

Proceedings and Reports

1996 Pre-Primary

Election Convention

of the

California Labor Federation

**AFL-CIO
COPE**

San Francisco, January 25, 1996

COMMITTEE
ON
POLITICAL
EDUCATION

John F. Henning, Executive Secretary-Treasurer
417 Montgomery Street, Ste. 300, San Francisco 94104



**Officers of the
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO**

Pre-Primary Election Convention
January 25, 1996

JOHN F. HENNING
Executive Secretary-Treasurer

ALBIN J. GRUHN
President

VICE PRESIDENTS, GEOGRAPHICAL

District No. 1
Richard C. Robbins
District No. 2
William Waggoner
District No. 3
Jim M. Wood
Ken Orsatti
Jerry P. Cremins
Dallas Jones
Steven T. Nutter
John Smith
District No. 4
Armando Vergara
District No. 5
Leo Valenzuela
District No. 6
Don Hunsucker
District No. 7
Billy Joe Douglas

District No. 8
Val Connolly
District No. 9
E. Dennis Hughes
District No. 10
Gunnar Lundeberg
Sherri Chiesa
Michael J. Day
T.J. (Tom) Stapleton
District No. 11
Owen Marron
Barry Lubovski
District No. 12
Jack McNally
District No. 13
Loretta Mahoney
District No. 14
Jack L. Loveall

VICE PRESIDENTS AT LARGE

Edward C. Powell
Janice Wood
Jim R. Green
Mike Quevedo, Jr.
Lee Pearson
Yolanda Solari

Steve Edney
Ophelia A. McFadden
Wayne A. Clary
Mary Bergan
Margaret Shelleda
Michael Riley

Ted Hansen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Proceedings of the 1996 Pre-Primary Convention	3-31
Endorsement Recommendations	10-31
Report of the Secretary Treasurer	32-35
Roll of Delegates	36-40

PROCEEDINGS

of the

1996 Pre-Primary Election Convention

of the

California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO (COPE)

Thursday, January 25, 1996

Cathedral Hill Hotel
San Francisco, California

Call to Order

President Albin J. Gruhn called the 1996 Pre-Primary election Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO to order at

10:20 a.m. in the El Dorado Room of the Cathedral Hill Hotel at San Francisco, with these words:

"Delegates, I do declare this 1996 Pre-Primary Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, in order to transact such business as may legally come before it. This is a private meeting for those authorized. It is not open to the general public.

"I will ask all of you to rise and join with me in the pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of our country."

Having led the delegates in the Pledge of Allegiance, President Gruhn next called on Reverend Peter Sammon of St. Teresa's Catholic Church of San Francisco, who gave the invocation.

Following the invocation, President Gruhn, now Chairman of the Convention, thanked Reverend Sammon and welcomed the delegates and visitors.

Welcome to Delegates and Visitors

ALBIN J. GRUHN

President

California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

Sisters and brothers, the adverse political developments that have occurred in our state and nation since our 1994 Pre-Primary Convention are hard to believe, particularly the extremists' Republican takeover of our national Congress and the Assembly of our State Legislature.

The political holocaust created by term limits is also taking a toll on many of our good labor friends in the Legislature.

In the Congress, these self-styled revolutionaries have unleashed a relentless attack upon our country's free trade union movement, an attack that is aimed at weakening and busting

our unions.

These extremists have proposed a so-called national Right-to-Work law. They have proposed weakening of the National Labor Relations Act by an amendment to allow the establishment of company unions.

They have proposed the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act, the cornerstone of the prevailing wage law, which is designed to outlaw wage exploitation in federal construction contracts. Such repeal would be a severe blow to our building and construction trades unions and their members, as well as union contractors, who signed agreements with our building and trades unions.

The cutthroat non-union contractors would have an unfair advantage by paying substandard wages, no fringe benefits, and poor working conditions.

These Republican extremists' so-called Contract with America is as phony as a wooden watch. It actually is a contract *on* America, particularly our trade unions and the youth and aged of our country. They say they are for a balanced budget, yet they prepare a tax cut that will cost \$725 billion over the next ten years, and will benefit big business and the rich, who already earn more than \$200,000 a year.

They say they are for economic opportunity, yet they propose to slash programs to provide nutrition for infants and pregnant women, school lunches for poor kids, summer jobs for teenagers, and job training for laid off workers.

These extremists say they care about working people, yet they propose to relieve corporations of their responsibility to provide safe and healthy workplaces, and they propose to weaken labor laws so there will be no one to speak for workers.

They want to repeal the minimum wage law—I am talking about the national minimum wage law—and they support contracting out of work, principally done by public workers, to private contractors with substandard wages, no

benefits, and poor working conditions.

These extremists' ideology is clear: let big business do what it wants and don't worry about the consequences for workers, for consumers, or for the environment. Leave the rich alone to enjoy their riches, and don't worry about working families, living paycheck to paycheck, falling further behind.

Gingrich, Armey and Dole

They don't care about the neediest among us—children, the aged, or the infirm—these so-called revolutionaries, extremists headed by Newt Gingrich and Dick Armey, the Republican Majority Leader of the House of Representatives, are shamefully in revolt against the laws and protections that made America the strongest democracy in the world and allowed working Americans to share some of the riches of our society.

These anti-union, anti-worker and anti-family revolutionaries must be stopped.

You know, I had a chance to take a look at their voting records. If you have not heard about their voting record, I have the report from the national AFL-CIO:

Newt Gingrich from Georgia, his life record, including 1994, in the AFL-CIO record, was 23 right votes—203 wrong votes, a percentage of 10 percent for labor and worker issues.

Let's go to Mr. Dick Armey. You have probably seen him on TV when he says he does not like the intrusion of government on business. He comes from Texas. His lifelong AFL-CIO voting record: three good votes—127 wrong votes, for a percentage of two percent.

These are the characters that are leading the House of Representatives.

Let's look at Senator Bob Dole's lifelong AFL-CIO voting record, up to and including 1994: 55 good votes and 296 bad votes, for a percentage of 16 percent. Dole is also very closely supported by the National Right-to-Work Committee.

We have the counterparts to these so-called phoney revolutionaries, Republican extremists, in our State Assembly—they propose the same anti-union, anti-worker, and anti-family programs.

To end this nightmare of extremists in the political spectrum of our state and nation, the California Labor Movement, our Family of Labor, must be the leading force in developing a grass roots political action campaign through our local central labor bodies and local unions—a campaign that will mobilize all of our support groups, unions, retiree organizations, for an all out registration, education, and get-out-the-vote effort, one-on-one contact with all of our members and their families.

We can and we will win the 1996 election by

electing our endorsed candidates for state and congressional offices, the reelection of President Clinton, as well as the victories on our recommended positions on the ballot propositions.

With this victory, California will once again take its rightful place in leading this nation on the path of social, economic and political justice for all Americans.

With respect to two other matters that are vital to all of us in our state, we must let Governor Pete Wilson know that the labor movement of this state works on the principle that an injury to one is an injury to all.

Mr. Governor, the building and construction trades workers of this state are not alone in their fight to prevent reduction of prevailing wage rates in California. The two million AFL-CIO members, with warm hearts, from every sector of our trade union movement, stand solidly with our highly skilled and hard working brothers and sisters in the construction trades in opposing any reduction of prevailing wage rates.

And, Mr. Governor, there are no extravagant wages here. Due to the very nature of seasonal and other aspects of the building and construction trades industry, many of the highly skilled construction workers earn as little as \$28,000 a year. How would you like to live on \$28,000 a year, Mr. Governor? Is that extravagant?

Raise the Minimum Wage

On another matter, due to the lack of action by the Governor's appointed Industrial Welfare Commission, the state minimum wage of \$4.25 per hour has not been raised since 1988. This wage is below the poverty level and needs to be increased. Many workers and their families on these wages have to go to Welfare for assistance in order to survive.

I am pleased to say that the Liveable Wage Coalition, sponsored by organized labor and headed by our Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Jack Henning, is working to place an initiative proposition on the ballot to increase the minimum wage by seventy-five cents, making it five dollars an hour by March of 1997, and another seventy-five cents in March of 1998, making it five dollars and seventy-five cents per hour.

The help of every union and every union member is needed in this campaign, getting the signatures to put this minimum wage increase initiative on the ballot this coming November election. We must raise the funds necessary to assure that we have the number of signatures and to carry on the proper campaign.

Our Federation's Executive Council, meeting prior to this Convention, is asking every local union in this state to contribute the amount equivalent of one dollar per member for this campaign fund.

This is an important and very vital issue to the labor movement of this state. We must get this initiative measure on the November ballot. And once we get it on the ballot, we can win. There will be opposition from many of the small business and other groups who oppose any increase in the minimum wage. They would have the minimum wage completely repealed. Working together we can overcome the opposition and win a great victory in November. In closing my remarks, I will again say—as I have said to you at many other conventions—that in unity, there is strength. United we stand, divided we fall. An injury to one is an injury to all. Unity—yes, solidarity—yes. American works best when we say “Union Yes.”

Thank you very much. God bless you.

Following his welcoming address, Chairman Gruhn then called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning who introduced the Regional Director of national COPE, Patricia Garcia, for her address to the Convention.

Address

PATRICIA GARCIA, Director Committee on Political Education AFL-CIO Region VI

Director Garcia greeted the assembled delegates on behalf of the national AFL-CIO. She told them about some of the political programs the national Federation plans to carry out in the next year.

The delegates cheered loudly when she announced the AFL-CIO's decision to spend \$35 million in 1996 for federal congressional elections, seven times the amount ever spent previously.

Of that amount, she said, \$20 million will be earmarked for media and advertising; \$15 million will go to organizers, phone banks and other political education activities.

Many of the 75 key congressional races targeted for special attention are in California, she pointed out. This state, she emphasized, has the talent, dedication and commitment to put forth political action programs to energize and educate the rank and file.

We must work smarter, she said. There are now 85 congressional seats that could be viewed as marginal. In the 15 closest elections, a switch of only 19,000 votes would have put the Democrats in the majority in the House of Representatives instead of the disastrous results that occurred in the 1994 elections.

That amounts to an average of just over 1,200 votes per district, she calculated, that could have resulted in a Democratic Speaker of the House instead of Newt Gingrich.

First term Republicans are voting heavily against labor's interests, she warned, and must be replaced with friendly Democrats.

Just as important as winning back the House of Representatives is keeping President Clinton in the White House. Clinton has created tax cuts through the earned income tax credit, pushed through the Family and Medical Leave Act, and added 5,000 new police officers in communities throughout the country—all of which help working families, she said.

In California, it is imperative that we keep the State Senate in control of friendly legislators, she stressed. That body is all that remains as a line of defense against the extremist, right wing, anti-union, anti-worker, Republican movement that hopes to eliminate the eight hour day standard, take away prevailing wages and make California another “Right-to-Work” state.

Lastly, Director Garcia appealed to those present to take a commitment back to their local organizations to put the Living Wage Initiative on the November ballot. That measure, she predicted, would bring a level of decency to those working at the sub-poverty level minimum wage.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning thanked Director Garcia for her inspiring words before making his report to the Convention.

Address

JOHN F. HENNING Executive Secretary-Treasurer California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO

Mr. Chairman and Delegates:

In terms of my report, we are meeting at a time, brothers and sisters, when American capitalism is not only dominant in terms of its control, but it's rampant and it's extending its tentacles on every continent. Global capitalism has become the preserve of American capital, and we face a grim struggle, because it holds powers that, in many cases, are beyond our reach or beyond our control.

But there are those measures with which we can retaliate with efficient action. In Washington and in Sacramento alike, American capital is moving to disenfranchise the American Trade Union Movement, to place upon it controls that mean its emasculation.

It's moving to the right, the capitalists' right, and capitalism is the right. It's moving to trash the aged, the infirm, and the handicapped. They have no soul.

Beyond that, they would degrade the homeless. And as to the poor, they call for their extinction by eliminating the lifelines of economic survival by those who have no means of income in our kind of a society. They live at the generosity, as it were, of the government.

But the people who control capitalism find their expression for action in the Republican Party. The Republican Party is moving against

the helpless, the unemployed, and all those who are the victims of the economic order.

Now, there is only one answer that the American trade union can give today. It must wage the counter-revolution on American capital and lead the way.

They boasted it's a revolution of the right, the revolution of conservatism, the revolution of a true America. Again, there is only one answer, and that is the counter-revolution.

There are immediate objectives that we must defend, and then there are the ultimate positions we must understand. The immediate objectives that face us in a particular way, as cited by Al Gruhn, is the saving of the building trades from devastation.

The prevailing wage theory that gives the construction workers in public projects a wage comparable to that prevailing in the industry is being assaulted by the governor of California. It's going to be a difficult, bloody fight to defeat that issue in the Legislature because the power of capital reaches not only, as we know, to Washington, but to the heart of our legislative process here in California.

We stand, of course, not only in the sense of conformity, but by moral duty, with the building trades in this fight.

But we have that other battle, the minimum wage battle, that Hilda Solis will speak to you on later.

The minimum wage reflects the immoral nature of capitalism. They have confined the minimum wage to \$4.25 an hour, and we talk of the building trades, as Al did, making only \$28,000 a year. My God, under the minimum wage, workers make \$8,840 a year, and that is if they're employed 52 weeks a year, which the poor rarely enjoy.

So we have initiated that struggle to raise the minimum wage, now below the poverty level by definition, not of liberals, not of labor, but by the government of the United States in an agency, barren of political control, that under both parties has maintained its autonomy.

We impose a poverty wage on our brothers and sisters by our silence. Well, we are moving against that silence.

But then there are other issues, brothers and sisters, that affect the very destiny of the Trade Union Movement, which has been in continuing decline, because of the changing character and the changing profit desires of capital.

Labor vs. Capital

We have been told from time immemorial that labor and capital need each other, that labor needs capital and capital needs labor. Brothers and sisters, don't be deluded.

We are told that we are of the middle class. It's true that unionism, in the economic sense,

has raised millions to the middle class, but that's a transient, passing thing. There is no permanence.

If you think the workers enjoy a middle class existence in this nation, tell it to the 40,000 AT&T workers who were put on the street by the stroke of a corporate pen.

If you think you are in the middle class, talk to the bank employees in New York when Citibank and Merchants Bank collaborated, merged, and put 40,000 out of work. Well, we say, they're non-union, we would be helpless in the face of the dominating power of capitalism.

We had the bank merger announced yesterday here in San Francisco that will put seven to ten thousand out of work. Again, they are workers. They are not unionized. But, again, if they were unionized, we would be helpless. We stand impotent before the power of American capitalism.

And if you look for the decline of the Movement, put the blame on the encroachments and the dominating power of American capital to do what it wants with the American work force. That's the enemy.

We Must Retaliate

So what do we do? We have to retaliate. We should make it clear we are not party to a middle class that gets a satisfying life. Let's get rid of those myths. We should move, certainly, in the legislative sense, to make it impossible for a board of directors of a corporation to put 40,000 or 10,000 workers or 5,000 workers on the street for corporate profit. That's a social crime.

And if they are waging unfettered war on the working people, as they are, in the councils of capitalism, we must wage war on them. We tell them this:

"We want you to walk the streets of America, the criminal streets of America, that have been shaped and fashioned by your avarice. You are a prey of the poor that you have created. You are a prey to the crime that you have bred in the bones of the underclass by damning them, from birth, to an inferior life."

We would like to take their children of comfort by God, and let those children live the life of children, boys and girls, cursed from infancy by this system called capitalism. We are the most homeless people of the Western World. Let the capitalists meet with Captain Murder on the streets of our city. They fashioned that murderer. They built a society which condemned millions to nothingness.

Let arrogant capital pay the price and let us not be partners to that conduct, to their criminal inheritance. Let us not be afraid of saying, "Capitalism is morally rotten."

We must never be servants of the ruling class. We must not give obeisance to them because

they have power. We must mobilize to destroy their power. That's the only political action that means anything.

It's not enough, although it is essential, to endorse Congressman Jones or Senator Smith. We must do that, but we don't get to the roots. You don't get to the roots for Congressman Jones or Senator Smith, because he will play the game of capitalism when he wants to run for reelection, when he wants their support. And never forget this, brothers and sisters, capital penetrates both parties. And anyone who doubts that should pick up an elementary reader and start learning the lessons of political life in this nation.

And so I think we have to depart from the doctrines of comfort that give us a feeling we are really part of this system. Tell that to the maritime workers, tell that to the longshoremen, tell it to the Seafarers' Union, tell it to the members of the Sailors' Union of the Pacific, tell it to the Marine Firemen. When American capital decided it was going to eliminate maritime jobs, it moved with ruthless speed.

There are no ships built in America any longer. American ships don't sail the seas in any significant numbers. Twice within the past year, American President Lines brought into our harbor over in Oakland ships that were built in Germany under wages inferior to American shipyard workers'; ships that were captained and officered by German crews with all Asian unlicensed personnel. And so they exploit one part of the humanity to bring down the standards of another part.

Where is the great glory of the past in maritime labor? Where is the great past glory of the automobile workers and the steel workers? Victims of the predatory, grasping nature of American capitalism.

Brothers and sisters, we have inherited a corrupt economic order. As a beginning we should demand that the government of the United States follow the policies of Roosevelt and institute a work program for everybody who is out of a job. They say we can't afford it. The hell we can't afford it. We are the richest nation in history. We can afford it if there would be a democratic distribution of wealth.

We want health benefits for all, from cradle to the grave. They say "we can't afford it." The wealthy can afford it, and they dictate policy. It's an inhuman policy to let our brothers and sisters in the American society die because they have not the capacity to pay the atrocious medical costs that prevail.

So we need an overview of the whole system. We were not born to subservience. We were not born to be lieutenants of fiscal and political corruption. We were not born for capitalism; we were born for a free, vital America, a Labor

America.

Thank you.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning was given loud, sustained applause upon the conclusion of his address. Chairman Gruhn thanked him and then again called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning who introduced the next speaker, Hilda Solis, chairperson, State Senate Industrial Relations Committee.

**Address
HILDA SOLIS, Chairperson
State Senate
Industrial Relations Committee**

Last year, Senator Solis told the delegates, she introduced SB 500, legislation to raise the minimum wage. The bill enjoys only Democratic support. Republicans have thus far refused to get behind the measure.

We need to work together to raise the minimum wage, she said. That's why the Liveable Wage Coalition is so critical for the bill's success. Opponents of the minimum, she pointed out, are dedicated to fighting workers, students, women, minorities and unions.

President Clinton's recent speech included a plea for a raise in the minimum wage, she said. We are working hard too, she noted, to bring dignity to people who labor below the poverty line, people who don't want welfare but can get more from public assistance than if they worked at the current minimum wage.

That's sending the wrong message to people who want to work, she said. Some 1.5 million Californians work at the minimum wage, she said, and there are at least 40,000 people on AFDC who could make more than they currently receive if the minimum wage were raised.

Government would save money if the minimum were raised, but that's not what Governor Wilson and his friends would have us believe.

The rhetoric is that if we raise the minimum wage, jobs will flow to other states and low wage countries. But, she emphasized, we all know that McDonald's and In-and-Out Burger and Jack-in-the-Box are not leaving California.

Our struggle is a grass roots effort. It's about getting more communities excited and helping President Clinton get reelected. It's a win-win situation for Democrats, she said, whether the election is in the Senate, Assembly, Congress or for the Presidency.

We need to raise \$750,000 to insure the success of the initiative campaign and right now we're \$600,000 short of that, she warned. She then asked for contributions from the union membership, for support staff, signature gathering volunteers and help from all of the labor endorsed candidates.

(Senator Solis received a standing ovation upon completing her address.)

Chairman Gruhn then called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning to announce the recommended appointments of the Convention's committees.

**Appointment of
Convention Committees
JOHN F. HENNING
Executive Secretary-Treasurer
California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO**

Secretary-Treasurer Henning announced the Convention Committees, appointed by President Gruhn, as follows:

Committee on Credentials

Loretta Mahoney, Chairwoman, California State Culinary Workers Council, Santa Rosa.

Nick Bardes, California Conference of Musicians, San Jose.

Miguel Contreras, Los Angeles County Federation of Labor.

Tim Cremins, California/Nevada Conference of Operating Engineers, Sacramento.

Henry Disley, Marine Firemen's Union, San Francisco.

Billy Joe Douglas, Plasterers and Cement Masons No. 814, Stockton.

James Earp, Operating Engineers No. 3, Alameda.

Ted Hansen, California State Council of Hotel and Restaurant Employees, Santa Rosa.

Michael Hardeman, Sign & Display No. 510, San Francisco.

Mickey Harrington, Electrical Workers No. 1245, Walnut Creek.

Leroy King, Northern California District Council of Longshoremens, ILWU, San Francisco.

Kathleen Kinnick, Office and Professional Employees No. 3, San Francisco.

Rod McLeod, Theatrical Stage Employees No. 16, San Francisco.

Herb Sisti, United Food and Commercial Workers No. 428, San Jose.

Marilyn Wollard, Tri-Counties Central Labor Council, Ventura.

Leon Wurzer, Communications Workers No. 9431, Auburn.

**Committee
Appointments Approved**

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to approve the appointments of the Committee on Credentials was seconded and carried.

He then announced the appointments to the Committee on Rules and Order of Business.

**Committee on
Rules and Order of Business**

Steve Edney, United Industrial Workers, Cannery Division, Wilmington.

Bob Balgenorth, State Building and Construction Trades Council, Pasadena.

Mary Bergan, California Federation of Teachers No. 8004, Oakland.

Michael Day, East Bay Auto Mechanics No. 1546, Oakland.

Joe Francis, San Diego-Imperial Counties Central Labor Council, San Diego.

Dolores Huerta, United Farm Workers, Keene.

E. Dennis Hughes, United Food and Commercial Workers No. 428, San Jose.

Dallas Jones, Los Angeles/Orange Counties Fire Fighters No. 1014, South Gate.

Gunnar Lundeborg, Sailors Union of the Pacific, San Francisco.

Chuck Mack, Teamsters, Auto Truck Drivers No. 70, Oakland.

Owen Marron, Alameda County Central Labor Council, Oakland.

Perry Martin, California State Conference of Transport Workers, San Francisco.

Jose Marino, Construction and General Laborers No. 304, Hayward.

Richard Robbins, Electrical Workers No. 2295, San Diego.

Yolanda Solari, California State Employees Association, No. 1000, SEIU, Sacramento.

William Waggoner, Operating Engineers No. 12, Pasadena.

Announcements

Secretary-Treasurer Henning announced that a march to Sacramento organized by the State Building Trades Council, directed by Council Secretary Robert Balgenorth, is planned for February 14. Building trades workers will be joining the march from all over the state, he said. Thousands are expected to descend on the Capitol in support of preserving prevailing wage rates.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning next announced that Richard Holober, campaign manager of the Liveable Wage Coalition, would conduct a meeting following the Convention on the training aspects of signature gathering to qualify the minimum wage initiative for the November ballot.

Chairman Gruhn then called on Steve Edney, chairman of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business for a report.

**Report of Committee on
Rules and Order of Business
Steve Edney, Chairman**

Chairman Edney reported as follows:

1. *ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER.* The Convention shall be governed by Robert's Rules of Order on all matters not provided for by the Constitution or specified in these Rules.

2. *RULES—ADOPTION OF STANDING*

RULES. The adoption of the standing rules shall require an affirmative vote of a majority of the duly qualified delegates to the Convention, present and voting. When once adopted, such standing rules shall remain in effect, unless suspended or amended as provided in these rules.

3. AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES. No standing rule of the Convention shall be amended except by an affirmative vote of a majority of the duly qualified delegates to the Convention, present and voting. No such amendment shall be considered until it shall have been referred to and reported by the Committee on Rules.

4. CONVENING OF THE CONVENTION. The Convention shall convene at 10:00 a.m.

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS. Whenever there is a majority and minority division on any Committee, both the majority and minority shall be entitled to report to the Convention. The discussion and vote of concurrence or non-concurrence shall be first on the minority report.

6. COMMITTEE QUORUM. A majority of any Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of its business.

7. PASSAGE OF COMMITTEE REPORTS BY CONVENTION. A majority of the delegates present and voting shall be required to act on a Committee report. No motion shall be acted upon until an opportunity to speak has been given the delegate making the same, if he or she desires.

8. ROLL CALL VOTE. At the request of 30 percent of the delegates present and voting, any motion shall be voted on by roll call per capita vote of the delegates. When a roll call has been ordered, no adjournment shall take place until the result has been announced.

9. PRECEDENCE OF MOTIONS DURING DEBATE. When a question is under debate or before the Convention, no motions shall be received but the following, which shall take precedence in the order named:

First: To adjourn;

Second: To recess to a time certain;

Third: For the previous question;

Fourth: To set as a special order of business;

Fifth: To postpone to a stated time;

Sixth: To postpone indefinitely;

Seventh: To refer to, or re-refer to Committee;

Eighth: To divide or amend;

Ninth: To lay on the table.

10. MOTIONS IN WRITING. Upon request of the Chair, a motion shall be reduced to writing and shall be read to the Convention by the Chair before the same is acted upon.

11. CONTENTS OF MOTIONS. No motion, whether oral or written, shall be adopted until the same shall be seconded and distinctly stated

to the Convention by the Chair.

12. MOTION TO RECONSIDER. A motion to reconsider shall not be entertained unless made by a delegate who voted with the prevailing side, such motion shall require a two-thirds vote to carry.

13. MOTION TO TABLE. A motion to lay on the table shall be put without debate.

14. RECOGNITION AND DECORUM OF DELEGATES.

(a) Delegates when arising to speak shall respectfully address the Chair and announce their full name and the identity of the organization which they represent.

(b) In the event two or more delegates arise to speak at the same time the Chair shall decide which delegate is entitled to the floor.

(c) No delegate shall interrupt any other delegate who is speaking, except for the purpose of raising a point of order or appealing from a ruling of the Chair.

(d) Any delegate may appeal from a decision of the Chair, without waiting for recognition by the Chair, even though another delegate has the floor. No appeal is in order when another is pending, or when other business has been transacted by the Convention prior to the appeal being taken.

(e) Any delegate who is called to order while speaking shall, at the request of the Chair, be seated while the point of order is decided, after which, if in order, the delegate shall be permitted to proceed. The same shall apply while an appeal from the Chair is being decided.

(f) No delegate shall speak more than once on the same subject until all who desire to speak shall have had an opportunity to do so; nor more than twice on the same subject without permission by a majority vote of those delegates present and voting; nor longer than five minutes at a time without permission by a majority vote of the delegates present and voting.

(g) Any delegate may rise to explain a matter personal to herself or himself and shall forthwith be recognized by the Chair, but shall not discuss a question in such explanation. Such matters of personal privilege yield only to a motion to recess or adjournment.

15. VOTING NOT TO BE INTERRUPTED. When once begun, voting shall not be interrupted. No delegate shall be allowed to change his or her vote, or to have his or her vote recorded after the vote is announced.

Report Approved

Chairman Edney's motion to adopt the Committee's report was seconded and carried.

Chairman Gruhn next called on Loretta Mahoney, chairwoman of the Committee on Credentials for her report.

**Report of
Committee on Credentials
Loretta Mahoney, Chairwoman**

Chairwoman Mahoney announced there were 345 registered delegates and then read the additions to and deletions from the Preliminary Roll of Delegates. (See completed Roll of Delegates)

Report Adopted

Chairwoman Mahoney's motion to adopt the Committee's report was seconded and carried.

Chairwoman Mahoney and Chairman Gruhn then thanked the Committee members and read their names. Chairman Gruhn next called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning for the Report of the Standing Committee on Political Education

and endorsements by the Convention:

Endorsement Procedure Explained

Chairman Gruhn described the endorsement process to be followed. Secretary-Treasurer Henning would read the names of the candidates recommended by the Executive Council for the offices of United States Representatives in Congress, the State Senate, the State Assembly, and positions on the statewide ballot propositions. Any delegate having a disagreement or question concerning a particular district, he said, should ask that that district be set aside to be taken up after the other districts were acted upon.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning reported as follows:

Report and Recommendations of the Executive Council

(Standing Committee on Political Education)

to the

PRE-PRIMARY ELECTION CONVENTION

of the

CALIFORNIA LABOR FEDERATION, AFL-CIO

San Francisco, January 25, 1996

The Executive Council of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO met at the San Francisco Hilton Airport Hotel, January 23-24, 1996 to consider local central body COPE recommendations for election of candidates to the United States House of Representatives, the State Senate, the State Assembly, and positions on the statewide ballot propositions, in a statewide primary election on Tuesday, March 26, 1996.

In the following instances a recommendation has been made by the Executive Council without consideration of the local central labor body COPE:

- No recommendation was received for the office in a party by the local central labor body COPE with jurisdiction for the district.
- No recommendation was received for the office in a party from one or more local central labor body COPEs that share jurisdiction of a district.
- Failure of local central labor body COPEs that share jurisdiction of a district to agree on a recommendation for the office in a party.

Such Executive Council recommendations are preceded by an asterisk (*).

In certain instances recommendations of the local central body COPE or the appropriate area or district political organization were rejected by the Executive Council by at least a vote of two-thirds of the membership of the Executive Council, present and voting, and recommendations were then made by the Executive Council. These recommendations are preceded by a double asterisk (**).

The following recommendations are accordingly submitted by the Executive Council for designated offices:

United States Representatives in Congress

District

- * 1. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 2. Roberts A. Braden (D)
No Endorsement (R*)
- * 3. Vic Fazio (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 4. Katie Hirning (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 5. Robert T. Matsui (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 6. Lynn Woolsey (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 7. George Miller (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- ** 8. Nancy Pelosi (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 9. Ronald V. Dellums (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 10. Ellen O. Tauscher (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 11. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 12. Tom Lantos (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 13. Fortney Pete Stark (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 14. Anna G. Eshoo (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 15. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 16. Zoe Lofgren (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 17. Sam Farr (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 18. Gary A. Condit (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 19. Paul Barile (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 20. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 21. Deborah A. Vollmer (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 22. Walter Holden Capps (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 23. Robert R. Unruhe (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 24. Brad Sherman (D)
No Endorsement (R)

District

- 25. Diane Trautman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 26. Howard L. Berman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 27. Barry Gordon (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- ** 28. David Levering (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 29. Henry A. Waxman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 30. Xavier Becerra (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 31. Matthew G. Martinez (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 32. Julian C. Dixon (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 33. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 34. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 35. Maxine Waters (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 36. Jane Harman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 37. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 38. Rick Zbur (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 39. R. O. (Bob) Davis (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 40. (Bob) Robert Conaway (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 41. Richard L. Waldron (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 42. George E. Brown, Jr. (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 43. Guy C. Kimbrough (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 44. Anita Rufus (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 45. Sally J. Alexander (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 46. Open (D)
Katherine (Kathy) H. Smith (R)
- 47. Tina Louise Laine (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 48. Dan Farrell (D)
No Endorsement (R)

United States Representatives in Congress (Cont'd)

District

49. **Peter Navarro (D)**
Nancy Casady (D) (Dual)
No Endorsement (R)
50. **Bob Filner (D)**
No Endorsement (R)

Congressional Districts Nos. 1, 8, 11, 21 and 49 were set aside by request.

Recommendations Adopted

With the exceptions of Districts 1, 8, 11, 21 and 49, which had been set aside, Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's endorsement recommendations for the United State Representatives in Congress was seconded and carried.

District No. 1

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation of Open, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in Congressional District No. 1 was seconded.

Delegate Mickey Harrington (Electrical Workers No. 1245, Walnut Creek) withdrew his request to set aside District No. 1.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation of Open, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in Congressional District No. 1 was then carried.

District No. 8

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation of Nancy Pelosi, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in Congressional District No. 8. His motion was seconded.

Delegate John Moran (Machinists Lodge No. 1414, San Mateo) spoke on the motion.

Delegate Dennis Kelly (United Educators of San Francisco No. 61) spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

Previous Question

Delegate Mary Bergan (California Federation of Teachers No. 8004, Oakland) called for the previous question. Her motion was seconded.

Chairman Gruhn called for the vote on the previous question and it lost.

On the Motion

Speaking in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation for the 8th Congressional District were delegates Rudy Meraz (Graphic Communications No. 583, San

District

51. **Rita Tamerius (D)**
No Endorsement (R)
52. **Open (D)**
No Endorsement (R)

Francisco), Don Basso (Sheet Metal Workers No. 104, San Francisco), Tom Linebarger (Painters and Decorators No. 913, Redwood City), Jose Trujillo (Community Redevelopment Agency of Los Angeles No. 164), Jacki Fox Ruby (Berkeley Federation of Teachers No. 1078), Stanley Smith (San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council) and Miguel Contreras (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles).

Speaking in support of the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates Joan-Marie Shelley (United Educators of San Francisco No. 61), Mike Hardeman (Sign and Display No. 510, San Francisco), Larry Martin (California State Conference of Transport Workers, San Francisco), Hene Kelly (United Educators of San Francisco No. 61), Barry Lubovski (Alameda County Building and Construction Trades Council, Oakland) and Peggy Gash (United Educators of San Francisco No. 61).

Previous Question

Delegate Mike White (Specialty Painters No. 1176, Oakland) moved the previous question. His motion was seconded and carried and debate was closed.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning then spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

Recommendation Adopted

Chairman Gruhn then called for the vote on the motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation of Nancy Pelosi, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in the Eighth Congressional District.

The motion carried and the recommendation was adopted.

District No. 11

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation of Open, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in the Eleventh Congressional District. His motion was seconded.

Delegate Jim Beno (San Joaquin-Calaveras Counties Central Labor Council, Stockton) spoke in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation.

Motion Lost

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was then lost.

New Recommendation Adopted: Jason Silva, Democrat No Endorsement, Republican

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to recommend Jason Silva, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in the Eleventh Congressional District was seconded and carried.

District No. 21

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation of Deborah A. Vollmer, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in the Twenty-first Congressional District. His motion was seconded.

Delegate John Spaulding (Kern, Inyo and Mono Counties Central Labor Council, Bakersfield) spoke in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was then carried.

District No. 49

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation of Peter Navarro, Democrat and Nancy Casady, Democrat (Dual) and No Endorsement, Republican in the Forty-ninth Congressional District.

His motion was seconded.

Delegate Matt McKinnon (California Conference of Machinists, Sacramento) withdrew his earlier objection to the Executive Council's recommendation.

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was then carried.

Recommendations Adopted as a Whole and as Amended

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion, duly seconded, the Executive Council's recommendations for U.S. Representatives in Congress, as a whole and as amended, were adopted.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning next read the Executive Council's recommendations for the State Senate:

State Senate

District

- * 1. Thomas (Tom) Romero (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 3. John L. Burton (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 5. Patrick Johnston (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 7. Jeff Smith (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 9. Barbara Lee (D)
Bob Campbell (D) (Dual)
No Endorsement (R)
- 11. Byron D. Sher (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 13. John Vasconcellos (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 15. Rusty Areias (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 17. Steven A. Figueroa (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 19. John Birke (D)
No Endorsement (R)

None of the State Senate districts was set aside.

Recommendations Adopted as a Whole

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommenda-

District

- 21. Adam Schiff (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 23. Tom Hayden (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 25. Teresa P. Hughes (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 27. Betty Karnette (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 29. No Democrats on the Ballot
No Endorsement (R)
- 31. Gary George (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 33. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 35. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 37. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 39. Deirdre (Dede) Alpert (D)
No Endorsement (R)

tions as a whole for the State Senate was seconded and carried.

He then read the Executive Council's recommendations for the State Assembly:

State Assembly

District

- * 1. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 2. John L. Gowney (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 3. Irene Perry (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 4. Erike J. Young (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 5. Eileen Burke-Trent (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 6. Kerry Mazzoni (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 7. Valerie K. Brown (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 8. Helen Thomson (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 9. Bill Camp (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 10. Matt Moretti (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 11. George Miller (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 12. Kevin Shelley (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 13. Carole Migden (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 14. Mark Friedman (D) (Dual)
Dion Louise Aroner (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 15. Gail Murray (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 16. Don Perata (D) (Dual)
Dezie Woods-Jones (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 17. Michael J. Machado (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 18. Michael Sweeney (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 19. Lou Papan (D) (Dual)
Madolyn L. Agrimonti (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 20. Liz Figueroa (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 21. Ted Lempert (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 22. Elaine White Alquist (D) (Dual)
Trixie Johnson (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 23. Mike Honda (D) (Dual)
Ken Yeager (D)
No Endorsement (R)

District

- 24. Ed Foglia (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 25. Ed Elliott (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 26. Dennis A. Cardoza (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 27. Fred Keeley (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 28. Mike R. Graves (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 29. Mike McGonigle (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 30. No Democrats on the Ballot
Brian Setencich (R)
- 31. Cruz M. Bustamante (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 32. John F. Hulpke (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 33. Betty Sanders (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 34. Lionel M. Dew (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 35. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 36. David Cochran (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 37. Jess Herrera (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 38. Jon M. Lauritzen (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- ** 39. Jim Dantona (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 40. Bob Hertzberg (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 41. Sheila James Kuehl (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 42. Wally Knox (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 43. Scott Wildman (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 44. Jack Scott (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 45. Antonio Villaraigosa (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 46. Louis Caldera (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 47. Kevin Murray (D)
No Endorsement (R)

State Assembly (Cont'd)

District

- 48. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 49. Diane Martinez (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 50. Martha M. Escutia (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 51. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 52. Carl Washington (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 53. Debra Bowen (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 54. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 55. Richard E. (Dick) Floyd (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 56. Sally M. Havice (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 57. Martin Gallegos (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 58. Grace F. Napolitano (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 59. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 60. No Endorsement (D)
Clair W. Harmony (R)
- 61. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 62. Joe Baca (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 63. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 64. Grace Slocum (D)
No Endorsement (R)

Assembly Districts Nos. 32 and 39 were set aside upon request.

Recommendations Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendations, with the exceptions of District Nos. 32 and 39, was seconded and carried.

District No. 32

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation of John F. Hulpke, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in the Thirty-second Assembly District. His motion was seconded.

John Spaulding (Kern, Inyo and Mono Counties Central Labor Council, Bakersfield) spoke in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation.

District

- 65. Shirley A. Morton (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 66. Patsy Hockersmith (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 67. No Endorsement (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 68. Audrey L. Gibson (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 69. Lou Correa (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 70. Shirley W. Palley (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 71. Jack Roberts (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 72. No Democrats on the Ballot
No Endorsement (R)
- * 73. Robert D. Wilberg (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 74. No Democrats on the Ballot
No Endorsement (R)
- 75. Open (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 76. Susan A. Davis (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 77. Janet Gastil (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 78. Howard Wayne (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- 79. Denise Moreno Ducheny (D)
No Endorsement (R)
- * 80. Steve Clute (D)
No Endorsement (R)

Secretary-Treasurer Henning spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

Delegate Kirk Vogt (Tulare-Kings Counties Central Labor Council, Visalia) spoke in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation, concurring with the recommendation of the Kern, Inyo and Mono Counties Central Labor Council.

Motion Lost

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was then lost.

New Recommendation Adopted:

John F. Hulpke, Democrat
Roy Ashburn, Republican

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to recommend John F. Hulpke, Democrat and Roy

Ashburn, Republican in the Thirty-second Assembly District was seconded and carried.

District No. 39

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved adoption of the Executive Council's recommendation of Jim Dantona, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in the Thirty-ninth Assembly District. His motion was seconded.

Delegate Miguel Contreras (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles) spoke in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation.

Delegate Dallas Jones (Los Angeles/Orange Counties Firefighters No. 1014, Southgate) spoke in support of the Executive Council's recommendation.

Delegate Regina Render (Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, Los Angeles) spoke in opposition to the Executive Council's recommendation.

Delegate Mark Aihara (Electrical Workers No. 11, Los Angeles) made a point of clarification. Secretary-Treasurer Henning responded to

Delegate Aihara's comment.

Motion Lost

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was then lost.

New Recommendation Adopted: Open, Democrat No Endorsement, Republican

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to recommend Open, Democrat and No Endorsement, Republican in the Thirty-ninth Assembly District was seconded and carried.

Recommendations Adopted as Amended

On Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion, duly seconded, the Executive Council's recommendations for State Assembly were adopted as a whole and as amended.

Secretary-Treasurer Henning next read the Executive Council's recommendations for the twelve propositions on the primary election ballot.

BALLOT PROPOSITIONS

PROPOSITION NO. 192

Seismic Retrofit Bond Act of 1996

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary:

- **This act provides for a bond issue of two billion dollars (\$2,000,000,000) to provide funds for a seismic retrofit program.**
- **Earmarks \$650 million for seismic retrofitting of toll bridges.**
- **Appropriates money from the state General Fund to pay off bonds.**
- **Requires measure to reappear on November 1996 ballot if rejected in March 1996.**

Bond Act (SB 146)—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

After the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, the state established a program to retrofit state highways and bridges for seismic safety. As a result, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) identified about 1,039 state highway bridges to be retrofitted as *phase one* of the Seismic Retrofit Program. Retrofit of all phase one bridges is currently under con-

struction and is funded from state gas tax revenues.

Following the 1994 Northridge earthquake, Caltrans identified an additional 1,209 state highway bridges that need to be retrofitted in order to meet seismic safety standards. These additional bridges comprise *phase two* of the Seismic Retrofit Program. Caltrans also identified seven state-owned toll bridges to be retrofitted for earthquake safety. The estimated cost of retrofitting phase-two bridges plus the state-owned toll bridges is about \$2 billion.

Proposal:

This measure authorizes the state to sell \$2 billion in general obligation bonds in order to reconstruct, replace, or retrofit state-owned toll bridges and highway bridges in *phase two* of the Seismic Retrofit Program. The measure provides that, of the \$2 billion, \$650 million shall be used only for the seismic retrofit of state-owned toll bridges. The measure also requires that expenditures for phase two seismic retrofit of state highway bridges, as well as for toll bridges, be funded exclusively from bond funds and not from other state funds, such as toll revenues or revenues from the state gas tax.

General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is required to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. General Fund revenues come pri-

marily from the state personal and corporate income taxes and sales taxes.

Fiscal Effect:

For these types of bonds, the state makes principal and interest payments from the state's General Fund, typically over a period of about 25 years. If the \$2 billion in bonds were sold at an interest rate of 5.5 percent, the cost would be about \$3.4 billion to pay off both the principal (\$2 billion) and the interest (\$1.4 billion). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$136 million per year.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 192 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 193

***Property Appraisal. Exception.
Grandparent-Grandchild Transfer.***

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary:

- **Amends State Constitution by not requiring new appraisal of real property upon purchase or transfer between grandparents and their grandchild, subject to certain conditions.**
- **Parents of grandchild must be deceased as of date of purchase or transfer.**
- **Purchase or transfer of principal residence does not qualify if grandchild already received a principal residence through previous purchase of transfer not requiring a new appraisal.**
- **\$1,000,000 limit on purchases or transfers of real property not requiring new appraisals, includes purchases or transfers between grandparents and grandchild, as well as between parents and children.**

Legislative Constitutional Amendment (ACA 17)—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

Local property taxes are based on each property's assessed value. As long as a property has the same owner, its assessed value generally cannot increase by more than 2 percent each year—even if the property's market value is increasing at a faster rate. As a result, the market value of many properties is higher than the

assessed value. Whenever a property is sold or transferred, it is reappraised and its assessed value often increases to reflect the market value. In such cases, the property taxes for that piece of property also increase.

Current law allows for some exceptions to this general rule. For example, current law allows parents to sell or transfer ownership of their principal residence and up to \$1 million of other property to their children without a reappraisal of the property and a corresponding change in its assessed value.

Proposal:

This constitutional amendment would extend the existing parent-child exemption from reappraisal to sales or transfers of property between grandparents and grandchildren. These sales or transfers would be exempt only in cases where both parents of the grandchild are deceased, and would apply only to the sale or transfer of a principal residence and the first \$1 million of other property. Grandchildren would not be eligible to receive the exemption—or would be eligible to receive only a reduced exemption—if they had already benefitted from a purchase or transfer that was exempt from reappraisal.

The new exemption proposed by this measure would apply only to sales or transfers of property occurring after March 26, 1996.

Fiscal Effect:

By exempting from reappraisal these grandparent-to-grandchild property sales and transfers, this measure would reduce property tax revenues to local governments. Because these sales and transfers occur infrequently, the property tax revenue loss would not be significant. After several years, the loss statewide could be about \$1 million annually.

Counties, cities, and special districts would bear nearly one-half of the annual revenue loss. The remainder of the loss would affect schools and community colleges, which also receive property tax revenue. Under existing law, losses to schools and community colleges would be made up by the state General Fund.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 193 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 194

***Prisoners. Joint Venture Program.
Unemployment Benefits. Parole.***

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary:

- **Provides that prisoner's employment in a joint venture program while in prison does not entitle the prisoner to unemployment benefits upon release from prison.**

Legislative Initiative Amendment (SB 103)—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:**Background:**

In November 1990, the California voters approved Proposition 139 which established the Joint Venture Program in the state prison system. Under this program, businesses may contract with the California Department of Corrections to hire inmates to produce, on the grounds of state prisons, various goods and services for sale. In 1995, about 200 inmates participated in Joint Venture businesses at any one time.

The Joint Venture Program generates revenues and savings to the state. For example, up to 80 percent of an inmate's Joint Venture wages is subject to: (1) federal, state, and local taxes; (2) payment of restitution to crime victims; (3) withholding for support of the prisoner's family; and (4) reimbursement to the state for the inmates's cost of room and board. Many inmates working in Joint Venture businesses are also eligible to earn credits that reduce the length of time they serve in prison, thereby reducing incarceration costs.

In general, businesses that participate in the Joint Venture program pay the same types of taxes as firms not involved in the program. Among these taxes are unemployment insurance taxes, which support the state Unemployment Insurance program. This program pays unemployment benefits to workers who lose their jobs through no fault of their own. The state tax rate paid by employers to support the Unemployment Insurance program is higher for businesses whose former employees are frequently paid unemployment benefits than for businesses which generate fewer benefit payments. Existing law provides that inmates are eligible to collect unemployment benefits after their release from state prison on the basis of their employment in the Joint Venture Program. As a result, some Joint Venture businesses may eventually pay higher Unemployment Insurance taxes.

Federal law permits all California businesses to receive a federal tax credit which lowers their federal unemployment tax payments. In order for California businesses to receive this tax credit, the state's Unemployment Insurance program must conform to federal standards.

Proposal:

This measure prohibits an inmate who participates in the Joint Venture Program, and is then released from state prison, from collecting unemployment insurance benefits based upon his or her participation in a Joint Venture business.

Fiscal Effect:

The measure prohibits unemployment benefit payments to former inmates based on their participation in the Joint Venture Program. Thus, this measure is likely to result in a reduction in expenditures for the state Unemployment Insurance program, as well as a reduction in the taxes paid by businesses to support the Unemployment Insurance program. To the extent that this measure encourages increased business participation and thereby increased inmate employment in the Joint Venture Program, it is likely to generate additional revenues and payments to the state to offset a portion of the cost of the program. The overall fiscal effect of the measure is likely to be minor.

Federal authorities have initially advised the state that denial of unemployment benefits to former inmates who worked for Joint Venture businesses may violate federal standards. If federal authorities ultimately make such a determination, California businesses would risk the loss of their federal tax credits.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 194 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 195

***Punishment. Special Circumstances.
Carjacking. Murder of Juror.***

Vote: No Recommendation**Official Summary:**

- **Adds murder during a carjacking, murder resulting from a carjacking kidnap and the intentional murder of a juror in retaliation for, or prevention of, the performance of the juror's official duties to the existing list of special circumstances for first-degree murder for which the death penalty or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole is authorized.**
- **Joined to Proposition 196 (Chapter 478, Statutes of 1995). If both measures pass, murder by intentional discharge of firearm at persons from a motor vehicle**

is also added to the list of special circumstances.

Legislative Initiative Amendment (SB 32)—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

First-degree murder is generally defined in state law as murder which is planned in advance, or which takes place during certain other crimes, including robbery, kidnapping, rape, or arson. It is generally punishable by a sentence of 25 years-to-life imprisonment with the possibility of release from prison on parole. However, a conviction for first-degree murder results in a more severe sentence of death or life imprisonment *without* the possibility of parole if the prosecutor charges and the court finds that one or more “special circumstances” specified in state law apply to the crime.

Currently, a first-degree murder resulting from a “carjacking”—taking a vehicle against the will of a driver or passenger by force or fear of force—is not such a special circumstance. However, state law specifies that carjackers can also be charged with robbery, which is a special circumstance crime. Consequently, under current law, a person convicted of first-degree murder during the commission of a carjacking and additionally convicted of robbery could be sentenced to death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

Similarly, a first-degree murder resulting from the kidnapping of an individual during a carjacking is not considered a special circumstance. Such offenders could be charged, as the law allows, with kidnapping as a special circumstance crime resulting in a sentence of death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

Finally, state law provides that the first-degree murder of a judge, prosecutor, or certain other public officials is a special circumstance punishable by a sentence of death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole. However, the law does not provide such a penalty in the case of the first-degree murder of a juror.

Proposal:

This measure adds first-degree murder during either a carjacking or a carjacking-kidnap to the list of special circumstances punishable by the death penalty or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole. This measure also specifies that the first-degree murder of a juror—either in retaliation for performing his or her official actions or to prevent the juror from carrying out his or her official duties—is a special circumstance.

Fiscal Effect:

Because this measure increases the number of crimes for which the special circumstances for first-degree murder applies, it would result in longer prison terms for some offenders, thereby increasing state costs. However, state law already permits carjackers or carjack-kidnappers who commit first-degree murder to be charged with robbery or kidnapping, thereby subjecting them to the harsher penalties for special circumstance crimes. Thus, the changes in the law made by this measure explicitly listing those two crimes as special circumstances are likely to result in minor additional incarceration costs.

The provision of this measure designating the first-degree murder of a juror as a special circumstance crime is likely to have little fiscal effect because such crimes occur infrequently.

In summary, we estimate that the measure would probably result in minor additional state costs.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning’s motion to adopt the Executive Council’s recommendation for Proposition No. 195 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 196

Punishment for Murder. Special Circumstances. Drive-By Shootings. Legislative Initiative Amendment.

Vote: No Recommendation

Official Summary:

- Adds the intentional murder of a person by discharging a firearm from a motor vehicle with the intent to inflict death to the list of special circumstances for first-degree murder for which the death penalty or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole is authorized.
- Joined to Proposition 195 (Chapter 477, Statutes of 1995). If both measures pass, murder during carjacking, murder resulting from a carjacking kidnap, and murder of juror in retaliation for, or to prevent, performance, of juror’s duties, are also added to the list of special circumstances.

Legislative Initiative Amendment (SB 9)—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

First degree murder is generally defined in state law as murder which is planned in

advance, or which takes place during certain other crimes, including robbery, kidnapping, rape, or arson. It is generally punishable by a sentence of 25 years-to-life imprisonment with the possibility of release from prison on parole. However, a conviction for first-degree murder results in a sentence of death or life imprisonment *without* the possibility of parole if the prosecutor charges and the court finds that one or more “special circumstances” specified in state law apply to the crime.

Currently, a murder resulting from a “drive-by shooting”—shooting someone from a motor vehicle—is a first-degree murder if the firearm was intentionally discharged with the intent to kill another person. Such a murder is punishable by a sentence of 25 years-to-life imprisonment with the possibility of parole. Such a murder is not a special circumstance warranting the more severe penalty of death or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

Proposal:

This measure adds first-degree murder resulting from a drive-by shooting to the list of special circumstances punishable by the death penalty or life imprisonment without the possibility of parole.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure would increase state costs primarily as a result of longer prison terms for offenders who receive a life sentence without the possibility of parole. The magnitude of these costs is unknown, potentially ranging into several millions of dollars annually in the long run.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning’s motion to adopt the Executive Council’s recommendation for Proposition No. 196 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 197

Amendment of the California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990. Mountain Lions.

Vote: No Recommendation

Official Summary:

- **Repeals mountain lion’s status as a specially protected mammal. Requires Fish and Game Commission to manage mountain lions as it manages mammals that are not rare, endangered, threatened.**
- **Requires Fish and Game Department**

implement mountain lion management plan that promotes health, safety, livestock and property protection; identifies priority zones where mountain lion removal has not alleviated threats.

- **Authorizes taking of mountain lions in priority zones, consistent with plan. Permits governmental agencies, landowners to take mountain lions imminently threatening public health, safety, or livestock.**
- **Allows legislative amendments.**

Legislative Initiative Amendment (SB 28)—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

In 1990, the California voters approved Proposition 117, the California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990. The act designated mountain lions as a specially protected mammal, and generally prohibited their taking (that is, hunting or killing), injury, possession, or sale. However, Proposition 117 allows the killing of a mountain lion if it (1) is perceived to be an imminent threat to public health or safety, (2) damages livestock or other property, or (3) is attacking people. In 1994, for example, 131 mountain lions were killed because they threatened public safety or damaged property or livestock.

Proposition 117 generally permits the Legislature to amend its provisions relating to mountain lions with a four-fifths vote of the members of both houses, but only if the amendments are consistent with the purposes of the act.

Proposition 117 also created the Habitat Conservation Fund (HCF). This fund is generally used to support the acquisition of lands for the protection of mountain lions, deer, rare, endangered, and threatened animals and plant life, wetlands, and park purposes. Proposition 117 required that the HCF receive \$30 million a year. This funding comes from the state’s General Fund and various environmental funds.

The state Fish and Game Commission is generally responsible for regulating the protection and use of wildlife species which are not rare, threatened, or endangered, in order to achieve a variety of goals. The commission does this by regulating the hunting, capturing, and killing of wildlife, including establishing hunting seasons; promoting public education; and protecting and enhancing habitat. The commission’s policies are implemented by the Department of Fish and Game.

Proposition 117 prohibits the commission or the Department of Fish and Game from adopting regulations that conflict with its provisions.

Proposal:

This measure amends Proposition 117's provisions related to mountain lions. Specifically, the measure does the following:

- Changes the vote requirement—from four-fifths to majority vote—for the Legislature to amend or repeal provisions of law concerning mountain lions, and eliminates the requirement that such changes be consistent with the purposes of Proposition 117.
- Eliminates the designation of the mountain lion as a specially protected mammal in California, and requires the Fish and Game Commission to regulate mountain lions in the same manner as it regulates other mammals which are not rare, endangered, or threatened.
- Requires the Department of Fish and Game to prepare a mountain lion management plan for the commission's approval and to implement the adopted plan. As part of the plan, the department must identify priority zones where the removal of individual mountain lions has not alleviated threats to public safety, livestock, domestic animals, other property, and other wildlife species. The measure authorizes the department to regulate, hunt, or kill mountain lions in priority zones if it has a plan for that zone. In addition, such actions must be consistent with the plan and maintain a viable mountain lion population in the zone.
- Authorizes the Department of Fish and Game to designate persons and government entities to remove or kill mountain lions that are perceived to be an imminent threat to public health or safety or livestock.

Fiscal Effect:

The measure reallocates existing funds in the HCF from land acquisition to the Department of Fish and Game to prepare and implement the mountain lion management plan. The reallocation would be up to \$250,000 annually for 1996-97, 1997-98, and 1998-99, and up to \$100,000 annually thereafter until July 1, 2020. The exact amount would depend on legislative action.

In addition, the measure declares the Legislature's intent that up to \$250,000 be appropriated annually from sources other than the HCF for public safety and public information programs related to mountain lions.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 197 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 198***Elections. Open Primary.*****Recommendation: Vote NO****Official Summary:**

- Provides that all persons entitled to vote, including those not affiliated with any political party, shall have the right to vote at any election for any candidate regardless of the candidate's political affiliation.
- Provides for a single primary ballot on which, under the appropriate title for each office, the names and party affiliations of all candidates are placed randomly and not grouped by political party.
- Retains separate partisan ballot only for the selection of elective political party committee members by voters of each party.
- Requires Legislature to conform conflicting statutes.

Initiative Statute—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:**Background:**

In general, California has three types of elections: primary, general, and special. Primary elections are held for both partisan offices, where candidates are identified on the ballot with a political party, and nonpartisan offices, where candidates are not identified with a political party.

In order to vote in primary elections for partisan offices, a voter must have identified a political party affiliation when registering to vote and can vote only for candidates of that party. Voters who have not identified a political party affiliation can not vote for candidates running for partisan office in primary elections. These voters, however, can vote for candidates for nonpartisan offices and on propositions.

For every primary election, the elections official in each county is required to prepare a partisan ballot for each political party and a nonpartisan ballot for voters who have not identified a political party affiliation.

Proposal:

This measure allows all persons who are entitled to vote in primary elections, including those not affiliated with a political party, to vote for any candidate regardless of the candidate's political party affiliation. Thus, voters in primary elections would be allowed to vote for candidates across political party lines. Furthermore,

the initiative provides that county elections officials prepare only one ballot for all voters. The candidates for an office would be listed randomly on the ballot and not grouped by political party affiliation. The candidate of each political party who receives the most votes for a state elective office becomes the nominee of that party at the next general election.

These provisions do not apply to elections of political party committee members. In these elections, voters would be restricted to voting for candidates of their won political party affiliation.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure would have no direct fiscal impact on the state. Counties could realize unknown, but probably minor savings statewide, primarily due to the preparation of fewer ballots.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 198 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 199

***Limits on Mobilehome Rent Control.
Low-Income Rental Assistance. Initiative
Statute.***

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary:

- **voids existing state rent control laws on mobilehomes. Prohibits new state and local rent control laws.**
- **Limits existing local rent control laws to current spaces. Prohibits controls on rent increases smaller than annual cost-of-living increase; eliminates controls on rent for space when tenancy or unit ownership changes.**
- **Requires park owners to provide subsidy of 10% of monthly rent for very low-income tenants if fewer than 10% of existing spaces are subject to rent control and if subsidy will not subject more than 10% of spaces to rent control or subsidy.**

Initiative Statute—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

About 500,000 California households live in mobilehomes. Mobilehomes differ from traditional single-family homes in that they are built

in factories and then moved to the place where the household wishes to live.

Most mobilehome owners have placed their homes on land that is rented from a mobilehome park owner. Once placed in a park, mobilehomes are difficult and expensive to move. As a result, when mobilehome owners wish to leave a park, they typically sell their home to someone else, rather than move the mobilehome.

Local Rent Control Laws. About 100 cities and counties have laws restricting the amount of rent mobilehome park owners may charge people who live in their park. These laws typically limit rent increases to rates equal to—or less than—inflation. Some communities, however, allow additional rent increases when a mobilehome is sold, transferred, or sublet. Local rent control laws apply to nearly 150,000 mobilehomes in California.

Proposal:

This measure phases out mobilehome rent control laws and prohibits local government from enacting new mobilehome rent control laws. The measure also requires mobilehome park owners to provide rent discounts to very-low income mobilehome owners.

Rent Control. The measure makes two major changes to existing local mobilehome rent control laws. First, the measure would eliminate—over time—all existing rent restrictions on mobilehomes. Specifically, rent restrictions on a mobilehome park space would be eliminated when a mobilehome owner sells, transfers, or sublets the home. It would take many years before all spaces in a park were exempt from rent control.

Second, the measure modifies the laws controlling rents on mobilehomes that remain subject to rent control. Specifically, these laws could not restrict annual rent increases to below the rate of inflation. This provision would allow park owners to increase rents at rates slightly higher than allowed under existing laws.

The measure also:

- Prevents local government from making new laws that control mobilehome rents.
- Overturns any state law restricting mobilehome rents.
- Requires any future state law controlling mobilehome rents to be approved by the voters.

Rent Discounts. The measure requires mobilehome park owners to provide 10 percent rent discounts to mobilehome owners with “very-low” income. The level of income considered “very-low” is defined by state law and varies by county. For example, two people with incomes of less than \$13,850 a year in Fresno County are considered to have “very-low”

income, whereas in Los Angeles County, the comparable amount is about \$20,500. Park owners would have to provide these discounts for up to 10 percent of the spaces in the park. (Mobilehome park spaces still subject to rent control, however, would count toward the 10 percent requirement.) Park owners could end a rent discount for various reasons, such as if the mobilehome owner is six days late with a rent payment or violates park rules. In these cases, a mobilehome owner could reapply for assistance in one year.

Fiscal Effect:

In the near term, local agencies with rent control laws would experience increased costs to administer the phase-out of rent control. In some communities, these increased costs would be offset by decreased costs to oversee mobilehome park rent increases. Any short-term net costs—or savings—would vary by community, but are not likely to be significant.

In the long term, after all mobilehome park spaces were exempt from rent control, local agency costs to administer rent control laws would be eliminated. The extent of these local agency savings statewide probably would total at least several million dollars annually.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 199 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 200

No-Fault Motor Vehicle Insurance. Limits Lawsuits. Initiative Statute.

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary:

- **Requires insurer to pay benefits regardless of who is at fault in most motor vehicle accidents. Suits against another driver prohibited unless specified crime or hazard proven.**
- **Requires at least \$50,000 and up to \$1,000,000 vehicle-owner insurance for personal injury protection; optional coverage to \$5,000,000. Minimum coverage permitted with waiver of full benefits.**
- **Generally covers vehicle occupants, pedestrians, bicyclists.**
- **Requires insurance benefits for medical and rehabilitation costs, wage loss, replacement services, and death. Supplemental optional coverage available.**

- **Generally requires benefit payment within 30 days or mandates arbitration.**
- **Incorporates health care fee limits.**

Initiative Statute—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

California's automobile insurance system is based on the concept of *fault*. Under this system, a person at fault for an automobile accident is required to pay for injuries or damages caused to someone else. Most people buy insurance to protect themselves financially in case they are at fault in an automobile accident.

In fact, state law requires all owners of motor vehicles (cars, trucks, and motorcycles) registered in California to be covered by a *minimum* level of insurance to assure that accident victims receive payments for losses from at-fault drivers. As Figure 1 shows, there are minimum coverage levels for *bodily injury* and *property damage*. A driver's bodily injury insurance makes payments to other persons for the *economic losses*, which include the costs of medical care (including rehabilitation) and lost job income, and for *noneconomic losses*—referred to as "pain and suffering." A driver's property damage insurance makes payments to someone whose property is damaged. In practice, most people who obtain insurance choose to cover their vehicles at higher levels than the law requires. On the other hand, many others choose to operate their vehicles without any insurance ("uninsured motorists"), which is in violation of current law.

Regardless of whether an at-fault driver has insurance, persons injured in an accident can sue to receive full payment for their injuries and losses. Generally, these lawsuits result from disagreements over who was at fault and payments for injuries and losses.

Proposal:

The measure establishes "no-fault" motor vehicle insurance system for personal injuries resulting from vehicle accidents. This system, if approved by the voters, would apply to accidents occurring on or after July 1, 1997. The measure significantly changes current law regarding payments for *bodily injuries*. (The measure does not change current law regarding payments for *property damage*.) There are two major components of the no-fault system.

No Fault Insurance. Instead of requiring coverage to pay for injuries caused to others, the measure requires drivers to cover *their own and their passengers'* injuries, *regardless of who is at fault for the accident*. The measure refers to this as Personal Injury Protection (PIP) insurance. A driver's PIP insurance also covers

Figure 1 Motor Vehicle Insurance Required Under Current Law		
<u>Type of Insurance</u>	<u>Maximum Payment Per Accident</u>	<u>Qualifications</u>
Bodily Injury	\$30,000	Total payments for bodily injury for each accident. (Maximum of \$15,000 per person.)
Property	\$ 5,000	Amount of damage to property of others as a result of an accident.

family members, as specified, who are injured while riding in other automobiles. It also covers drivers and their families involved in automobile accidents while walking or biking. All owners of motor vehicles operated or registered in California would be required to carry PIP insurance and would be required to provide proof of insurance annually to the Department of Motor Vehicles in order to register or reregister a vehicle.

Ability to Sue. In most cases, people would no longer be allowed to sue to recover damages for death or bodily injury from automobile accidents. The determination of fault would no longer be a factor for payment of expenses related to a person's automobile accident injuries. Instead, payments would come from a person's own insurance policy, not from suing someone else or collecting from someone else's insurance policy. A person could still sue for bodily injuries in certain cases, such as accidents involving drunk drivers or drivers committing a felony.

The measure also prohibits the owner of a motor vehicle not insured for property damage from suing to recover property damage to their vehicle.

The major provisions of this measure are discussed below:

PIP Insurance. The measure requires a minimum level of PIP insurance of \$50,000 per person per accident. This covers benefit payments for medical care, rehabilitation, wage loss, replacement services (activities such as cooking or housekeeping that can no longer be performed due to injury), and death resulting from motor vehicle accidents. The \$50,000 could be used for one type of benefit (such as medical care) or for a combination of benefits.

The measure requires insurance companies to offer other levels of PIP insurance, ranging

from \$250,000 to \$5 million. The measure, however, defines \$1 million in coverage as a "standard" level. Anyone buying PIP insurance of less than the standard amount must sign a waiver statement.

Under PIP insurance, drivers automatically have the minimum coverage that is required in other states and Canada when the vehicle is operated there.

PIP Insurance for Pain and Suffering. Under this measure, a person generally could not sue another driver for losses—including pain and suffering. The measure, however, requires insurance companies to make available insurance that pays up to \$250,000 for pain and suffering resulting from a permanent and serious injury. Drivers would buy this insurance to cover costs for pain or suffering experienced by themselves, their passengers, and their families. The amount of payment for any given case would be determined by a schedule to be established by the Insurance Commissioner. Insurance companies could also offer pain and suffering policies that pay benefits for all injuries, not just permanent and serious ones.

Assigned Claims Plan. The measure requires all insurers authorized to provide PIP benefits to participate in an Assigned Claims Plan. This plan would pay PIP benefits for certain accidents involving uninsured vehicles. For example, the plan covers a pedestrian who does not own a car and is hit by an uninsured vehicle. Children (under 18) whose families do not have PIP coverage would also be covered under the plan if injured or killed in uninsured vehicles.

Insurance Premiums. Consistent with current law, the measure allows an insurance company to charge rates (or premiums) for PIP insurance coverage subject to approval by the Insurance Commissioner. While fault would no longer be a factor in determining who is respon-

sible for injuries and losses, the measure still allows fault to be a factor in determining the premiums charged to individual drivers. Specifically, the measure prohibits an insurance company from increasing anyone's premiums as a result of claims for PIP benefits unless the person is found to be 51 percent or more responsible for the accident.

Prompt Payment of Claims. The measure requires insurers to pay PIP claims within 30 days of the time the insurer receives documentation of the accident. The insurer must pay a 24 percent annual interest rate on late payments.

Self-Insurance. Consistent with current law, the measure allows businesses to self-insure their vehicles. The measure sets forth requirements for qualifying as a self-insurer. These requirements are designed to guarantee that a self-insurer has the financial capacity to handle anticipated claims. Under the measure, government-owned vehicles are automatically deemed self-insured.

Fiscal Effect:

This measure would have several major fiscal impacts on state and local governments. In summary, we estimate that the measure would result in major annual savings to the state and local governments and major annual revenue losses to these governments. As discussed below, these impacts would vary by governmental entity. The net impact on the public sector as a whole is unknown.

Health Care Savings. Under current law, the state and counties provide basic and emergency health care services to low-income persons who have no medical insurance. As a result, when they are injured in automobile accidents, the state and counties pay for much of the medical costs incurred. Under this measure, many of these costs would instead be borne by PIP insurance. We estimate that the measure would result in savings to the state and counties, potentially over \$100 million annually.

Loss in Vehicle Registration Revenues. Currently, there are over 25 million cars registered in the state. Vehicle owners pay registration and license fees annually to the state and local governments. There are, however, several million people who register their vehicles but fail to obtain automobile insurance. Under this measure, people could not register their cars unless they had this insurance. It is likely that many of these uninsured drivers who currently register their vehicles would no longer do so. Consequently, state and local governments would lose revenues in the tens of millions of dollars annually, potentially exceeding \$100 million annually.

Savings From Reduced Claims for Bodily Injury Against State and Local Governments.

The state and most local governments self-insure their own vehicles for employees to use for government business. When these employees are liable for damages caused in automobile accidents, the government pays claims to those who suffer damages. In 1994-95, the state paid approximately \$16 million in motor vehicle claims and associated legal fees for bodily injury or death. The state receives significantly less than this for its own claims against drivers of nonstate vehicles. Under this measure, the state would realize savings by not incurring these net costs. Based on this estimate at the state level, the annual savings to state and local governments could be in the tens of millions of dollars annually.

Loss in Gross Premiums Tax Revenue.

Under current law, insurance companies doing business in California pay a tax of 2.35 percent of "gross premiums." This tax is called the gross premiums tax. The measure would affect, in several ways, total premiums paid for automobile insurance. This—in turn—would also affect state General Fund gross premiums tax revenues. For instance, total premiums paid for automobile insurance would decrease because insurers would no longer pay costs associated with lawsuits for death and bodily injury. On the other hand, total premiums paid would increase because some people who currently do not purchase automobile insurance would do so under this measure. The net impact would probably be a revenue loss, potentially greater than \$10 million annually.

Decreased Health Insurance Costs to State and Local Governments. Under the measure, persons injured in automobile accidents would receive medical benefits from PIP insurance before receiving any benefits from their health insurance policies. This could result in lower premiums paid by state and local governments for employee health care insurance.

State Administration. The measure would increase state administrative costs to: (1) adopt regulations that are in accordance with the measure, (2) ensure that carriers are in compliance with these new regulations, and (3) verify insurance coverage before issuing or renewing motor vehicle registrations. We estimate that start-up costs would be about \$15 million, with costs of about \$10 million annually thereafter.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 200 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 201

Attorneys' Fees. Shareholder Actions. Class Actions. Initiative Statute.

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary:

- **Requires losing party to pay winning party's reasonable attorneys' fees and expenses in shareholder actions against corporations and in class actions based on securities law violations.**
- **Payment by member of losing party not required if position was substantially justified and payment would be unjust. Court may require losing party's attorney to pay.**
- **After hearing, court may require plaintiff to furnish bond for defendant's estimated fees and expenses, unless plaintiff owns or traded at least 5% of shares. Plaintiff's attorney may agree to furnish bond and pay defendant's fees and expenses for plaintiff.**

Initiative Statute—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

Currently, persons who own stock in a company (shareholders) can sue the company when they believe there has been misconduct by company officials which violates laws protecting the interests of the shareholders. Many of these lawsuits are "class action cases," meaning that these lawsuits are filed on behalf of a group of shareholders with similar interests. Under current law, with certain exceptions, both the suing party (the "plaintiff") and the defending party (the "defendant") are required to pay their own legal expenses.

Proposal:

This measure changes who is responsible for paying the legal expenses of persons involved in shareholder lawsuits. Specifically, the measure requires the losing party in shareholder lawsuits to pay the winning party's reasonable legal expenses, including attorney fees. The measure permits the court, however, to waive the liability of the losing party if it finds that the lawsuit was substantially justified and the payment of the legal expenses would be unjust. The court may also reduce the expenses or require the losing attorney, rather than the losing client, to pay all or part of the expenses.

This measure also requires the plaintiff in shareholder lawsuits to post a bond, if ordered by the court, to ensure the payment of the

defendant's expenses should the plaintiff lose. No bond is required if the plaintiff owned or traded a specified amount of the company's stock. The measure provides that the plaintiff's attorney may furnish the bond.

Fiscal Effect:

The fiscal impact of this measure on state and local governments is unknown, but probably not significant. This is because there are few of these cases in the state courts.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 201 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 202

Attorneys' Contingent Fees. Limits. Initiative Statute.

Recommendation: Vote NO

Official Summary:

- **Limits fees which plaintiffs' attorneys may collect, if payable contingent on plaintiffs' recovery of compensation, in personal injury, wrongful death, other tort cases. Hourly rates not limited.**
- **Requires demand against defendants for compensation with supporting information. Allows defendants to respond with early settlement offer with supporting information. If accepted, plaintiffs' attorneys may not collect contingent fees exceeding 15% of defendants' offer. If not accepted, they may collect fees above 15% only on part of recovery in excess of defendants' early settlement offer.**
- **Fiduciary relationship applies to fee agreement between plaintiff, plaintiff's attorney.**

Initiative Statute—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

An injured party (the "plaintiff") may sue a person, business, or government (the "defendant") to recover damages for personal injury, death, or property loss. These types of cases are referred to as "tort" cases. The amount of damages to be paid in a tort case may be determined by negotiation and settlement, court trial, or arbitration. Settlement may occur at any stage of the process.

Typically, tort cases are handled on a “contingent fee” basis, which means that the plaintiff’s attorney is paid a percentage of the settlement or judgment only if the case is won or settled in favor of the plaintiff. Generally, attorney contingent fees are negotiated between the plaintiff and the attorney. Current law limits attorney contingent fees for tort cases only in medical malpractice cases. In all cases, attorneys are required by law to provide written contracts that specify, among other things, the contingent fee agreed upon and the extent to which the plaintiff may be required to compensate the attorney for matters not covered in the contract. The court may reduce a contingent fee if it finds the fee unjust.

Proposal:

This measure limits the amount of contingent fees attorneys representing plaintiffs could charge their clients when the defendant makes an early offer to settle the tort claim. Specifically, if the plaintiff accepts an early settlement offer, the attorney contingent fee would be limited to no more than 15 percent of the offer. If the plaintiff rejects an early settlement offer, the fee would then be limited to no more than 15 percent of the early settlement offer, plus an additional amount agreed to by the attorney and client. The additional amount would be a percentage of the recovery in excess of the early settlement offer. Contingent fees also would be limited to no more than 15 percent in those cases where attorneys do not fully disclose early settlement offers to their clients.

The measure provides that these fee limitations may not be waived.

The measure requires the plaintiff’s attorney to disclose to his or her client (1) the fee limitations imposed by this measure and (2) that lower fee rates can be negotiated. The measure also requires these attorneys to disclose all offers of early settlement of tort disputes to their clients.

Fiscal Effect:

The fiscal impact of this measure on state and local governments is unknown. It could result in either net savings or costs, depending largely on how attorneys and their clients respond to its provisions. The responses could affect the number of cases filed, the number of cases settled before trial, and the amount of the awards in cases against state and local governments.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning’s motion to adopt the Executive Council’s recommendation for Proposition No. 202 was seconded and carried.

PROPOSITION NO. 203

Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 1996

Recommendation: Vote YES

Official Summary:

- **This act provides for a bond issue of three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) to provide funds for school facility improvement programs.**
- **Earmarks \$2.025 billion for primary and secondary schools, and \$975 million for higher education.**
- **Appropriates money from General Fund to pay off bonds.**

Bond Act (AB 680, AB 1168)—Analysis by the Legislative Analyst:

Background:

Public education in California consists of two distinct systems. One system includes local school districts that provides elementary and secondary (kindergarten through 12th grade) education to about 5.3 million students. The other system (commonly referred to as “higher education”) includes local community colleges, the California State Universities, the University of California, and the Hastings College of the Law. This higher education system provides a wide range of education programs beyond the kindergarten through 12th grade (K-12) level.

K-12 Schools

The state, through the State School Building Lease-Purchase Program, provides much of the money for school districts to buy land and to construct, reconstruct, or modernize school buildings in the K-12 system. In order to receive money under this program, school districts must meet certain eligibility requirements.

Under other related programs, the state also provides money to (1) remove hazardous asbestos from school buildings, (2) purchase portable classrooms, (3) repair and renovate child care facilities that provide care for school-aged children before and after school hours and during summer vacation, and (4) purchase and install air conditioning equipment and insulation materials in eligible year-round schools.

Since 1986, the voters have approved \$6.8 billion in state general obligation bonds to fund these K-12 school facilities programs. As of January 1996, there was about \$60 million remaining from these funds.

In addition to obtaining money from the state, local school districts raise funds for school buildings in three main ways:

Figure 1

Uses of \$2.025 Billion for K-12 Schools

At Least \$960 Million to:

- Buy land and construct new school buildings.

Up to \$900 Million for:

- Projects in small school districts that may not otherwise receive state funding because of their small size.
- Removal of hazardous asbestos from school facilities.
- Purchase of portable classrooms or child care facilities.
- Reconstruction or modernization of existing school buildings.
- Purchase and installation of air conditioning equipment and insulation materials for eligible school districts with year-round school programs.
- Construction of school facilities in districts where enrollment increases are caused by the building of new state or federal prisons.

- Providing classroom facilities for severely handicapped children for programs administered by county boards of education.
- Replacement of roofs at existing school buildings.
- Projects and equipment to increase school security.

Up to \$100 Million to:

- Strengthen school facilities for earthquake safety.

Up to \$40 Million for:

- Projects in which school districts pay for at least 60 percent of the cost of a project.

Up to \$25 Million for:

- School projects that include certain facilities (such as a library or park) that will be jointly used by the school district and another governmental entity.

● **Local General Obligation Bonds.** School districts are authorized to sell bonds to finance school construction projects, with the approval of two-thirds of the voters in the district. In these cases, the bonds are paid off by taxes that are levied on property located within the school district.

● **Special Local Bonds (Known as "Mello-Roos" Bonds).** School districts are authorized to form special districts in order to sell these bonds for school construction projects, with approval of two-thirds of the voters in the special district. (The special districts generally do not encompass the entire school district.) The bonds are paid off by charges assessed to property owners in the special district.

● **Developer Fees.** School districts are authorized to impose developer fees on new construction. As of January 1, 1996, the maximum allowable fee under state law is \$1.72 per square foot on residential buildings and 28 cents per square foot on commercial or industrial buildings. These fees may be used only for construction and reconstruction of school buildings.

K-12 School Building Needs. There is no district-by-district estimate on the future demand for school facilities. The state Department of Finance estimates that the number of students attending K-12 schools statewide will increase by about 600,000 over the next five years. Given this projected growth, several billions of dollars will be needed statewide for new school facilities over the next

five years. Additional funds will be needed for reconstruction or modernization of existing school facilities, including air conditioning for schools that operate year-round.

As of May 1995, applications submitted by school districts for state funding of land and new school buildings totaled approximately \$5.3 billion. In addition, applications for state funding to reconstruct or modernize school buildings, purchase portable classrooms, remove hazardous asbestos from schools, and provide air conditioning for year-round schools totaled approximately \$1.8 billion.

Higher Education

California's system of public higher education includes 139 campuses serving about 1.8 million students:

● The University of California has nine campuses, with a total enrollment of about 158,000 students. This system offers bachelor, master, and doctoral degrees, and is the primary state-supported agency for research.

● The California State University system has 22 campuses, with an enrollment of about 330,000 students. The system grants bachelor and master degrees.

● The California Community Colleges provide instruction to about 1.3 million students at 107 campuses operated by 71 locally governed districts throughout the state. The community colleges grant associate degrees and also offer a variety of vocational skill courses.

● The Hastings College of the Law is gov-

erned by its own board of directors and has an enrollment of about 1,300 students.

The state provides money to support these institutions of public higher education. This support covers both ongoing operating and capital improvement costs. In addition to state funds, these institutions also receive widely varying amounts of nonstate funds for both support and capital improvements.

Since 1986, the voters have approved nearly \$2.4 billion in general obligation bonds for capital improvements at public higher education campuses. As of January 1996, there was about \$14 million remaining from these funds. In addition, since 1986 the Governor and the Legislature have provided about \$2.4 billion for public higher education facilities from lease-payment bonds.

Higher Education Building Needs. Each year the institutions of higher education prepare five-year capital outlay plans, in which they identify projects that they believe should be funded over the next five years. The most recent five-year plans identify a total of \$6.6 billion in projects for the period 1996-97 through 2000-01.

Proposal

This measure authorizes the state to sell \$3 billion in general obligation bonds for K-12 schools (\$2.025 billion) and higher education facilities (\$0.975 billion).

General obligation bonds are backed by the state, meaning that the state is obligated to pay the principal and interest costs on these bonds. General Fund revenues would be used to pay these costs. These revenues come primarily from state personal and corporate income taxes and sales taxes.

K-12 School Facilities

The \$2.205 billion for K-12 schools would be used as shown in Figure 1.

As the figure shows, almost one-half of the funds (at least \$960 million) would be used to build new schools. The measure also allows up to \$1.065 billion to be used for a wide variety of school capital outlay purposes.

The \$2.025 billion for K-12 schools would be distributed to eligible school districts by the State Allocation Board. The board is a seven-member body composed of four members of the Legislature, two directors of state departments, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

State School Building Aid Program. This measure would allow \$40 million in unsold bonds previously approved for the State School Building Aid Program to instead be sold for the State School Building Lease-Purchase Program. (Under the aid program, the state lends bond funds to school districts for school construction

and the districts pay back the loan plus interest over a period of up to 30 years. However, there has not been activity in the aid program for many years. This is because since 1976 the state has funded school facilities under the lease-purchase program.

Higher Education Facilities

The measure includes \$975 million to construct new buildings, alter existing buildings, and purchase equipment for use in these buildings for California's public higher education system. The Governor and the Legislature would decide the specific projects to be funded by the bond monies.

Fiscal Effect:

For general obligation bonds, the state makes principal and interest payments from the state's General Fund typically over a period of about 25 years. If the \$3 billion in bonds authorized by this measure plus the \$40 million in unsold bonds transferred from the School Building Aid Program are sold at an interest rate of 5.5 percent, the cost over the period would be about \$5.21 billion to pay off both the principal (\$3.04 billion) and interest (\$2.17 billion). The average payment for principal and interest would be about \$208 million per year.

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for Proposition No. 203 was seconded and carried.

Recommendations Adopted as a Whole

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for all those ballot propositions that had thus far qualified for the March 26, 1996 ballot as a whole. His motion was seconded and carried.

Propositions Not Yet on the November Ballot

Chairman Gruhn next called on Secretary-Treasurer Henning to present the Executive Council's recommendations for three unnumbered propositions in circulation but not yet qualified for the November 5, 1996 ballot.

Proposition to Raise the Minimum Wage

Recommendation: Vote YES

Secretary-Treasurer Henning moved to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation. His motion was seconded.

Speaking in support of the Executive Council's recommendation were delegates

Owen Marron (Alameda County Central Labor Council, Oakland), Steve Nutter (UNITE! Southwest District Council, Los Angeles), Dean Tipps (California State Council of Service Employees, Sacramento), Matt McKinnon (California Conference of Machinists, Sacramento) and John Perez (UFCW Region 8 States Council, Buena Park).

Recommendation Adopted

The motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation for the proposition to raise the minimum wage was carried.

Announcement

Secretary-Treasurer Henning announced that the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor had contributed \$1,000 to the campaign to raise the minimum wage.

Proposition Regarding Attorney-Client Fee Arrangements and Security Fraud

Recommendation: Vote YES

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was seconded and carried.

Proposition to Continue Highest Income Tax Brackets on the Wealthy

Recommendation: Vote YES

Recommendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the Executive Council's recommendation was seconded and carried.

Resolution Calling for Financial Support for the Living Wage Initiative

Secretary-Treasurer Henning then read the text of the Executive Council's resolution calling for financial support for the minimum wage campaign as follows:

Whereas, The California Labor Federation is a sponsor of the Living Wage Act of 1996, an initiative for the 1996 General Election Ballot, which would raise the California minimum wage from \$4.25 an hour to \$5 in 1997 and to \$5.75 in 1998; and

Whereas, The increase in the minimum wage would bring a significant and long-overdue improvement in the standard of living for over 1.8 million California workers, who are forced to live in poverty; and

Whereas, The Living Wage Initiative enjoys overwhelming public support and is a key element in labor's strategic electoral plan for 1996; and

Whereas, The Living Wage Initiative is in urgent need of massive financial support now, in order to collect the 750,000 signatures needed by the end of March to qualify the measure for the November ballot; and

Whereas, Having taken on this battle, failure to qualify the initiative for the ballot would be a severe political blow to organized labor; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the California Labor Federation urges every AFL-CIO local union in California to make an immediate contribution from the General Treasury Fund of at least one dollar per member to the Liveable Wage Coalition, the initiative's sponsor; and be it further

Resolved, That the California Labor Federation urges every AFL-CIO local union in California to request immediately comparable funding from its International Union.

Resolution Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adopt the resolution to support the Living Wage Initiative was seconded and carried.

Announcement

Secretary-Treasurer Henning announced the San Francisco Labor Council's call for a rally on Friday, January 26 at Union Square in San Francisco to protest the recent non-union ownership of the Emporium which jeopardizes a long history of union jobs at the department store.

Sergeants-at-Arms Commended

The Sergeants-at-Arms were thanked by Secretary-Treasurer Henning for their service at the Convention. He read their names as follows:

Joe Sharpe (UFCW No. 648, San Francisco)

Claire Caldwell (Transport Workers No. 250-A, San Francisco)

Diana Volpini-Allen (Office and Professional Employees No. 3, San Francisco)

Harold Mucker (Northern California District Council of Laborers, Richmond)

Bob Burns (Operating Engineers No. 12, Pasadena)

Vincent O'Halloran (Sailors Union of the Pacific, San Francisco)

Commendation Adopted

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to commend the Sergeants-at-Arms was seconded and carried.

**Training Session on Gathering
Signatures for Minimum Wage Petitions
Announced**

Secretary-Treasurer Henning next introduced Richard Holober, campaign manager of the Liveable Wage Coalition, who advised the delegates to remain seated after adjournment of the Convention so he could conduct a training session on the proper gathering of signatures to put

the Living Wage Initiative on the General Election ballot.

Adjournment

Secretary-Treasurer Henning's motion to adjourn was seconded and carried, whereupon at 1:30 p.m. the 1996 Pre-Primary Election Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, was adjourned sine die.

REPORT OF SECRETARY-TREASURER

John F. Henning

To the 1996 Pre-Primary COPE Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO:

The blows of political devastation fell heavily on American workers in the November elections of 1994.

Not only in Washington, but in state elections coast to coast Republicans won elective territories not held in decades.

Both House and Senate came under a Republican rule not known in Washington since the notorious Taft-Hartley Congress of 1946.

In California, the Congressional majority of 32 Democrats to 20 Republicans became a 27-25 Democratic edge.

California also saw a close but real Republican victory in the State Assembly by a 41-39 count. The past quarter of a century had known a virtually constant Democratic control.

Our State Senate remained Democratic with its 21 Democrats, two Independents and 17 Republicans.

The irony is that labor's political effort in 1994 was, if anything, more efficient and aggressive than in most past elections.

This due in large to the fervent spirit aroused by the hope of winning the White House through the election of William Jefferson Clinton.

We won the White House but lost much of the infrastructure of political influence.

The Republican Party, with its newfound control of Congress and state capitols, is unleashing the power of ruthless capitalism not only against labor but against the poor, the minorities, the aged, the handicapped and the youth of America.

The destructive anti-worker, anti-social budget being proposed by the Republicans is for the advantage of those who have so much of the nation's wealth as against the survival needs of those who have so little. Pure Republican doctrine.

It is the duty of labor to lead the counter-revolution which means nothing less than the education of the American working class on the animalistic nature of something we call the market economy, or more bluntly, capitalism.

A LOOK AT THE 1994 ELECTIONS The Primary

The primary elections of June, 1994 gave no suggestion of the national Republican sweep

that would follow in the general elections of November, 1994. California's Congressional and State Assembly races were caught in this national tide.

In advance of the June primary, the Federation's Standing Committee on Political Education printed and distributed 361,000 endorsement pamphlets in 14 variations based on geographic location to inform members and their families of labor's position on candidates and propositions as determined by the Pre-Primary Election Convention held in April.

Six of the COPE-endorsed candidates for statewide constitutional office won nomination in the June primary and four did not. COPE-endorsed incumbent U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein won the nomination for the U.S. Senate seat she held. In addition, the following COPE-endorsed candidates won their races in the June Primary: Kathleen Brown for Governor; Gray Davis for Lieutenant Governor; Tom Umberg for State Attorney General; Delaine Eastin for Superintendent of Public Instruction; and Art Torres for State Insurance Commissioner. The four COPE-endorsed candidates who did not win their party's nomination were the following: Gwen Moore for Secretary of State; Rusty Areias and Don Perata for State Controller (this was a dual endorsement); and David Roberti for State Treasurer. COPE-endorsed candidates won nomination in 117 primary election races involving the U. S. House of Representatives, State Senate and State Assembly while only 11 endorsees lost, for an overall victory rate of 91 percent. Thirty-one COPE-endorsed congressional candidates won while four lost—an 89 percent victory rate. In the State Senate, COPE backed 20 candidates and they all won for a 100 percent victory rate. In the State Assembly, 66 of 73 COPE-endorsed candidates were successful, for a 90 percent victory rate.

All four of the labor-backed candidates for the State Board of Equalization won nomination.

The voters agreed with labor's position on two of seven statewide ballot propositions. COPE-endorsed Proposition 175, The Renters' Income Tax Credit, was defeated. COPE-endorsed Proposition 176, the elimination of local business license taxes or fees on non-profit organizations, was passed by the voters. COPE-endorsed Proposition 177, a property tax exemption for any construction needed for disabled access, was passed. COPE-endorsed Proposition 180, a bond for park land acquisition and facilities was defeated. COPE-

endorsed Proposition 1A, the Earthquake Relief and Seismic Retrofit Bond, was defeated. COPE-endorsed Proposition 1B, a K-12 school construction bond, was defeated. COPE-endorsed Proposition 1C, the Higher Education Facilities Bond, was defeated.

The General

Immediately after the primary, a unified labor movement went to work in a determined effort to elect its friends to office in the November general election.

COPE's registration, education, and get-out-the-vote efforts were reinforced by continuing support from the black, Latino and senior communities through its field coordinators from the A. Philip Randolph Institute, the Labor Council for Latin American Advancement and the Federation of Retired Union Members (FORUM). APALA—the Asian Pacific American Labor Alliance expanded its work to advance pro-labor candidates in the Asian community.

Federation-sponsored workshops were conducted in August at San Francisco and Los Angeles, forming a strategy to help activists from central labor councils and local unions elect labor's friends to office and mobilize the labor movement against Proposition 187, the anti-immigrant, anti-minority ballot measure sponsored by Governor Wilson and the Republican Party. Participants were told how COPE computers could be used to locate unregistered union members and persuade those who were already registered to support COPE-endorsed candidates and labor's positions on ballot propositions. The skills and knowledge of how to use the COPE computers enhanced labor's time-honored grass roots registration, education, and get-out-the-vote programs.

The California Labor Federation printed and distributed 322,000 endorsement pamphlets to registered union members which were broken down into 12 regional variations, highlighting labor's choices among candidates for congressional, state legislative, statewide office and ballot propositions. Special emphasis in the general election was given to re-electing Dianne Feinstein to the U.S. Senate, electing Kathleen Brown as governor, defeating the anti-immigrant Proposition 187 and passing Proposition 186, the Single-payer Health Plan.

Labor made recommendations on six statewide ballot initiatives. The voters supported labor's position on two of these measures. On Proposition 188, the voters rejected the deadly and fraudulent effort by the tobacco industry to eliminate local efforts to control smoking in the workplace. In addition, the voters agreed with the Federation's recommenda-

tion on Proposition 183, thus supporting a change in recall elections.

The voters disagreed with the Federation's recommendations on four of the statewide ballot issues. The voters passed "3 strikes" sentencing rules whereas the Federation had recommended a "no" vote. In addition, over the strenuous and hard fought opposition by labor throughout the state, a majority of the voters supported the racist Proposition 187. Many in labor feel that this proposition divides workers along ethnic and income lines and weakens our ability to remain united against the onslaught of unrestrained capital. The voters rejected Proposition 181-The Passenger Rail and Clean Air Bond Act of 1994. The Federation had recommended a "yes" vote on this issue. Finally, trade unionists all over California fought long and hard to pass the "Single-payer Health Plan. Millions of dollars from the health industry were arrayed against the Federation's position and the voters rejected Proposition 186.

COPE-endorsed candidates were victorious in three out of seven statewide constitutional offices. Incumbent Governor Pete Wilson beat Kathleen Brown, the COPE-endorsed candidate. Labor supported Gray Davis for Lieutenant Governor, Kathleen Connell for State Controller, Delaine Eastin for State Superintendent of Public Instruction and each of them was successful in their election. Labor's choices for Secretary of State, Tony Miller; State Treasurer, Phil Angelides; State Attorney General, Tom Umberg; and State Insurance Commissioner, Art Torres, were all defeated.

Three of the four successful candidates to the State Board of Equalization were also endorsed by the California Labor Federation.

The November General Election was disastrous for labor in the California State Assembly and the United States House of Representatives. Although labor held on to tenuous majority in the State Senate, losing the Governor's race and the majority in the State Assembly has created a real threat to the lives of working people in California.

On a statewide basis, the California AFL-CIO endorsed a total of 141 candidates favorable to working people for seats in the U.S. House, State Senate, and State Assembly. Seventy-five of these endorsed candidates were elected, a success rate of 53 percent.

The composition of the California Congressional Delegation changed from 32 Democrats and 20 Republicans before the 1994 election to 27 Democrats and 25 Republicans after the election. Twenty-two of the 47 COPE-endorsed candidates running in congressional races were successful, a 47 percent victory rate.

The composition of the California State Senate changed from 22 Democrats, 16 Republicans, and two Independents before the 1994 election to 21 Democrats, 17 Republicans, and two Independents after the election. In the State Senate, 14 of 18 COPE-endorsed candidates won election for a 78 percent victory rate.

The composition of the California State Assembly changed from 47 Democrats and 33 Republicans before the election to 39 Democrats and 41 Republicans after the election. Thirty-nine out of 76 COPE-endorsed State Assembly candidates won election for a 51 percent victory rate.

COPE-endorsed candidates winning congressional seats in the 1994 general election listed in the order of their congressional district number were:

District:

3. Vic Fazio (D)
5. Robert T. Matsui (D)
6. Lynn C. Woolsey (D)
7. George Miller (D)
9. Ronald V. Dellums (D)
12. Tom Lantos (D)
13. Fortney Pete Stark (D)
15. Norm Mineta (D)
16. Zoe Lofgren (D)
18. Gary A. Condit (D)
24. Anthony C. Beilenson (D)
26. Howard L. Berman (D)
29. Henry Waxman (D)
30. Xavier Becerra (D)
31. Matthew G. Martinez (D)
32. Julian C. Dixon (D)
33. Lucille Roybal-Allard (D)
35. Maxine Waters (D)
36. Jane Harman (D)
37. Walter R. Tucker III (D)
42. George E. Brown, Jr. (D)
50. Bob Filner (D)

COPE-endorsed candidates winning State Senate seats in 1994, listed by their district numbers, were:

District:

2. Mike Thompson (D)
6. Leroy F. Greene (D)
10. Bill Lockyer (D)
16. Jim Costa (D)
18. Jack O'Connell (D)
20. Herschel Rosenthal (D)
22. Richard G. Polanco (D)
24. Hilda Solis (D)
26. Diane E. Watson (D)
28. Ralph C. Dills (D)
30. Charles M. Calderon (D)
32. Ruben S. Ayala (D)
38. William A. (Bill) Craven (R)
40. Steve Peace (D)

Victorious COPE-endorsed Assembly candidates in November 1994, included:

District:

1. Dan Hauser (D)
6. Kerry Mazzoni (D)
7. Valerie K. Brown (D)
8. Tom Hannigan (D)
9. Phillip Isenberg (D)
11. Bob Campbell (D)
12. John L. Burton (D)
13. Willie L. Brown, Jr. (D)
14. Tom Bates (D)
16. Barbara Lee (D)
17. Michael J. Machado (D)
18. Michael Sweeney (D)
20. Liz Figueroa (D)
21. Byron D. Sher (D)
22. John Vasconcellos (D)
23. Dominic L. (Dom) Cortese (D)
26. Sal Cannella (D)
31. Cruz M. Bustamante (D)
39. Richard Katz (D)
40. Barbara Friedman (D)
41. Sheila James Kuehl (D)
42. Wally Knox (D)
45. Antonio Villaraigosa (D)
46. Louis Caldera (D)
47. Kevin Murray (D)
48. Marguerite Archie-Hudson (D)
49. Diane Martinez (D)
50. Martha M. Escutia (D)
51. Curtis R. Tucker, Jr. (D)
52. Willard H. Murray, Jr. (D)
53. Debra Bowen (D)
55. Juanita M. McDonald (D)
57. Martin Gallegos (D)
58. Grace F. Napolitano (D)
62. Joe Baca (D)
76. Susan A. Davis (D)
78. Deirdre (Dede) Alpert (D)
79. Denise Moreno Ducheny (D)

Special Elections and Recall Elections

Special elections, primarily as a result of term limits, continued to plague labor's efforts to protect and advance the interests of working people. Republican Richard Mountjoy won a special election for the open seat in Senate District 29 which had been held by Republican Frank Hill. This election was held concurrently with the November 8th General Election. Mountjoy's ultimate resignation from his Assembly seat forced another special election to replace him in the predominantly Republican 59th Assembly District. Republican Bob Margett won this election.

Assembly Democrats with the support of Paul Horcher (who changed his registration from Republican to Independent) reelected Willie Brown, Jr. as Speaker. The speakership fight immediately sparked two recall elections.

One recall against Paul Horcher in the 60th Assembly District was successful and Horcher was replaced by Republican Gary Miller. Labor mobilized strong support to defeat the Horcher recall, but this effort was not enough in this heavily Republican district. The Republicans next tried to recall Democratic Assembly Member Michael Machado in the 17th Assembly District in Stockton. Union members drove to Stockton from all over California for eight weekends and many evenings. Virtually every union family was approached about the Republican attack on jobs, wages, contracts, benefits, and workers' rights. Because of the determined and massive commitment of labor, this recall attempt was defeated two to one.

On May 9, 1995 there was a special election to replace Republican State Senator Marian Bergeson who had resigned. Republican Ross Johnson won this State Senate special election and therefore another special election had to be called to replace him in the 72nd Assembly District. Republican Dick Ackerman won that special election.

Assembly Member Brown resigned his Speakership in order to run for Mayor of San Francisco. Republican Doris Allen was elected the first female speaker in the history of California. All of her support came from Assembly Democrats and this sparked another recall against Republican Speaker Allen. Doris Allen ultimately resigned her Speakership in

order to fight her recall and with the support of all the Assembly Democrats elected Republican Brian Setencich of Fresno as her replacement. Doris Allen lost her recall fight and was replaced by Republican Scott Baugh.

In San Francisco, organized labor created the city's most successful grassroots operation in memory through its Labor/Neighbor strategy and won the election for Mayor Brown. Willie Brown's vacated Assembly seat has created another special election which has been called concurrently with the March 26th Presidential Primary.

Democratic Congressman Norm Mineta from San Jose resigned his congressional seat and another special election was called to replace him. Republican State Senator Tom Campbell defeated Democrat Jerry Estruth on December 15, 1995 for this seat. As a result, Campbell vacated the 11th State Senate seat and another special election has been called concurrently with the March 26 Presidential Primary to fill that vacancy. Democrat Byron Sher is a candidate for that seat.

In December of 1995, Democratic Congressman Walter R. Tucker III resigned his seat as the representative of the 37th Congressional District in Los Angeles. The special election to replace him will occur concurrently with the March 26th Presidential Primary.

Roll of Delegates

This comprises the completed roll of delegates to the 1996 Pre-Primary Election Convention of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO.

Actors and Artistes of America, Associated	Electrical Workers No. 441 (939) Douglas Saunders, 313 Claude Johnson, 313 David Swantz, 313	Los Angeles/Orange Counties Fire Fighters No. 1014 (2,736) Dallas Jones, 2,736
AFTRA-San Francisco (312) Rebecca Rhine, 156 Jon Fromer, 156	Electrical Workers No. 551 (311) Steven M. Johnson, 156 Steven A. Benjamin, 155	Contra Costa County Fire Fighters No. 1230 (432) Mike Impastato, 216 Ron Walker, Jr., 216
Carpenters and Joiners of America, United Brotherhood of	Electrical Workers No. 569 (429) Allen Shur, 215 James Aylsworth, 214	Monterey Park Fire Fighters No. 3625 (10) Wade Elliott, 5 Frank Padilla, 5
Carpenters No. 22 (917) Jim McPartlan, 917	Electrical Workers No. 595 (1,269) John Lou Reid, 635 Victor K. Uno, 634	Flight Attendants, Association of
Pile Drivers No. 34 (600) Thom C. Donnelly, 600	Electrical Workers No. 617 (557) James A. Gallagher, 279 Ernest H. Hills, 278	Association of Flight Attendants Council 11 (238) Liz Loeffler, 238
Carpenters No. 713 (1,908) Paul J. Makela, 1,908	Electrical Workers No. 1245 (16,042) Mike Davis, 5,348 Mickey Harrington, 5,347 Eric Wolfe, 5,347	Association of Flight Attendants Council 12 (106) Charlotte Costello, 106
Carpenters No. 751 (757) William P. O. Donnell, 253 William Scanlan, 252 Ron Petty, 252	Electrical Workers No. 2295 (151) Albert J. Musingo, 76 Richard Robbins, 75	Food and Commercial Workers, Int'l. Union, United
Carpenters No. 1147 (533) Rodney L. Osborn, 533	Elevator Constructors, Int'l. Union of	UFCW Insurance Workers No. 73-I (54) Robert Rule, 27 Phalika Ngin, 27
Communications Workers of America	Elevator Constructors, Int'l. Union of	UFCW Butchers No. 120 (1,259) Donald Binney, 630 Walt Harrison, 629
Communications Workers No. 9400 (437) Richard Bepler, 437	Elevator Constructors No. 18 (144) John Reynolds, 144	UFCW No. 428 (8,012) E. Dennis Hughes, 2,003 Ronald J. Lind, 2,003 Frank Crocco, 2,003 Herb Sisti, 2,003
Communications Workers No. 9404 (305) Bernard Chiaravalle, 385	Engineers, Int'l. Union of Operating	UFCW Retail Clerks No. 648 (1,848) Joseph P. Sharpe, 924 James A. O'Meara, 924
Communications Workers No. 9412 (963) H.C. Cotner, 321 Raul (Sandy) Sandoval, 321 Jeff Robertson, 321	Operating Engineers No. 3 (9,167) James Earp, 9,167	UFCW Retail Clerks No. 870 (911) Richard Benson, 304 Jim Liggins, 304 Michael Henneberry, 303
Communications Workers No. 9415 (1,948) William B. Harvey, 1,948	Operating Engineers No. 12 (9,167) Wm. C. Waggoner, 1,834 Steve Billy, 1,834 Dale I. Vawter, 1,833 Robert W. Burns, 1,833 Bob Waggoner, 1,833	UFCW Retail Clerks No. 1288 (2,314) Gregory (Don) Hunsucker, 1,157 Dave Wilson, 1,157
Communications Workers No. 9421 (1,357) Tom Ramirez, 1,357	Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO, United	Glass, Molders, Pottery, Plastics and Allied Workers Int'l. Union
Communications Workers No. 9431 (129) Leon Wurzer, 129	United Farm Workers, AFL-CIO (2,476) Sergio Guzman, 413 Marcos Medina, 413 Salvador Pena, 413 Dolores Huerta, 413 Efren Barrajas, 412 Irv Herschenbaum, 412	Glass, Molders, Pottery Workers No. 52 (261) Bernard G. York, 261
Communications Workers No. 9505 (1,639) Don Arenfeld, 547 Ed Venegas, 546 Mary Hicks, 546	Fire Fighters, Int'l. Association of	Glass, Molders, Pottery Workers No. 82 (150) John Moreno, 150
Electrical Workers, Int'l. Brotherhood of	L.A. City Fire Fighters No. 112 (2,636) Mike McOsker, 1,318 Dan McCarthy, 1,318	Glass, Molders, Pottery Workers No. 141 (282) Flora Williams, 141 Dorothy Jackson, 141
Electrical Workers No. 6 (686) Franz E. Glen, 229 John Walsh, 229 Dan Fross, 228	Fresno Fire Fighters No. 753 (201) Allan Rush, 101 Jack Coleman, 100	Glass, Molders, Pottery and Plastics Workers No. 177 (275) Mike D. Navarec, 138 Ralph T. Boyd, 137
Electrical Workers No. 11 (4,125) Kim Craft, 1,375 Mark Aihara, 1,375 Jane Templin, 1,375	San Francisco Fire Fighters No. 798 (1,262) James M. Ahern, 421 Timothy F. O'Brien, 421 Bob Arzave, 420	
Electrical Workers No. 47 (464) Scott Hanlon, 464		
Electrical Workers No. 332 (917) Steve G. Wright, 306 Stew Young, 306 Paul Shaimas, 305		
Electrical Workers No. 340 (381) Roy Ridley, 381		

Glass, Molders, Pottery Workers
No. 192 (137)
Antonio Castillo, 137

**Government Employees,
American Federation of**
Labor Department Lodge No.
2391 (132)

Jack Cunningham, 66
Jim Greene, 66
American Fed. of Government
Employees No. 2654 (5)
Brenda Brown, 5

**Graphic Communications Int'l.
Union**

Graphic Communications
No. 583 (874)
Lee E. Lahtinen, 292
Rudy S. Meraz, 291
Larry Gutierrez, 291

Graphic Comm.
No. 388-M (4,445)
Reynaldo Munoz, 4,445

**Hotel Employees & Restaurant
Employees Int'l. Union**

Hotel and Restaurant Employees
No. 18 (283)
Loretta Mahoney, 283
Hotel and Restaurant Employees
No. 49 (1,251)
Joseph McLaughlin, 1,251
Hotel and Restaurant Employees
No. 340 (1,633)
Matthew Mullany, 545
Jessica Hinckel, 544
Ignacio Contreras, 544

**Iron Workers, Int'l. Association
of Bridge, Structural and
Ornamental**

Iron Workers No. 377 (91)
Randell Oyler, 91

Iron Workers No. 416 (137)
Thomas Bernsen, 69
Bob Tipton, 68

Shopmen's No. 509 (683)
Philip Eckert, 342
Darrel Shelton, 341

**Laborers' Int'l. Union of North
America**

Hod Carriers No. 36 (91)
Alex Corns, 46
Joe N. Mitchell, 45

Laborers No. 67 (335)
Jerry Rodarte, 168
Rudy Calderon, 167

Laborers No. 89 (2,222)
Harry Jordan, 741
William L. Smith, 741
Paul Aleman, 740

Hod Carriers and Laborers No.
139 (463)
Albin J. Gruhn, 463

Construction & General Laborers
No. 261 (1,146)
Mario De La Torre, 287
Fausto Guzman, 287
Oscar De La Torre, 286
Robert McDonnell, 286

Laborers No. 270 (2,286)
Rey Turrey, 2,286
Laborers No. 291 (546)
Don W. Buffington, 546

Hod Carriers and Laborers No.
294 (771)

Artis Cook, 771
Laborers No. 300 (2,841)
Luis Robles, 1,421
Willie Robinson, 1,420

Construction & General Laborers
No. 304 (1,586)
Jose A. Moreno, 397
Richard L. Smith, 397
Alvaro Reynoso, 396
Arthur Plant, 396

Laborers No. 324 (1,487)
Jesse Duran, 372
Ken Faria, 372
Gene May, 372
Willie Hicks, 371

Laborers No. 326 (379)
Ralph Ross, 379

Const. and General Laborers
No. 389 (571)
Anthony Dimas, 571

Laborers No. 402 (411)
Owen F. Betts, 411

Laborers No. 507 (755)
Patrick Knight, 378
Robert LaFarga, 377

Laborers No. 585 (751)
Leo Valenzuela, 751

Laborers No. 591 (179)
Pablo R. Lino, 179

Laborers No. 652 (2,473)
Joe Mendoza, 2,473

Shipyard Laborers No. 802 (946)
Debbie Baker, 946
Shipyard & Marine Laborers
No. 886 (350)
Don Hightower, 175
Jim Collins, 175

Laborers No. 1130 (455)
David J. Gorgas, 455

Laborers No. 1184 (744)
John L. Smith, 744

**Letter Carriers, National
Association of**

Letter Carriers Branch
No. 133 (46)
Stuart B. Friedman, 23
Lawrence T. McConnell, 23

**Machinists and Aerospace
Workers, Int'l. Association of**

Machinists Lodge No. 158 (1,556)
Daniel P. L. Borrero, 778
Albert Silva, 778

Machinists Lodge No. 389 (60)
Peter Zschiesche, 30
Elaine Kennedy, 30

Air Transport Lodge
No. 1058 (383)
Kenneth Boone, 192
Moises Montoya, 191

Peninsula Auto Mechanics No.
1414 (2,281)
Arthur Pulaski, 381
Shelley Kessler, 380
Glen Gandolfo, 380
Leland Stafford, 380
Donald Barbe, 380
John Moran, 380

Automotive Machinists
No. 1484 (634)

George A. Bioletto, 317
John F. Irving, 317
Machinists & Aerospace Workers
No. 1528 (26)
Alfred Dunson, 13
Joe Atilano, 13

East Bay Auto Machinists No.
1546 (2,329)
Michael J. Day, 583
J. D. Bobo, 582
D. D. Crosatto, 582
R. V. Miller, 582

Automotive Lodge No. 2182 (727)
Huntley B. Hennessy, 364
James H. Beno, 363

**Maintenance of Way Employees,
Brotherhood of**

Br. of Maint. of Way Employees
No. 1196 (32)
Richard Bigard, 32

**Masters, Mates and Pilots, Int'l.
Organization of**

Masters, Mates and Pilots (275)
Carl G. Holmes, 138
Frank Madeiros, 137
San Francisco Bar Pilots (54)
Kenneth Carlson, 54

**Musicians of the U.S. and
Canada, American Federation of**

Musicians No. 6 (455)
Maria Tschirgi, 228
Earl Watkins, 227

Musicians No. 47 (917)
Serena Kay Williams, 917

San Jose Federation of Musicians
No. 153 (23)
Wally Malone, 23
David Winters, 22

**Needletrades, Industrial and
Textile Employees, Union of
(UNITE)**

UNITE! No. 213 (34)
Rance Steve Jackson, 34
UNITE! No. 214 (201)
Augustin Ramirez, 101
Delores Tutson, 100

Newspaper Guild, The
No. Calif. Newspaper Guild No.
52 (1,213)

Larry D. Hatfield, 607
Doug Cuthbertson, 606

**Office and Professional
Employees Int'l. Union**

Office and Professional
Employees No. 3 (1,478)
Nancy Wohlforth, 370
John F. Henning, 370
Kathleen Kinnick, 369
Diana Volpini-Allen, 369

Office and Professional
Employees No. 29 (2,775)
Elizabeth Alonso, 925
Mindy Dravis-Gonzalez, 925
Sandra McMullan, 925

**Painters and Allied Trades of the
U.S. and Canada, Int'l.**

Brotherhood of
Painters No. 4 (512)
Jerry Y. Melton, 256
Rodney V. Reclus, 256

- Sign and Display No. 510 (603)
Michael E. Hardeman, 603
- Glaziers & Glass Workers
No. 718 (296)
John Reynolds, 296
- Painters and Decorators
No. 913 (248)
Art DeMarchis, 124
Tom Linebarger, 124
- Specialty Painters No. 1176 (184)
Mike P. White, 184
- Paperworkers Int'l. Union,
United**
- United Paperworkers
No. 307 (917)
Brian Carter, 306
Michael DiGildo, 306
Antonio Villalobos, 305
- Plasterers' and Cement Masons'
Int'l. Union of the U.S. and
Canada, Operative**
- Cement Masons No. 814 (92)
Billy Joe Douglas, 92
- Plumbing and Pipe Fitting
Industry of the U.S. and
Canada,**
- United Assn. of Journeymen and
Apprentices of the**
- Plumbers No. 78 (1,017)
Jerry P. Cremins, 1,017
- Sprinkler Fitters No. 483 (364)
Peter J. Cerri, 364
- Roofers, Waterproofers and
Allied Workers, United Union of**
- Roofers No. 40 (336)
Stanley Warren, 168
Larry Hamilton, 168
- Painters No. 507 (533)
Art Castillo, 533
- Seafarers Int'l. Union of North
America**
- Fishermen's Union of
America (138)
Joseph Francisco, 69
Terry R. Hoinsky, 69
- Marine Firemen's Union (462)
Henry Disley, 231
Robert Iwata, 231
- Sailors Union of the
Pacific (2,062)
Gunnar Lundeberg, 344
Kaj Kristensen, 344
Duane Hewitt, 344
Vince O'Halloran, 344
Jack Mannering, 343
Thomas Koppel, 343
- Seafarers—Atlantic & Gulf (929)
George McCartney, 310
Nick Celona, 310
Steve Barry, 309
- Seafarers—Inland Division(279)
Roy A. Mercer, 140
Vincent Coss, 139
- United Industrial Workers—
Cannery Division (4,125)
Steve Edney, 4,125
- Service Employees Int'l. Union,
AFL-CIO**
- Health Care Workers
No. 250 (821)
Sal Rosselli, 274
- Dan Martin, 274
Shirley Ware, 273
- Service Employees No. 415 (920)
Tim McCormick, 460
Janet Smith, 460
- Social Services No. 535 (6,012)
Jerry Fillingim, 3,006
David Bullock, 3,006
- Los Angeles County Service
Employees
No. 660 (8,235)
Alejandro Stephens, 8,235
- United Public Employees No. 790
(8,125)
Paul Varacalli, 1,161
Marshall Walker III, 1,161
Josie Mooney, 1,161
Bill Lloyd, 1,161
Mary Ann Turley, 1,161
Sandy Tibbets, 1,160
LaWanna Preston, 1,160
- Service Employees
No. 790-A (98)
Richard Brooks, 98
- California State Employees
Association No. 1000
SEIU (3,667)
Yolanda Solari, 1,834
Perry Kenny, 1,833
- Service Employees
No. 2028 (245)
Kay Ryan, 123
Mary Grillo, 122
- Sheet Metal Workers, Int'l.
Association**
- Sheet Metal Workers
No. 104 (1,325)
Don Basso, 332
Paul Manion, 331
Vince Tripi, 331
Leroy Diaz, 331
- Sheet Metal Workers
No. 162 (747)
Paul Broyles, 249
Paul Martino, 249
Luciano Olivar, 249
- Stage Employees and Moving
Picture Machine Operators of
the U.S. and Canada, Int'l.
Alliance of Theatrical**
- Theatrical Stage Employees
No. 16 (464)
Rod McLeod, 232
Francis X. Crowley, 232
- Theatrical Employees
No. B-18 (91)
Angie Ribeiro, 46
Martin Dias, 45
- San Diego Area Municipal
Employees No. 127 (505)
Owen Evans, 253
Louis Monteilh, 252
- M.P. Machine Operators
No. 169 (52)
Robert L. McEwing, 26
Robert S. Owens, 26
- IATSE No.611 (26)
Richard Larsen, 13
Victoria Schrott, 13
- M.P. Photographers No. 659 (454)
Bruce C.Doering, 227
Steve Flint, 227
- Studio Electrical Lighting
Technicians No. 728 (762)
Frank Sontag, 254
Cordell Boyd, 254
Foster Denker, 254
- M.P. First Aid Employees
No. 767 (110)
Eddie R. Clark, 110
- Theatrical Wardrobe No. 768 (84)
Dorothy Priest, 84
- Theatrical Wardrobe No. 784 (93)
Anne Polland, 47
Alfred Lorente, Jr. 46
- M.P. Art Directors No. 876 (186)
Gene Allen, 186
- IATSE Studio Teachers No. 884
(78)
Elise Ganz, 78
- State, County and Municipal
Employees, American
Federation of**
- Sacramento County Employees
No. 146 (330)
Gary Miller, 330
- Comm. Redev. Agency of Los
Angeles No. 164 (49)
Jose D. Trujillo, 49
- Contra Costa County Professional
Tech. Employees
No. 512 (85)
Richard Cabral, 43
Nadine Peyrucain, 42
- Contra Costa County Clerical
Employees No. 2700 (823)
Sharon Naramore, 275
Pamela Aguilar, 274
Lidia Hernandez, 274
- San Diego County Superior Court
Employees No. 3500 (47)
Ed Lehman, 24
Cheri Aegertur, 23
- Teachers, American
Federation of**
- United Educators of San Francisco
No. 61 (3,621)
Joan-Marie Shelley, 403
Peggy Gash, 403
Dennis Kelly, 403
Hene Kelly, 402
Elaine Merriweather, 402
Dennis Dunne, 402
Federico Fernandez, 402
Kathy Yen, 402
Robin Brasso, 402
- San Jose Federation of Teachers
No. 957 (86)
Mike Nye, 43
Ray Behvand, 43
- Salinas Valley Federation of
Teachers No. 1020 (313)
Pat Egan, 157
John Nolan, 156
- Berkeley Fed. of Teachers No.
1078 (364)
Jacki Fox Ruby, 364
- San Mateo CC Federation of
Teachers No. 1493 (396)
Joaquin J. Rivera, 396
- Los Angeles College Guild No.
1521 (3,504)
Leon Marzillier, 3,504

Peralta Federation of Teachers No.
1603 (352)
Talli Ebin, 352

Newport/Mesa Federation of
Teachers No. 1794 (329)
Mary Bergan, 329

Coast Federation of Educators No.
1911 (272)
Kristina Bruning, 136
Carol Burke, 136

Gilroy Federation of Teachers No.
1921 (84)
Gregory Eddy, 42
Robert Bravo, 42

Greater Santa Cruz Federation of
Teachers No. 2030 (263)
Robert Hudson, 132
William Wright, 131

Placer-Nevada Teachers
No. 2267 (19)
Thomas A. Romero, 19

Calif. Fed. of Teachers
No. 8004 (36)
Mary Bergan, 36

**Teamsters, Chauffeurs,
Warehousemen and Helpers of
America,**

Int'l. Brotherhood of

Teamsters, Auto Truck Drivers
No. 70 (763)
Chuck Mack, 382
Joseph L. Silva, Jr., 381

Building Materials-Construction
Teamsters No. 216 (71)
Philip A. Tarantino, 36
Christopher P. Welsh, 35

Construction, Building Materials
Workers No. 291 (87)
Pete Gemma, 44
Pete Rodriguez, 43

Sanitary Truck Drivers
No. 350 (225)
Robert Morales, 113
James D. Payton, 112

Bakery Wagon Drivers &
Salesman No. 484 (103)
John Bottali, 52
Thomas Oneto, 51

Food, Indust. & Bev. Warehouse
Drivers No. 630 (629)
J.L. (Jerry) Vercruse, 210
Kurt S. Larsen, 210
Duncan Anderson, 209

Warehouse, Mail Order, Retail
Employees No. 853 (857)
Rome A. Aloise, 286
Jim Travis, 286
John C. Becker, 285

Teamsters No. 856 (882)
Michael J. McLaughlin, 882

Transit Union, Amalgamated

Amalgamated Transit
No. 276 (156)
Vincent Contino, 156

Amalgamated Transit
No. 1027 (134)
Rick Steitz, 134

Amalgamated Transit
No. 1574 (386)
Karega Hart, 193
James Hobby, 193

Amalgamated Transit
No. 1605 (135)
Carol Wells, 68
Joel R. Self, 67

**Transport Workers Union of
America**

S.E.A.M. Transport Workers No.
200 (161)
Alice Fialkin, 81
Nate Jackson, 80

Transport Workers No. 250-A
(1,467)

Joe W. Barnes, 367
William K.Y. Jung, 367
Claire Caldwell, 367
Wilson Mills, 366

Transport Workers
No. 502 (1,435)
Paul E. Hunt, 1,435

Transport Workers No. 505 (367)
Alfred C. Mayes, 184
Thomas Smoot, 183

**Utility Workers Union of
America**

Utility Workers No. 246 (423)
Carl Wood, 212
Bernardo R. Garcia, 211

**Building and Construction
Trades Councils**

Alameda County Building &
Construction Trades
Council (2)

Barry Luboviski, 1

Marin Building and Construction
Trades Council (2)
Peter Tiernan, 1
Randell L. Oyler, 1

Napa and Solano Counties
Building Trades
Council (2)
John T. Miller, 1

San Francisco Building and
Construction Trades
Council (2)
Stanley M. Smith, 1

San Joaquin Building Trades
Council (2)
Joe Winstead, 1
Bob Blagg, 1

San Mateo Building and
Construction Trades
Council (2)
Marcy Schultz, 1

Santa Clara-San Benito Cos.
Building Trades
Council (2)
John Neece, 1
Bill Nack, 1

Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake Cos.
Bldg. Trades Council (2)
John Reynolds, 1
Bill Scott, 1

Stanislaus-Merced-Tuolumne Co.
Building Trades
Council (2)

Larrell D. Fortner, 1
Tony Ledoux, 1

California State Councils

Building and Construction Trades
Council, California
State (2)

Bob Balgenorth, 1
Carpenters, California State
Council of (2)
Daniel M. Curtin, 1

Hotel and Restaurant Employees,
Calif. State Council of (2)
Loretta Mahoney, 1
Ted Hansen, 1

Machinists, California Conference
of (2)

Matthew McKinnon, 1
Jerry Butkiewicz, 1

Muscians Locals, Calif.
Conference of (2)
Nick J. Bardes, 1

Operating Engineers,
Calif./Nevada Conference
of (2)
Tim Cremins, 1

Service Employees, Calif. State
Council of (2)
Dean Tipps, 1

Damon Moore, 1

Teachers, California Federation
of (2)
Mike Nye, 1

Transport Workers, Calif. State
Conf. of (2)
Lawrence B. Martin, 1
Bobbie Brown, 1

Central Labor Councils

Alameda County Central Labor
Council (2)
Owen A. Marron, 1
Judith M. Goff, 1

Contra Costa Central Labor
Council (2)
Steven A. Roberti, 1
Margaret Shelleda, 1

Fresno-Madera Cos. Central Labor
Council (2)
Don Hunsucker, 1
Randy Ghan, 1

Kern-Inyo-Mono Counties Central
Labor Council (2)
John Spaulding, 1

Los Angeles Federation of Labor
(2)
Regina Render, 1
Miguel Contreras, 1

Marin County Central Labor
Council (2)
Bernard V. Chiaravalle, 1
Philip Cohen, 1

Merced-Mariposa Central Labor
Council (2)
Jerry Martin, 1

Monterey County Central Labor
Council (2)
Allyne Hammer, 1
Ed Brown, 1

Napa-Solano Counties Central
Labor Council (2)
Anes Lewis-Partridge, 1
Steve Brook, 1

Orange County Central Labor
Council (2)
Bill Fogarty, 1

Sacramento Central Labor
Council (2)
Ralph J. Oliveri, 1

San Bernardino-Riverside Cos.
Central Labor Council (2)
Donald Holmes, 1

San Diego-Imperial Cos. Central
Labor Council (2)
Joseph S. Francis, 1

San Francisco Labor Council (2)
Paul Dempster, 1
Walter L. Johnson, 1

San Joaquin-Calaveras Cos.
Central Labor Council (2)
James H. Beno, 1

San Mateo County Central Labor
Council (2)
Art Pulaski, 1
Robert Anderson, 1

Santa Cruz County Central Labor
Council (2)
Timothy J. McCormick, 1

Sonoma, Mendocino, Lake
Counties Central Labor
Council (2)
John Hadzess, 1
Michael Allen, 1

South Bay AFL-CIO Labor
Council (2)
Amy B. Dean, 1
Cindy Chavez, 1

Tri-Counties Central Labor
Council (2)
Marilyn Wollard, 1

Tulare-Kings Counties Central
Labor Council (2)
Kirk Vogt, 1

Councils

Food and Commercial Workers,
Region 8 States
Council (2)
John Perez, 1
Rich Hedges, 1

Maritime Ports, Southern Calif.
Council (2)
Steve Edney, 1

Metal Trades Council, Bay
Cities (2)
Richard E. Harden, 1

San Francisco Maritime Trades
Port Council (2)
Gunnar Lundeberg, 1

District Councils

Carpenters, Gold Coast District
Council of (2)
Wayne E. Catalano, 1

Laborers, No. Calif. District
Council of (2)

Harold Mucker, 1
Dave Thomas, 1

Laborers, So. Calif. District
Council of (2)
Tony R. Hoffman, 1

Longshoremen, No. Calif. District
Council of (2)
Leroy King, 1
Don Watson, 1

Machinists District Lodge
No. 725 (2)
James A. Byard, 1

Painters, Bay Counties District
Council No. 8 (2)
Robert J. Murray, 1
Roland Sheppard, 1

Plasterers, No. Calif. District
Council of (2)
Chris Hernandez, 1
Mike Moylan, 1

Public Employees, California
Region District Council (2)
Charles Reiter, 1

UNITE! Southwest District
Council (2)
Steve Nutter, 1