The Executive Board of Local 1245 considers the 1960 presidential election to be the most important order of business facing America and organized labor.

The world situation demands that the greatest of care be exercised in the selection of the Executive Branch of the United States government. Our foreign policies can no longer be operated and implemented by the old methods of diplomacy and protocol which have guided the Department of State and the career servants who form the vanguard of America in its world relationships.

Foreign policy includes the attitudes of our President, our Vice-President, and the Cabinet of the Administration. It includes the attitudes of the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. It includes the attitudes of the members of our armed forces.

Perhaps not as directly, our foreign policy includes the attitudes of those Americans who hold foreign investment portfolios, our tourists abroad, and most of all, the majority of the whole American people.

DECISIONS CRITICAL

Advanced communication techniques, technological advances, and the nuclear bomb have shrunk the world so far as our isolated position is concerned. A few moments can well determine the fate of America.

There are some who have ready answers to the great problems faced by America in the Atomic Age. One extreme view holds that we should crawl into our shell and ignore the

(Continued on Page 9)

Local 1245's Executive Board has issued the following statement regarding their agreement with the endorsement of candidates of Senator John F. Kennedy and Senator Lyndon B. Johnson by the AFL-CIO and the I.B.E.W.

The objects of Local 1245 as outlined in its By-Laws oblige the organization "to promote the material, social and intellectual welfare of its members by all lawful means" and among others to "recommend and support candidates for public office who in the opinion of the Executive Board will assist the objectives of this Union or of working men in general."

Each member of the Executive Board was elected and placed in office to exercise his best judgment in behalf of the membership as a whole. In accepting his office, he has pledged himself to provide leadership to effect the objectives and desires of the membership.

The above mandates call for decision and action. It is in this spirit that we have moved to recommend and support the candidates of Senator John F. Kennedy and Senator Lyndon B. Johnson.

The need for intelligent political action has never been greater than now. The next Administration of the United States may be called upon to take actions which could determine the life or death of freedom in the free world; even the fate of the world itself.

The American people must select an administration which can not only meet the challenges of totalitarian Communism around the world but can also strengthen and advance our own society, both socially and economically.

Our studies of the last eight years lead us to believe that we have not met these challenges at home or abroad.

Our defenses are lagging and scientific progress has been behind what it could have been.

Democracy has been extended but positive leadership has been lacking.

We believe that both parties are dedicated to the public good. We have supported the idea of the independence of the Labor Movement from political control. We have urged all to register and vote and to exercise their rightful part in the political life of the community by studying issues and exercising independent judgment in casting their ballots.

We have no preconceived notion that elections can be won because of recommendations by leadership. Each voter will cast his ballot based on his own beliefs. We would not have it any other way. It is, however, our duty to report our findings both as to platforms and candidates.

We are placing our analysis of those things which we feel are differences between the Presidential candidates and the programs upon which they will run in our newspaper so you may judge for yourself.

We believe the contrast is sharp and clear. It is therefore our considered judgment that we should support the endorsement of AFL-CIO and I.B.E.W. We concur in the AFL-CIO pronouncement: "the election of John Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson as President and Vice President respectively is in the best interest of the United States and of the Labor Movement and we urge our members to give them full and unstinting support."

Talks Underway on Clerical Progression

Representatives of the Union and the P.G.&E. reached a tentative agreement on Lines of Progression for the Central Accounting Department of General Office at a meeting on September 28.

The final agreement will be contained in a Letter of Understanding between the two parties. Effective date for the agreement will be October 1, 1960.

The next meeting which will negotiate Lines of Progression for the Stores Division Clerical Employees has been tentatively set for Tuesday, October 23. The various Clerical Departments will be considered in this order.

Following agreement on Stores Division the parties will negotiate on the Power Bureau, Domestic and Commercial Accounting Bureau (both in General Office) and the Geographic Divisions.

Serving on the Committee for the Union were Florence White, Kathleen O'Rourke and John Morgan from the Central Accounting Department, Assistant Business Manager L. L. Mitchell and Business Representative Norman Amundson. Representing the Company were the Assistant Manager of Industrial Relations Vera J. Thompson, L. W. Bonbright and Robert F. Cheary, Personnel Manager, General Office.
The basic principles of our Government were shaped by the pioneers of this nation. The ideas formed the basis for two of the greatest documents on people's rights in world history.

One, the Declaration of Independence, enunciated broad principles of government and the second, the Constitution of the United States of America, was to establish the form of government.

During the drafting of the Constitution, two divergent political parties were formed by the representatives designated to perform this task.

One supported the idea of a government run and controlled by an aristocratic monarch who would select his government, and the people, the lower class, the poor, would have no say. The other believed that government should belong to the people and re-emphasized the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

Two famous men in our history have become symbols of these factions because of their leadership in the cause they advocated. Oddly enough, the cause of the landed and rich was led by a poor man, Alexander Hamilton, and the cause of the common man by a wealthy landowner, Thomas Jefferson.

Hamilton, foreign born and arriving in the Colonies almost on the eve of the Revolution, had shared the experiences of the colonists and failed to understand the democracy of colonial and frontier life. His training and education were formal, his views were formal. His political beliefs were predicated on the strength of money and the belief that possession of money and property was the mark of a true gentleman.

Jefferson, being a son of pioneers, grew up with the spirit of democracy. His training and education were in law and philosophy. His experiences with colonial life dictated his philosophy. He had no confidence in the integrity of the self-control and the good judgment of his friends and associates among the common people of his day.

The issues in these great debates were not merely ones of economic abstraction; the litmus test of the Declaration epoch were full of discussions on class rights and economic interests. It is with this background of debate that the question of money and property is the object of the debate.
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NEW ORGANIZING STEPS ARE TAKEN

Local Union 1245 is currently involved in two petitions pending before the National Labor Relations Board and is seeking affiliation with the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local Union 465, San Francisco. The first case involves the With assistance of Local Union 1245 members employed by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company in the City of Eureka, the Board will be hearing testimony from local union and company representatives. The second case involves the representation of employees of the Sonoma County Water Agency in the City of Santa Rosa. The Board will be hearing testimony from union and company representatives on September 15, 1960.

A 5 per cent general wage increase, effective September 1, 1960, was granted to Local Union 1245 members employed by the State of California in the City of Eureka. The City Council finally passed this year's salary ordinance. The City Council's action came on a 6 to 3 vote to grant 5 per cent increases. The City's workforce, which increased by 5.7 per cent in 1960, is rising faster in the City of Eureka than in the State of California as a whole.

EAST BAY MUNI'S GRANT 5% RAISE

The City Council of Alameda has granted a 5 per cent general wage increase to be effective September 1, 1960. The increase was granted to members of Local Union 1245, representing employees of the City of Alameda. The City's workforce, which increased by 5.7 per cent in 1960, is rising faster in the City of Alameda than in the State of California as a whole.

POLITICS

Bertha—"I heard your boy friend is very polite." Gertie—"Oh, yes. He has excellent manners. Every time I drop something, he kicks it over to me, so I can make it through the exam."

ISABELLE MAJORS

LONG BEACH MEET SHAPES PROPOSALS TO SO. CAL ED.

On September 17 and 18, Long Beach was the scene of a two-day meeting of the Policy Committee of Local 47, I.B.E.W., which represents the majority of the employees of the Southern California Edison Company.

The twenty Policy Committee meetings took the Unit recommendations for bargaining and worked them into a package which will be proposed to Edison in forthcoming negotiations.

President Don Bouchard chaired the meeting and Business Manager Bob Bobo, who served as consultant in the difficult chore of selecting major points, was in attendance at more than 100 separate Unit proposals.

Henry M. Conover, Director of Labor Relations, I.B.E.W., keynoted the meeting with an excellent analysis of general economic conditions and a comparison of the electric power industry as it concerns the wages and conditions of employees. Presenting the Board's views to Conover, is rising in the power industry is not the national average, and profits are still growing so that ability to pay wage increases is further provided, good working conditions, is un

SACO TRANSIT ACCORD REACHED

Improved sick leave provisions and a 4 per cent general wage increase to be effective September 15, 1960 were granted to Local 1245 members employed in the city of Eureka. The Board of Directors of the Sago Transit Company in Eureka voted to accept results of negotiations. Wages were increased from 7c to 11c per hour, with the new rates being among the highest in the transit industry. Representing Local 1245 in negotiations were Robert W. Cahoon, Business Representative and Assistant Business Manager Frank Kaznowski of the City of Eureka. The City of Eureka has requested the Board to work them into a package to present to the Edison Board of Directors for consideration.

The Policy Committee's decision on the Edison proposals is expected to be announced in the near future.
In a unilateral action, which clearly indicates the need for legislation guaranteeing the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining to employees of publicly owned utilities, the Board of Directors of the Statewide Municipal Utility Districts (S.M.U.D.) authorized a 20% hike for all weekly rated employees in an amount equal to 4 1/2% per cent while applying a 5.06% per cent increase to clerical and supervised employees. The proposed increase will be effective August 1, 1960. The proposal was received by the Union and was referred to the Board of Directors for action. However, the facts presented were apparently ignored when they took the action they did.

On June 3, 1960, the Union's proposals, with respect to improved working conditions and fringe benefits affecting certain classes of employees, were submitted to the District. Receipt of these proposals on June 6th and a meeting between the parties was arranged for July 5th. Subsequent meetings were held on July 9th and 20th and August 5th. The last was the undesignated meeting of August 2nd; the District reserved the right to notify employees sooner of its decision. The Union requested the District to survey the costs of including: (1) an increase of 50c in August 1 and 2. During the period, employees, were submitted to the proposals, with respect to employment, job rotation and safety personnel. Local Union 1245's Committee, that the membership was the District's offer. However, in rejecting the District's offer, the membership voted by secret ballot, voting 4 1/2 per cent increase for weekly rated employees. The proposals of Directors to protest this future considerations by the District. Receipt of these proposals, with respect to implantation of job rotation and safety personnel. Local Union 1245's Committee, that the membership was the District's offer. Having arrived at what was indicated by both parties. The Union did not object with respect to total and permanent disability coverage in the group life insurance program — such proposals, with respect to implantation of job rotation and safety personnel. Local Union 1245's Committee, that the membership was the District's offer. Having arrived at what was indicated by both parties. Before accepting the 4 1/2 per cent increase to office and supervisorial employees, the Union asked the following question: "Who decided: (1) Establishment of a Consumer Council with the Governor.

A meeting at which Mr. Ronald T. Weakley, was held on August 17. While no agreement was reached, some movement was indicated by both parties. The Union offered a 4 1/2 per cent increase for those employees who were under 15 years of age. The District would only match 50c and 75c, a 4 per cent general wage increase for weekly rated employees. The District reserved the right to adjust 2.5 per cent increase.

REJECT UNANIMOUSLY The resolutions submitted to the Union by the Board of Directors on August 3rd were unanimously rejected by the Union, voting by secret ballot, with the following negative vote: 'Voting was 4 1/2 per cent increase for weekly rated employees. The proposal was rejected 20 to 19, 100% —weekly rated employees. The public employees. The proposals were accepted, but not adjusted 20 to 19, 100% —weekly rated employees. The public employees. The proposals were rejected, but not adjusted.

Five resolutions, with respect to the following:

1. To require the Board of Directors to pay all costs of filing a grievance in the form of payroll deduction of Union dues and fees only. The District would not agree to the proposal.

2. To require the District to pay for the costs of payroll deduction of Union dues, this same clause was included in the proposal. However, in rejecting the District's offer it was 籐 determined that it be reiterated in view of the fact that the District reserved the right to adjust 2.5 per cent increase for those employees who were under 15 years of age. The District would only match 50c and 75c, a 4 per cent general wage increase for weekly rated employees. The District reserved the right to adjust 2.5 per cent increase.

3. To consider the District's offer in the form of payroll deduction of Union dues and fees only. The District would not agree to the proposal.

4. To adjust 4 1/2 per cent increase for weekly rated employees. Before accepting the 4 1/2 per cent increase to office and supervisorial employees, the Union asked the following question: "Is the District's offer unacceptable?"

5. To require the District to pay all costs incurred in the form of payroll deduction of Union dues and fees only. The District would not agree to the proposal.

The District's offer was based on the District's proposal for the future. The Union, voting by secret ballot, decided the District's offer was unacceptable. The District would not agree to the proposal. Before accepting the 4 1/2 per cent increase to office and supervisorial employees, the Union asked the following question: "Is the District's offer unacceptable?"

The District would not agree to the proposal. Every Member

Public Employee Groups Gather In Sacramento

The weekend prior to the California Labor Federation Convention found representatives from unions throughout the State, attending the meeting in Sacramento, as they make their plans for the future.

The Public Employees Council of California, whose purpose it is to consolidate and unify the efforts of the constituent organizations in the preservation and retention of the present economic gains and advance the improvement of the working conditions, including hours of work, salary and wage rates, retirement benefits, leaves and vacations. The public employees, agreed that the State should be enlarged to retain the rights of self-organization and collective bargaining at the next session of the California State Legislature. To this end, a resolution of the Board of Directors was called for the first weekend in December to be adopted. The resolution was adopted by a comprehensive and coordinated legislative program. Roy D. McBride, Chairman of S.M.U.D. Unit No. 1245, was elected as President for Office No. 5, which covers the Bay Area Counties. Roy D. McBride, Chairman of S.M.U.D. Unit No. 1245, was elected as President for Office No. 5, which covers the Bay Area Counties. Roy D. McBride, Chairman of S.M.U.D. Unit No. 1245, was elected as President for Office No. 5, which covers the Bay Area Counties. Roy D. McBride, Chairman of S.M.U.D. Unit No. 1245, was elected as President for Office No. 5, which covers the Bay Area Counties.
Special Feature – Grievance Processing

Grievance Steps
Give Life Value
To Job Contract

Filibuster policy, as established by the Federal Government and the State of California, is that collective bargaining is the best method of settling differences between labor and management over hours, wages and working conditions.

To bargain collectively is the mutual obligation of the parties to meet and confer in good faith on the negotiations of an agreement or any question thereunder and to prepare such agreements in the form of a written document.

What is a collective bargaining agreement? It represents the minimum the union is willing to accept and the maximum the company is willing to give. It is a compromise between the parties and is an instrument to be used as a guide in the settlement of differences that arise between the parties. Except in a few instances, it is not absolute with respect to its provisions. As an example, the job bidding provisions leave much to the discretion of the parties involved.

It is a legal document subject to interpretation by the parties through the grievance procedures and arbitrations. The decisions are enforceable at law and the parties are legally bound by statute to carry out its provisions. Wages and certain other features are enforceable by the labor commissioner and certain others by Federal courts or local authority.

It is apparent then that the grievance procedure and its results become as significant as the process by which the original provisions were developed.

In order to promote a better understanding of its value and the need for support of those involved in the process, we have developed this special feature. In so doing, we wish to pay tribute to the hundreds of loyal members whose devotion to the ideals of unionism have caused them to carry out their jobs without compensation or hope of reward beyond that of knowing they have served their fellow workers.

Steward Is Key to Good Conditions

In the collective bargaining agreement are set forth the rules which govern the working life of every person covered by that agreement. The term which we use to define these rules more specifically is "wages, hours and working conditions."

Whether these rules will be complied with or become just a scrap of paper is dependent upon the Steward. His primary job and the reason the Business Manager appoints him is to "enforce the contract." He has other responsibilities such as organizing, but his first duty is to the members who are covered by that agreement.

The difficulty of his task will depend upon many things. The attitude of the department, the amount of cooperation he gets from fellow members, the complexities of his job situation in terms of shift work, overtime, special assignments, are all items which will contribute to the ease or difficulty of his performance as a Steward "SETTLE IT EARLY."

One fact has developed over the years as unions and companies have become more experienced in industrial relations – the best place to settle a grievance is between the Steward and the foreman or supervisor. Settling grievances at this level requires a supervisor who is willing to recognize the authority which the Steward is granted by the Business Manager, and a Steward who is aware of the responsibilities which go with that authority.

A Steward must be able to sort out from the countless complaints and gripes which he hears, those issues which are real grievances. These are the issues which he must present to the supervisor. Experienced and capable Stewards will present a factual case based on a record of what actually happened. They know that rumors, hearsay, "take this up, but don't mention my name," and personality clashes, are not longer grievances.

Every day, in the vast jurisdiction of our Local, grievances are being taken up by Stewards and are being settled at this first level of the Grievance Procedure. A few of these grievances, however, are being settled at this level and are gone higher.

SOME GO HIGHER

Sometimes after a thorough discussion of the problem, the Steward and supervisor realize that they have a fundamental disagreement. Then it is necessary for the Steward to "formalize" the grievance by putting it into written form. He does this by gathering all his notes and other information and filling out a Grievance Form. On this form, he must state in writing the facts which the grievance is based upon and the corrective action which he wants the Company to take.

Under our present agreement, this written grievance must be answered by the Company in writing – in five days. At this point, when he receives the Company answer, the Steward must consult with his Business Representative or the Union. A decision must be made on whether the Union will go to the next step in the Procedure – the Local Investigating Committee.-

A Grievance is formalized at this time and any further discussion involving the employee's qualifications – promotion or transfer, demotion or discipline – the grievance goes to the next meeting of the Joint Grievance Committee.

In discharge cases and for cases involving an employee's qualifications – promotion or transfer, demotion or discipline – the grievance goes to the Joint Grievance Committee.

If the Division Joint Grievance Committee cannot agree, the grievance is referred to the System-wide Review Committee. This body may hold hearings or may even return the matter to the Joint Grievance Committee for further investigation and consideration. If the Review Committee reaches a settlement, the grievance must be referred to a third party.

The grievance is referred to Arbitration shortly after the Company and Union Members of the Review Committee realize they cannot agree and exchange their differing opinions on the matter.

The Arbitrator's decision in final and binding upon the parties.
The Division Grievance Committee

17 Area Grievance Units, From Kern to Eureka, Meet Monthly

Every month from Bakersfield north, the seventeen grievance units meet to discuss and settle at the local level or from the Local Union, one of them to represent Clerical Employees and one to represent Physical Employees and one to represent the General Construction Department which meets in San Francisco.

Geographic Division Joint Grievance Committee consists of four members appointed by the General Office in Emeryville, General Office in San Francisco, Pipeline Operations and members in Rohnert Park and the General Construction Department which meets in San Francisco.

At their meetings the Committee determines which cases are to be settled at the Division Headquarters. In addition, the Committee conducts a hearing or investigation on matters which are to come up during the next session with the Company representatives. Employee members of the Committee are allowed time off with pay to attend the meetings.

TIME AND EFFORT
Membership on the Grievance Committee requires a considerable expenditure of time and effort. A complete and thorough knowledge of the Agreement must be acquired, plus an understanding of Job Definitions and Lines of Progression. Similar cases which have been processed previously must be considered before new requirements must be kept. Some knowledge of related areas in Industrial Relations such as Labor Law and Arbitration procedures is of great assistance in all of this. The Business Representative is available to assist the Committee to adequately perform its functions.

A position on the Grievance Committee carries with it a responsibility to the Members of the Union in the area covered. Due to its importance the Business Manager attempts to select the best people he can find—members whom he knows are devoted to the cause of Unionism and the welfare of their fellow members. It is a distinct honor to serve on this committee.

Local Investigating Committee Acts on Cases at the Job Level

In 1952 the grievance procedure was revised to establish two new processes. One was the elimination of the step calling for the hearing before the Personnel Manager and the creation of an expanded Review Committee. The other was the establishment of an Investigating Committee to process cases which affected the status of the employees.

The purpose of the Committee is to speed up the disposition of cases where an immediate investigation of the facts concerning qualifications for promotion or transfer, or reason for discipline, demotion or discharge is required. The Committee is composed of one member from the Union and one from the Company and attempts to settle cases in close to the job level as possible. These cases are the most difficult and time-consuming of all cases handled under the grievance procedure.

In general, the burden of writing, together with his reasons for the position, using whatever arguments he believes relative to the case. These statements, together with the evidence obtained, are referred to the Division Grievance Committee for its study and decision.

In our last negotiations, various time limits for processing these kinds of grievances were established. In discharge cases, a separation was made and shorter time limits were established, together with provisions for a special meeting of the Division Grievance Committee in certain instances. This was done to provide a fair and speedy determination of these cases so that the affected employee could more readily determine his future. In discharge cases, the decision on the disposition of pensions, contributions, stock purchases, unemployment insurance, etc., become more pressing as time runs.

This Committee should be given the full cooperation of both employees and management. Its investigations call for interviews with persons who may shed light on the case. Those who may be interviewed should answer all questions honestly and straightforwardly so that a proper determination of the facts can be made.

In their eight years of operation, the local Investigating Committees have settled many cases and have become an important part of grievance processing.

The East Bay Grievance Committee meets at breakfast two days in October. They will discuss at the meeting. Left to right are "Nick" Garcia, Lineman, John Wilden, Business Representative, Bill Myers, Service Operator, Joan Byun, PBX Operator 'A', and Mel Robbins, Electrician, Steam Department.
Local 1245's System Review Committee

"Higher Court' Disposes of 213 Top Grievances in Eight Years

The System Review Committee handles all cases which cannot be resolved by the lower level grievance procedure within the division.

This Committee, three Union members and three Company members, is charged with the responsibility of arriving at a decision on the cases referred to it based upon the record submitted by the parties.
Voluntary arbitration of disputes arising out of a collective bargaining agreement has been accepted almost universally by both labor and management. It is many times considered a part of the collective bargaining field. It is many times thought to be synonymous with surrender, but many times considered a part of the collective bargaining process. It is none of these and is a separate and distinct process in the field of industrial relations.

A precise definition of arbitration by J. Noble Braden of the American Arbitration Society is this: “Arbitration is the reference of a dispute by voluntary agreement of the parties to an impartial person for determination on the basis of evidence and arguments presented by the parties who agree in advance to accept the decision of the arbitrator as final and binding.”

A JUDICIAL PROCESS
A collective bargaining agreement is actually a judicial process and the arbitrator is the judge of the case. The parties present their evidence, witnesses, exhibits or documents and each side is permitted to cross examine the evidence of the other. Upon the evidence and arguments advanced by each side, the arbitrator makes a decision, and the arbitrator’s decision is binding.

The parties are bound by voluntary agreement to abide by the decision. There are two fields of labor arbitration:

1. Collective bargaining disputes.
2. Contract interpretation disputes.

Collective bargaining disputes are disputes as to what shall be the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. If the union and the employer cannot reach agreement, the collective bargaining agreement is nullified, instead of a strike or other action they ask an arbitrator to settle the issue. Our contract bargaining disputes are generally partisan and act as judges of their own choosing.

Contract interpretation disputes involve the questions of interpretation of the terms of the collective bargaining agreement. Precedents and other interpretations of arbitration boards are cited and an opinion on the case together with the decision rendered is the final and the case is settled.

The arbitrator’s opinion comes very important for here he sets forth the basis for the decision and what he says can have broad implications regarding parallel cases or companion clauses of the agreement.

PREPARATION OF CASE
The arbitrator then using all the data available will write an opinion on the case together with the decision rendered. This will then be discussed in an executive session of the arbitration board where both sides can discuss it. When a majority of the board has reached agreement, the decision becomes final and the case is settled.

The arbitrator’s opinion becomes very important for here he sets forth the basis for the decision and what he says can have broad implications regarding parallel cases or companion clauses of the agreement.

The arbitrator’s opinion becomes very important for here he sets forth the basis for the decision and what he says can have broad implications regarding parallel cases or companion clauses of the agreement.

PREPARATION OF CASE
Preparation of case for arbitration must be thorough and complete. The party preparing the case must prepare the previous grievance steps that the company must have taken before the grievance process is referred to the arbitrator. The previous grievance steps guarantee parties in good faith have tried to settle the dispute before it was referred to an arbitrator. The grievance process is the only alternative to private warfare—the arbitral process.
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CALIF. LABOR FED IN BALLOT STAND

Delegates to the Third Convention of the California Labor Federation meeting in Sacramento during the week of August 15-20 reelected their top officers, continued their strong opposition to the $1 3/4 billion water proposal, as set forth in Proposition #1, and voted over a comprehensive and positive program of action for the next two years.

Returned to office by acclamation was Thomas L. Pitts, Executive Secretary-Treasurer, together with President Albin J. Grunh and General Vice President Manuel Dias.

The delegates, following a lengthy floor debate, voted overwhelmingly to oppose Proposition #1.

Frank Melfe

Brother Melfe's experience with the old nonunion condition convinces him that those who have not seen what the Union has done for them through the years. He knows what conditions existed at the old Fresno Gas Manufacturing Plant in those days. He fired the boilers there for several years.

Before he started with PG&E in 1928, he was in the Gas Division of B.C. Electric in Canada. He has also worked for a time in the Pennsylvania, coming over from Italy, Italy at the age of 15.

Shop Steward McCauley wishes to thank Brother Melfe for his hard-won experience and advice. All his brothers join in wishing Frank and his wife many years of rest and relaxation. Frank, himself intends to catch up on his fishing and gardening together. Mr. and Mrs. Melfe probably plan to indulge in spending their grandchildren a little also.

HERR SIKE

30 YEARS IN 1245—HONOR TWO RETIRING

Two retiring members with over thirty years of membership in Local 1245, were honored at a retirement dinner at the Italian Valley in Salinas on August 14.

Brother Art Johnson, Hole Digger Operator in Salinas, was initiated on June 1, 1946. Brother Herb Sikes, Electric Meterman, Salinas, joined the Executive Council on March 2, 1942.

At the present time, Brother Johnson is recuperating from a serious lung operation. Before long, however, he informs us that he'll be down on the beach enjoying his favorite sport—surf fishing.

The following people were welcomed into membership in Local 1245 during the month of August.

**WELCOME!**

Brother Sikes intends to do something about the acre of land which surrounds his home in Pruneda. Herb is well known in the Salinas area for the many years he spent teaching gymastics to youngsters around Salinas. Many adults in Salinas were once his pupils and remember his devotion to physical fitness.

Officers and members of Local 1245 hold Business Representative Spike Ensel, who prepared guns and scrolls to Brothers Johnson and Sikes, in extending best wishes for many happy years of retired life.

Ken - Nix, Decades, T-V Tops

Groups in hundreds of Northern California communities are planning television - Watching Parties centered, rallying for the presidential campaign.

The Kennedy - Nixon TV debates, continuing throughout the country, have attracted unprecedented national interest, as do each of Senator John F. Kennedy's television appearances.

The next TV date for the Democratic candidate will be an informal occasion. On Thursday, Sept. 29, Republican Senator Barry Goldwater will pay a half-hour visit to his old home in Sonora. Kennedy will present the ticket on the next day.

Senators Kennedy will appear on the "Meet the Press" on Sunday, September 25, for an extensive program of time in California, 3 p.m. over NBC stations and affiliates. Channels 4, S.F. (Channel 3, Sacramento; Channel 10, San Jose; Channel 6, Reno, and Channel 24, Fresno.)

Sunday, October 10, Senator Kennedy is scheduled to "Meet the Nation" on the Columbia network. The next broadcast time in California, 6 p.m., Friday, October 21, 10 to 1 p.m.

The Kennedy - Nixon debates are carried by all major TV networks and stations at key radio in many localities. The dates and hours for the remaining debates are Friday, October 7, 7 to 8:30 p.m.; October 8, 8:30 to 10 p.m.

The October 7 program will be in the form of a news conference. Both candidates will be on the air with questions from professional newsmen. On Oct. 13, Senators Kennedy and Vice-President Nixon will hold a continental news conference in New York and in Republican California.

The final debate will take the same form as the first one on Sept. 28. The candidates will speak for eight minutes, then there will be a half-minute question from a panel of newsmen. Each answer will be limited to two and one-half minutes, and the opponents will have two and one-half minutes to meet each answer. Finally, each candidate will have a three-minute clos ing statement.

Business Representative Scott Wedsworth recently held a meeting of the clerical stewards in the Fresno area to discuss the executive and business departments of the company in connection with the Centralization of San Joaquin Accounting which would occur. Present at the meeting from left to right were: Eleanor Kilgore, Cliff Nugent, Bill Harrem, John Strode, the late Kaufmann, Marie Paul, Scott Wedsworth, Bus. Rep. Norman Amundson, and Isabelle Mejias.
The following analysis of certain planks of the Republican and Democratic platforms, together with a comparison of the AFL-CIO position made by the Federation's General Board, is only a portion of the 20-page Executive Board program to compare the program of the candidates. The issues, which the Executive Board believed most needed discussion, and some of the fundamental differences are presented here for consideration by the membership. These comparisons cover key domestic and foreign policy issues which are inter-related to federal economic policy.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

AFL-CIO recommendations to both parties stressed the basic importance of steady economic growth. It is necessary because a continuation at this low level will deny proper job opportunities to an ever growing population and place ever greater demands upon our resources. As a result, schools, hospitals, and housing, and every other kind of public service, will remain inadequate in the military might and material resources.

With an adequate rate of economic growth we need neither fear for the future, but we will add dimension to its promise.

We believe it is the obligation of government, and in particular the federal government, to demonstrate every stimulus to bring about the rate of economic growth.

The Republican platform talks about "high priority to vigorous economic growth" and then proceeds to stress its failure. The Democratic platform states unequivocally that it is the federal government's obligation to bring our economy "can and must grow at an average rate of 5 per cent annually" and pledges the next Administration to do just that. An adequate economic growth, with rising wage levels, has not been adequate to cope with rising costs and a missions in the public sector of our national economy.

The Democratic platform states unequivocally that the Democratic Administration has maintained an average rate of 5 per cent annually and pledges the next Administration to continue on the present course.

The Republican platform talks about "high priority to vigorous economic growth" and then proceeds to stress its failure. The Democratic platform states unequivocally that it is the federal government's obligation to bring our economy "can and must grow at an average rate of 5 per cent annually" and pledges the next Administration to do just that. An adequate economic growth, with rising wage levels, has not been adequate to cope with rising costs and missions in the public sector of our national economy.

The Democratic platform states unequivocally that the Democratic Administration has maintained an average rate of 5 per cent annually and pledges the next Administration to continue on the present course.
Kennedy Right 92%; Nixon 13%

"Let's look at the record" is a familiar expression in American politics, but the records for the Kennedy, Nixon campaign are as clean as they come.

The reason: for the first time both presidential candidates have extensive voting records by which the people might judge how well they have done in the past, not just before.

Mr. John F. Kennedy and Vice-President Richard M. Nixon both are "on the record" as a result of their experience in Congress.

Both men launched their public service when they were elected to the Senate in 1950 and Kennedy moved to the upper chamber in 1952. Nixon became vice-president in 1953 and, in his capacity as providing officer of the Senate, has voted only in case of a tie.

Against this background, the Committee on Political Education has selected 155 key votes on such issues as civil right, education, consumer welfare, labor, housing, foreign policy and so on.

The candidates were judged by labor's position.

Kennedy, on these key votes, was shown to have voted "right" a total of 150 times and "wrong" just twice. Nixon was shown to have cast 10 "right" votes and 59 "wrong" votes. On the COPE scorecard, Kennedy was 96.1 percent "right" compared to Nixon's 13 percent.

The voting records enable "profiles" of each candidate to be developed from the way he voted over a period of time on a broad range of issues. The records also allow a direct comparison of the two men on specific votes. In addition, Nixon can be judged on all 155 of the tie-breaking votes he cast while presiding over the Senate.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Kennedy's record showed 12 "right" votes and no "wrong" votes. Nixon had five "right" votes and two "wrong" votes on tax loopholes. Kennedy voted to pass the Fair Employment Practices Commission and three times in the Senate in support of efforts to change Rule 22 and curb filibustering. Nixon cast his one key vote to advance the 21-day rule to keep the Rules Committee from bottling up liberal bills.

Nixon cast two "right" and three "wrong" votes. Nixon's "right" votes included support for anti-poll tax bills in the House in 1947 and 1949. His "wrong" vote came when he voted for a voluntary rather than an enforceable FEPC and in twice voting against the 21-day rule.

CONSUMER WELFARE

Kennedy, according to COPE, cast ten key votes in favor of workable controls on prices and rents after World War II and during the Korean emergency. Nixon voted on one such.

Nixon was recorded once in favor and seven times against controlling inflation. He was absent on two key votes.

On the natural gas issue, Kennedy cast five key votes against reducing federal control over the prices charged by natural gas companies, COPE noted. Nixon voted "wrong" once and was absent once.

Kennedy and Nixon are compared easily in the consumer field. On price and rent control votes when they were congressmen, there were five instances, when both were present and voting. All five times, according to [source], to extend rent control in light of the Korean emergency—Kennedy voted "right" and Nixon voted "wrong."

EDUCATION

Kennedy has had seven chances to vote on education. Six times he voted in favor of legislation on scholarships, school construction, teacher salaries and schools in defense areas. He was absent once.

Nixon has had two voting opportunities. He voted against aid to education and teacher salaries on one occasion and was absent on the other.

Kennedy and Nixon are separated by a crucial vote which occurred last February. On an amendment which proposed $1.1 billion for school construction and teachers' salaries, Kennedy voted against a tabling motion designed to kill the amendment. The Senate vote ended in a 44 to 44 tie and Nixon then cast the deciding vote to table and kill the amendment.

TAXES

On income taxes, there were seven key votes to test Kennedy. Six times he voted in the interest of low-income taxpayers and he was absent once. Nixon had five opportunities and he voted all five times in favor of higher-bracket taxpayers.

On legislation to close tax loopholes, Kennedy voted "right" four times while Nixon voted five times to preserve the loopholes.

For example, on the oil and gas depletion allowance—the biggest loophole of 1952 was in a senator in a Kennedy "right" vote in voting against an amendment to reduce this allowance. Kennedy in 1958 was "right" in voting in favor of an amendment to reduce the depletion allowance for taxpayers with oil and gas income of over $1 million a year.

When the two men were both in the House, there were five votes on income tax changes. Kennedy was "right" and Nixon "wrong" all five times, as on a 1947 bill to give a 60 percent hike to taxpayers with family of four more than $7,800 in lost income over past six years. Kennedy drew record crowds at union-sponsored functions in day-long campaign tour through Michigan.

In 1958, an amendment to raise public assistance payments to the aged, blind and disabled by about 85 a month died when the Senate vote ended in a 40 to 40 tie. Kennedy was "right" in voting for it. Nixon witheld his tiebreaking vote and the amendment failed for want of a majority.

MINIMUM WAGE

On the one comparative vote, when both men were in the House in 1949, Nixon was "wrong" in voting for an amendment to eliminate 1 million workers from federal wage-hour protection. Kennedy was "right" in voting against the amendment.

LABOR

Kennedy, measured by COPE on 22 key votes, was judged to have voted "right" every time in the interest of working people and union members. Nixon was judged, on 8 key votes confronting him, to have voted "wrong" seven times. He was absent once.

"Nixon has failed to cast a single vote," COPE noted. "for fair labor-management relations legislation, equitable regulation of welfare and pension funds, safeguards for Davis-Bacon wage provisions, adequate unemployment compensation or the relief of chronically-depressed areas."

In a 1947 vote on a bill barred from inflationary wages and the final Taft-Hartley Act, Kennedy voted "right" and Nixon "wrong."

In 1956, Nixon broke a 39 to 39 tie in favor of an amendment to have the prevailing wage on the federal highway construction program determined by state agencies rather than federally. Kennedy was "right" in voting against it.

In 1959, the key Senate vote which sealed the so-called McCarren "bill of rights into the Landrum-Griffith Act ended in a 45 to 45 tie. Kennedy was "right" in voting against it. Nixon then broke the tie in favor of the move.

FOREIGN POLICY

Kennedy and Nixon had nearly identical voting records when both were in the House in the 1947-49 period, COPE reported. Both supported the Marshall Plan, Greek-Turkish aid, United Nations' relief aid and so on. Since then, their records diverge.

Kennedy, with the exception of one vote in 1953 to trim economic aid to Europe, has continued his support of economic and military aid to America's allies, COPE noted.

Nixon, COPE reported, "has voted on both sides of the question." COPE listed Nixon as "wrong" on two especially critical votes—when he voted against a wheat-for-indes bill during the 1954 famine in China, his vote held the Senate down from 192 to 191 a $60 million economic aid-Korea bill in January 1956. Kennedy voted "right" on both of these issues.

Comparison of Kennedy, Nixon Votes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>KENNEDY</th>
<th>NIXON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Policy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration D. P.s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Wage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Powers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidelands</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The votes cast by Kennedy and Vice President Nixon will not add up to the total listed for each subject. Totals include votes for the 1960-62 period when Nixon was in the Senate and Kennedy in the House and the period 1963-65 when Nixon, as Vice President, cast only tie-breaking votes.