Proposition No. 1, better known as the "Governor's Initiative Petition" or the "State Expenditure Limitation Program," is the only measure on the ballot November 6th. The idea of limiting government or state spending is very appealing to the average person. The reason for this appeal being so great is because most people will make the natural assumption that if we limit state spending, our taxes will not continue to go up and up and that they might even go down. Nothing could be better than a tax break during this inflationary, tight money period. Conversely, nothing could be worse than a plan which sounded good, but merely shifted the costs of essential services to the local communities and caused further increases in property taxes and sales taxes by these bodies.

Opposition
Local 1245, the California State AFL-CIO, the League of Women Voters, the League of California Cities, the County Supervisors Association, and many other organizations have come out against Proposition No. 1. Our job is to tell you why Local 1245 recommends a NO vote on Proposition No. 1, and then give you as much information as we can to help you understand our position.

Misleading Information
Whom do you believe? This is the problem the voter faces when he listens to the arguments put out by both sides. They both sound very convincing. Using the same set of figures, they come up with different answers. Why did the Governor make any proposal at all? Why did he make this specific proposal? Why is there opposition to his proposal? What axe does Labor in general, and Local 1245 specifically, have to grind?

Before attempting to answer the above questions, it is necessary that we identify the sources of information used. The main document for study was the analysis made by A. Allen Post, the non-partisan legislative analyst for the State of California. Other sources researched were a report by AFL-CIO economist Arnold Cantor and numerous newspaper articles, etc.

Technical Language
Unless you are a trained economist or accountant, it is likely that you will have difficulty understanding Post's analysis and the appendices. We will attempt to put the information in a form the membership and the general public can understand and relate to.

Post's Reliability
Everyone who watches the news on T.V. and reads the newspapers will recall Governor Reagan's reaction to the analysis. Post was accused of being partisan and incompetent.

Doesn't it seem strange that a man who has worked under four different governors, three Republicans and one Democrat, over the past twenty years as the State's legislative analyst during this entire period, could all of a sudden become incompetent and partisan?

Post's methodology is simple. He has taken the formula, going back in time and applying a formula to known figures, is a common method used by economists and analysts to test a theory. Projecting into the future, if you have mathematical absolutes, is also a common practice.

Examination Results
The introduction to Post's analysis is a blockbuster. He starts out by saying "that although the measure is entitled 'Revenue Control and Tax Reduction' it does not limit state spending."

He then goes on to say that "had this measure been adopted in 1966, the Governor's proposed budget for 1973-74 would have to be reduced by about 2.4 billion or 25.5 percent. Such a reduction would in effect eliminate all of the existing direct property tax relief programs and in addition, require a 30 percent curtailment in State support for local schools."

"Emergency" Loopholes
The initiative calls for a limit on local property tax rates, but these "limits" actually represent a weakening of the limitations provided under existing law. At the present time, only counties may increase property tax

(Continued on Page Six)
**Bargaining Roundup**

**CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC UTILITIES COMPANY (Lassen Division)**
Union is preparing proposals. Union committee consists of Charles Innsley, Ronald M. Stout and Business Representative Dean Cofer.

**CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC UTILITIES COMPANY (Winnebago District)**
Proposals were exchanged with one general bargaining meeting concluded; another meeting scheduled for the very near future. Union's committee consists of Walt Hardenbrook and Business Representative John Stralla.

**TELEPROMPTER OF SANTA MARIA (Clerical)**
No meeting date set at this time. Bargaining will be conducted by Business Representative Mark R. Cook, with committee member Minnie Pinedo.

**STATE TV CABLE**
First meeting is scheduled for October 9, 1973. Union's committee consists of Harvey Van Meter and Business Representative Dean Cofer.

**CITY OF ROSEVILLE**
General bargaining session will be held on October 3, 1973. Union's committee consists of Paul Jefferson and Business Representative Edward A. Fortier.

**SACRAMENTO MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT**
Interim bargaining has been progressing on meal allowances. Union's committee consists of Richard L. Daugherty, R. A. Beede and Business Representative Ken Larson.

**LINDMORE IRRIGATION DISTRICT**
Complete

**MEREDITH IRRIGATION DISTRICT**
Five meetings have been held. Another meeting on general bargaining will be held within the next two weeks. Union's committee consists of Charles C. Mancebo, Robert Olivarez, Charlie Winder and Business Representative John T. McMannis.

**NEVADA UTILITIES DISTRICT**
Union's committee has met twice with the District's labor committee. Will meet again on October 23, 1973. Union's committee consists of Betty Laird, Kent Paseco, William Bogdanoff, Fred Mildred and Business Representative Edward A. Fortier.

**OAKDALE IRRIGATION DISTRICT**
Union's committee has met with the Employer's joint committee. Date has not set at this time. Union's committee consists of Ed Koch, Joe Mendoza and Business Representative Peter R. Dutton.

**PLACER COUNTY WATER AGENCY**
A general bargaining meeting will be held on October 2, 1973. Union's committee consists of Bob Coolidge and Business Representative Edward A. Fortier.

**THERMOLITO IRRIGATION DISTRICT**
The next general bargaining committee meeting will be held on October 10, 1973. Union's committee consists of Paul F. Washesleki and Business Representative Anthony Morgado.

**TRI-DAM PROJECT**
Have had one meeting to exchange and explain proposals. Future meeting date is not set at this time. Union's committee consists of William Cashman and Business Representative Peter R. Dutton.

**TURLOCK IRRIGATION DISTRICT**
Have had one meeting and have submitted Union's proposals. Next meeting date not set at this time. Union's committee consists of Frank LaChappell, Frank Lucas, Arlin Babb, James Vargo and Business Representative Peter R. Dutton.

**YUBA COUNTY WATER AGENCY**
Membership rejected Agency's proposals. At the present time no meetings are scheduled. Union's committee consists of Don Brown and Business Representative Anthony Morgado.

**PACIFIC GAS TRANSMISSION**
Union's committee consisting of Ed Johnston, Frank Locati, D. Davis, Business Representative Wayne Weaver and Business Manager L. L. Mitchell met the week of September 24th preparing proposals to present to the Company. No date is set for a future meeting at this time.

---

**Unit Reporter Announces East Bay Dinner Dance**

I wish to announce the coming of Local 1245's "class event" of the year. Once again Oakland Unit No. 2311 is preparing for their 3rd Annual Dinner-Dance on November 10, 1973. This year the evening will be held at the new, modern center location—Antonino's, located at 23700 Hesperian Blvd. in Hayward.

The attractive decor of Antonino's will continue the stylish flair of this unit's two previous dinner-dances. The evening will be off to a friendly start with a no host cocktail hour commencing at 6 p.m. At 7:30 p.m., the full course buffet dinner will be served with your choice of ribs or New York tips. And from 9 p.m. until 1 a.m. the music of a quality combo will be available for your dancing pleasure.

All of this: the good food, the friendly atmosphere, and the sound of music, can be yours for $4.50 per person. Tickets will be available throughout the various yards in the East Bay Division.

Unit 2311's Social Club, headed by Leroy Holley, has also requested that the next regular meeting of the Advisory Council be held in conjunction with this year's dinner-dance, so that more of our members can see the inner workings of our Local and, at the same time, enable the officers and staff to acquaint themselves with the brotherhood of the East Bay Division. This year's dinner-dance chairman is Ray Redinger of the Oakland gas dept.

Remember the date . . . Nov. 10th. We'll see you there!

Gary Abrahamson  
Unit Reporter  
No. 2311—Oakland

---

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**
Wage and Contract Committee: General negotiating committee has been at Local Union headquarters in Walnut Creek for the past five days preparing Union's proposals for general bargaining. Proposals were exchanged between Company and Union on October 1, 1973. Union will study Company's proposals and the first meeting with Company will be on October 5, 1973. Union's committee consists of Marvin G. Coleman, Wesley E. Distich, Larry C. Finch, J. L. Dietz, Jack B. Hill*, James McCauley, Roger Kyle, William Manley. Bus. Mgr. M. A. Walters will be Union's spokesman.

The Clerical Cross Hatch subcommittee has been meeting with Company on a continuing basis since November of 1972. This committee consists of Jack B. Hill*, Ed Vallojo*, Gilbert Houston and E. Lloyd Medlin, with Arthur Marks as consultant. (*For continuity of discussions relating to clerical job evaluation problems.) Ass't. Bus. Mgr. L. N. Foss will be Union's spokesman.

**E.E.O.C. TITLE VII COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**

**CONSOLIDATION OF GAS METER SHOPS**
Union's committee met with Company on September 27, 1973. Company will prepare some additional material necessary for Union's committee to study Company's proposals.

**GAS STREET DEPARTMENT**
No change since last report

**MARYSVILLE GAS LOAD CENTER**
No change since last report

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**

---

**Useful Report**

---

**E.E.O.C. TITLE VII COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**
Union is still awaiting Company's answer to Union's proposal. Company explaining Union's proposals. Union's committee consists of Dorothy L. Hill, Betty Sheppard, Terry L. Scott and Roger Stalcup.

**CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA**

---

**MARYSVILLE GAS LOAD CENTER**

---

**CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA**

---

**R3rd Annual Dinner-Dance**

---

**MARYSVILLE GAS LOAD CENTER**

---
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This is a Winter to Save on Fuel and Power

By Sidney Margolius, Consumer Expert for Utility Reporter

This is a year of high costs, and even potential shortage of fuel and electricity in many parts of the country. You have a double reason for practicing maximum economy: your own pocketbook and the national energy shortage.

Nationally, electric rates are at a 30-year high. Gas rates have gone up even more, with the past five years. Utility companies have won some big rate increases the past three years.

In general, your utility bills are affected by (1) the type of lighting fixtures you use; (2) the design and construction of appliance models; and (3) how you use such equipment.

LIGHTING: Higher-watt light bulbs are more efficient than lower-watt. One 100-watt bulb produces more light (1750 lumens) than two 60-watt bulbs (two x 850 lumens or a total of 1700).

For the same wattage, ordinary bulbs (1750 to 1,000 hours life) are more efficient than so-called long-life bulbs which use the long-life bulbs only in hard-to-reach fixtures.

Fluorescent lighting is about three to five times more efficient than incandescent lighting.

WATER HEATERS: These are the most widely-used forms of savings. They are used for almost six years, and of the right size to provide the most efficient recovery. Relative costs may vary in different areas of cheap electricity and where natural gas is cheap (as in the Southwest).

Many electric water heaters in homes are the so-called "builders line" guaranteed for only five years. Builders install these models to save $25 or $30. But these cheaper units have higher standby losses than the ten-year models, the New York State Interdepartmental Fuel and Energy Committee found. The more efficient units soon recover their cost in power saving as well as in increased life.

Avoid overheating water. Laundry needs only 140 degrees at most. Water for on-the-spot hot drinks is less than 120. To save for children's education. Their tax advantage is not as certain as for other uses than children's education. Their tax advantage is not as certain as for other uses than rock records or for other uses than children's education. Their tax advantage is not as certain as for other uses than rock records or for other uses than children's education.

LEDs are one of the most widely-used forms of savings. They are convenient to buy on the pay-roll savings plan, they pay 5½% a year if held to maturity, and have certain tax advantages if held properly for that purpose.

The best use of E bonds is for long-term savings. Some families also buy E bonds for short-term savings as for household goods.

But there is little point to buying E bonds for such temporary purposes.

E bonds pay no interest if cashed within the first six months of purchase; 3% during the following six months of year to one year; 4½% if held one to 1½ years; 4.5 for 1½ to 2 years, which simulates gradual increases thereafter. If you hold them for five years and ten months to maturity, you get the full 5½%.

Thus, for a family in a 20% tax bracket, the E bond 5½% yield can be the equivalent of a taxable 7½%.

In any case, E bond earnings are not subject to state or local income taxes.

Some bond denominations provide more flexibility. If you need cash, you incur less tax liability cashing a smaller bond than a larger one. When you cash in bonds, cash those bought most recently. That way you protect the higher interest being earned by the older bonds, and also defer their greater tax liability.

Since E bonds are dated the month bought, you can gain two months of extra interest by buying at the end of a month and redeeming at the beginning of a suitable month (at the end of a normal interest period).

Children's Savings

Many families use E bonds to save for children's education. Their tax advantage is not as certain here since children usually don't pay taxes anyway. Certainly for an older child who may have to cash the bonds in a year or so, E bonds are not a preferred investment since they do not earn full interest the first couple of years.

E bonds do have the advantage (over cash gifts) of a rate guaranteed to waiting until he cashes the bonds and then reporting that time the total increase in value. The combination of accumulated interest plus his own part-time earnings could put him into a taxable bracket.

Norman M. Phillips read the Utility Reporter and found his membership card number in the September issue of the paper. Brother Phillips is in the Gas Service Department of P.G.&E. in Watsonville, Calif. and we wish to congratulate him on winning the $50.
A meeting of Local 1245 Shop Stewards from the North Bay Area was held at the Holiday Inn on Sept. 21, 1973, at 8:00 p.m. Corb Wheeler, Bus. Rep., reported on the activities of the Stewards and thanked them for their participation. The stewards have filed over 250 grievances so far this year and of that amount 78 have been filed formally. Corb reported that as a result of this activity and the growing knowledge of the contract by the stewards, the members are receiving the full benefits of the contract and membership in the union.

Ken Lohre, Bus. Rep. and Editor of the Utility Reporter, asked for more participation from the membership in their paper, the Utility Reporter. He also reported on the status of the Cross Hatch Committee and commented on the Local's participation in the Electrical Worker's Journal.

Bus. Manager L. L. Mitchell reported on the Local's contribution to the environmental organization and elaborated on the need for this type of program and the problems of ecology and economy. He reported on the activity of the negotiating committees and outlined many of the things which come into play as far as the committees' considerations are concerned, control's, etc. He also reported on the newly approved $500 death benefit for spouses and cautioned the stewards that the plan was not yet in effect and that the members would be notified when everything has been approved.

Brother Mitchell opened the floor for a lively question and answer period. The majority of the stewards' questions centered on the upcoming negotiations. Several stewards raised the question of need for political activity by the members since politics has removed our right to bargain freely.
Steward Education Programs

SAN JOSE STEWARDS MEET

Forty-five Shop Stewards of the San Jose Division, General Construction and Teleprompter met at the Hyatt House Hotel at 10:00 a.m. on Saturday, September 22, 1973 for an all day meeting.

The basic purpose of this meeting was for the stewards' general education on the Occupational Safety Health Act, industrial injury problem and the involvement of governmental agencies and laws within our collective bargaining processes and relationships with employers of our members, as well as updating the stewards on the current progress for the upcoming negotiations with PG&E.

Mr. Donald S. Fischer, Senior Compliance Officer for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration gave an informational and educational presentation on the purpose of the Act, reporting procedures and the responsibilities of employers and employees under the Act. A lively question and answer session followed Mr. Fischer's presentation.

Attorney Frank Brass from the Law Firm of BRUNDAGE, NEYHART, GRODIN & BEESON covered his activities in behalf of Local 1245 members and gave an interesting report on the industrial injury area. He conducted a lengthy question and answer session with the stewards on industrial injury problems and advised them of his assistance and availability on industrial injury information and problems.

Business Manager L. L. Mitchell reported on the current status of the forthcoming bargaining with PG&E and other company and agency bargaining programs this year for Local 1245 members. He commented on the difficulties our negotiating committees will face this year in order to be in compliance with governmental regulations and laws, and still provide relief for our members' over-burdened pockets and improve their benefit programs and working conditions.

Roger Stalcup, member of Local 1245's E.E.O.C. Compliance Committee, gave a current status report of his committee's activities and the effect on our seniority systems in order to bring them into compliance with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Jack Hill reported on the current status of discussions with PG&E on the Clerical Grade Index and Cross-Hatch systems. He stated that after three years of discussions with PG&E on this problem, he is beginning to see a light at the end of the tunnel.

Other comments on points of interest were covered by Business Manager L. L. Mitchell, Business Representative Orv Owen and Vice President C. P. "Red" Hennessy, with assistance from Business Representatives Bob Storrs, Ken Nata and Ken Lohre.

Shown above are some of the San Jose Division area Shop Stewards who gave up a Saturday to attend the meeting.
Vote No on Prop. No. 1
(Continued from Page One)

rates and this is only for emergencies. Increases above 1% must be approved by the Governor and the Controller.

Arnold A. Ziffel of Economic Resources notes that "under the Governor’s proposal the local property tax rates could be increased by the legislature above the maximum ‘to allow for special circumstances creating hardships.’ Moreover, any local government (except school districts) by a four-fifths vote of its governing body could be permitted to increase property tax rates to pay for ‘emergency situations.’

“As a result, these provisions make it easier for local governments to increase property taxes. As important, other provisions would make it necessary for them to do so in order to keep the local government units (who bear the consequences of dismantled public programs).

“Specifically, under the proposal, if the costs of a federal program are transferred or imposed upon the local government, local tax rates may be increased commensurately. This does not appear to affect the State revenue limitation. Therefore, the burden of funding any cuts in federal aid will fall on local governments.

“Moreover, roughly two-thirds of the State’s revenue currently goes to aid the localities. Any cut-back in federal grants-in-aid to the State will, therefore, affect the amount of money available for aiding local government units, thus local governments are twice damned.”

Regressive Taxation

In this day and age, the attitude of the public towards taxes and government is such that it is difficult to find anyone interested in discussing any type of tax, whether it be regressive or progressive in nature. People are apathetic about the idea of paying “more than their share” that any taxation is considered too much.

Setting “attitudes” aside for the moment with a realization that some form of taxation is necessary, let us discuss the fairest method of taxation.

The progressive income tax system is considered to be the fairest form of taxation. It is based on the “ability to pay.” The more you make the more you pay.

Sales tax and property tax are considered regressive forms of taxation. The sales tax is regressive because low income groups, by necessity, spend more of their incomes on the necessities of life.

Residential property taxes are more regressive and take over 4.3 percent of the annual incomes of persons earning $4,000 or less, compared to only 2.2 percent of the income of persons earning between $50,000 and $100,000.

The potential effect of the proposed “State Expenditure Limitation Program” sounds to many in direct reductions in sales and property tax simply because these increases would be easier to implement. The governing board of any local government unit, except a school district, by a four-fifths vote could increase the maximum tax rate in an “emergency situation.” Even if you cut in half the “projected shortage of funds predicted by A. Allen Post, it is easy to envision local emergencies all over the State when the State support is withheld due to lack of funds.

It appears as though we are looking at just another tax shift instead of real tax reform and that this shift is going to hurt the little guy, John Q. Worker (namely you and me), and help the rich “fat cats” even more.

Could Quality Education Continue?

The attitude reflected at the polls regarding school bond elections is understandable and yet alarming. If Proposition No. 1 should pass and the trend towards greater reliance on local property taxes is increased, the inequities under which our youth are now being raised will only increase.

It could be the “beginning of the end” of public education as we know it today. It was not too many years ago that only the children of the affluent went to school. History tells us of the dangers of returning to a two-class (rich and poor) society. While no one can argue that education in one of our State universities is not a good buy, the costs have already risen to the point of excluding a person of modest means from getting higher education due to lack of funds. Public education was and is the cornerstone of a free and democratic system of government. The existence of the middle class in America can be in large part attributed to our system of public education: they go hand in hand. The high standard of living which we enjoy today is tied directly into the existence of a middle class. We can go on and on talking together free education and our present form of government and way of life, and anything which has the potential of threatening “free” education as we know it today must be stopped.

No one would willingly and knowingly allow the politicians to take away our rights, educational or otherwise, but we might possibly give them up in our anger over unfair taxation.

There is no intent to imply that Proposition No. 1 is a threat to the “free world,” but it does in a small way threaten the stability of one of the most important institutions in our society, and specifically in the State of California.

Why Was a Proposal Made?

The Governor and the Legislature have been promising us tax reform for years and the Governor feels that Proposition No. 1 satisfies these promises.

The proposal was made in the form of an initiative petition because the Legislature would not approve the Governor’s plan. The proponents of Proposition No. 1 will probably tell you that the position to Proposition No. 1 is strictly a bi-partisan act on the part of the Democrats in the Assembly and the Senate.

The Democrats respond that their opposition is not based on partisanship politics, but instead on the flaws and basic concepts contained in the initiative petition.

Good Parts of Plan Already Enacted

The Legislature passed and the Governor signed a bill delaying a one cent increase in the State sales tax until April 1, 1975. The Legislature also enacted a variable one-time income tax credit, a measure which was also contained in the initiative petition.

Formula Obsolet

Because the Legislature enacted the above mentioned pieces of legislation, the formula for computing the reduction in State expenditures is already obsolete. The delay in sales tax will reduce State revenues for 1973-74 by $316,000,000.

Local 1245’s Opposition

Local 1245 is joining with the State AFL-CIO and many other organizations in opposing Proposition No. 1. We are doing so because we believe that the plan is dishonest and that we have been misinformed. We believe that this measure would merely shift the burden from the State to the local communities and that it would cause complete fiscal chaos and individual hardship.

We are charged in the Constitution and Bylaws of this Local Union to speak out and advise the membership on legislation which would affect them as citizens and as working men and women. We have always opposed regressive taxation and we will continue to do so. We think an increase in sales and property taxes is inevitable if Proposition No. 1 is passed. We don’t need it.

It is unfortunate that the Governor saw fit to use this very expensive method of trying to shift the tax burden in California. If the taxpayers are going to get stung with an estimated $20,000,000,000 election, it ought to have contained some methods of reform which would close the unfair loopholes which presently exist.

Nothing has been done about laws which still allow the Governor and other millionaires to make hundreds of thousands of dollars in a year and not pay any State taxes.

Nor does Proposition No. 1 do anything about the “Capital Gains” loophole which treats capital gains preferentially by taxing only one-half of any income, will it come to the rich, it will not do much.

There are numerous other loopholes which were not changed by Proposition No. 1. In fact, this 20 million dollar proposition did not close one loophole.

We urge you to do some research on your own and then

VOTE NO ON PROPOSITION No. 1

North Bay Happenings

Numerous members in North Bay are representing I.B.E.W., Local 1245 in Youth Programs. They are performing the type of service that is indeed a credit to the labor movement.

Joe Kauwe, Santa Rosa Shop Steward, is Head Coach of a Sr. Midget Pop Warner Football team in Sebstapol.

Jack Dearing, St. Helena Shop steward, is coaching a Youth Football team in St. Helena.

Bill Wallace of Santa Rosa is in charge of the Boys’ Club in Sebstapol.

Steve Storall of Napa is actively involved in the Youth Recreation Programs in Napa.

Sorry to report that Otto Dean of Vallejo is in disability. Hope to see him well and on his feet soon.

Many thanks to Jim Kopriya for his faithful work on the Division Grievance Committee. He is re-signing as a result of a new job assignment. Job well done, Jim.

Marshall Proschold, North Bay Advisory Councilman, attended the Santa Rosa, Ukiah, Ft. Bragg and Lakeport meetings this month. His presence was greatly appreciated by the membership.

While Schwert of Sohny Tree has agreed to represent the tree trimmers on the Negotiating Committee. Dan is dedicated and will perform in the best interest of the membership. He is a credit to I.B.E.W., Local 1245.

John Schott of Sohny Tree has been appointed as Advisory Councilman for Tree trimmers. John has served as a Shop Steward and on a negotiation committee in the past. I am sure he will help the labor movement.

We would like to welcome Gene Riordan back to work after a brief illness. Gene has proven to be a member well thought of by the membership.

Local 1245 and Lindmore Irrigation District Settle

The members of Local 1245 employed by the Lindmore Irrigation District have ratified the agreement reached at the bargaining table.

A general wage increase of $40.00 a month “across the board” was negotiated. A “high option” for workers was included. The hospitalization plan which will cost the District $7,000 more per month per employee was also negotiated.

The funeral leave section was changed to include grandparents, and also the section will be changed to provide for 3 consecutive working days off instead of just 3 consecutive days off.

The term of the agreement is one year, retroactive to Sept. 1, 1973. The agreement was signed by the contractor, and the Union. The members of the negotiation team were Clyde D. Berger and Business Representative John McManus.
Tracy Unit Pig Feed is Great Success

It seems that the members of Local 1245, employed by the U.S.B.R. in the Tracy area, continuously outdo their efforts of the previous year when it comes to having a pig feed.

To say that a good time was had by all is an understatement. It was rumored that a few people had difficulty in getting around the next day because of their activity on the baseball diamond and the volleyball court. Someone said that the editor of the Utility Reporter threw his arm out on the first throw of the baseball game and couldn't raise his arm over his head for a week. It must be tough to get old.

The event is a real family affair with an emphasis on good wholesome fun. In addition to the roast pig and beer, hot dogs and punch were available for the kids.

A great deal of effort goes into an event such as this and those who put it together are to be congratulated. This type of an event is a credit to the brotherhood and an example for other Units to emulate.

Three million, fifteen thousand and sixty-five.

This photo shows Jack Nottingham, bent over, and Dave Reese as they began to excavate the pig. They had quite an audience looking on.

Mr. and Mrs. Bill Peitz, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Patterson and Mrs. Bill Miller are shown seated at the table in the foreground.

The photos above and below show the folks "chowin down" on that delicious pork.

Heck with Statistics: How about People?

To heck with the statistics, look at the human factors.

This is the thrust of a column by syndicated economist Sylvia Porter, written before, but in anticipation of, President Nixon's veto of the minimum wage increase.

She said the statistical arguments "miss the two central points," and she went on:

"The first overwhelmingly significant of these points is simply: How dare we ask the very lowest paid workers among us to stand in the first line of defense against an inflation fueled by the buying and borrowing of the affluent? How can we possibly justify asking those already being pinched the hardest to accept an even stiffer pinch 'for the national good?'

"What sort of distorted economics translates price pressures resulting from a worldwide boom and its soaring demands for goods and services into a wage curb on those who don't even earn enough to have normal, much less 'soaring,' demands for anything?"

"The second point is implicit in the first: 1973's inflation is being caused by excessive demands for goods and services, not by excessive costs of labor.

"And if we now leapfrog back into a cost-push inflation after this dreadful demand-pull inflation, the reason will be today's price spiral, not any increases in the pay of the lowest-rung workers.

"Let's get some facts into perspective in these last days before Nixon gets the minimum wage bill and decides on a veto:

"It would take an immediate raise to $2.16 an hour just to cover price rises since the last minimum wage boost. It would take an immediate raise to $2.12 an hour just to maintain the 1968 ratio of minimum wage earnings to the earnings of manufacturing workers (55 percent).

"The average yearly wage of a migrant farm worker in 1972 was $1,830; of a hired farm worker, $3,170; of a full-time domestic worker, about $1,200.

"Nearly 25 million Americans live in poverty today, many because the work they do doesn't even command the minimum wage. And those who do get the $1.60 hourly minimum wage are actually earning only $64 for a five-day, 40-hour week."
The Safety Scene

Assembly Bill 150 Signed into Law

On October 2, 1973, Assembly Bill No. 150 was signed by Governor Ronald Reagan.

This law is conceived to be the most important piece of legislation to come out of Sacramento in many years, as it provides for the assurance of safe and healthful working conditions for all California working men and women by authorizing the enforcement of effective standards, assisting and encouraging employers to maintain safe and healthful working conditions, and by providing for research, information, education, training, and enforcement in the field of occupational safety and health.

The proper title for this beneficial aid to working men and women in California is The California Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1973.

Through its enactment, it will abolish the Industrial Safety Board in the Division of Industrial Safety of the Department of Industrial Relations, and creates the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board and the Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board in the department and specifies their membership, powers and duties.

The Act took effect immediately, as it was an "urgency statute".

The purpose of this Act is to allow the State of California to assume responsibility for development and enforcement of occupational safety and health standards under the State plan pursuant to Section 18 of the Federal Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-596), which was enacted December 29, 1970. As of this writing, it is expected that the Division of Industrial Safety will assume this responsibility effective November 1, 1973.

As we will be referring to this Act in future issues of the Utility Reporter, we believe it advisable to reprint here the basic definitions for the edification of Local 1245 members:

6302. (a) "Director" means the Director of Industrial Relations.

(b) "Department" means the Department of Industrial Relations.

(c) "Insurer" includes the State Compensation Insurance Fund and any private company, corporation, mutual association, and reciprocal or inter-insurance exchange, authorized under the laws of this State to insure employers against liability for compensation under this part and pursuant to Section 3200 et seq. (commencing with Section 3201), and any employer to whom a certificate of competence to self-insure has been issued.

(d) "Division" means the Division of Industrial Safety.

(e) "Standards Board" means the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, within the department.

(f) "Appeals Board" means the Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board, within the department.

9306. (a) "Place of employment" means the place or places at, and within the appurtenant thereto, where employment is carried on, except a place the safety jurisdiction over which is vested by law in any state or federal agency other than the division.

(b) "Employment" includes the carrying on of any trade, enterprise, project, industry, business, occupation or work, including all exposition, demobilization, and construction work, or any process or operation in any way related thereto, in which person is employed to work for hire except household domestic service.

9304.1 "Employee" means every person in an employment required by any employer to engage in any employment or to go to work or be at any time in any place of employment.

9305. (a) "Occupational safety and health standards and orders" means standards and orders adopted by the Standards Board pursuant to Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 140) of Division 1.

(b) "Special order" means any order, or any provision of this division, or any part thereof in, or authorized by, this division, which repeated violation creates a real and apparent hazard to employees.

(c) Fails or refuses to comply, after notification and expiration of any abatement period, with any standard, order, special order, or provision of this division, or any part thereof, which failure or refusal creates a real and apparent hazard to employees.

(d) Directly or indirectly, knowingly induces another to do any of the above.

9425. Any employer, and every employee having direction, management, control, or supervisory control of any employment, place of employment, or any other person, who willfully violates any occupational safety or health standard, order, or special order, and that violation caused death to any employee, or caused permanent or prolonged impairment of the body of any employee, shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars ($10,000), or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both; except that if the conviction is for a violation committed after a first conviction of such person, punishment shall be by a fine of not more than twenty thousand dollars ($20,000), or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both. Nothing in this section shall prohibit a prosecution under Section 192 of the Penal Code, rather than under this section, for the death of an employee. However, no person may be prosecuted under both this section and Section 192 of the Penal Code for the same act or omission.

9426. Whoever knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any application, report, record, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained pursuant to this division shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars ($10,000), or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both.

9434. The civil penalties provided for in this chapter shall not be assessed against employers that are governmental entities.