV	R	R	R	R	NV	R
Fong	(D)	12	3	R	R	R	W	W	R	R	NV	NV	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R
Foran	(D)	17	1	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Gonsalves	(D)	8	4	R	R	R	W	W	NV	R	NV	W	W	R	NV	NV	NV	R	NV	R	R
Greene, B.	(D)	7	4	NV	R	W	NV	NV	R	NV	W	W	W	R	R	NV	R	NV	NV	R	R
Greene, L.	(D)	9	6	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	W	W	W	R	NV	NV	NV	R	R	R	R
Hayes	(R)	7	7	NV	NV	W	W	NV	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R
Hinckley	(R)	2	8	W	W	R	W	NV	W	NV	W	W	R	W	NV	W	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV
Johnson, H.	(D)	11	2	R	R	NV	NV	R	R	R	NV	NV	W	R	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R
Johnson, R.	(R)	7	7	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	NV	NV	W	NV	R	R	NV	R	R
Karabian	(D)	9	0	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV	R	R	NV	NV	NV	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R
Ketchum	(R)	3	12	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	NV	R	NV	NV
Knox	(D)	12	5	R	R	W	R	NV	R	R	R	W	W	R	W	W	R	R	R	R	R
Lanterman	(R)	7	10	NV	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R
MacDonald	(D)	9	7	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	W	W	R	W	R	NV	R	NV	R	R
McGee	(R)	8	6	NV	R	NV	W	NV	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	NV
McMillan	(D)	7	3	NV	R	W	R	W	R	R	NV	NV	W	R	R	R	NV	NV	NV	NV	NV
Meyers	(D)	16	1	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Milias	(R)	6	10	NV	W	W	W	W	NV	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	R	R	R
Miller	(D)	7	4	NV	R	R	NV	NV	R	R	W	W	W	R	NV	R	W	R	NV	NV	NV
Mobley	(R)	8	8	R	W	NV	W	W	W	R	W	W	W	NV	W	R	R	R	R	R	R
Monagan	(R)	4	9	NV	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	R	W	NV	W	R	NV	R	NV	NV
Moorhead	(R)	10	8	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R

		R	W	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
Moretti	(D)	7	7	NV	R	NV	W	NV	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	NV	R
Mulford	(R)	7	9	R	W	W	W	W	NV	R	W	W	W	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R
Murphy	(R)	12	5	R	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	W	R	NV	R	R
Negri	(D)	10	5	R	R	W	R	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	R	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R
Pattee	(R)	9	5	NV	NV	W	R	W	NV	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	NV	R
Porter	(D)	9	6	R	W	W	W	NV	R	R	W	W	W	NV	NV	R	R	R	R	R	R
Powers	(D)	10	6	NV	R	W	R	W	W	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	NV	R	R	R
Priolo	(R)	7	8	R	NV	W	W	W	W	R	W	W	R	W	W	NV	R	R	NV	R	R
Quimby	(D)	13	4	NV	R	W	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Ralph	(D)	7	4	R	R	NV	NV	NV	R	R	W	W	W	R	W	NV	R	NV	NV	NV	R
Roberti	(D)	12	3	NV	R	R	R	NV	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R
Russell	(R)	6	9	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	NV	NV	W	W	W	R	R	R	NV	R
Ryan	(D)	6	7	NV	R	NV	W	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	W	W	W	R	R	NV	R	R
Schabarum	(R)	6	9	NV	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	R	W	W	NV	W	R	R	NV	R
Shoemaker	(D)	12	1	NV	R	R	R	NV	R	R	NV	NV	W	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R
Sieroty	(D)	10	4	NV	R	R	R	NV	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	W	NV	R	NV	R
Stacey	(R)	6	7	R	W	W	W	W	NV	NV	W	NV	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R	R	NV
Stull	(R)	7	10	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	NV	R	W	W	W	R	R	W	R	R
Thomas	(D)	13	3	R	R	R	R	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
Townsend	(D)	14	1	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	NV	NV	NV	R	R
Unruh	(D)	8	6	R	R	W	NV	W	R	R	W	W	W	W	R	R	R	NV	NV	R	NV
Vasconcellos	(D)	11	6	NV	R	W	W	R	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	R
Veneman	(R)	6	10	R	W	W	NV	W	W	R	W	W	W	W	W	R	W	R	R	NV	R
Veysey	(R)	3	12	NV	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	W	NV	R	R	R	R	NV	W
Wakefield	(R)	5	10	W	W	NV	W	W	W	W	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	NV	R	NV	R
Warren	(D)	12	3	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R	W	W	W	R	R	R	R	R	NV	NV	R
Wilson	(R)	3	9	NV	W	NV	W	W	W	R	W	W	NV	W	W	R	W	NV	NV	R	NV
Z'berg	(D)	12	4	R	R	R	R	W	NV	R	R	W	W	R	R	R	W	R	R	R	NV
Zenovich	(D)	9	3	NV	R	R	R	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	R	NV	R	R	R	NV	R	NV

R—Right; W—Wrong; NV—Not Voting.

1. AB 176—Warren. Freezes wage credits during periods of disability with respect to pregnancy. Passed 46-3; July 10.
2. AB 182—Brathwaite. Provides coverage for agricultural workers. Passed 42-31; July 10.
3. AB 1010—Powers. An extension of the Moretti Act's breakdown of the women's 8-hour law. Passed 44-21; July 7.
4. AB 1024—Wilson, Gonsalves, Campbell and Fenton. Opens the door to the free use of amateur tax-subsidized competition to those earning their living through the entertainment industries. Passed 41-29; July 8.
5. AB 1101—Biddle. Anti-picketing, anti-trespassing measure. Passed 41-14; June 24.
6. AB 1163—Ketchum. Would delay pay checks of California's seasonal workers. Refused passage 34-32; May 20.
7. AB 1182—Milias, Meyers, Dent, Barnes, Burke, Cullen, Duffy, Karabian, Z'berg, Bagley, Chappie, Mobley, Russell, Brathwaite and Townsend. Requires that representatives of public agencies meet and confer in good faith with representatives of recognized employee organizations. Passed 71-4; July 3.
8. AB 1463—Unruh, Monagan, Ralph, Veneman, Campbell, Mulford. Revolutionizing the California Apprenticeship Training Program. Passed 55-13; May 28.
9. AB 1464—Ralph, Unruh, Monagan, Veneman, Campbell, Mulford. Revolutionizing the California Apprenticeship Training Program. Passed 47-21; May 28.
10. AB 1465—Unruh. Relating to summer employment, with a \$5 million price tag. Passed 59-16; July 7.
11. AB 1555—Cullen. Pay delay bill for California's seasonal workers. Refused passage 39-36; May 22.
12. AB 1555—Cullen. Pay delay bill for California's seasonal workers. Reconsideration granted 41-24. Speaker granted unanimous consent to re-refer to Committee on Industrial Relations; May 23.
13. SB 232—Grunsky. Strengthens "equal pay for equal work" concept. Passed 49-10; May 29.
14. SB 393—Dills, Burns, Cusanovich, Grunsky, McCarthy, Kennick and Mills. Relating to the taxation of motion pictures. Passed 54-18; July 19.
15. SB 397—Sherman. Prohibits an employer from discharging an employee for taking time off to serve on jury duty. Passed 61-0; August 1.
16. SB 576—Rodda, Short, Mills, Moscone. Protects wage-earning motion picture projectionists from liability for arrest in cases involving movie censorship. Passed 50-2; June 14.
17. SB 602—Alquist, Lagomarsino, Moscone, Sherman and Short. Relating to California-made products. Passed 57-0; July 25.
18. SB 1228—Moscone, Alquist, Dills, Marks, Burgener, Wedworth and Petris. Requires that representatives of public agencies meet and confer in good faith with representatives of recognized employee organizations. Passed 62-1; July 31.

Tabulated Vote on 12 Senate Roll Calls

		R	W	I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Alquist	(D)	10	2	W	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R
Beilenson	(D)	6	1	R	NV	NV	NV	NV	R	R	R	NV	R	W	R
Bradley	(R)	2	6	W	NV	R	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	W	NV	W
Burgener	(R)	6	5	R	W	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	NV	W
Burns	(D)	5	6	W	R	NV	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	W
Carrell	(D)	7	1	R	NV	R	R	NV	R	R	R	W	NV	NV	R
Collier	(D)	8	2	W	R	NV	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	NV
Cologne	(R)	6	5	R	R	R	R	R	R	NV	W	W	W	W	W
Coombs	(R)	6	6	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W
Cusanovich	(R)	3	6	R	NV	NV	R	R	NV	W	W	W	W	W	W
Danielson	(D)	6	0	R	NV	R	NV	R	NV	R	R	NV	R	NV	NV
Deukmejian	(R)	4	6	NV	W	R	R	R	NV	R	W	W	W	W	W
Dills	(D)	6	1	W	R	NV	NV	R	R	R	R	NV	R	NV	NV
Dolwig	(R)	3	6	W	R	NV	NV	NV	R	R	W	W	W	W	W
Dymally	(D)	8	1	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R	NV	NV	R	W	R
Grunsky	(R)	6	3	R	R	R	R	R	R	NV	W	W	NV	NV	W
Harmer	(R)	3	6	R	W	R	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	W	NV	W
Kennick	(D)	7	2	R	R	NV	NV	NV	R	R	R	W	R	W	R
Lagomarsino	(R)	6	6	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	W	W
Marks	(R)	11	0	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R	R
Marler	(R)	7	5	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	W	W	W
McCarthy	(R)	4	6	W	R	R	R	R	NV	NV	W	W	W	W	W
Miller	(D)	4	3	W	NV	NV	NV	NV	R	W	R	W	R	NV	R
Mills	(D)	7	1	R	R	NV	NV	R	R	R	R	NV	R	W	NV
Moscone	(D)	9	0	R	R	NV	R	R	NV	R	R	NV	R	R	R
Petris	(D)	11	0	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R	R
Richardson	(R)	2	7	W	W	R	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	W	NV	W
Rodda	(D)	8	1	NV	R	R	R	R	NV	R	R	W	R	R	NV
Schmitz	(R)	2	5	W	R	R	NV	NV	NV	W	W	W	NV	NV	W
Schrade	(R)	6	5	R	R	R	R	R	NV	R	W	W	W	W	W
Sherman	(R)	10	2	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	R	W
Short	(D)	10	2	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	W	R	W	R
Song	(D)	6	2	R	R	NV	NV	NV	R	NV	R	R	R	W	W
Stevens	(R)	5	6	R	R	R	R	NV	R	W	W	W	W	W	W
Stiern	(D)	4	4	R	W	R	NV	NV	NV	W	R	W	R	W	NV
Teale	(D)	6	2	W	NV	R	NV	R	R	W	R	NV	NV	R	R
Walsh	(D)	8	3	W	R	NV	R	R	R	R	R	W	W	R	W
Way	(R)	2	6	NV	R	NV	NV	NV	R	W	W	W	W	W	W
Wedworth	(D)	8	3	W	W	R	R	R	NV	R	R	W	R	R	R
Whetmore	(R)	3	5	W	R	R	NV	NV	R	NV	W	W	W	NV	W

R—Right; W—Wrong; NV—Not Voting.

1. SB 232—Grunsky. Strengthens "equal pay for equal work" concept. Passed 23-14; April 15.
2. SB 393—Dills, Burns, Cusanovich, Grunsky, McCarthy, Kennick and Mills. Relating to the taxation of motion pictures. Passed 27-6; April 24.
3. SB 397—Sherman. Prohibits an employer from discharging an employee for taking time off to serve on jury duty. Passed 27-0; April 18.
4. SB 576—Rodda, Short, Mills, Moscone. Protects wage-earning motion picture projectionists from liability for arrest in cases involving movie censorship. Passed 24-0; May 1.
5. SB 1228—Moscone, Alquist, Dills, Marks, Burgener, Wedworth and Petris. Requires that representatives of public agencies meet and confer in good faith with representatives of recognized employee organizations. Passed 25-0; July 12.
6. SB 602 Alquist, Lagomarsino, Moscone, Sherman and Short. Relating to California-made products. Passed 30-0; June 6.
7. SB 1228—Moscone, Alquist, Dills, Marks, Burgener, Wedworth and Petris. Requires that representatives of public agencies meet and confer in good faith with representatives of recognized employee organizations. Concurrency in Assembly amendments 23-12; August 1.
8. SB 1272—Bradley. Relating to payment of wages. Refused passage 20-19; July 1.
9. SB 1272—Bradley. Relating to payment of wages. Reconsideration granted 29-2; July 2.
10. SB 1272—Bradley. Relating to payment of wages. Refused passage 19-17; July 18.
11. AB 1010—Powers. An extension of the Moretti Act's breakdown of the women's 8-hour law. Passed 21-8; July 29.
12. AB 1101—Biddle. Anti-picketing, anti-trespassing measure. Passed 21-13; July 25.