Dear Local 1245 Member,

Elected officials have a big say in how much money goes into your wallet. The governor has the power to appoint people to the courts and to key agencies, including the California Public Utilities Commission, which administers electric deregulation, and the Industrial Welfare Commission, which administers overtime. The governor also has the power to sign—or veto—bills that protect your job security and your wage. Probably the single most important thing you can do in the next four years to protect your livelihood is to help elect Gray Davis as the next governor.

But a governor can't be effective without a legislature committed to the interests of working people. In the following pages you will find an explanation of key bills acted on by the 1997-98 legislature, and the candidates' positions on these bills. We have done our best to give you the facts upon which to make an informed decision. The rest is up to you. Inform yourself. Volunteer some time with your local Central Labor Council to help elect good candidates in your district. And on November 3rd, get out and vote!

In Unity,

Jack McNally
Business Manager
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Rolling the union on...

Russia's Massive Strike: Twelve million people and 39,000 enterprises took part in strike action or work stoppages during a massive demonstration in Russia earlier this month. Meetings or demonstrations were held in 10,000 towns and villages with the following demands: Resignation of the president and the Duma (parliament); new election of president and Duma; and change of the direction of the economic reforms.

Failure to Pay: Fully half of farm labor contractors in California don't pay workers the federal minimum wage, a US Labor Department investigation has found. In addition, 20% of grape growers in the state fail to pay minimum wage.

Clash with Police: Striking bank workers armed with high-pressure water hoses fought a running battle with riot police firing tear gas in downtown Bogota on Oct. 11, the fifth day of a nationwide public sector work stoppage, Reuters reported. The bank workers, together with an estimated 700,000 other public sector workers, including doctors, teachers, oilmen, and telecommunications and airport staff have been on strike across the country since Wednesday, protesting the government's planned austerity measures.

Raiding Social Security: Last month more than 500 senior citizens rallied against a bill, subsequently passed, that will raid the Social Security Trust Fund surplus to give voters an $80 billion tax cut in an election year. President Clinton has said he will veto the bill if it reaches his desk.

Not-So-Happy Meals: Women 17-to-20 years old work nine to ten hours a day, seven days a week, for as little as six cents an hour making the plastic toys—mostly Disney characters—given away by McDonald's to purchasers of its "Happy Meals" for children. The National Labor Committee reported. The toys are made in the Keyhinge Toys Co. factory in Da Nang City, Vietnam, where 90% of the 1,000 employed are young women. Earlier this year, 200 became ill, 25 collapsed and were hospitalized for acute exposure to acetone, a chemical solvent.

Open enrollment at PG&E

Local 1245 members at PG&E should watch the mail for Benefits Open Enrollment packages during the week of Oct. 19. Open Enrollment is from Oct. 26 to Nov. 13. Materials for retirees will be sent the week of Oct. 12. Retiree Open Enrollment is Oct. 19-30. United HealthCare replaces Prudential. The covered benefits of these plans have not changed, only the company that administers them. Members will be offered a United HealthCare plan or any HMO available in the region.

Those currently in Prudential plans will be automatically enrolled in United HealthCare plans unless they choose to change. New or current Point-of-Service Plan members must call PG&E's Benefits Service Center during Open Enrollment to select or retain their primary care physician.

Notice regarding agency fee payers objection plan

Any employee who is not a member of the IBEW and who pays agency fees to IBEW Local 1245 pursuant to a union security provison in Local 1245's collective bargaining agreement has the right to object to expenditures of fees for activities which are not reasonably related to collective bargaining or undertaken to advance the employment-related interests of employees represented by the Local. The agency fees paid by a fee payer who perfects an objection will be reduced by an amount reflecting the portion of the overall expenditures of the Local Union that are used for non-chargeable activities. Objections must be made annually and will be effective for a single calendar year. Each fee payer who wishes to file an objection with Local 1245 must do so in writing, addressed to the Business Manager, Local 1245, Post Office Box 4790, Walnut Creek, California 94596, by certified mail. In registering their objections, objectors must state their name and address and that they pay fees to this Local, and provide their nonmember identification number, if known, and their social security number. Objections must be postmarked during the month of November preceding the calendar year for which the objection will be in effect, or during the first thirty days after the objector commences paying fees to the Local Union as required by a collective bargaining agreement. Objections must be renewed annually, during the month of November.
Union steps up efforts to defeat Proposition 9

Members of Local 1245 have moved into the vanguard of opposition to Proposition 9, the ballot measure that threatens service reliability and jobs in the electric industry. By the first week of October, union members had made over 100 presentations to employees, community, and retiree groups to urge rejection of Proposition 9.

The campaign has included dozens of on-site presentations at PG&E facilities by rank and file union members, with more events planned in the closing weeks of the campaign, including an October 16 event with food and campaign information at the Fresno Call Center being organized by Local 1245 Executive Board member Chris Habeckler.

Local 1245 members are also reaching out to the wider community to sound the alarm about Proposition 9. In San Luis Obispo, Advisory Council member Dan Lockwood is operating a "No on 9" table at the local Farmers Market. In San Jose, retiree club member Orv Owen organized a "No on 9" presentation to the area's Federation of Retired Union Members (FORDUM) in mid-September.

The union was also coordinating efforts with local AFL-CIO central labor councils to provide volunteers for precinct walking and phone banking, helping make sure that the message to potential voters includes a pitch against Proposition 9, as well as support for gubernatorial candidate Gray Davis and U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer. These efforts will carry the "No on 9" message to an estimated one million union households throughout the state by election day.

Local 1245 members are also directly visiting the offices of other local unions to provide campaign leaflets, bumper stickers and yard signs.

As of early-October, polling data showed Proposition 9 as too close to call, with a large number of voters still undecided. However, the "No on 9" campaign seemed to be picking up valuable momentum as several major newspapers recommended a "no" vote, including the San Jose Mercury News, the Fresno Bee, the Bakersfield Californian and the San Francisco Chronicle.

Over 3,000 organizations have now signed on as endorsers of the "No on 9" campaign throughout northern and central California.

More time to consider impacts

Unions help delay natural gas deregulation

California Senate bill supported by Local 1245 will delay the ability of the California Public Utilities Commission to deregulate the natural gas industry for "core" customers until Jan. 1, 2000. The bill, SB 1602, requires the CPUC to report to the legislature should the CPUC find additional restructuring of the natural gas industry to be in the public interest.

Local 1245 and other unions in the Coalition of Utility Employees (CUE) actively lobbied the legislature to adopt this measure delaying natural gas deregulation. In recent months Local 1245 had become increasingly concerned that natural gas deregulation would be adopted by the CPUC without insuring adequate safeguards for consumers and utility employees.

Despite repeated requests by the union, the CPUC appeared unwilling to take any steps to provide assistance to utility employees displaced by any future deregulation of the natural gas industry.

By helping achieve passage of SB 1602, the union has helped check the CPUC's headlong drive to deregulate natural gas regardless of the consequences, and has provided more time for a careful examination of all the relevant issues.

Among other things, the bill provides the Legislature an opportunity to enact legislation giving the CPUC the authority to develop consumer protection regulations before the natural gas market for core customers is opened.

Unions lobby for change

CPUC to be more accountable

Local 1245 and its partners in the Coalition of California Employees (CUE) have played a key role in passing new legislation that insures greater accountability by the California Public Utilities Commission. Under existing law, an appeal to the California Supreme Court is the only avenue of protest for anyone objecting to a CPUC decision. This state of affairs has greatly limited the public's ability to challenge CPUC actions.

The new law, SB 779, expands judicial review of major CPUC decisions by both the California Supreme Court and the courts of appeal in California.

Local 1245 worked hard to educate legislators about the sweeping power the CPUC holds over the lives of utility employees, and the importance of keeping the CPUC accountable to the public. Passage of SB 779 is a step in the right direction.
Davis vs. Lungren: Actions Speak Louder Than Words

Gray Davis opposed Gov. Pete Wilson's attack on overtime pay premiums. Gray Davis openly and vigorously supports restoring the eight-hour day and overtime premium pay.

Gray Davis co-chaired the campaign to rescue Cal-OSHA after then-Gov. George Deukmejian tried to eliminate the agency.

Gray Davis refused to implement a 5% pay cut for 27,000 state employees in 1991 even after Gov. Pete Wilson ordered it.

Gray Davis stood tall with construction workers when big business tried to dismantle California's prevailing wage laws.

Gray Davis openly and firmly supported the effort by organized labor to increase the minimum wage.

Gray Davis won a court order overturning Gov. Wilson's attempt to increase health insurance premiums for state employees without renegotiating contracts.

Gray Davis spearheaded a program to invest state employee pension funds in affordable housing for first-time homebuyers, resulting in employment for 8,000 construction workers, the construction of a projected 5,000 new homes, and a handsome 20% return for the pension fund.

Gray Davis identified more than 20,000 vacancies in the state workforce when state employees were threatened with layoffs in the budget balancing process of 1991, thereby demonstrating that further layoffs were unnecessary to balance the budget.

Gray Davis, as Controller, saved taxpayers more than half a billion dollars by cracking down on medi-Cal fraud, rooting out government waste and inefficiency, and exposing the misuse of public funds.

Dan Lungren defended the Wilson administration's elimination of daily overtime regulations, costing California workers over $1 billion annually in overtime pay.

Dan Lungren strongly supported Proposition 226, which would have gagged workers' political speech.

Dan Lungren did not support the Minimum Wage Initiative (Proposition 210). At that time, the purchasing power of California's minimum wage had dropped to a 40-year low.

Dan Lungren defended Gov. Wilson's raid of public employee pension funds. He opposed Proposition 162, which prevented politicians from dipping into pension funds.

Dan Lungren defended the Wilson administration's attempt to undermine prevailing wage laws and reduce construction workers' pay and benefits. As a Congressman, he voted to weaken federal prevailing wage protections.

Dan Lungren, while in Congress, voted to drastically slash funding for the Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA).

Dan Lungren did not support Proposition 97, the initiative to restore Cal-OSHA.

Dan Lungren defended the Wilson administration's gutting of ergonomic regulations.

Dan Lungren, while in Congress, repeatedly voted against expanding Medicare coverage and voted against health care for the jobless.

Dan Lungren, while in Congress voted for cutting federal workers' collectively-bargained health care coverage.

Dan Lungren, while in Congress voted for cutting funds for scholarships for talented high school students who wish to become teachers, and other higher education programs.
Boxer vs. Fong: Senator Boxer Stands Up For Us

- Senator Barbara Boxer supports overtime premium pay. She fought a bill that would have let employers require workers to work over 40 hours per week at straight-time pay.
- Barbara Boxer opposed Proposition 226, which would have severely restricted unions' political activity. She recently voted against a similar measure in Congress (S. 1663).
- Barbara Boxer co-sponsored a bill to increase the minimum wage.
- Barbara Boxer supports using the budget surplus to save Social Security first.
- Barbara Boxer opposes raising the eligibility age for Medicare benefits.
- Barbara Boxer wrote a Patient Protection Act to ensure that doctors and patients make health care decisions, not accountants or HMO bureaucrats.
- Barbara Boxer opposed Congressional efforts to cut $270 billion from Medicare and use the savings to provide more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.
- Barbara Boxer supported the Family and Medical Leave Act (1993), which gave workers up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave for the birth or adoption of a child, or to deal with a seriously ill child, spouse, or elderly parent.
- Barbara Boxer voted against NAFTA, understanding it would kill American jobs and lead to erosion of worker rights and environmental standards in the US and Mexico.
- Barbara Boxer voted against the Team Act (S. 295), a bill designed to let management create "company unions," hand pick the leaders, and then negotiate with those leaders with no democratic input from the employees.
- Barbara Boxer helped uphold the Presidential Executive Order that forbids the government from doing business with large federal contractors that use permanent replacement workers in strikes.

- Matt Fong has failed to take a position on defending overtime pay protections.
- Matt Fong refused to take a position on Proposition 226, last June's ballot measure that would have severely restricted unions' political activity.
- Matt Fong opposes raising the minimum wage.
- Matt Fong favors partial privatization of Social Security, making retirees bear the risk if investments go bad.
- Matt Fong favors raising the age for becoming eligible for Medicare.
- Matt Fong supports the current system which permits HMOs bureaucrats to make medical decisions for patients, rather than leaving such decisions to the patients in consultation with their doctors.
- Matt Fong favors abolishing the inheritance tax and capital-gains tax, which would shift the tax burden onto working people while providing huge windfalls to the already-rich.
**ATTORNEY GENERAL**

**Lockyer vs. Stirling**

**It's Clear Where They Stand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overtime Pay</th>
<th>Job Safety</th>
<th>Pension Protection</th>
<th>Patients' Rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lockyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led the fight in the legislature and courts to oppose Gov. Wilson's elimination of California's daily overtime law.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote law that requires more safety inspections in high-hazard industries. Helped pass Prop. 97, which reestablished Cal-OSHA.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fought pension raids and appointed labor representative to Public Employees Retirement Board.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Patient's Bill of Rights. Led the fight for state budget funding to provide health insurance for working families.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led the court fight to defend Gov. Wilson's ban on daily overtime protections, which costs workers over $1 billion annually in lost overtime.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed restoration of Cal-OSHA. Opposed legislation to allow criminal charges against bosses who cause worker deaths by violating safety laws.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defended Gov. Wilson's pension raid and opposed Prop. 162, the worker-supported ballot measure to protect pensions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed legislation to give Attorney General power to prevent takeovers of community hospitals by for-profit operators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statewide Offices**

What's at Stake for Working Californians?

**LT. GOVERNOR**

**Bustamante vs. Leslie**

The Voting Record Tells the Story

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leslie Voted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bustamante Voted</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leslie Voted</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AB 15/SB 680: Restore Overtime Protections**
This bill would restore time-and-a-half pay for work in excess of 8 hours in a day, double-time for work in excess of 12 hours.

**AB 1015: Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations**
This bill would increase the penalty on bosses whose willful violation of safety laws leads to a worker's death or serious injury.

**AB 480: Allow Family Sick Leave**
This bill would permit employees to use sick leave to care for an ill family member.

**SB 500: Increase State Minimum Wage**
This bill increased the state minimum wage from $4.25 per hour to $5.00 on July 1, 1996 and to $5.75 on July 1, 1997.
The prospect of punishing utility companies may give some people a warm glow. But if they think it's going to make their electricity cheaper or more reliable, they are deluding themselves.

A common sentiment expressed by those who favor Proposition 9 is that utilities—not ratepayers—should bear the consequences for past investments, especially for the nuclear investments that helped drive up the cost of electricity in California. This "punish the utilities" argument casts Proposition 9 as a morality play, with utilities like PG&E as the bad guy and the ordinary ratepayer as the innocent victim.

The historical reality is not so simple. It is true that utilities saw nuclear power as a profit opportunity. Profits increased with the size of the investment under the regulatory framework in place at the time. But it is also true that the nation was looking for alternatives to oil-fired generating plants, especially after the oil embargo of 1973. Nuclear plants under construction at that time struck many people as a reasonable alternative to uncertain supplies of oil and of natural gas, which was also thought to be in short supply at that time. In fact, California in 1978 outlawed natural gas as a new boiler fuel.

While there was a vigorous movement against nuclear power, the construction of nuclear plants like Diablo Canyon was approved by regulators appointed by our elected representatives. Many in the business community, especially, were outspoken advocates of nuclear power. When utilities like PG&E undertook nuclear projects, they did so with the approval and under the guidance of properly constituted legal authority.

If nuclear power was a mistake, it was not a mistake made by utilities in a vacuum. And so Californians must face the question: why should utilities be the sole party to suffer for a decision in which a large part of society was involved?

Legislators addressed this issue in fashioning AB 1890, the electric restructuring law of 1996. To the extent that consumers benefitted from the energy generated by nuclear plants, they should also have the responsibility for seeing through to the conclusion their responsibility for paying for these plants. The Competition Transition Charges authorized by AB 1890 assure that all customers (not just residential ratepayers) will share in the burden of paying off these plants.

AB 1890 was passed by unanimous votes in both houses of the California Legislature. AB 1890 took into account the historical background of electric generation decisions, and represented a fair compromise on a very complex issue. The unanimous votes were made possible by the good-faith efforts of legislators to balance the competing interests of all the parties to the debate over electric energy in California.

Now some groups want to undo this hard-won compromise in order to stick utility companies with all the costs of past investments. Those who adopt this "punish the utilities" attitude are not defenders of some moral high ground—they are pursuing a vendetta against one industry and its stockholders rather than trying to determine what energy policies will best serve the public as a whole.

When you strip away the moral indignation and consider the practical issues, the problems with Proposition 9 start coming into focus.

First, Proposition 9 is unlikely to lead to lower rates for residential and small commercial consumers. In fact, Proposition 9 repeals the 10% rate reduction that was mandated by AB 1890 and went into effect last January. Further, by making it economically unfeasible to operate nuclear plants, Proposition 9 will axe 20% of California's electric generating capacity, which will almost certainly drive prices up for the remaining capacity.

Proposition 9 also poses a threat to taxpayers. Proposition 9 would forbid the use bonds to reduce electric rates, throwing into a legal limbo the $6 billion in rate reduction bonds already issued. Who will pay to redeem those bonds? The state of California is ultimately responsible, which means California taxpayers. If Proposition 9 passes, taxes will have to be raised, or services will have to be cut. This prospect of funding cuts for local services has caused firefighters, police officers, and local public officials to unite against Proposition 9.

A less visible but very real danger is that passage of Proposition 9 would compromise the reliability and safety of the state's electric service. Utilities would take a huge financial hit, which would most likely translate into workforce reductions. The utility downsizings of the early 1990s, followed by the prolonged outages of 1995, demonstrated that an adequate workforce and good service are closely linked.

For utility workers Proposition 9 contains an additional insult: it would abolish the funding mechanism for early retirement and voluntary severance programs, as well as retraining and job placement services for displaced utility employees.

Some people argue that utilities should not be allowed to collect the Competition Transition Charges authorized by AB 1890 because in the past utilities have allegedly appropriated money intended for maintenance and used it for other purposes. Even if that charge could be proven, it would be an argument for tighter public controls on how utilities spend money, not an argument for cutting the utilities' revenue. It makes no sense to jeopardize reliable service to California's citizens in the name of making utilities behave properly.

The prospect of punishing utility companies may give some people a warm glow. But if they think it's going to make their electricity cheaper or more reliable, they are deluding themselves.

What's at Stake for Working Californians?

- Advocates expanding opportunities for all eligible citizens to participate in elections
- Favors multi-day elections to increase voting opportunities for working families
- Supports same-day polling place registration with valid ID
- Favors permanent absentee voter status to all voters, allowing citizens to vote from home if they wish

SECRETARY OF STATE
Michela Alioto

Endorsed by Your Union!
Preserving overtime pay premiums

On April 11, 1997, Gov. Pete Wilson's appointees on the Industrial Welfare Commission wiped out the requirement that workers be paid overtime at time-and-a-half after eight hours of work in one day. This change took effect January 1, 1998.

The results are just what Wilson's corporate friends wanted: Ending the eight hour day transfers a billion dollars a year from the paychecks of workers into the pockets of employers. This represents an average loss of $1,600 per year for a manufacturing worker. Workers now have no legal protection against a boss who wants to work them 14 hour a day, and workers can be fired if they refuse.

More accidents on the job will inevitably result as workers are forced to work longer hours. Studies have found that 12-hour shifts increase the risk of accidents and workplace injuries resulting from exhaustion and reduced attention. Consider the dangers of exhausted workers handling toxic chemicals, driving trucks, or working in oil refineries, and it is clear that the end of daily overtime is a threat to public safety.

Daily overtime gives part-time and temporary workers a chance to earn extra pay if they put in extra long work days. But under the new regulations, these workers suffer the greatest loss of pay, since they may never reach a forty-hour work week. A worker with two part-time jobs might never get overtime pay, even if he or she works much more than forty hours per week.

Employers claim they want greater scheduling flexibility for workers, but the flexibility they want is a one-way street. Under the old regulations, workers could choose to work four 10-hour days without overtime if two-thirds of the employees agree. But under the new regulations, employers can impose longer hours without the workers' consent. Workers who cannot make the change are subject to termination.

Union workers continue to benefit from overtime language in their union contracts, but it will be increasingly difficult to defend overtime standards at the bargaining table as unionized employers try to compete with nonunion employers who no longer have to pay overtime premiums.

For members of Local 1245, overtime pay is a bread-and-butter issue. Many members rely on overtime pay to make ends meet. And without the overtime premium, employers can wreak havoc on employees' schedules without having to worry about incurring overtime costs.

Last year, the California legislature voted to restore the overtime law by passing SB 680. But Gov. Wilson vetoed this legislation, and so the struggle to restore overtime protection continues.

The fight for overtime pay depends on two things: electing legislators who will pass another overtime bill, and electing a governor who will sign it.

Maintaining strong safety standards

Safety standards work. According to the National Safety Council and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, more than 170,000 lives have been saved since the passage of the federal OSHA in 1970.

OSHA inspections and enforcement actions have made workplaces safer. Injuries declined an average 22% in workplaces where OSHA inspected and penalized employers for violations.

Still, 154 workers lose their lives as a result of workplace injuries and illnesses, and another 18,000 are injured—every day. One reason that injury rates remain so high is that employers know they can get away with operating an unsafe workplace.

The unscrupulous employer regards paying fines as just another cost of doing business—cheaper than providing safe working conditions.

There are two basic ways to persuade employers to eliminate hazards in the workplace: increase the fines and make negligent employers do prison time when their willful negligence leads to serious injury or death.

AB 1015, which passed the California legislature last year, would have done just that. AB 1015 provided for a fine of not more than $250,000, a period of imprisonment of not more than one year, or both, for an employer who willfully violates an occupational safety or health standard, order or special order and thereby causes the death or permanent or prolonged impairment of the body of an employee.

Further, AB 1015 provided that if the trier of fact finds that in committing the criminal offense it was reasonably foreseeable that the conduct constituting the violation would cause death or permanent or prolonged impairment of the body of the employee, the offense is punishable by a fine not to exceed five hundred thousand dollars ($500,000), imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, or by a fine not to exceed one million dollars, and imprisonment in the state prison, or both.

This is not rocket science. Employers who knowingly let workers be maimed or killed are criminals and deserve punishment. A majority of legislators agreed when they passed this bill (which was then vetoed by Gov. Wilson).

How do the candidates for Assembly and Senate in your district stand on AB 1015? Find out in the following pages.
When a California Court of Appeals ruled that it is permissible to discriminate against older workers if the employer can save money by hiring younger workers, most Americans were understandably outraged. What good are laws against age discrimination if you say it's all right to discriminate so long as the reason is money?

In the case Marks v. Loral (1997), the appeals court approved a jury instruction given by the trial court that there is no violation of law if the employer's dismissal of an older worker was based upon the desire for economic gain—attained by firing higher paid older employees and replacing them with younger employees at a lower rate of pay—even if such a decision disproportionately affected older workers. The California Supreme Court refused to hear the matter.

The whole point of anti-discrimination laws is to protect people against the impersonal and sometimes cruel effects of competitive markets. Older people are particularly at risk of discriminatory behavior because often they have worked their way up the wage ladder. Despite their loyalty and years of service, the unscrupulous employer will be tempted to terminate such workers in order to save a buck. Some free market extremists will argue that this is simply the way a market works. But most fair-minded people recognize the basic injustice of punishing workers simply because they have gotten older. All of us realize, at some level, that someday we ourselves are going to be joining the ranks of "older Americans." Is joblessness and poverty a just reward for years of dedicated service and loyalty to an employer?

Recognizing the basic injustice of the Marks v. Loral decision, the California Legislature took up a bill designed to give older Americans protections against this kind of brutal discrimination. SB 1098 makes it an unlawful employment practice for an employer, because of the age of any person over the age of 40, to refuse to hire or employ the person, or to discharge, dismiss, reduce, suspend, or demote the person, or refuse to select the person for a training program leading to employment, or to discharge the person from a training program leading to employment, or to discriminate against the person in compensation or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, except in cases where the law compels or provides for this action.

The bill also provided that an employer may not refuse to hire or employ, and may not discharge, dismiss, reduce, suspend, demote, deny access to a training program leading to employment to, or discriminate in compensation or other terms and conditions of employment against, any individual, over the age of 40 on the ground that a younger employee would perform the job for a lower salary.

This important piece of legislation offered older workers real protections against unscrupulous employers, and it offered legislators a chance to stand up and be counted for the principle of honoring older Americans and defending older workers against the predatory practices of employers who would repay loyalty with calculated cruelty.

And it gives you a chance to size up the values of the candidates for the California Assembly and Senate. This bill was vetoed by Gov. Wilson, but it could be introduced again if California voters elect legislators who care about fair treatment for older workers.

The Key Vote: S.B. 1098

Did Your State Senator & Assembly Member Vote
FOR
Working People
AGAINST
Working People

The Key Vote: S.B. 1968

Use the Maps on Pages 10 & 14 to Identify Your Senate & Assembly District. Then find out where the candidates in your district stand on these important issues.

Election of 'family-friendly' sick leave policy

Every working parent knows what it's like to wake up in the morning with a sick child. All too often workers are confronted with the impossible choice of neglecting their children or jeopardizing their job. Current federal law requires private employers with 50 or more employees to permit an employee to take up to 12 weeks of unpaid family leave. But the law provides no protection for employees who must miss work to tend an ailing child.

Assembly Bill 480 was designed to correct this situation. The bill would permit employees to utilize their own sick leave to tend to a sick child. Employees would have the right to reinstatement and back pay if they are dismissed or suspended for using sick leave in this manner, and could seek damages through the Labor Commissioner or a court action in the form of one day's pay for each day denied.

Are the Assembly & Senate candidates in your district for 'family-friendly' employment policies?

The Key Vote: A.B. 480

Equitable treatment for part-timers

Existing law provides that employers must pay equal wages to all employees of both sexes for equal work on jobs requiring equal skills and effort and responsibility.

But the law contains no protections for part-time workers who perform work equal to their full-time counterparts. Different pay, benefits or level of benefits, may be offered to full-time employees than are offered to part-time employees.

S.B. 1968 provides pay and benefits for part-time workers with full-time workers of employees with 20 or more employees. Employers would be prohibited from discriminating against any part-time or contingent worker in payment of wages or provision of non-mandated benefits.

In an era when many employers are reducing full-time workers to part-time status to save money, this bill offered significant protections for full-time as well as part-time workers.

Where did your candidates stand on this key issue?

The Key Vote: S.B. 1968

* * *
Locate Your State Senate District, Then Find Out Where the Candidates Stand
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 2 California Senate**

- Wes Chesbro
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Chesbro For Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Chesbro For Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Chesbro For Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Chesbro For Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Chesbro For Working People

- John Jordan
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Jordan For Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Jordan For Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Jordan For Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Jordan For Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Jordan For Working People

**District 4 California Senate**

- Maurice Johannessen
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Johannessen Against Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Johannessen Against Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Johannessen Against Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - No Position
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Johannessen Against Working People

- Mark Desio
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Desio For Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Desio For Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Desio For Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Desio For Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Desio For Working People

**District 6 California Senate**

- Deborah Ortiz
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Ortiz For Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Ortiz For Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Ortiz For Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Ortiz For Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Ortiz For Working People
  - No Position

- Chris Quackenbush
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Quackenbush Against Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Quackenbush Against Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Quackenbush Against Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Quackenbush Against Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Quackenbush Against Working People

(No Incumbent)

(No Incumbent)

(No Incumbent)

(No Incumbent)

No Photo Available

Refused to Take a Stand
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 8</th>
<th>District 10</th>
<th>District 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Senate</strong></td>
<td><strong>California Senate</strong></td>
<td><strong>California Senate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco &amp; part of San Mateo Counties</td>
<td>Parts of Alameda and Santa Clara Counties</td>
<td>Mariposa, Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne, &amp; part of Fresno &amp; Madera Counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jackie Speier</strong></td>
<td><strong>Jim Tomlin</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dick Monteith</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Jackie Speier" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Jim Tomlin" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Dick Monteith" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Monteith Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Monteith Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Position</td>
<td>Speier For Working People</td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Where Do the Candidates Stand?**

- **Jackie Speier**
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Speier For Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Speier For Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Speier For Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Speier For Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Speier For Working People

- **Jim Tomlin**
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Penemize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

- **Liz Figueroa**
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Figueroa For Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Figueroa For Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - No Position
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Figueroa For Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - No Position

- **Bob Gough**
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Penemize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

- **Dick Monteith**
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Monteith Against Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Monteith Against Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - No Position
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - No Position
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Monteith Against Working People

- **Sal Cannella**
  - Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
  - Cannella For Working People
  - Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
  - Cannella For Working People
  - Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
  - Cannella For Working People
  - Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
  - Cannella For Working People
  - Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
  - Cannella For Working People
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 14 California Senate**
Part of Fresno, Kern & Tulare Counties (See page 10)

**Challenger**

**Chuck Poochigian**
- **No Incumbent**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Poochigian Against Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Poochigian Against Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Poochigian Against Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Poochigian Against Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

**Incumbent**

**Jim Costa**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Costa For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Costa For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Costa For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Costa For Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

**Challenger**

**Gregg Palmer**
- No Major Party Challenger
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

**District 16 California Senate**
Kings & part of Fresno, Kern, Madera, & Tulare Counties (See page 10)

**Challenger**

**Jack O'Connell**
- **Incumbent**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

**Incumbent**

**Gregg Palmer**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Palmer Against Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

**District 18 California Senate**
San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, & part of Ventura Counties (See page 10)

**Challenger**

**Gordon Klemm**
- **Incumbent**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- O'Connell For Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

**Incumbent**

**Jack O'Connell**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Klemm For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Klemm For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Klemm For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Klemm For Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)

**Challenger**

**Gordon Klemm**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Klemm For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Klemm For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Klemm For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Klemm For Working People
- Fairness for Part-Time Employees (SB 1968)
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Locate Your State Assembly District, Then Find Out Where the Candidates Stand
Incumbent
Virginia Strom-Martin
Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, and part of Sonoma Counties (See page 14)

Challenger
Sam Crump

Restored Overtime Protections (SB 680)
Strom-Martin For Working People
Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
Strom-Martin For Working People
Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
Strom-Martin For Working People
Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
Strom-Martin For Working People

District 1
California Assembly

Refused to Take a Stand

(No Incumbent)
Richard Dickerson

Colusa, Glenn, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, and parts of Butte and Yolo Counties (See page 14)

(No Incumbent)
Francie Sullivan

Restored Overtime Protections (SB 680)
Dickerson Against Working People
Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
Dickerson For Working People
Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
Dickerson Against Working People
Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
Dickerson For Working People

District 2
California Assembly

Refused to Take a Stand

(No Incumbent)
Scott Gruendl

Lassen, Modoc, Nevada, Plumas, Sierra, Yuba & part of Butte Counties (See page 14)

(No Incumbent)
Sam Aanestad

Restored Overtime Protections (SB 680)
Gruendl For Working People
Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
Gruendl For Working People
Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
Gruendl For Working People
Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
Gruendl For Working People

District 3
California Assembly

Refused to Take a Stand

October 1998 
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Assembly&lt;br&gt;Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mono, and Placer Counties (See page 14)</td>
<td><strong>District 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Assembly&lt;br&gt;Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mono, and Placer Counties (See page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong>&lt;br&gt;Thomas Oiler</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong>&lt;br&gt;Mark Norberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiler Against Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiler Against Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiler Against Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oiler Against Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(No Incumbent)</th>
<th>(No Incumbent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Assembly&lt;br&gt;Part of Sacramento County (See page 14)</td>
<td><strong>District 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Assembly&lt;br&gt;Part of Sacramento County (See page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong>&lt;br&gt;Linda Davis</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong>&lt;br&gt;Dave Cox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis For Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis For Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis For Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis For Working People</td>
<td>Norberg For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 6</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Assembly&lt;br&gt;Marin &amp; part of Sonoma Counties (See page 14)</td>
<td><strong>District 6</strong>&lt;br&gt;California Assembly&lt;br&gt;Marin &amp; part of Sonoma Counties (See page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong>&lt;br&gt;Kerry Mazzoni</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong>&lt;br&gt;Russ Weiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Position</td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzoni For Working People</td>
<td>Mazzoni For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzoni For Working People</td>
<td>Mazzoni For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzoni For Working People</td>
<td>Mazzoni For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refused to Take a Stand*
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

District 7
California Assembly
Parts of Sacramento, Solano & Yolo Counties (See page 14)

Incumbent
Helen Thomson

Challenger
Toni Thompson

Secure Overtime Protections (SB 680)
Thomson For Working People

Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
Thomson For Working People

Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
Thomson For Working People

Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
Thomson For Working People

District 8
California Assembly

Incumbent
Helen Thomson

Challenger
Toni Thompson

Secure Overtime Protections (SB 680)
Thomson For Working People

Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
Thomson For Working People

Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
Thomson For Working People

Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
Thomson For Working People

District 9
California Assembly
Part of Sacramento County (See page 14)

Incumbent
Darrell Steinberg

Challenger
Mike Dismukes

Secure Overtime Protections (SB 680)
Steinberg For Working People

Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
Steinberg For Working People

Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
Steinberg For Working People

Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
Steinberg For Working People
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## Where Do the Candidates Stand?

### District 10
#### California Assembly
Parts of Sacramento & San Joaquin Counties (See page 14)

**Incumbent**
**Tom Torlakson**

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Torlakson For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Torlakson For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Torlakson For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Torlakson For Working People

**Challenger**
**Debra Gravert**

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Gravert For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Gravert For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Gravert For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Gravert For Working People

**Incumbent**
**Anthony Pescetti**

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Pescetti For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Pescetti For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Pescetti For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Pescetti For Working People

### District 11
#### California Assembly
Part of Contra Costa County (See page 14)

**Incumbent**
**Kevin Shelley**

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Shelley For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Shelley For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Shelley For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Shelley For Working People

**Challenger**
**Mike Fitzgerald**

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Fitzgerald Against Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Fitzgerald For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Fitzgerald For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Fitzgerald For Working People

**Challenger**
**No Major Party Challenger**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 13</th>
<th>District 14</th>
<th>District 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>Dion Louise Aroner</td>
<td>Lynne Leach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Bernard</td>
<td>Jerald Udinsky</td>
<td>Charles Brydon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Where Do the Candidates Stand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migden For Working People</strong> Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td><strong>Migden For Working People</strong> Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migden For Working People</strong> Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td><strong>Migden For Working People</strong> Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Position</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td><strong>No Position</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aroner For Working People</strong> Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td><strong>Aroner For Working People</strong> Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aroner For Working People</strong> Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td><strong>Aroner For Working People</strong> Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aroner For Working People</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td><strong>Aroner For Working People</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leach Against Working People</strong> Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td><strong>Leach Against Working People</strong> Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leach Against Working People</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td><strong>Leach Against Working People</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brydon For Working People</strong> Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td><strong>Brydon For Working People</strong> Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brydon For Working People</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td><strong>Brydon For Working People</strong> Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## The Issues: Where Do the Candidates Stand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 16</strong></td>
<td><strong>District 17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Perata</td>
<td>Michael Machado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 18</strong></td>
<td><strong>District 19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Corbett</td>
<td>Carol Nowicki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 16 - California Assembly
- **Incumbent**: Don Perata
- **Challenger**: Linda Marshall

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**: Perata For Working People (Yes), Marshall Against Working People
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**: Perata For Working People (Yes), Marshall Against Working People
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**: Perata For Working People (Yes), Marshall Against Working People
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**: Perata For Working People (Yes), Marshall For Working People

### District 17 - California Assembly
- **Incumbent**: Michael Machado
- **Challenger**: Jay Smart

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**: Machado For Working People (Yes), Smart Against Working People
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**: Machado For Working People (Yes), Smart For Working People
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**: Machado For Working People (Yes), Smart For Working People
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**: Machado For Working People (Yes), Smart For Working People

### District 18 - California Assembly
- **Incumbent**: Ellen Corbett
- **Challenger**: Carol Nowicki

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**: Corbett For Working People (Yes)
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**: Corbett For Working People (Yes)
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**: Corbett For Working People (Yes)
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**: Corbett For Working People (Yes)

### District 19 - California Assembly
- **Incumbent**: (No Incumbent)
- **Challenger**: (No Incumbent)

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**: (No Position)
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**: (No Position)
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**: (No Position)
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**: (No Position)
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 19 California Assembly**

**Incumbent**
Lou Papan

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)

**Challenger**
Penny Ferguson

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)

**District 20 California Assembly**

**Incumbent**
Ted Lempert

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)

**Challenger**
Laverne Atherly

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**Incumbent**

**Elaine White Alquist**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)

**Challenger**

**Stan Kawczynski**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)

**Incumbent**

**Mike Honda**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)

**Challenger**

**Patrick Du Long**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)

**Incumbent**

**James Cunneen**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- No Position

**Challenger**

**Phil Stokes**
- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
The Issues: Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 25**
California Assembly
Mariposa, Tuolumne & parts of Fresno, Madera & Stanislaus Counties (See page 14)

**Incumbent**

George House

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- House Against Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- House Against Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- House For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- House Against Working People

**Challenger**

Wesley Firch

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Firch For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Firch For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Firch For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Firch For Working People

**District 26**
California Assembly
Merced & parts of San Joaquin & Stanislaus Counties (See page 14)

**Incumbent**

Dennis Cardoza

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Cardoza For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Cardoza For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Cardoza For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Cardoza For Working People

**Challenger**

Patty Hollingsworth

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- No Photo Available
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Cardoza For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Cardoza For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Cardoza For Working People

**District 27**
California Assembly
Parts of Monterey & Santa Cruz Counties (See page 14)

**Incumbent**

Fred Keeley

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Keeley For Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Keeley For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Keeley For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Keeley For Working People

**Challenger**

Phil Chavez

- Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)
- Chavez Against Working People
- Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)
- Chavez For Working People
- Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)
- Chavez For Working People
- Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)
- Chavez For Working People
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### District 28
**California Assembly**
San Benito & parts of Monterey, Santa Clara & Santa Cruz Counties (See page 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Incumbent</strong></th>
<th>Peter Frusetta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Frusetta For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Frusetta For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Challenger</strong></th>
<th>Alan Styles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Styles For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Styles For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Styles For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Styles For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 29
**California Assembly**
Parts of Fresno & Tulare Counties (See page 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Incumbent</strong></th>
<th>Mike Briggs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Challenger</strong></th>
<th>Dean Florez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District 30
**California Assembly**
Kings and parts of Fresno, Kern & Madera Counties (See page 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Incumbent</strong></th>
<th>Robert Prenter Jr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Prenter Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Prenter Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Prenter For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Prenter Against Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Challenger</strong></th>
<th>Dean Florez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)</td>
<td>Florez For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Issues: Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 31 California Assembly**

**Sarah Reyes**

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**

**David Jackson**

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**

**District 32 California Assembly**

**Roy Ashburn**

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**

**Robert Tucker**

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**

**District 33 California Assembly**

**Betty Sanders**

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**

**Abel Maldonado**

- **Restore Overtime Protections (SB 680)**
- **Penalize Bosses for Willful Safety Violations (AB 1015)**
- **Allow Family Sick Leave (AB 480)**
- **Prohibit Discrimination Against Older Workers (SB 1098)**
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The Issues: Where Do the Candidates Stand?

Incumbent
Keith Olberg

District 34
California Assembly
Inyo & parts of Kern & San Bernardino Counties (See page 14)

Challenger
Steven Figueroa

Incumbent

Keith Olberg

Challenger

Steven Figueroa

District 34
California Assembly
Inyo & parts of Kern & San Bernardino Counties (See page 14)

Where Do the Candidates Stand?

Incumbent

Keith Olberg

Challenger

Steven Figueroa

District 34
California Assembly
Inyo & parts of Kern & San Bernardino Counties (See page 14)

How the Local 1245 Candidates Survey was conducted

IBEW Local 1245 undertook the Candidate Survey to give our members an opportunity to see how candidates for the US House, state Senate, and state Assembly stand on important labor issues such as wages, working conditions, and occupational safety and health. It is our intention to give members a chance to evaluate the candidates based on objective evidence.

Such objective evidence is available in the form of voting records. The issues we selected were all voted on during the current (1997-98) session of the US House, state Assembly, or state Senate. The survey shows how the incumbents actually voted on the given issue. In cases where the incumbent was absent or abstained from voting, they are listed as having "No Position."

Non-incumbent candidates (challengers and candidates running in districts where there is no incumbent running) were sent a survey asking them to declare whether they were generally for or against the selected bills. (We also sent a summary of the language contained in the bills, and in some cases we sent the entire text of the bill if a candidate so requested.) All surveyed candidates received a follow-up letter reminding them of the deadline for returning the survey, as well as a telephone call as a last reminder. If a non-incumbent refused to respond to our survey, they were awarded a "chicken." This seemed an appropriate symbol for candidates who don't have the courage to say where they stand. If a non-incumbent candidate responded to the survey, but chose not to take a position on a particular issue, their position on that issue was listed as "No Position."

There were two exceptions to this procedure in the survey of Congressional candidates that appeared in the September 1998 issue of Utility Reporter. Barbara Lee, who was recently elected to replace Congressman Ron Dellums, was not in office when the issues in our survey came up for a vote. Congresswoman Lee was invited to state her position on these issues and she did so. Lois Capps, who was recently elected to finish the term of her late husband, Walter Capps, was not yet in office when some of the issues in our survey came up for a vote. In those cases, she was invited to state her position on these issues and she did so.

We have made every effort to include in our Election Guide all major party candidates for Congress, state Assembly and state Senate within Local 1245’s geographical jurisdiction. If a candidate failed to participate, it was by his or her own choice. Local 1245’s endorsements of California candidates can be found on Page 29. We hope that our efforts to survey the candidates provide you, the member, with objective information to assist you as you form your own opinion about the candidates.

Remember: Vote November 3!
Help Get the Job Done!

We need your help to defeat Proposition 9, elect Gray Davis as governor, and elect legislative candidates who will restore the law protecting overtime pay for California's workers. Please call the Central Labor Council nearest you and volunteer at least three hours of your time to help elect candidates who support labor's agenda. This is one way you can truly make a difference!

Central Labor Council of Alameda County  
510-569-1426

Kern, Inyo & Mono Counties Central Labor Council  
805-324-6451

San Joaquin & Calaveras Counties Central Labor Council  
209-948-5526

Butte-Glenn Counties Central Labor Council  
530-343-9474

Marysville Central Labor Council  
530-743-7321

San Mateo County Central Labor Council  
650-572-8848

Central Labor Council of Contra Costa County  
925-228-0161

Merced-Marioposa Central Labor Council  
209-722-3636

Santa Cruz & Monterey County Labor Council  
408-633-1869

Five Counties Central Labor Council (Redding Area)  
530-241-0319

Central Labor Council of Napa & Solano Counties  
707-557-5036

South Bay Central Labor Council  
408-266-3790

Central Labor Council of Fresno & Madera Counties  
209-275-1151

North Bay Counties Central Labor Council  
707-545-6970

Stanislaus & Tuolumne Counties Central Labor Council  
209-523-8079

Central Labor Council of Humboldt & Del Norte Counties  
707-443-7371

Sacramento Central Labor Council  
916-927-9772

Tri-Counties Central Labor Council  
(805-641-3712)

San Francisco Labor Council  
415-440-4809

Will you invest 3 hours to defend your wage against legislative attack?
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Proposition 9: What's at Stake for Utility Workers?

No On 9!

Local 1245 members speak out

“I think it would wipe out the utility industry as we know it. It will be of no benefit to the consumer...It’s the law of supply and demand. If the supply goes away and demand stays there, the price [of electricity] is going to go up.”

Roy Runnings, Materials Leadperson, PG&E, Geysers Power Plant

“The 20% rate cut catches everyone’s attention, but it’s not guaranteed. It’s going to mean higher taxes. The state’s going to be responsible for paying off the bonds.”

Chris Habecker, Service Rep., PG&E, Fresno

“It would compromise PG&E’s ability to continue to deliver electricity safely and reliably. And because the state is liable for paying off the $6 billion in bonds, services at the local level will be reduced.”

Bill Brill, Meter Reader, PG&E, San Jose

“The dividend for retired PG&E employees can’t handle another cut, which would happen if Proposition 9 did pass. The rate increase would be a burden on all the fixed income people.”

Glen Fries, Sr. Operating Clerk, PG&E, Fresno
California Candidates & Propositions Endorsed by IBEW Local 1245

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. SENATOR</th>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>LT. GOVERNOR</th>
<th>ATTORNEY GENERAL</th>
<th>SECRETARY OF STATE</th>
<th>STATE CONTROLLER</th>
<th>STATE TREASURER</th>
<th>DISTRICT 26: Dennis Cardoza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Boxer</td>
<td>Gray Davis</td>
<td>Cruz Bustamante</td>
<td>Bill Lockyer</td>
<td>Michela Alioto</td>
<td>Kathleen Connell</td>
<td>Phil Angelides</td>
<td>2. Wes Chesbro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. No Endorsement</td>
<td>70. No Endorsement</td>
<td>71. No Endorsement</td>
<td>72. No Endorsement</td>
<td>73. No Endorsement</td>
<td>74. No Endorsement</td>
<td>75. No Endorsement</td>
<td>76. No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. No Endorsement</td>
<td>78. No Endorsement</td>
<td>79. No Endorsement</td>
<td>80. No Endorsement</td>
<td>81. No Endorsement</td>
<td>82. No Endorsement</td>
<td>83. No Endorsement</td>
<td>84. No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROPOSITION 3: YES
Presidential Primary Elections: Changes existing open primary law to require closed, partisan primary for purposes of selecting delegates to national political party presidential nominating conventions. Limits voting for such delegates to voters registered by political party. Proposition 3 fixes an accidental error in California’s Open Primary Law.

PROPOSITION 4: NO RECOMMENDATION
Wildlife, Body-Gripping Traps Ban.

PROPOSITION 5: NO
Tribal-State Gaming Compacts: Specifies terms and conditions of mandatory compact between state and Indian tribes for gaming on tribal land. Allows slot machines and banked card games at tribal casinos.

PROPOSITION 6: NO RECOMMENDATION
Prohibition on Slaughter of Horses and Sale of Horsemeat for Human Consumption.

PROPOSITION 7: NO
Air Quality Improvement, Tax Credits: Authorizes $218 million in state credits annually, in addition to state and Indian tribes for gaming on tribal land. Allows slot machines and banked card games at tribal casinos.

PROPOSITION 8: NO
Public Schools, Class Size Reduction. Parent-Teacher Council, Teacher Credentialing: Proposes class size reduction funding for districts establishing parent-teacher governing councils. Requires teacher credentialing, testing, evaluations; pupil suspension for drug possession. Cuts education funds. Funds a new law school and state board of education. Glorifies the status of the public education bureaucracy (the triple the existing size), a political appointee (with no limit on his salary), and 8000 new positions (not elected). Taxpayer authorized to spend tax dollars and set 8000 different local curricula (ignoring uniform state standards).

PROPOSITION 9: NO
Electric Utilities. Assessments. Bonds. Initiative Statute: Prohibits assessment of taxes, bonds, or charges to pay costs of nuclear power plants. Limits recovery by electric companies for non-recovered costs, including nuclear costs, and current rates for which utilities can recover costs associated with providing voluntary severance, early retirement incentives, worker retraining, and job placement services. Prohibits issuance of rate reduction bonds. State government net revenue reductions potentially in the high tens of millions of dollars annually through 2001. Local government net revenue reductions potentially in the tens of millions of dollars annually through 2001. Con sequencing. Business, police, fire, taxpayer and school groups agree Proposition 3 can’t deliver on its false promises. Proposition 3 would jeopardize electric rates and reliability, harm utility employees, hit taxpayers with liability for costs, gut Social Security, hold bonds, undermine school, police and fire budgets, and damage California’s economy.

PROPOSITION 10: NO RECOMMENDATION
State and County Early Childhood Development Programs. Additional Tobacco Surtax.

An Important Message for Local 1245 Members in Nevada

Local 1245 is contacting all Assembly and Senate candidates in Nevada to find out their positions on the critical issue of electric deregulation in Nevada. Based on the candidate’s answers, they have been unable to contact the candidates to see if they will vote on that survey in the Utility Reporter prior to the General Election. But we will mail the results of our survey—the union’s endorsements—to all of our members in Nevada. Watch your mailbox!
Don’t overlook tree safety

Trees are appreciated for their shade value and overall aesthetics. What we overlook sometimes are conflicting overhead power lines. If you notice a tree that is touching powerlines, it is important that you notify the utility provider. Tree clearance from powerlines is vital, first for public safety, and, second, for system reliability.

Remember: stay clear of trees that are into overhead conductors. The threat of electrical shock is real!

Your local utility should be able to supply you with a listing of trees suitable for planting in the proximity of power lines.

Threat of lead poisoning

Lead poisoning can slow your children’s growth and cause learning and behavior problems.

Children under six years of age are at the highest risk. Lead can be found in paint on houses built before 1969, imported decorative dishes, handmade pottery, hobbies that use stained glass, fishing weights, radiators, car batteries and soil near freeways, smelters and factories.

Health hazards from lead include damage to kidneys, nervous system and brain disorders, as well as death. Measurements for lead are in parts per million (ppm). Normal soil conditions are 50 ppm, city soil 200-500 ppm. Over 1,000 ppm is defined as hazardous.

Young children who swallow lead dust may not look or act sick. A blood test should be given if you suspect poisoning.

Healthy eating can help protect your children from lead poisoning. Always wash your children’s hands. Serve your children food high in calcium and iron.

New faces on union Safety Committee

The Local 1245 Safety Committee has a new look with the addition of several new members. They include: Ralph Muraca, City of Santa Clara; Grant Ritchie, Sacramento Municipal Utility District; Rod Wright, Modesto Irrigation District; Bill Bell, Pacific Gas & Electric; and Ray Thomas, City of Redding. Not pictured: Matt Goldsmith, Outside Line Construction. (Photo: Art Murray)

Healthcare reforms aren’t working

President Clinton recently made headlines by ordering the Department of Health and Human Services to deny Medicare contracts to health insurance companies that discriminate against high-risk consumers.

And the Democrats and Republicans are currently outdoing each other to crack down on the excesses of HMOs.

It is encouraging to see both parties addressing the public’s distress over misdeeds by private health insurers. But this sort of piecemeal regulation is useful only to spotlight the abuses of the present system. As policy, it runs the risk of adding more layers of bureaucracy without addressing the deeper problem of a fragmented, profit-oriented health system.

In such a system, insurers pursue profits in two basic ways. They avoid covering people who are sick or likely to get sick. And they work to minimize the costs of treatment of sick people they can’t avoid covering. This strategy, of course, is at odds with the whole point of health insurance. HMOs put out a great deal of publicity about how they emphasize wellness, prevention and coordinated care. This certainly described the community-oriented, non-profit group health plans of a generation ago.

But today’s for-profit HMO’s lack that social mission. They are responsive mainly to Wall Street. They have much higher patient turnover than old-fashioned pre-paid group plans, so it doesn’t make economic sense for them to invest in your lifetime wellness. And the cost savings that can be garnered by more comprehensive screenings and vaccinations pale next to the savings available from avoiding sick people and limiting care.

Most states now prohibit health plans from denying a new mother two days in the hospital; they require HMOs to pay for reasonable emergency room care and inpatient mastectomies. But it is just not practical to regulate health care, one condition at a time.

The federal Kennedy-Kassebaum law requires insurance companies to offer coverage at reasonable prices to people who’ve lost their health insurance because they moved or changed jobs. However, Kennedy-Kassebaum offers no assistance to people seeking insurance for the first time.

But the worst consumer abuses of the present HMO system are not touched by any of the proposed legislation or regulation. These include doctor-compensation formulas that make the doctor’s income contingent on how much care is withheld; subtle marketing practices by managed care companies that make plans attractive to healthy subscribers and unattractive to sick ones; and elaborate protocols that get between doctor and patient, aimed mainly at saving money.

It is ironic, to say the least, that our desire to keep health insurance in the private sector led to less patient choice, more gaps in coverage, more clinical interference by private bureaucrats and a backlash of (mostly ineffectual) government regulation. At some point, one hopes soon, this system will collapse of its own weight and universal health insurance will be back on the national agenda.

(Robert Kuttner is co-editor of American Prospect. Excerpted from Health Letter.)
e the voters are the real jury sitting in judgment of the Congress of the United States and we must make a decision on Election Day, Nov. 3. At stake are the quality and future of programs that affect all Americans. There are significant risks in this election for senior citizens, their children, grandchildren.

The quality and future of Social Security, Medicare, Older Americans Act, Patients Bill of Rights, education of our children and grandchildren—all of these will be voted on by the next Congress.

It is extremely important that every eligible citizen vote in this election, because Americans of all ages have a vital stake in the outcome of decisions made by the next Congress.

This is a critical election year for seniors as well as working men and women. The ongoing attempt to enact legislation that would force labor unions to get written authorization from their members for political use of dues money is nothing more than an attempt to muzzle free speech in this country. We cannot allow this to happen. As you know, by working together, seniors and unions defeated the effort in California. However, the forces in the Republican party who supported the passage of Prop. 226 are still alive and kicking.

Wall Street brokers and financial planners have joined forces with conservative ideologues in an effort to privatize Social Security and get their hands on an additional $150 billion in fees and profits a year. We cannot allow this to happen.

The insurance industry wants to reinvent Medicare, which now operates on a fee-for-service basis, and force seniors into for-profit managed-care networks where they will find health care rationed on behalf of their members for political decision, but the passage of Prop. 226 are still alive and kicking.

But Social Security aims to make retirement a matter of solidarity and rights, not luck. Society has a collective responsibility to take care of its old and infirm—that's the solidarity part. And we have a right to retire on a decent income once we've done our share of work. We fulfill our responsibility by paying into the system and by electing a government that guarantees our rights.

Because people are expected to live longer than in the past, and because baby boomers will expand the rolls of retirees, pessimistic projections have the system running a 23% deficit in about 30 years. To be prudent, we must come up with more money. That is a painful political decision, but the privatizers avoid that by promising a free lunch from the stock market.

But there is no free lunch. The more extreme versions of "reform" reduce monthly payouts to about $400 per month, i.e., poverty level...The stealth reforms would also raise the retirement age to 70...The same politicians who are squirmish about raising the social security tax on the wealthy have no problem tackling a mandatory five years onto your working life. A viable plan that spreads the pain among the classes will go a long way towards combating public cynicism. So will an energetic movement that makes social solidarity a real alternative to the anxious and isolated scramble to secure a decent retirement.

Keep the faith!

By Orv Owen

Voters are the jury on November 3rd

Don’t replace guaranteed earnings with speculation

Those who would privatize Social Security ask us to give up a pension with guaranteed benefits for a chance to do better on the stock market. While the privatizers boast loudly of working men and women, the plan’s balance sheet. We cannot allow this to happen. Seniors and citizens over 50, who traditionally vote in larger proportions than any other segment of the population, can play an even more important role in determining who gets elected in the next Congress. However, we must increase our efforts to get out the vote in the aging community as well as among our friends and neighbors.

To make a difference, you’ve got to vote!

When Samuel Gompers, the first president of the American Federation of Labor, was asked about the political policy of the AFL, he stated: "Reward your friends and punish your enemies."

It was true then, and it is true now! Keep the faith!

Congratulations to the newly-retired!

The Local 1245 Retirees Club extends its congratulations to these recently-retired members of the union. We invited you to participate in a Retirees Club chapter in your area, or to start one if there is none if there is none! Call Austin Lea at 925-933-6060 Ext. 240.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Yrs/Svc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Ball</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Borson</td>
<td>Stockton, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bowley</td>
<td>Fresno, CA</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Crane</td>
<td>Bakersfield, CA</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Rocha</td>
<td>Pleasanton, CA</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Sarletic</td>
<td>Sun Lakes, AZ</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Silva</td>
<td>Paradise, CA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Tyrrell</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Retiree Club dates

East Bay Chapter: Meets 2nd Thursday each month, 10 a.m., at Local 1245 headquarters, 3063 Citrus Circle, Walnut Creek, Ca.

San Jose Chapter: Meets 1st Thursday each month, 10 a.m., at Local 332, 1870 Stone Ave., San Jose.
Union honors members at service award ceremony

Fresno, Ca.
March 14, 1998

45 Years
Bill Pease, left, and Frank Ruiz, right receive awards from Business Manager Jack McNally.

40 Years
Pease, William

35 Years
Fulton, Thomas
Mendez, Cray
Richmond, Henry
Tillery, Thomas

30 Years
Corbin, James
Donaldson, G. L
Donovan, Frank
Ferguson, Vernon
Kral, Jerry
McGuiire, Glenn
Mclaughlin, Donald
Pendley, Orvil
Richmond, Henry
Tillery, Thomas

25 Years
Anderson, Terry
Browner, Arthur
Gonzalez, Frank
Hernandez, Gilbert
Humel, Je
Walter, Dan
James, Stan
Kaye, Thomas
Martinez, Thomas
MacGown, Lance
Moore, Beverly
Mendenhall, Cesar
Morris, Roger
Omaha, Abraham
Ozelas, Michael
Patrick, Norrell
Peters, Richard
Pug, Jonathan
Puckett, Michael
Udell, Patricia
Ram, Robert
Ramirez, Mano
Ramirez, Ramon
Real, Alan
Rodriguez, Robert
Rodriguez, Roger
Rodriguez, Brian
Rodriguez, John
Schiott, Ermittz
Schroeder, Robert
Serpa, Vince
Serpa, Tony
Starkiey, Jim
Stout, Thomas
Torres, Frank
Tuttles, Robert
Urbano, Antonio
Valdez, Joe
Vantassel, Ted
Vujich, Richard
Waltum, Richard
Wilson, James
Witherell, Dee
Yamanaha, Karson

20 Years
Aguiar, Danny
Allen, Steve
Alvarado, Angel
Anton, Sue
Armada, George
Barber, Rob
Barrett, Clinton
Beasley, Gerlad
Blachmon, Alphon
Bryant, Howard II
Bryan, Patricia
Camacho, Robert
Cano, Gregory
Carra, S.
Chepoy, Bryan

15 Years
Aguayo, Danny
Alderete, Frank
Alvarado, Angel
Anton, Sue
Armada, George
Barber, Rob
Barrett, Clinton
Beasley, Gerlad
Blackmon, Alphon
Bryant, Howard II
Bryan, Patricia
Camacho, Robert
Cano, Gregory
Carra, S.
Chepoy, Bryan

10 Years
Aguayo, Danny
Allen, Steve
Alvarado, Angel
Anton, Sue
Armada, George
Barber, Rob
Barrett, Clinton
Beasley, Gerlad
Blackmon, Alphon
Bryant, Howard II
Bryan, Patricia
Camacho, Robert
Cano, Gregory
Carra, S.
Chepoy, Bryan

5 Years
Aguayo, Danny
Allen, Steve
Alvarado, Angel
Anton, Sue
Armada, George
Barber, Rob
Barrett, Clinton
Beasley, Gerlad
Blackmon, Alphon
Bryant, Howard II
Bryan, Patricia
Camacho, Robert
Cano, Gregory
Carra, S.
Chepoy, Bryan

1 Year
Aguayo, Danny
Allen, Steve
Alvarado, Angel
Anton, Sue
Armada, George
Barber, Rob
Barrett, Clinton
Beasley, Gerlad
Blackmon, Alphon
Bryant, Howard II
Bryan, Patricia
Camacho, Robert
Cano, Gregory
Carra, S.
Chepoy, Bryan