

**Report**  
**ON**  
**LABOR LEGISLATION**  
**AND**  
**LABOR RECORD**  
**OF**  
**Senators and Assemblymen**

---

**Forty-Second Session**  
**OF THE**  
**CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE**

**January 8 to January 26, and**  
**February 26 to April 27, 1917**

---

**ISSUED BY**  
**CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR**  
**SECRETARY'S OFFICE**  
**Underwood Building, 525 Market Street**  
**SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.**



Report  
ON  
LABOR LEGISLATION  
AND  
LABOR RECORD  
OF  
Senators and Assemblymen

---

Forty-Second Session  
OF THE  
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

January 8 to January 26, and  
February 26 to April 27, 1917

---

ISSUED BY  
CALIFORNIA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR  
SECRETARY'S OFFICE  
Underwood Building, 525 Market Street  
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.



# INDEX

	Page
Introductory .....	5
<b>Report on Labor Legislation:</b>	
A, Bills enacted into law.....	8
B, Constitutional Amendments .....	13
C, Laws enacted despite Labor's opposition.....	14
D, Bills advocated by Labor, but not passed.....	14
E, Anti-Labor bills defeated.....	17
<b>Labor Record of Senators and Assemblymen:</b>	
A, Explanatory .....	19
B, Records of Senators:	
Part 1, Enumeration and Description of the 10 Roll-Calls upon which each Senator's Record is based.....	20
Part 2, Good and Bad Votes cast by each Senator and number of times absent on the 10 Roll-Calls.....	20
Part 3, "Comparative Records" of Senators, affording an easy glance at the "Best," the "Medium," and the "Worst".....	23
C, Records of Assemblymen:	
Part 1, Enumeration and Description of the 10 Roll-Calls upon which each Assemblyman's Record is based.....	24
Part 2, Good and Bad Votes cast by each Assemblyman and number of times absent on the 10 Roll-Calls.....	24
Part 3, "Comparative Records" of Assemblymen, affording an easy glance at the "Best," the "Medium," and the "Worst".....	27

# INTRODUCTORY

To the Trade-Unions of California:

From the viewpoint of Labor the Forty-second session of the California Legislature differed materially from any of its predecessors.

Practically the entire session was a stand-up battle between organized labor and the would-be union-busters of the State who gained a new lease of life through the manipulation of the million dollar slush fund by the notorious law and order committee of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

By way of explanation it should be noted that the State Federation of Labor had conducted the usual "questioning" of candidates before the Primary Election. It will be recalled that the number of questions asked had been reduced to the minimum because the experiences of several legislative campaigns had convinced us that concentration upon important issues was more fruitful of tangible results than a general scattering of our forces upon all pending measures worthy of support.

The nature and number of the replies received were fairly satisfactory. Very soon it became evident, however, that the organized labor crushers had prearranged to swamp candidates for the Legislature with anti-labor literature and with many different sets of questions.

With an impertinence and effrontery characteristic of star chamber reformers they commenced their letter writing campaign by demanding to know what answers had been made by the respective candidates to the State Federation of Labor questions. Next, they insisted upon an expression of "views" on eight subjects ranging from "protection for strike breakers" to the "single tax."

Then came a whole package of literature in favor of compulsory arbitration of labor disputes, an anti-boycott law and against the State Federation's anti-injunction bill. All these letters and other "explanatory" matter sent to the press dwelt freely upon the alleged "intolerance of the labor bosses" and the need for greater political activity by the "right-thinking business men." Space forbids a detailed account of the various steps taken by the labor crushers to counteract and offset the State Federation of Labor's very effective legislative work. The "net" results are the things that count. And it is certainly encouraging and gratifying to be able to report substantial progress for Labor and a dead standstill for the exploiters of labor.

## Principal Measures Sponsored by State Federation.

The State Federation of Labor had centered upon three measures: The Anti-Injunction bill; the bill to abolish employment agencies operated for profit; and the amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act. The Legislature passed the Anti-Injunction bill and approved the amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act. The employment agency bill was defeated in the Assembly. It is true, Governor Stephens nullified Labor's most important victory by yielding to Chamber of Commerce pressure and applying the pocket veto to the Anti-Injunction bill. The point is that the elected Legislature stood up where the appointed Governor failed. So much for the fate of Labor's principal measures.

The Chamber of Commerce also had three main issues, i. e., the Compulsory Arbitration bill, the Anti-boycott bill, and a fixed determination to kill the Anti-Injunction bill. Now note the results. The Compulsory Arbitration bill was badly beaten in the Assembly; the Anti-Boycott bill never left the Committee room, but the Anti-Injunction bill received a majority in the Senate and the Assembly despite the veiled threats and suave pleas of the "Open-Shoppers." So had it not been for Governor Stephens the Legislative program of the union busters would have received a clean knockout.

A considerable part of the Legislature's time was taken up with the "wet and dry" issue. The two big measures of the "drys," the Rominger bill and the county unit bill, were both beaten after lengthy adventures in oratory, and the "wets" were equally unsuccessful in their attempt to propitiate the semi-dry sentiment throughout the state by regulating the saloon traffic. Both sides were frank enough to admit that they had no hope of enacting any law that would go into effect without being submitted to the voters at the next election, so the real object of the fight was the indorsement of the Legislature, with the moral effect it was expected to exert in the inevitable battle at the polls. It was, therefore, mainly a tactical struggle for a position of advantage in the next State campaign, and the net outcome seems to have been what the referee would call a draw.

As usual there were many measures pending, which could not be classified as labor bills, but in which organized labor was nevertheless vitally concerned. For example, there was the preparedness measure, drafted at the instance of the State Council of Defense and recommended by the Governor. This bill was passed in the closing days of the session. It provides for the creation of a State defense guard of 1000 men between the ages of 30 and 50 for whatever emergency use may

be deemed necessary, with the exception of duty in connection with industrial disputes. The act carried with it an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for equipment and maintenance.

Compulsory military training in the public schools was strenuously urged, but the measure enacted (S. B. 599, by Senator Luce) provides only for physical education for at least twenty minutes a day in the elementary schools and two hours a week in the high schools. All pupils are required to take this work. A State supervisor of physical education is to be appointed to have charge of the organization of the work and to prepare a manual for the instruction of teachers.

The women's clubs of the State were represented by competent lobbyists and were largely successful in obtaining the passage of most of their legislative recommendations. These included the women's jury bill, which amends the codes to permit the selection of women for jury service, and a series of bills giving women a greater measure of control of community property.

Measures aimed at lessening the law's delay were only partly successful, two of four proposed constitutional amendments aimed at the reform of the judiciary being adopted. The four amendments were introduced as the result of conferences between committees representing the two branches of the Legislature and the State Bar Association. One of the two approved amendments proposes to create an extra department of three Justices in both the First and Second district Appellate Courts, located respectively at San Francisco and Los Angeles, the purpose being to permit quicker action on appeals. The other amendment provides for the establishment of municipal or inferior courts in San Francisco and Los Angeles to take over many civil cases now handled by the superior courts. The municipal courts would have jurisdiction in cases not to exceed \$1000.

The Railroad Commission's jurisdiction over public service corporations was increased in various ways. The most important extension of power concerned the regulation of automobiles in passenger and freight service between municipalities. By the repeal of the present "blue sky law," otherwise known as the investment companies' act, the Corporation Commissioner is given increased powers and authority under a new act which has been named the corporate securities act.

### **The Usual Turmoil of the Closing Days.**

Notwithstanding every effort to avoid the usual turmoil of the closing days, there was the same mad scramble to clear congested files as has been witnessed at every previous session. Bills were being railroaded through by the wholesale, without any pretense of thoughtful consideration, while almost as many more were ruthlessly slaughtered on sentimental appeals from members of influence. No better object lesson of the truth of the oft-repeated charge that our system of making laws is hopelessly defective could be afforded than by a first-hand study of the final sessions of our latest legislature. All who have been through these extraordinary closing performances agree that the present system is fundamentally wrong, and that a radical change of some sort is inevitable in the not far distant future. As has been said by an observer: The business of law-making is too important to be conducted much longer after the fashion of a street sweeping machine, which remains in inactivity throughout the day and then, at evening, starts out with a rush to clear everything out of its way.

The Legislative Headquarters maintained jointly by the California State Federation of Labor, the State Building Trades Council, San Francisco Labor Council and the Railroad Brotherhoods, was again located in the same quarters where the Labor lobbyists have held the fort for the past four sessions. From beginning to end there was perfect cooperation and genuine team work among the labor representatives.

Of course, it would have been better for obvious reasons if more tried and true trade-unionists had been members of the Legislature instead of lobbyists. To be sure, the net compensation of a Legislator—\$1000 for the sessions—is scarcely an inducement to enter the race for a seat in the Senate or Assembly. But it is becoming more and more evident that in order to secure the best results, in order to bring the real viewpoint of the workers forcibly to the attention of the lawmakers, more really representative workers must be sent to the Legislature. The occupational census of the members of the Assembly should be sufficient to drive home this point. It is given herewith for an analytical study by California trade-unionists:

Occupation of Assemblymen—Attorneys 29, Farmers, Ranchers, Stockmen, etc. 10, Real Estate Operators 5, Newspapermen, Publishers, Advertisers, etc. 5, Retired 4, Clerks 3, Merchants 3, Contractors 2, Insurance Agents 2, Investment 2, Pharmacists 2, School Teachers 2, Accountant 1, Carpenter 1, Civil Engineer 1, General Manager 1, Hop Buyer 1, Hotel Manager 1, Manufacturer 1, Physician and Surgeon 1, Secretary 1, Traveling Salesman 1, No occupation 1—Total 80.

The total number of bills introduced in the Senate (not including resolutions

or amendments) was 1203. Of this number 624 passed the Senate; 510 went to the Governor who approved 409 and vetoed 101.

In the Assembly there were introduced 1480 bills. 616 of these went to the Senate and 526 reached the Governor's office. The Governor signed 396 and vetoed 132.

Eighteen proposed Constitutional Amendments were approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and Assembly and will appear on the ballot for ratification at the next general election.

Respectfully submitted,

**EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, CALIFORNIA STATE  
FEDERATION OF LABOR.**



DANIEL C. MURPHY,  
President.

ROY H. LOMAN,  
F. C. MARSH,  
HARRY POTHOFF,  
WITTEN W. HARRIS,  
T. J. VITAICH,  
H. J. YOUNG,  
E. H. HART,  
FRED W. HECKMAN,  
MARGARET A. MALONE,  
A. J. ROGERS,  
CHAS. CHILD,  
J. J. MATHESON,  
WM. J. McQUILLAN,  
JAMES GIAMBRUNO,  
N. M. PALMER,

Vice-Presidents.

PAUL SCHARRENBURG,  
Secretary-Treasurer.

San Francisco, Cal., August 28, 1917.

# Report on Labor Legislation

## A, BILLS ENACTED INTO LAW

### THE NEW WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.

**S. B. 818 (Chapter 586), by Senator Luce.** The best and most comprehensive labor law enacted by the Forty-second Session was the act known as "The Workmen's Compensation, Insurance and Safety Act of 1917." It becomes effective January 1, 1918, and is a careful revision and re-enactment of the pre-existing law the "Boynton Act," excepting therefrom only the parts relating to the organization of the Industrial Accident Commission and the Compensation Insurance Fund, which parts of said act are continued in force.

This new law advances our compensation system several stages toward its goal and embodies the results of the Commission's experience during the last few years. While the commission failed in its laudable effort to extend the system to the hitherto exempted classes of employers and employees, it is gratifying to note the care with which details have been worked out, indicating that the Commission fully realizes the existing shortcomings and is anxious to adopt reasonable expedients to overcome the difficulties encountered in the administration of the law. And while all of said expedients and new methods may not prove altogether satisfactory and are open to further improvement, the Commission is to be commended for its progressive treatment of the problems entrusted to it and for the formulation in definite terms of many of its previously rather vague and uncertain principles of administering the law.

Of the many substantial improvements contained in the act we take occasion to mention only a few which have been more prominently before the public by reason of their general and fundamental character.

**Choice of Physician or Surgeon.** The most signal of these improvements relates to a limited choice of doctor. Upon request of the employee for a change of physician the employer is required to nominate three competent physicians, if available, from whom the employee may select the one he desires to treat him. In a serious case, the employer is also required to furnish a consulting physician. Fundamentally considered, this choice of doctor, though limited as above, is a great advance upon present theory of the relationship between employer and employed in regard to compensation. It is legal recognition of the principle that regardless of who is liable for the cost, the employee as a patient possesses or retains the same right as any other rational patient to control his own body and that his consent is required in regard to the medical treatment he is to receive. That further progress in this respect can and must be made before an employee is upon perfect equality with any other member of the human family, is apparent to every thinking man or woman who believes in the democratic tendencies of our institutions, but this act makes a good beginning in that direction and time will bring eventually all the choice necessary to establish proper medical service in the interest of all concerned.

**Reduction of Waiting Period.** Another important improvement is the reduction of the waiting period (the time that the law determines must elapse before the pecuniary benefits will begin to run or be allowed) from fourteen days to ten days. This means that thousands of persons sustaining minor injuries will become entitled to pecuniary benefits after the tenth day, and that in other minor cases an additional pecuniary benefit for four days will be paid.

The new compensation act, on an average, slightly increases the weekly compensation to be paid to employees. There is a decrease of about 1 per cent. in the compensation paid to a 6-day worker, but a 7-day worker receives an increase of about 4 per cent. These tables will serve to give a comparison between the average earnings computed under the Boynton Act and those under the Luce Act:

#### AVERAGE EARNINGS.

Under Boynton Act—6-day work.		
Person earning	One Week	One year
\$2.....	\$11.54.....	\$600.00
\$3.....	17.31.....	900.00
\$4.....	23.08.....	1200.00
Under Luce Act—6-day work.		
\$2.....	11.40.....	592.80
\$3.....	17.10.....	889.20
\$4.....	22.80.....	1185.60

Under Boynton Act—7-day work.			
\$2.....	12.77	91.21	664.00
\$3.....	19.15	94.19	996.00
\$4.....	25.54	97.21	1328.00
Under Luce Act—7-day work.			
\$2.....	13.90	5	691.60
\$3.....	19.95	5	1037.40
\$4.....	26.60	5	1383.20

Thus it will be seen that the new Act has, on the whole, increased the amount of compensation to be paid to employees, both by shortening the waiting period and by the manner of computation of the average weekly earnings.

**Changes Relating to Wilful Misconduct.** If the employee is injured or dies by reason of the serious and wilful misconduct of the employer, he or his heirs are entitled to have the amount of compensation otherwise recoverable increased one-half, provided that the said increase shall not exceed \$2,500. If the injury is caused by the serious and wilful misconduct of the injured employee, the compensation shall be reduced one-half, provided that this shall not apply in death cases and in permanent disability cases in excess of 70 per cent. of total. The purpose of this is to eliminate suits in the courts, and yet impose a penalty on the employer, if he is guilty of serious and wilful misconduct. Likewise the employee's penalty is reduced one-half, but only for injuries of a temporary character, or, if permanent in character, not to include the more serious rated beyond 70 per cent., and, as noted, not to include death cases.

**Guaranty of Payment When Due.** Still another improvement are the provisions having for their purpose the prompt payment of compensation when due. This lack of security of payments became aggravated about a year ago through the failure of the Commonwealth Casualty Company. The prospective losses of the claimants were made good by the Legislature which appropriated sufficient money to pay all the claims for compensation involved in the failure of the company. The commission has made some excellent provisions to secure claimants in the future. Thus all private employers are required either to insure their liabilities under the act with one or more approved insurance carriers, or obtain from the commission a certificate of consent to self-insure. Such self-insurer may also be required to furnish a bond or other securities to guarantee the payment of benefits. If the employer shall fail so to secure the payment of compensation, any injured employee or his dependents may file an application for compensation with the Commission and also bring action at law against the employer for damages, with the right to attach the property of the employer after the institution of an action. If a judgment is obtained against the employer in excess of the compensation awarded, any compensation paid shall be credited upon the judgment. In addition, it shall be presumed that the injury was a direct result and grew out of the negligence of the employer, and the burden of proof shall rest upon the employer to rebut the presumption of negligence. In such proceeding it shall not be a defense to the employer that the employee may have been guilty of contributory negligence, or assumed the risk of the hazard complained of, or that the injury was caused by the negligence of a fellow servant. No contract, rule or regulation shall be allowed to restore to the employer any of the foregoing defenses.

**Powers of Insurance Commissioner Enlarged.** Every insurance carrier is required to file with the Insurance Commissioner a bond in favor of the Insurance Commissioner as trustee for the beneficiaries of awards of compensation. The bond has to be executed by the insurance carrier and some surety company or companies approved by the Insurance Commissioner. Each insurance carrier must file this bond on October 1, 1917. Every year thereafter, commencing July 1, 1918, a new bond must be filed with the Insurance Commissioner. The Industrial Accident Commission believes the reserve requirements, plus careful supervision by the Insurance Commissioner (whose powers have been enlarged), will give reasonable security for the payment of compensation. With the bond requirement in addition, we think compensation payments ought to be sure, especially as the new Act makes it obligatory on every employer to either carry insurance or satisfy the Industrial Accident Commission of financial ability to pay.

There are many other improvements which cannot be detailed here but which in the aggregate serve to make the entire act the best thus far drafted by the Commission.

It is to be noted that with the improvement in the law the criticism on the part of the wage earners is growing less in volume and it is to be hoped that within a comparatively short time the only drawback to the system of compensation will be the fact that it does not cover all employments and employees of every description.



## **LAND COLONIZATION.**

**S. B. 584 (Chapter 755), by Senator Breed.** By the passage of a land settlement bill, the State will embark in an entirely new enterprise by which it is hoped to encourage the settlement of small, improved farms by persons of moderate means. The administration of the act is to be carried out by a board of five members, and an appropriation of \$260,000 will be placed at the disposal of the Board to purchase 10,000 acres of improved lands.

The Board is authorized to subdivide the tracts and sell them on easy terms to settlers. The sales are to be made on loans, with amortizing payments extending over a period not to exceed forty years, and with the right to repay the loan any time after five years.

Unless the applicant is prepared to pay half the purchase price of his allotment, he would be required to apply to the Federal Farm Loan bank at Berkeley for 50 per cent. of the appraised value of the land and 20 per cent. of the value of the improvements.

The \$260,000 advanced by the State is calculated to be returned within fifty years with interest at the rate of 4 per cent.

## **ANTI-COERCION ACT.**

**A. B. 1025 (Chapter 141), by Mr. Gebhart.** Under the terms of this law it is made unlawful for any employer of labor, or any officer, agent or employee of any employer of labor to make, adopt or enforce any rule or regulation compelling or coercing any employee to patronize said employer, or any other person, firm or corporation, in the purchase of anything of value. A proviso in the law states that nothing therein shall be interpreted as prohibiting any employer of labor from prescribing the weight, color, quality, texture, style, form and make of uniforms required to be worn by their employees.

## **EMPLOYEES' BONDS AND PHOTOGRAPHS.**

**A. B. 662 (Chapter 108), by Mr. Gebhart.** This measure was introduced with the object of assisting street carmen and certain other workers who have been compelled to give a bond each year, and the cost of such bond has been deducted from their pay.

It has become almost a universal custom for all employers who require a bond from their employees to pay for same, and it is only just and proper that street car and inter-urban employees should enjoy the same privileges as they will under this law.

The law also provides that if an employee's photograph is required as a condition of employment the employer will have to pay for it.

## **SEMI-MONTHLY PAY-DAY LAW.**

**A. B. 285 (Chapter 574), by Mr. Ryan.** This law provides for semi-monthly pay days of laborers in the employ of any county of the first or second class only, meaning counties with a population of 400,000 or over. A bill (A. B. 211) aiming to correct the defects in the law providing semi-monthly pay days in private employment was approved by the Legislature but vetoed by the Governor.

## **GREATER SAFETY FOR ELECTRICAL WORKERS.**

**A. B. 932 (Chapter 575), by Mr. Harris.** This law was furthered by the organized Electrical Workers. It amends and strengthens the "Act to regulate the construction and maintenance of subways, manholes, and underground rooms, chambers, and excavations; used to contain, encase, cover, or conduct wires, cables, or appliances to conduct, carry, or handle electricity, and providing the punishment for the violation thereof."

Under the terms of a section added to the old law the railroad commission of California is vested with authority and power to inspect all work which is included in the provisions of the act, and to make such further additions or changes as said commission may deem necessary for the purpose of safety to employees and the general public. The said railroad commission is also charged with the duty of seeing that all the provisions of the act are properly enforced.

## **HOTEL, TENEMENT AND HOUSING LAWS.**

**Senate Bills No. 433 and No. 800 (Chapters 736 and 738), by Senator Burnett.** Both these bills repeal housing laws covering the same subjects. The Hotel Law, which was repealed, however, was nothing more than a mere skeleton and the only requirement under it was that there should be backyards behind every hotel building. The new Hotel Law, as embodied in Senate Bill No. 433 is, on the other hand, probably the best hotel regulation bill in existence in the United States today, and the new Tenement House Law is, likewise, a model of its kind, and a 20 per cent. improvement over the former law.

The construction of new hotel and tenement buildings is regulated in detail so that a minimum percentage of 25 per cent. of the lot shall remain open and

uncovered by the building, the heights of wooden and non-fireproof buildings are limited to three and six stories, respectively, and every window must open onto either a street, or a court of a minimum size. Thus, inside rooms are prohibited and sunshine and air are guaranteed for all parts of the building. In addition, there are strict requirements concerning fire escapes, fireproof construction of boiler and furnace rooms, and fireproofing of enclosed stairways and elevator shafts. In addition to these structural features there are some 30 sections in each law regulating the sanitary maintenance of the plumbing, public hallways, porches and methods of garbage disposal in existing as well as new hotels and tenement houses. The sections of the laws dealing with the construction are to be enforced by the local building inspectors, and the sections with regard to maintenance and sanitation are within the jurisdiction of the local health officers with indirect power of enforcement in the State Housing Commission. Violation of the law is made a misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment.

**S. B. 457 (Chapter 737), by Senator Benson,** is known as the dwelling house law and covers all family dwellings other than tenement houses. This is the first State law in the United States regulating single dwellings and two family flats. The requirements concerning construction are very few, it merely being required that every room shall have a window, and that the windows shall open either on to the street or an unoccupied space at least four feet in depth, and a minimum size is also fixed for the windows. The other sections of the law require the sanitary maintenance of all portions of the house and premises. California's biggest housing problem is in connection with single dwellings, especially shacks erected by greedy landlords and real estate agents in the poorer sections of our cities, and this law should certainly go far to abolish bad housing conditions in the State.

#### **VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.**

**S. B. 1140 (Chapter 720), by Senator Jones.** The State Board of Education made numerous recommendations to the Legislature this session which have crystallized into laws. The most important among these, in the opinion of educators, is that affecting vocational education. It provides for the acceptance by California of the provisions of the Smith-Hughes bill recently passed in Congress. Under this act the Federal Government apportions to California \$40,000 for the coming year, upon condition that California appropriates an equal amount for vocational training. The Federal aid is to increase by gradations until, in 1921, it will amount to \$250,000. Will C. Wood, Commissioner of Secondary Education, states:

"This money is to be used exclusively for vocational training in the secondary schools. It is to be used in training pupils for non-professional money-making occupations, including agriculture and the trades. A limited amount may be devoted to household economics. The fund will be administered by the State Board of Education and will be apportioned only to those schools which meet the standards prescribed by the Board of Vocational Training."

#### **FREE TEXT-BOOKS FOR HIGH SCHOOLS.**

**A. B. 1154 (Chapter 550), by Mr. Harris.** This law provides that when a majority of the heads of families, or of the electors of a high school district, shall petition the high school board of any high school district to furnish the free use of text books to the pupils of the district, the high school board shall purchase such books from an approved list submitted by the State Board of Education and shall furnish the use of such books free to the pupils. The books shall be paid for out of the "special fund" of the high school district.

In the absence of such a petition containing a majority of the names of heads of families, or electors, the high school board shall purchase the books as stated above and furnish them to the pupils at an annual rental of not to exceed \$3 per pupil.

It is provided that after July 1, 1920, all high school text books shall be furnished free by the district.

In the opinion of the Attorney General the Constitution will not permit the ownership of the books to pass from the district, therefore, only the use of the books is free. In that respect the law is the same as the law which applies to elementary text books. The essential difference between the high school text book law and the law relating to free elementary books is that the district is the unit of purchase and distribution of high school text books, whereas, the State is the unit for elementary books.

#### **LABELING OF PRISON-MADE ARTICLES.**

**A. B. 1240 (Chapter 164), by Mr. Lyons.** This law requires the labeling of articles offered for sale and intended for personal wear, manufactured in State penitentiaries, reform schools, or other institutions supported at public expense.

It also requires that a notice stating such goods are on sale, shall be conspicuously posted in places where such goods are offered for sale.

### **SOCIAL INSURANCE.**

**S. B. 749 (Chapter 312), by Senator Kehoe.** The Social Insurance Commission, created by the 1915 Legislature, has been continued by reason of a \$22,500 appropriation, and its work for the next two years will be confined to gathering data for submission to the next Legislature, in the event that a system of compulsory or voluntary health insurance is approved at the next general election. A proposed constitutional amendment on this subject was adopted. (See Constitutional Amendments.) It would give the Legislature authority to establish whatever social insurance may be deemed advisable and desirable.

### **AUTOMATIC BELL-RINGER FOR LOCOMOTIVES.**

**A. B. 942 (Chapter 784), by Mr. Farmer.** This measure was championed by the Railroad Brotherhoods. The object of the bill is to insure greater safety by making it compulsory to install automatic bell-ringers on all locomotives in the State.

### **PLUMBERS' LICENSE ACT.**

**A. B. 232 (Chapter 65), by Mr. Phillips.** This measure was championed by the organized Plumbers. It provides for the examination, certification and registration of plumbers, prescribes the powers and duties of the State Board of Health in reference thereto, and specifies penalties for a violation thereof.

### **STATE MARKET COMMISSION.**

**S. B. 86 (Chapter 802), by Senator Luce.** More sweeping than its predecessor is the new State market commission act, re-enacting the State commission market act of 1915 with alterations. It provides that the duties of the State Market Commission shall be:

To act as adviser to producers and distributors when requested; to gather and disseminate impartial information concerning supply, demand, prevailing prices and commercial movements, including common and cold storage of food products; to encourage the organization of co-operative associations among producers, distributors and consumers; to encourage standardization of California food products; to act as mediator, when invited, in controversies between producers and distributors; to extend the market for California products.

The Commission is to consist of but two members, the State Market Director, who is to be appointive by the Governor, and a Commission secretary, to be selected by the Market Director. The director's appointment is to be for four years and his salary is to be \$5000 a year. The director is to engage in no other line of business during his term of office.

### **STATE FISH EXCHANGE.**

**S. B. 87 (Chapter 803), by Senator Luce.** The new State Fish Exchange Act states its purpose as follows:

"It is the purpose of this act to bring about an increased consumption of fresh fish by the people of California, to enable them to obtain the same at reasonable prices, and to empower the State Market Director to regulate and control the business of buying and selling fresh fish, to regulate the destruction of good fish, to create a State Fish Exchange, to license those engaged in marketing fresh fish, to create a State fish exchange fund, to provide penalties for violations of this act, to investigate and report upon the fish industry, and to promote the sale of fish."

License fees of varying amounts are to be charged those engaged in the numerous branches of the fishing and fish distributing business, to be used in an advertising fund for increasing the consumption of fish.

### **INSPECTION OF STEAM BOILERS.**

**S. B. 820 (Chapter 202), by Senator Luce.** This measure marks an important advance in the labor legislation of the State. For a decade or more the steam engineers and other crafts have sought to obtain legislation of this character without success, by reason of the opposition of the same classes of employers who are still opposing workmen's compensation. The main provisions of the law are as follows:

No boiler, unless exempted, shall be operated in this State without a permit, to be obtained from the Industrial Accident Commission. The permit must be posted under glass in a conspicuous place near the boiler. It is a misdemeanor to violate this provision, and the operation of a boiler without a permit shall constitute a separate offense for each day's violation. Where serious menace to life and safety is apprehended, the commission, a commissioner, any safety inspector, or any

person affected, may apply to the Superior Court for an injunction restraining the operation of a boiler until the unsafe condition is corrected or the permit secured. A temporary restraining order will be issued upon the filing of a certificate from the commission that no permit exists for the operation of such boiler, or an affidavit of the inspector that its operation constitutes a menace to the life and safety of persons employed about it.

Boilers exempt from the act are: (1) boilers under the inspection of the United States government; (2) boilers operated by employers not subject to the workmen's compensation act; (3) boilers of twelve horsepower or less, on which the pressure does not exceed fifteen pounds per square inch; (4) automobile boilers and boilers on road motor vehicles.

Inspections must be made internally and externally not less than once a year. Repairs and alterations may be ordered and the operation of a boiler suspended while they are made. Such orders may be reviewed by the commission and the courts in the same manner as are safety orders of the commission. The inspectors may be appointed by the commission, or with its approval, attested by a certificate, by any county, city, insurance company, or persons specially employed to test their own boilers. Inspectors are to obtain their certificates from the commission, which has the right also to revoke such certificates. The fees for inspection are fixed by the commission, and may not exceed \$2.50 for each external inspection and \$7.50 for each internal inspection per annum. The fee must be paid before the permit to operate a boiler is issued. Free inspections may be made by inspectors employed by a county, city, insurance company or person or corporation testing their own boilers only. All fees collected are to be paid into the accident prevention fund. Every inspector must forward reports of inspections to the commission which serve as basis for the validity of permits to operate boilers.

### **INSPECTION OF ELEVATORS.**

**S. B. 827 (Chapter 74), by Senator Luce.** Provides for periodical inspection of elevators operated in places of employment. The law is drafted along the lines of the boiler inspection bill, containing similar provisions as to permits, fees, scope, and manner of enforcement. Not less than two inspections for each year are required. The fees must not exceed two dollars for each inspection, or four dollars for each elevator.

## **B—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS**

### **RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE FOR ABSENT VOTERS.**

**Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 1** amends Section 1 of Article 2 of the Constitution, empowering the Legislature to enact legislation providing for the casting of votes by duly registered voters, who by reason of their occupation are required to travel about the State and are absent from their voting precinct on election day. This measure is necessary to make effective any so-called absent voters' bill. Organized labor has for many years advocated such measures.

### **RELATIVE TO JUDICIAL POWERS.**

**Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 61.** If adopted by the voters this amendment will render all sections of article 6 of the Constitution, excepting Section 1, subject to repeal, or amendment by the Legislature, that it deprives the provisions of this article of their constitutional character and makes them simply statutory, or like other laws enacted by the Legislature. The import of the amendment is greater than most persons may realize. For one thing its adoption will enable the Legislature to pass any law affecting legal procedure without first submitting same to a vote of the people. It is the most progressive step on the subject taken by the Legislature since the Constitution of 1879 was adopted.

### **RELATIVE TO HEALTH INSURANCE.**

**Senate Constitutional Amendment No. 26.** This measure is in legal effect an enabling act empowering the Legislature to establish a health insurance system providing for the health, welfare, and support during illness of any and all persons and their dependents whose incomes in the determination of the legislature are insufficient to meet the hazards of sickness; the system to be supported by compulsory contributions from the insured persons, their employers, and from the State by appropriations. The amendment also empowers the Legislature to permit those persons whose incomes fall above the limit determined upon by the Legislature for the compulsory insurance, to voluntarily insure themselves.

The benefits of health insurance are readily acknowledged. Through this medium, scientific medical assistance and hospital care are assured the wage earner and his family and during these enforced periods of idleness caused by illness, a substantial part of wages is paid to him. Since a part of the cost of health insurance is put upon the employing group, the responsibility of industry for the

health and economic security of the persons upon whose labor industry depends, is recognized. The contribution from the State acknowledges the responsibility of the commonwealth for the general conditions affecting the health and welfare of persons working within its borders.

Health Insurance takes the burden of illness from the individual wage earner where it now rests as an unjust burden—the greatest cause of poverty and destitution—and distributes it, not only over the wage earners as a group, but also over the two other responsible factors,—industry and the State.

Health Insurance has preceded Compensation legislation in most countries and, in the opinion of many, provides an even more needed protection.

By its wording, the amendment dedicates the State to a policy of social health insurance. It will, if endorsed by the ballot of the majority of the voters, amount to a practical command from the citizens of the State to the Legislature, to proceed to action in order that Health Insurance may soon be adopted as a means of administering economic justice in industry.

## **C—LAWS ENACTED DESPITE LABOR'S OPPOSITION**

### **ABOLISHING NAPA REFORMATORY.**

A. B. 1370 (Chapter 165), by Mr. Bruck. This measure abolishes the Napa Farm Reformatory by giving the control and management of the "Fry Ranch," located in Napa County, into the hands of the State Board of Control, to use as a farm for the benefit of the State and its institutions. There is a history attaching to this bill which deserves some note. The land comprises several thousand acres, some of the best land in the county, and was acquired by the State at a very reasonable figure. The 1911 Legislature authorized the purchase in conformity with a plan to use the farm as a reformatory for first offenders. The reformatory plan was worked out by the Commonwealth Club, and was heartily supported by organized labor of the entire State. The basis of the plan was to separate the young offenders from contact with more hardened criminals, to educate them in habits of work and usefulness, and to minimize the competition in industry occasioned by the employment of prison labor. Ever since the farm was purchased there has been a persistent lobbying before the Legislature on the part of certain interests in Napa County to prevent the use of the farm for reformatory purposes, and at each session bills have been introduced for the sale of the farm and discontinuance of the employment of prisoners thereon. Efforts on the part of the supporters of the plan to obtain funds to provide implements for the farm were frustrated, and the passage of this act will, for the time being, suspend the use of the land for its original purpose. The Governor had promised to hear objections to the measure, but for some unexplained reasons failed to give a hearing and promptly signed the bill, thus upsetting the work of those who had hoped to be able to demonstrate the practicability of this system of prison reform. The few prisoners who were employed during the last four years left a good record behind them, wherefore it is regrettable indeed that the plan could not be fully tried out. The next session of the Legislature will be asked to restore the land as a reformatory farm and appropriate sufficient money to carry out the necessary improvements.

### **WOMEN'S EIGHT HOUR LAW WEAKENED.**

A. B. 174 (Chapter 582), by Senator Lyon. This bill amends the women's eight-hour law, exempting therefrom also the occupation of canning fish. Since the original enactment of the women's eight hour law in this State in 1911, this is the first successful attempt to weaken it, every preceding session having added a little to extend its scope. It is difficult to understand the attitude of those who consented to this exemption, as by no stretch of the imagination or actual fact does there exist any necessity or excuse to require the relaxation of the eight-hour principle for the benefit of fish canneries. Instead of exempting any kind of cannery from the operation of the law, there is no good reason why they should not all be included in the act. Organized labor should spare no effort to accomplish this in the future. A protest against this measure was filed with the Governor, but to no avail.

## **D—BILLS ADVOCATED BY LABOR, BUT NOT PASSED**

### **THE ANTI-INJUNCTION BILL.**

S. B. 1035, by Senator Flaherty. For twelve years the State Federation of Labor has diligently worked for the enactment of a law to curb the injunction judge. This Legislature finally passed a satisfactory bill closely following the text

of "Labors' Bill of Rights" enacted by the Congress of the United States and approved by President Wilson.

But again Labor met its Waterloo. This time at the hands of an appointed Governor.

The Governor gave the following statement to the press as his reason for vetoing Labor's most important bill:

"I have very carefully considered the provisions of Senate Bill 1035, known as the Anti-Injunction Act, during the period since the adjournment of the Legislature and have come to the conclusion that it should not be signed.

"Very clearly the provision as to trial by jury of contempt offenders gravely menaces the authority of the courts in injunction proceedings. This bill would so multiply the difficulties of enforcement as to make practically useless the injunction when applied to violations of the abatement law, to the maintenance of gambling places, to the theft of irrigation water, and to other cases where, in the enforcement of the law, this process is used. I deem it my duty in the face of prevailing conditions and the uncertain future to do no act that will in any way tend to diminish the power of the courts in the enforcement of the laws. Manifestly, the consequences of this provision were not contemplated in the passage of this bill through the Legislature in its effort to correct conditions affecting labor disputes."

Andrew Furuseth, the man who has at several sessions made the affirmative argument for the Anti-Injunction bill, a man recognized throughout the land as an authority upon this question, was asked to reply to Governor Stephens' statement. He did so. And his criticism of the Governor's action on the Anti-Injunction is well worth reading. It follows in full:

### **The Veto of the Anti-Injunction Bill.**

(By Andrew Furuseth.)

And so the Governor of California has pocketed the Injunction Limitation Act passed by the Legislature. And he did it because the Jury section would destroy the effect of the writ in cases: first, where the writ was used to protect water and other property; second, because the writ would have no more value in enforcing law than law itself. The Jury section became necessary by the words "lawful" and "peaceful" inserted in the bill. The word "lawful" authorized the use of Equity to enforce law—to supersede it. The "peaceful" authorized making Equity into an instrument to keep the peace and thus invaded the police power. All of it destructive of democracy—government by law enacted by the People—either directly or through representatives. He says in substance that the writ could no more be effective in stopping vice. It has no such proper function; vice is individual and to be dealt with by law. There is some truth in his statement that the trial by jury would leave the trespasser on disputed property, whether water or land, in a better position than he is under the writ as it came to us from Great Britain. The main purpose of the writ was to protect vested rights and while slavery still existed, vested right to the labor of the slave, serf or peon; but there can be no vested right in labor here in the United States. If there was a question about who had a valid title to some property the Court of Equity could step in and order both parties to keep off the property until the question of title could be judicially determined. If some powerful person or corporation was about to trespass upon property under some claim of right the court could estop the trespass on the pain of instant imprisonment. To permit him to enter and exercise property right might destroy the property forever. In dealing with property this was sound and wholesome use of the irresponsible power of the King, for whom and in whose name the Judge was acting; but to extend the jurisdiction to labor—laborers or workers—presupposes a property right in such laborers or workers. Leave the writ of injunction to operate on property only and none will ask that it be amended or curtailed. The trouble has been and is, however, that the Judges, or those behind them, sought and are seeking to use the writ to enforce law, so as to get away from trial by jury and to destroy the individual freedom of men. When this is done the Court of Equity usurps the jurisdiction of the Court of Law and destroys trial by jury, together with all the safeguards with which Anglo-Saxon Jurisprudence has sought to protect the individual from being railroaded to prison by the socially or politically powerful, and the Governor's position is simply placing property rights above human rights—the ownership of water above the freedom of man. As a statesman the Governor ought to understand the real value of the writ and the legitimate power of the Equity Court. He pleads this value somewhat garbled against the working people, against whom the writ has been unlawfully used. The relation between the workman and the employer is not a property relation. It cannot be under our fundamental law, which holds that there can no longer be any property right in one man over any other man. This much was settled at Appomattox and by the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

The only commercial value in a slave was the working power inherent in him or her. The price was determined by age, health, strength, and skill—by the power to produce. The slave was examined in all these before being bought and the price was determined by that standard. The sum total of the examination was to ascertain the amount, quality and endurance of the labor power in the slave.

The power to labor is the most individual, the most personal of all that be; it is an attribute of life—a part of the great mystery, the operation of which we can see, feel and to some extent describe, the essence and source we know not. Labor-power grows with the growth, it diminishes in sickness or with age, and it passes away in death of the individual. It cannot be separated from the person, and since the person cannot be property neither can this purely personal attribute be property. To apply the equity power in personal relations is to restore slavery. The control by the individual over his labor power cannot be alienated even by himself or herself without restoring slavery, and slavery of a worse type than the kind abolished. The ownership of the individual carried with it the obligation of support. The restored slavery would eliminate this obligation.

With all the legal advice at his disposal the Governor should have known that there are other and very conclusive reasons for denying to the Equity Court the power to issue injunctions in matters that are personal and properly beyond its jurisdiction. Equity government is personal government—autocracy or absolutism; that it is exercised by a judge instead of a king makes it no whit less dangerous—no less reactionary. As government by injunction—personal government—advances, government by law passes away. Permit the Court, sitting in Equity, to assume jurisdiction beyond the property limits and you place all humanity again under the irresponsible rule of a cult—the legal profession. The boundary is so plain that there is no excuse for the lawyer who crosses it.

Equity has no jurisdiction except to protect property and then only where there is no remedy at law. The Governor might have looked into any law book and found that nothing can be property in any legal sense unless it can be disposed of—that is, can be transmitted from one person to any other person. Labor—labor power is the power to produce some thing. It may be a writ of injunction, a book, a poem, a barrel of oil or a ditch; but whatever it be it is the product of labor—of labor power in activity, and may be property—properly belonging to the producer, but capable of being disposed of. There is a fundamental difference between a barrel of oil and the man, who pumped it from the ground, or the man who rolls it along the dock. The Governor should have known and should have appreciated this and should have taken the proper steps to protect the writ for its proper purposes, when it was assailed by the Judiciary and thus to have protected the citizens of California against the usurpations of the courts to which the improper use of the writ subjects the individual citizen. It should have been easy for him to do this. He was in Congress when it declared that “the labor power of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce.” That he did not take the proper steps to protect either the property or the citizens, when it was in his power so to do, indicate that he is lacking in that sincerity which is a prerequisite in any man placed on guard by the People.

To pocket the act might have been an error of judgment, the explanation made it a betrayal of trust.

#### **PROHIBITING COLLECTION OF FEES BY EMPLOYMENT AGENTS.**

Both Assembly Bill No. 9 (by Mr. Collins) and Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 19 (by Mr. Harris), sought to abolish the private employment bureaus, i. e., all employment agencies operated for profit.

Notwithstanding the establishment of the State Free Employment Agencies under the direction of the Labor Commissioner the men and women of our State who seek employment are still mulcted by private agencies to the tune of about \$500,000 per annum. This is blood money, pure and simple, and was so regarded by Congress years ago when it was made unlawful to charge any seaman a fee for securing him employment. More recently both Washington and Idaho have passed laws (the former by the Initiative) to abolish employment agencies operated for profit.

The associated private employment agencies of California, however, with the aid of a well filled campaign sack, easily persuaded the majority of the Assemblymen that Labor's effort to protect the men and women seeking work was a vicious attack on business and property. Frank M. Smith of Alameda County (who was masquerading as a floor leader of the administration), made this the occasion for launching a bitter personal attack upon “salaried” labor officials. It was hinted that this was a part of his bargain with the Employment sharks. At any rate, his flow of billingsgate came entirely unprovoked and was promptly repudiated by every self-respecting member of the Legislature.

It had been the intention to submit this matter to a vote of the people via the Initiative but a recent United States Supreme Court decision (five against four)

held that the Washington State law relating to this subject was unconstitutional.

In view of that decision Labor of California will necessarily have to adopt other means to check this sort of graft. A prohibitive license upon employment agencies operated for profit should bring substantially the same results.

#### **FEMALE DOMESTIC SERVANT TEN HOUR BILL.**

**A. B. 350, by Mr. Baldwin.** This measure sought to give some relief from long working hours to female domestic servants. The present California law relating to domestic servants reads as follows:

"Sec. 2013. The entire time of a domestic servant belongs to the master; and the time of other servants to such extent as is usual in the business in which they serve, not exceeding in any case ten hours in the day (Enacted March 21, 1872)."

It is sad commentary on our much heralded progress that the "entire time" of certain servants in California still belongs "to the master."

Only twenty-one Assemblymen voted for a change in this condition. For particulars see "Records of Assemblymen."

#### **THE SUNDAY CLOSING BILL.**

**A. B. 172, by Mr. Morris.** This bill would have secured one day off in seven, namely, on Sunday, for a number of miscellaneous workers employed in services like those of butchers, barbers, laundry workers, salesmen, etc. The title of the bill was unfortunate, in that it announced the general principle of the bill to be "the prohibition of unnecessary labor and the pursuit of unnecessary labor on Sunday," which was seized upon by the advocates of prohibition of the liquor traffic to interject an amendment providing for the closing of saloons on Sunday. There was a general understanding between the Sunday Closing League and the California Trades Union Liberty League to let this bill go through without interjecting any wet and dry issue into it. This arrangement was upset by the strong prohibition element in the Assembly, which insisted upon incorporating the saloons into the bill. Inasmuch as there were other measures before the Assembly dealing with the regulation of saloons, the prohibitionists should be held responsible for the loss of this measure. The bill was defeated in the Assembly.

#### **THE SEMI-MONTHLY PAY DAY BILL.**

**A. B. 211, by Mr. Harris.** This was a measure combining the objects of the Payment of Wages act of 1911 and the Semi-Monthly Pay Day act of 1915. The latter act was found unworkable in the form it emerged from the last session, and the first-mentioned act, as amended in 1915, needed also some revision, hence this bill was drafted to deal with the entire subject of payment of wages according to the best thought and experience up to the present. The bill prescribed the manner of payment upon quitting or discharge, established regular pay days twice a month in most employments, and at least one pay day a month in all other. On account of constitutional difficulties the penalties for violations were limited to money damages in proportion to the number of days payment is delayed, not exceeding thirty days in any case, which damages may be recovered by civil suit. The bill passed the Legislature but was among those pocket-vetoed by the Governor.

#### **MINERS' EIGHT-HOUR BILL.**

**A. B. 1441, by Mr. Brackett.** This bill was known as the "collar to collar" bill. It is the law of other mining States and was recently put into effect in the coal mines of Australia by a general strike. It has been before several of the California Legislatures and again was introduced at the specific request of the miners, but never came out of Committee. The principal reason for the defeat of this bill is due to the fact that the miners of the State are very poorly organized, and until such time as they become aware of the necessity of coming into the trade-union movement, they can expect to work an unlimited number of hours.

### **E—ANTI-LABOR BILLS DEFEATED**

#### **THE COMPULSORY MEDIATION BILL.**

**A. B. 538, by Mr. Goetting.** This bill was introduced at the instance of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce and was in substance a copy of the Lemieux Act of Canada. The provisions are as follows: Compulsory mediation between employer and employees and in the event of failure to agree, then a member of the Railroad Commission was authorized to endeavor to get the employers and employees together. If this second mediation should fail to bring results, the bill prescribed that for a period of 15 days, immediately following, the employees must remain at work. This simply meant that during these 15 days the employer would avail himself of every means possible to overcome any action the men might make at the end of the 15 days.

The unfairness of such a proposition soon became self-evident and although



the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce called upon every Chamber of Commerce in the State for assistance, and they in turn flooded the various members of the Assembly with scores of telegrams, only 16 "aye" votes were cast for this most unfair measure. For details see "Records of Assemblymen."

#### **THE APPRENTICE BILL.**

**S. B. 735, by Senator Rominger.** This measure was aimed directly at the apprentice rules of labor organizations.

Two years ago a similar measure was introduced in the Legislature. It was conceived in hatred and born in prejudice and passion. It was discussed in public by its proponents as a "get even" measure.

The greatest and most unscrupulous exploiters of Labor pleaded for the enactment of this bill on the grounds that it would give the American boy a chance.

The representative of the Holt Manufacturing Company, who appeared at the public hearing in support of the bill, told the whole story. He declared that, without restraint, the American boy should be allowed to go and come as he saw fit. Of course, the obvious result would be an endless chain of boys going and coming. Reaching maturity the unfortunate victims of this system would find themselves thrown upon the world lacking every attribute of proficiency which is the earmark of your real mechanic.

P. H. McCarthy, President of the State Building Trades Council, and Geo. A. Tracy, President of the Typographical Union, made telling arguments against the bill. The former, in the course of his remarks, forcibly called attention to the hypocrisy behind the plea for the American boy. He said:

"The employers in one department alone of the building industry in the San Francisco bay counties are entitled, under the union rules, to 1560 apprentices, and yet they employ only 550, intentionally leaving vacant 1010 places which belong properly to the American boy. The employers to whom I refer are the most vociferous of the many advocates of a square deal for the American boy.

"According to the carpenters' trade rules referred to, they could employ 1560 apprentices, and yet they employ 550 only. One thousand and ten available places denied to American boys for whose welfare these sham patriots are so much concerned that they cannot sleep nights!"

To the credit of the Senate it should be recorded that this bill received only nine "aye" votes out of forty. For details see "Records of Senators."

#### **THE ANTI-BOYCOTT BILL.**

**S. B. 695, by Senator Ballard.** This was one of the pet measures of the would-be union busters. Its declared aim was to outlaw sympathetic strikes and secondary boycotts.

In a lengthy circular letter sent out by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce appeared the following paragraph:

"Senator Ballard's Bill, now pending in the California Legislature, has the full support and approval of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, and that organization will use its best efforts to insure its enactment into law."

Happily, the "full support" of the open shop brigade did not amount to much. Only 2 Senators (Ballard and Chamberlin of Los Angeles) voted to report this vicious measure out of Committee. The following Senators voted to "table" the bill in Committee: Benson of Santa Clara, Burnett of San Francisco, Carr of Alameda, Duncan of Butte, Jones of Santa Clara, Kehoe of Humboldt, Luce of San Diego and Tyrrell of Alameda.

# Labor Record of Senators and Assemblymen

---

## EXPLANATORY

Each Senator's and Assemblyman's record on a selected list of important measures affecting Labor will be found under the respective titles, "Records of Senators" and "Records of Assemblymen."

Each of these divisions contains three parts. The first part describes and numbers the particular roll-calls upon which the legislators' records are based.

The second part gives an alphabetical list of the legislators, and indicates how many times and upon which particular measures they voted for or against Labor; also the number of times they failed to vote.

The third part is known as the "Comparative Record." It enables anyone to see at a glance "how good" or "how bad" his Senator and Assemblyman voted upon Labor measures. In these Comparative Records, the legislators are arranged in numerical order in accordance with the number of "good votes" cast by each.

# RECORDS OF SENATORS

## DESCRIPTION OF THE 10 ROLL-CALLS UPON WHICH THE SENATORS' RECORDS ARE BASED.

(Unless otherwise noted an "Aye" vote is a vote for Labor and credited to the respective Senators as a "good" vote.)

- A. S. B. 1035. Anti-Injunction bill. (April 18.)
- B. S. B. 736. Apprentice bill. (March 29.) The "ayes" are bad votes, the "noes" are good votes.
- C. S. B. 818. Improved Workmen's Compensation bill. Amendment by Senator Slater to exempt farmers from the operation of the bill. (March 27.) The "ayes" are bad votes, the "noes" are good votes.
- D. S. B. 818. Improved Workmen's Compensation bill. Final passage. (March 27.)
- E. S. B. 818. Improved Workmen's Compensation bill. Concurrence in objectionable Assembly Amendment. (April 27.) The "ayes" are bad votes, the "noes" are good votes.
- F. S. B. 175. Amended Women's Eight Hour bill, permitting more than eight hours' work in fish canneries. (March 27.) The "ayes" are bad votes, the "noes" are good votes.
- G. S. B. 101. Improved Child Labor bill. (April 4.)
- H. A. B. 534. Prohibiting the discharge of an employe for failure to patronize boarding house owned or conducted by the employer. (April 3.)
- I. A. B. 662. Requiring employers to pay cost of bonds and photographs when demanded of employes or applicants for employment. (April 3.)
- J. S. B. 820. Providing for the periodical inspection of Steam Boilers, etc., to insure safety of employes. (March 28.)

## GOOD AND BAD VOTES CAST BY EACH SENATOR AND NUMBER OF TIMES ABSENT.

Each capital letter designates a certain Roll-Call.

For explanation of Roll-Calls, see upper part of this page.

(Compiled from Daily Journals issued during session.)

- BALLARD, JOHN W. (Rep.), Los. Angeles.  
 3 Good Votes: C, D, E.  
 7 Bad Votes: A, B, F, G, H, I, J.  
 Voted on every roll call.
- BENEDICT, HENRY S. (Prog.-Dem.-Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 Was elected to Congress for the unexpired term of Wm. D. Stephens.
- BENSON, FRANK H. (Rep.-Prog.-Prohib.), Santa Clara.  
 9 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: F.  
 Voted on every roll call.
- BREED, A. H. (Rep.-Prog.-Dem.), Alameda.  
 5 Good Votes: C, D, E, G, J.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, B, F, H, I.  
 Voted on every roll call.
- BROWN, WILLIAM E. (Rep.-Prog.-Dem.-Prohib.), Los Angeles.  
 2 Good Votes: C, D.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, F, G, H, J.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: B, E, I.
- BURNETT, LESTER G. (Rep.), San Francisco.  
 2 Good Votes: C, D.  
 3 Bad Votes: F, G, J.  
 Absent 5 roll calls: A, B, E, H, I.
- CANEPA, VICTOR J. (Ind.), San Francisco.  
 8 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, F, H, I, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: G.  
 Absent 1 roll call: E.
- CARR, FRANK M. (Rep.), Alameda.  
 6 Good Votes: A, B, E, G, H, I.  
 1 Bad Vote: J.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: C, D, F.

CARR, WM. J. (Prog.), Los Angeles.  
 6 Good Votes: B, C, D, E, G, J.  
 3 Bad Votes: A, H, I.  
 Absent 1 roll call: F.

CHAMBERLIN, HARRY A. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 Good Votes: None.  
 9 Bad Votes: B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.  
 Absent 1 roll call: A.

CHANDLER, W. F. (Prog.-Rep.), Fresno.  
 5 Good Votes: C, D, E, I, J.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, B, F, G, H.  
 Voted on every roll call.

CROWLEY, JOHN JOS. (Prog.-Dem.), San Francisco.  
 7 Good Votes: B, C, D, E, H, I, J.  
 2 Bad Votes: F, G.  
 Absent 1 roll call: A.

DUNCAN, W. E., JR. (Dem.-Prog.-Soc.), Butte.  
 8 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I.  
 1 Bad Vote: J.  
 Absent 1 roll call: F.

EVANS, S. C. (Rep.-Prohib.), Riverside.  
 6 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, G, J.  
 3 Bad Votes: F, H, I.  
 Absent 1 roll call: E.

FLAHERTY, LAWRENCE J. (Rep.-Prog.), San Francisco.  
 9 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: F.  
 Voted on every roll call.

GATES, EGBERT J. (Rep.-Dem.), Los Angeles.  
 7 Good Votes: B, C, D, E, H, I, J.  
 3 Bad Votes: A, F, G.  
 Voted on every roll call.

HANS, GEORGE J. (Rep.), Alameda.  
 4 Good Votes: A, B, C, D.  
 1 Bad Vote: F.  
 Absent 5 roll calls: E, G, H, I, J.

INGRAM, THOMAS (Rep.-Dem.), Nevada.  
 8 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, H, I, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: F.  
 Absent 1 roll call: G.

INMAN, J. M. (Rep.-Dem.-Prog.), Sacramento.  
 6 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, H, I.  
 2 Bad Votes: G, J.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: E, F.

IRWIN, J. L. C. (Dem.), Kings.  
 3 Good Votes: C, D, I.  
 6 Bad Votes: A, B, E, G, H, J.  
 Absent 1 roll call: F.

JOHNSON, M. B. (Rep.-Dem.), San Mateo.  
 6 Good Votes: C, D, G, H, I, J.  
 2 Bad Votes: A, F.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: B, E.

JONES, HERBERT C. (Prog.-Dem.-Rep.-Prohib.), Santa Clara.  
 8 Good Votes: B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J.  
 2 Bad Votes: A, F.  
 Voted on every roll call.

KEHOE, WILLIAM (Rep.-Prog.-Prohib.), Humboldt.  
 9 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: I.  
 Voted on every roll call.

KING, LYMAN M. (Rep.-Prog.), San Bernardino.  
 6 Good Votes: A, B, E, G, H, I.  
 1 Bad Vote: F.  
 Absent: 3 roll calls: C, D, J.

LUCE, EDGAR A. (Prog.-Dem.), San Diego.  
 7 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, G, J.**  
 3 Bad Votes: **F, H, I.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

LYON, HENRY H. (Rep.-Dem.), Los Angeles.  
 9 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, J.**  
 1 Bad Vote: **F.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

McDONALD, WALTER A. (Rep.-Prog.-Dem.), San Francisco.  
 8 Good Votes: **A, C, D, E, F, H, I, J.**  
 1 Bad Vote: **G.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **B.**

MADDUX, L. J. (Dem.), Stanislaus.  
 Good Votes: **None.**  
 9 Bad Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **H.**

NEALON, JAMES C. (Dem.), San Francisco.  
 7 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, I, J.**  
 3 Bad Votes: **F, G, H.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

PURKITT, CLAUDE F. (Dem.-Rep.-Prohib.), Glenn.  
 1 Good Vote: **G.**  
 6 Bad Votes: **A, B, C, F, H, I.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **D, E, J.**

RIGDON, E. S. (Dem.-Soc.-Prohib.), San Luis Obispo.  
 6 Good Votes: **A, B, E, G, H, I.**  
 3 Bad Votes: **C, D, J.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **F.**

ROMINGER, JOSEPH A. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 3 Good Votes: **C, D, H.**  
 6 Bad Votes: **A, B, F, G, I, J.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **E.**

RUSH, BENJ. F. (Rep.), Solano.  
 4 Good Votes: **A, D, H, I.**  
 2 Bad Votes: **C, G.**  
 Absent 4 roll calls: **B, E, F, J.**

SCOTT, WM. S. (Prog.-Rep.), San Francisco.  
 7 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, H, I, J.**  
 2 Bad Votes: **F, G.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **E.**

SHARKEY, WILL R. (Rep.), Contra Costa.  
 7 Good Votes: **A, C, D, G, H, I, J.**  
 2 Bad Votes: **B, F.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **E.**

SHEARER, WM. B. (Dem.), Siskiyou.  
 Good Votes: **None.**  
 8 Bad Votes: **C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **A, B.**

SLATER, HERBERT W. (Dem.-Prog.-Soc.), Sonoma.  
 6 Good Votes: **A, B, D, H, I, J.**  
 4 Bad Votes: **C, E, F, G.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

STUCKENBRUCK, J. W. (Dem.), San Joaquin.  
 1 Good Vote: **I.**  
 8 Bad Votes: **A, C, D, E, F, G, H, J.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **B.**

THOMPSON, J. R. (Dem.), Santa Barbara.  
 4 Good Votes: **B, D, I, J.**  
 5 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, G, H.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **F.**

TYRRELL, EDWARD J. (Prog.-Rep.), Alameda.  
 7 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, H, I, J.**  
 2 Bad Votes: **F, G.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **E.**

## COMPARATIVE RECORD OF SENATORS.

Based upon 10 Important "Roll-Calls" on Labor Measures.

		Party.	Good Votes	Bad Votes.	Absent on Roll-Call	
Group I.	{	1. BENSON, FRANK H.....	R.-P.-Ph.	9	1	0
		2. FLAHERTY, LAWRENCE J..	R.-P.	9	1	0
		3. KEHOE, WILLIAM .....	R.-P.-Ph.	9	1	0
		4. LYON, HENRY H.....	R.-D.	9	1	0
Group II.	{	5. CANEPA, VICTOR J.....	I.	8	1	1
		6. DUNCAN, W. E., JR.....	D.-P.-S.	8	1	1
		7. INGRAM, THOMAS.....	R.-D.	8	1	1
		8. McDONALD, WALTER A....	R.-P.-D.	8	1	1
		9. JONES, HERBERT C.....	P.-R.-D.-Ph.	8	2	0
Group III.	{	10. CROWLEY, JOHN JOS.....	P.-D.	7	2	1
		11. SCOTT, WM. S.....	P.-R.	7	2	1
		12. SHARKEY, WILL R.....	R.	7	2	1
		13. TYRRELL, EDWARD J.....	P.-R.	7	2	1
		14. GATES, EGBERT J.....	R.-D.	7	3	0
		15. LUCE, EDGAR A.....	P.-D.	7	3	0
		16. NEALON, JAMES C.....	D.	7	3	0
Group IV.	{	17. CARR, FRANK M.....	R.	6	1	3
		18. KING, LYMAN M.....	R.-P.	6	1	3
		19. INMAN, J. M.....	R.-D.-P.	6	2	2
		20. JOHNSON, M. B.....	R.-D.	6	2	2
		21. CARR, WM. J.....	P.	6	3	1
		22. EVANS, S. C.....	R.-Ph.	6	3	1
		23. RIGDON, E. S.....	D.-S.-Ph.	6	3	1
		24. SLATER, HERBERT W.....	D.-P.-S.	6	4	0
Group V.	{	25. BREED, A. H.....	R.-P.-D.	5	5	0
		26. CHANDLER, W. F.....	P.-R.	5	5	0
Group VI.	{	27. HANS, GEORGE J.....	R.	4	1	5
		28. RUSH, BENJ. F.....	R.	4	2	4
		29. THOMPSON, J. R.....	D.	4	5	1
Group VII.	{	30. IRWIN, J. L. C.....	D.	3	6	1
		31. ROMINGER, JOSEPH A.....	R.	3	6	1
		32. BALLARD, JOHN W.....	R.	3	7	0
Group VIII.	{	33. BURNETT, LESTER G.....	R.	2	3	5
		34. BROWN, WILLIAM E.....	R.-P.-D.-Ph.	2	5	3
Group IX.	{	35. PURKITT, CLAUDE F.....	D.-R.-Ph.	1	6	3
		36. STUCKENBRUCK, J. W.....	D.	1	8	1
Group X.	{	37. SHEARER, WM. B.....	D.	0	8	2
		38. CHAMBERLIN, HARRY A....	R.	0	9	1
		39. MADDUX, L. J.....	D.	0	9	1
		40. BENEDICT, HENRY S*.....	P.-D.-R.	0	0	10

\* Was elected to Congress for the unexpired term of Wm. D. Stephens.

# RECORDS OF ASSEMBLYMEN

## DESCRIPTION OF THE 10 ROLL-CALLS UPON WHICH THE ASSEMBLYMEN'S RECORDS ARE BASED.

(Unless otherwise noted an "Aye" vote is a vote for Labor and credited to the respective Assemblymen as a "good" vote.)

- A. S. B. 1035. Anti-Injunction bill. (April 26.)
- B. A. B. 538. Compulsory Mediation bill. (April 13.) The "ayes" are bad votes, the "noes" are good votes.
- C. S. B. 818. Workmen's Compensation bill. Amendment by Mr. Manning to exempt farmers from the operation of the bill. (April 26.) The "ayes" are bad votes, the "noes" are good votes.
- D. S. B. 818. Workmen's Compensation bill. Final passage. (April 27.)
- E. A. B. 9. Employment Agency bill, prohibiting the collection of fees. (March 19.)
- F. A. C. A. 19. Employment Agency Constitutional Amendment, prohibiting the collection of fees. (April 27.)
- G. A. B. 350. Female Domestic Servants' "Ten Hour" bill. (April 20.)
- H. A. B. 1240. Requiring the labeling of articles manufactured in prisons. (April 17.)
- I. S. B. 87. Regulating the buying, selling, destroying, etc., of food fish. (April 24.)
- J. A. C. A. 1. Authorizing the Legislature to enact a law to permit absent voters to cast their ballots. (March 13.)

## GOOD AND BAD VOTES CAST BY EACH ASSEMBLYMAN AND NUMBER OF TIMES ABSENT.

Each capital letter designates a certain Roll-Call.  
For explanation of Roll-Calls, see upper part of this page.

(Compiled from Daily Journals issued during session.)

ALLEN, CROMBIE (Rep.-Prohib.), San Bernardino.

5 Good Votes: B, C, D, I, J.

3 Bad Votes: E, F, G.

Absent 2 roll calls: A, H.

AMBROSE, THOMAS L. (Rep.-Prog.-Prohib.), Los Angeles.

7 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, G, I, J.

2 Bad Votes: E, F.

Absent 1 roll call: H.

ANDERSON, FRANK W. (Rep.), Alameda.

7 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, H, I, J.

2 Bad Votes: E, G.

Absent 1 roll call: F.

ARGABRITE, JOSEPH M. (Dem.-Prohib.), Ventura.

5 Good Votes: D, G, H, I, J.

5 Bad Votes: A, B, C, E, F.

Voted on every roll call.

ARNERICH, PAUL J. (Rep.-Dem.), Alameda.

2 Good Votes: B, J.

1 Bad Vote: I.

Absent 7 roll calls: A, C, D, E, F, G, H.

ASHLEY, GEO. W. (Rep.), San Joaquin.

4 Good Votes: B, D, I, J.

5 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, G.

Absent 1 roll call: H.

BAKER, EDWIN (Rep.), Los Angeles.

6 Good Votes: A, D, F, G, H, J.

3 Bad Votes: B, E, I.

Absent 1 roll call: C.

BALDWIN, HUGH J. (Rep.), San Diego.

9 Good Votes: A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I, J.

Bad Votes: None.

Absent 1 roll call: D.

BARTLETT, ALFRED L. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 1 Good Vote: B.  
 8 Bad Votes: A, C, D, E, F, G, H, J.  
 Absent 1 roll call: I.

BRACKETT, W. R. (Ind.), Alameda.  
 8 Good Votes: A, B, C, E, F, G, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: None.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: D, H.

BROWN, C. H. (Rep.-Soc.), Butte.  
 2 Good Votes: I, J.  
 7 Bad Votes: A, C, D, E, F, G.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: B, H.

BROWN, T. V. (Rep.), Santa Clara.  
 7 Good Votes: A, B, D, E, G, I, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: C.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: F, H.

BRUCK, BISMARCK (Rep.), Napa.  
 2 Good Votes: D, I.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, B, C, E, F.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: G, H, J.

BURKE, JOE C. (Rep.), Orange.  
 5 Good Votes: B, D, H, I, J.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, G.  
 Voted on every roll call.

BYRNE, HENRY D. (Rep.), San Francisco.  
 1 Good Vote: J.  
 8 Bad Votes: A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I.  
 Absent 1 roll call: D.

CALAHAN, WILLIAM E. (Rep.-Prohib.), Contra Costa.  
 6 Good Votes: A, D, F, G, I, J.  
 2 Bad Votes: C, E.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: B, H.

CARLSON, A. W. (Rep.-Prog.), Fresno.  
 3 Good Votes: D, E, J.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, B, C, F, G.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: H, I.

COLLINS, WILLIAM M. (Rep.-Dem.), San Francisco.  
 7 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, H, I.  
 Bad Votes: None.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: F, G, J.

DENNETT, LEWIS L. (Rep.), Stanislaus.  
 3 Good Votes: A, D, I.  
 3 Bad Votes: C, E, J.  
 Absent 4 roll calls: B, F, G, H.

DORAN, W. A. (Rep.), San Diego.  
 Good Votes: None.  
 9 Bad Votes: A, B, C, E, F, G, H, I, J.  
 Absent 1 roll call: D.

EDWARDS, LAWRENCE (Dem.-Rep.), San Joaquin.  
 4 Good Votes: A, B, D, I.  
 1 Bad Vote: E.  
 Absent 5 roll calls: C, F, G, H, J.

EKSWARD, FRANK LEONARD (Dem.), San Mateo.  
 3 Good Votes: B, D, J.  
 7 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, G, H, I.  
 Voted on every roll call.

FARMER, BERT L. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 4 Good Votes: B, D, H, J.  
 3 Bad Votes: E, F, G.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: A, C, I.

FINLEY, T. R. (Dem.), Santa Barbara.  
 1 Good Vote: D.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, I.  
 Absent 4 roll calls: B, G, H, J.

FRIEDMAN, LEO R. (Rep.), San Francisco.  
 3 Good Votes: A, B, D.  
 6 Bad Votes: E, F, G, H, I, J.  
 Absent 1 roll call: C.



GEBHART, LEE (Rep.-Prog.-Dem.), Sacramento.  
 9 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: **None**.  
 Absent 1 roll call: G.

GELDER, GEORGE (Rep.-Dem.-Prog.), Alameda.  
 5 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, J.  
 2 Bad Votes: E, I.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: F, G, H.

GODSIL, CHARLES WM. (Rep.-Prog.-Dem.), San Francisco.  
 10 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: **None**.  
 Voted on every roll call.

GOETTING, CHARLES W. (Rep.), San Francisco.  
 3 Good Votes: D, H, I.  
 7 Bad Votes: A, B, C, E, F, G, J.  
 Voted on every roll call.

GREEN, LYMAN (Rep.), Sonoma.  
 3 Good Votes: B, D, I.  
 7 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, G, H, J.  
 Voted on every roll call.

GREENE, CARLTON W. (Rep.-Dem.), San Luis Obispo.  
 2 Good Votes: B, J.  
 7 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, G, H, I.  
 Absent 1 roll call: D.

HARRIS, WITTEN W. (Dem.), Kern.  
 10 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: **None**.  
 Voted on every roll call.

HAWES, FREDERICK C. (Rep.-Prog.-Dem.), San Francisco..  
 7 Good Votes: A, C, E, F, G, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: **None**.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: B, D, H.

HAWSON, HENRY (Dem.), Fresno.  
 3 Good Votes: B, H, J.  
 6 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, G, I.  
 Absent 1 roll call: D.

HAYES, D. R. (Rep.), Santa Clara.  
 8 Good Votes: A, B, C, E, F, G, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: **None**.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: D, H.

HAYES, J. J. (Rep.), San Francisco.  
 8 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, H, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: **None**.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: F, G.

HILTON, OSCAR W. (Rep.-Dem.-Prog.), Solano.  
 9 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I, J.  
 Bad Votes: **None**.  
 Absent 1 roll call: H.

HORBACH, ROBERT (Rep.), Tulare.  
 4 Good Votes: D, H, I, J.  
 4 Bad Votes: A, C, F, G.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: B, E.

HUDSON, R. H. (Rep.-Dem.-Prohib.), Santa Cruz.  
 4 Good Votes: B, D, I, J.  
 3 Bad Votes: C, E, H.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: A, F, G.

JOHNSON, A. BURLINGAME (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 2 Good Votes: H, I.  
 5 Bad Votes: A, C, E, F, J.  
 Absent 3 roll calls: B, D, G.

JOHNSTON, JOHN W. (Rep.), Sacramento.  
 7 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, F, H, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: I.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: E, G.

KLINE, CHESTER M. (Rep.), Riverside.  
 4 Good Votes: **C, H, I, J.**  
 3 Bad Votes: **B, E, F.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **A, D, G.**

KNIGHT, SAMUEL (Rep.-Prohib.), San Bernardino.  
 10 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

KYLBERG, H. (Rep.), Merced.  
 6 Good Votes: **A, D, G, H, I, J.**  
 3 Bad Votes: **B, C, F.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **E.**

LONG, W. A. (Rep.), Kings.  
 4 Good Votes: **D, G, I, J.**  
 6 Bad Votes: **A, B, C, E, F, H.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

LYON, CHARLES W. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 4 Good Votes: **B, D, I, J.**  
 3 Bad Votes: **A, E, F.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **C, G, H.**

LYONS, HARRY (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 6 Good Votes: **B, D, F, H, I, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 4 roll calls: **A, C, E, G.**

McCRAY, C. C. (Rep.), Shasta.  
 2 Good Votes: **B, H.**  
 4 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, I.**  
 Absent 4 roll calls: **D, F, G, J.**

MADISON, ROBERT (Rep.), Sonoma.  
 6 Good Votes: **A, B, D, F, I, J.**  
 1 Bad Vote: **C.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **E, G, H.**

MANNING, J. E. (Rep.), Marin.  
 1 Good Vote: **J.**  
 6 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, F, G, I.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **B, D, H.**

MARKS, MILTON (Rep.), San Francisco.  
 9 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, F, H, I, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **G.**

MARTIN, WILLIAM J. (Rep.-Dem.-Prog.), Monterey.  
 4 Good Votes: **A, D, I, J.**  
 5 Bad Votes: **B, C, E, F, H.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **G.**

MATHEWS, A. J. (Rep.-Dem.), Lassen.  
 6 Good Votes: **A, C, D, F, I, J.**  
 3 Bad Votes: **B, E, G.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **H.**

MERRIAM, FRANK F. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 5 Good Votes: **B, D, G, H, J.**  
 5 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, F, I.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

MITCHELL, THOMAS A. (Rep.-Dem.), San Francisco.  
 8 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **H, J.**

MORRIS, CLARENCE W. (Rep.), San Francisco.  
 8 Good Votes: **A, B, C, E, F, G, I, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **D, H.**

MORRISON, HARRY F. (Rep.-Dem.), San Francisco.  
 8 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, H, I, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **F, G.**

MOUSER, FRANK H. (Rep.-Dem.), Los Angeles.  
 8 Good Votes: **A, B, D, E, F, H, I, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **C, G.**

PARKER, IVAN H. (Rep.-Dem.-Prog.), Placer.  
 4 Good Votes: **B, D, H, I.**  
 1 Bad Vote: **C.**  
 Absent 5 roll calls: **A, E, F, G, J.**

PETTIS, J. A. (Rep.), Mendocino.  
 Good Votes: **None.**  
 6 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, F, I, J.**  
 Absent 4 roll calls: **B, D, G, H.**

PETTIT, MELVIN (Prog.-Dem.-Prohib.), Fresno.  
 5 Good Votes: **B, D, H, I, J.**  
 5 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, F, G.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

PHILLIPS, PETER C. (Rep.-Dem.-Prohib.), Los Angeles.  
 5 Good Votes: **A, B, C, H, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 5 roll calls: **D, E, F, G, I.**

POLSLEY, HARRY (Rep.-Dem.-Soc.), Tehama.  
 7 Good Votes: **A, B, D, F, G, H, J.**  
 1 Bad Vote: **E.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **C, I.**

PRENDERGAST, N. J. (Rep.-Dem.-Prog.), San Francisco.  
 5 Good Votes: **A, C, D, H, I.**  
 1 Bad Vote: **B.**  
 Absent 4 roll calls: **E, F, G, J.**

QUINN, JOHN F. (Dem.), Humboldt.  
 5 Good Votes: **A, B, D, H, J.**  
 5 Bad Votes: **C, E, F, G, I.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

REAM, H. B. (Dem.), Siskiyou.  
 5 Good Votes: **A, B, G, H, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Absent 5 roll calls: **C, D, E, F, I.**

ROSE, J. LEONARD (Rep.-Dem.), Alameda.  
 6 Good Votes: **A, B, D, H, I, J.**  
 2 Bad Votes: **C, E.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **F, G.**

RYAN, JAMES J. (Rep.-Dem.-Prog.), San Francisco.  
 10 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J.**  
 Bad Votes: **None.**  
 Voted on every roll call.

SATTERWHITE, WILLIAM T. (Rep.-Prog.), Alameda.  
 6 Good Votes: **A, B, C, D, H, I.**  
 1 Bad Vote: **E.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **F, G, J.**

SHEPHERD, E. R. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 3 Good Votes: **C, H, J.**  
 4 Bad Votes: **A, B, E, G.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **D, F, I.**

SMITH, FRANK M. (Rep.), Alameda.  
 5 Good Votes: **C, D, H, I, J.**  
 2 Bad Votes: **A, E.**  
 Absent 3 roll calls: **B, F, G.**

TARKE, LOUIS (Rep.), Sutter.  
 4 Good Votes: **D, H, I, J.**  
 4 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, F.**  
 Absent 2 roll calls: **B, G.**

VICINI, C. P. (Dem.), Amador.  
 2 Good Votes: **B, H.**  
 7 Bad Votes: **A, C, E, F, G, I, J.**  
 Absent 1 roll call: **D.**

WATSON, GEORGE C. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 1 Good Vote: H.  
 8 Bad Votes: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, I.  
 Absent 1 roll call: J.

WILLIAMS, DAN E. (Rep.), Tuolumne.  
 4 Good Votes: A, B, H, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: E.  
 Absent 5 roll calls: C, D, F, G, I.

WILLS, ROBERT E. (Rep.-Dem.-Prohib.), Imperial.  
 1 Good Vote: I.  
 5 Bad Votes: B, C, D, E, J.  
 Absent 4 roll calls: A, F, G, H.

WISHARD, HARRY A. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 7 Good Votes: A, B, D, F, H, I, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: G.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: C, E.

WRIGHT, HENRY W. (Rep.-Prog.-Dem.), Los Angeles.  
 5 Good Votes: C, D, H, I, J.  
 3 Bad Votes: A, E, F.  
 Absent 2 roll calls: B, G.

YONKIN, HENRY H. (Rep.), Los Angeles.  
 2 Good Votes: B, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: C.  
 Absent 7 roll calls: A, D, E, F, G, H, I.

YOUNG, C. C. (Rep.-Prog.), Alameda.  
 8 Good Votes: A, B, C, D, F, H, I, J.  
 1 Bad Vote: E.  
 Absent 1 roll call: G.

### COMPARATIVE RECORDS OF ASSEMBLYMEN.

Based upon 10 Important "Roll-Calls" on Labor Measures.

		Party.	Good Votes	Bad Votes.	Absent on Roll-Call
Group I.	1. GODSIL, CHARLES WM.....	R.-P.-D.	10	0	0
	2. HARRIS WITTEN W.....	D.	10	0	0
	3. KNIGHT, SAMUEL.....	R.-Ph.	10	0	0
	4. RYAN, JAMES J.....	R.-D.-P.	10	0	0
Group II.	5. BALDWIN, HUGH J.....	R.	9	0	1
	6. GEBHART, LEE .....	R.-P.-D.	9	0	1
	7. HILTON, OSCAR W.....	R.-D.-P.	9	0	1
	8. MARKS, MILTON .....	R.	9	0	1
Group III.	9. BRACKETT, W. R.....	I.	8	0	2
	10. HAYES, D. R.....	R.	8	0	2
	11. HAYES, J. J.....	R.	8	0	2
	12. MITCHELL, THOMAS A....	R.-D.	8	0	2
	13. MORRIS, CLARENCE W....	R.	8	0	2
	14. MORRISON, HARRY F.....	R.-D.	8	0	2
	15. MOUSER, FRANK H.....	R.-D.	8	0	2
	16. YOUNG, C. C.....	R.-P.	8	1	1
Group IV.	17. JOHNSTON, JOHN W.....	R.	7	1	2
	18. COLLINS, WILLIAM M.....	R.-D.	7	0	3
	19. HAWES, FREDERICK C....	R.-P.-D.	7	0	3
	20. BROWN, T. V.....	R.	7	1	2
	21. POLSLEY, HARRY .....	R.-D.-S.	7	1	2
	22. WISHARD, HARRY A.....	R.	7	1	2
	23. AMBROSE, THOMAS L.....	R.-P.-Ph.	7	2	1
	24. ANDERSON, FRANK W.....	R.	7	2	1

Group V.	25.	LYONS, HARRY .....	R.	6	0	4
	26.	MADISON, ROBERT .....	R.	6	1	3
	27.	SATTERWHITE, WILLIAM T.	R.-P.	6	1	3
	28.	CALAHAN, WILLIAM E.....	R.-Ph.	6	2	2
	29.	ROSE, J. LEONARD.....	R.-D.	6	2	2
	30.	BAKER, EDWIN.....	R.	6	3	1
	31.	KYLBERG, H.....	R.	6	3	1
	32.	MATHEWS, A. J.....	R.-D.	6	3	1
Group VI.	33.	PHILLIPS, PETER C.....	R.-D.-Ph.	5	0	5
	34.	REAM, H. B.....	D.	5	0	5
	35.	PRENDERGAST, N. J.....	R.-D.-P.	5	1	4
	36.	GELDER, GEORGE .....	R.-D.-P.	5	2	3
	37.	SMITH, FRANK M.....	R.	5	2	3
	38.	ALLEN, CROMBIE.....	R.-Ph.	5	3	2
	39.	WRIGHT, HENRY W.....	R.-P.-D.	5	3	2
	40.	ARGABRITE, JOSEPH M....	D.-Ph.	5	5	0
	41.	BURKE, JOE C.....	R.	5	5	0
	42.	MERRIAM, FRANK F.....	R.	5	5	0
	43.	PETTIT, MELVIN .....	P.-D.-Ph.	5	5	0
	44.	QUINN, JOHN F.....	D.	5	5	0
Group VII.	45.	EDWARDS, LAWRENCE.....	D.-R.	4	1	5
	46.	PARKER, IVAN H.....	R.-D.-P.	4	1	5
	47.	WILLIAMS, DAN E.....	R.	4	1	5
	48.	FARMER, BERT L.....	R.	4	3	3
	49.	HUDSON, R. H.....	R.-D.-Ph.	4	3	3
	50.	KLINE, CHESTER M.....	R.	4	3	3
	51.	LYON, CHARLES W.....	R.	4	3	3
	52.	HORBACH, ROBERT.....	R.	4	4	2
	53.	TARKE, LOUIS.....	R.	4	4	2
	54.	ASHLEY, GEO. W.....	R.	4	5	1
	55.	MARTIN, WILLIAM J.....	R.-D.-P.	4	5	1
	56.	LONG, W. A.....	R.	4	6	0
Group VIII.	57.	DENNETT, LEWIS L.....	R.	3	3	4
	58.	SHEPHERD, E. R.....	R.	3	4	3
	59.	CARLSON, A. W.....	R.-P.	3	5	2
	60.	FRIEDMAN, LEO. R.....	R.	3	6	1
	61.	HAWSON, HENRY.....	D.	3	6	1
	62.	EKSWARD, FRANK LEONARD	D.	3	7	0
	63.	GOETTING, CHARLES W....	R.	3	7	0
	64.	GREEN, LYMAN.....	R.	3	7	0
Group IX.	65.	ARNERICH, PAUL J.....	R.-D.	2	1	7
	66.	YONKIN, HENRY H.....	R.	2	1	7
	67.	McCRAV, C. C.....	R.	2	4	4
	68.	BRUCK, BISMARCK.....	R.	2	5	3
	69.	JOHNSON, A. BURLINGAME	R.	2	5	3
	70.	BROWN, C. H.....	R.-S.	2	7	2
	71.	GREENE, CARLTON W.....	R.-D.	2	7	1
	72.	VICINI, C. P.....	D.	2	7	1
Group X.	73.	FINLEY, T. R.....	D.	1	5	4
	74.	WILLS, ROBERT E.....	R.-D.-Ph.	1	5	4
	75.	MANNING, J. E.....	R.	1	6	3
	76.	BARTLETT, ALFRED L.....	R.	1	8	1
	77.	BYRNE, HENRY D.....	R.	1	8	1
	78.	WATSON, GEORGE C.....	R.	1	8	1
Group XI.	79.	PETTIS, J. A.....	R.	0	6	4
	80.	DORAN, W. A.....	R.	0	9	1

