

# Special Edition Voting Record SCOPE

Published by California CIO Council on Political Education  
117 West Ninth Street • Los Angeles 15, California

Form 3547 is requested.

**ADDITIONAL SCOPE COPIES AVAILABLE  
SEE PAGE 9 FOR REORDER PRICES**

December 3, 1957

SPECIAL EDITION VOTING RECORD

75

Volume 1, No. 3

## LEGISLATOR'S VOTING RECORD TELLS TRUE STORY

### "POLLS" USE MISLEADING QUESTIONS

The California CIO Cope has charged that the California Citizens Committee for Voluntary Unionism has issued a fraudulent interpretation of a poll conducted on its behalf by the Opinion Research Corporation of Princeton, N.J. The California CIO Cope stated "The questions asked in the poll do not show that the people of California would vote for the same 'right-to-wreck' union law that exists in eighteen states. In fact, California citizens have turned down such proposals in the past with emphatic majorities."

COPE officials pointed out that many people would have voted in favor of the question in the poll which was posed as follows: "Some states have passed 'right-to-work' laws that guarantee each worker the right to hold his job in a company no matter whether he joins a labor union or not; if you were asked to vote on such a law would you vote for it or against it?" COPE officials declared that "no state has passed such a law as posed in the question because a 'right-to-work' law that guaranteed each worker the right to hold his job in a company irrespective of his union membership would be a law that guaranteed a worker permanent employment with a company so long as said worker desired such permanent employment. It implies a full employment law; it implies that no member of a union can be fired because it would be a violation of his right to work."

In the past California CIO COPE has pointed out that such misleading questions and the huckster slogan "right-to-work" can bring affirmative replies from voters because of the double meaning of such questions.

The second question on the poll; "No one should be required to join any private organization like a labor union, against his will. Do you agree with this or do you disagree?" It is also misleading. The CIO COPE statement says: "It is surprising that only 66% of the union members interviewed agreed with the question. Naturally, Steelworkers would not want to be forced to belong to the Auto Workers Union or vice versa. Union members want to be able to choose their place of employment on the basis of their own individual decision. They want to choose their union by majority rule of the workers in a given collective bargaining unit or industry."

"This survey", the COPE statement concludes, "is made up of double-talking, double-meaning and double-thinking questions. It is a product of the kind of totalitarian thinking which holds the individual's right to make up his own mind in contempt."

### Much Still To Be Done

A statement by AFL-CIO President George Meany:

The legislative record of the Eighty-fifth Congress at its half-way mark merits considerable praise as well as severe criticism. For one achievement alone the first session of this Congress has earned a place in history—it adopted the first civil rights bill in eighty-two years.

This new law does not go as far as the AFL-CIO advocated, but it does constitute a great milestone of progress in the fight to assure enjoyment of constitutional rights by all citizens, regardless of race or color. Insofar as this law will protect the right of Negroes to vote, it may by its own operation accomplish other important civil rights reforms.

It is not too surprising that this Congress failed to make similarly significant advances in other fields. The time necessarily consumed by the civil rights issue foredoomed the chances of other legislation.

Considering how many previous Congresses had been stalled on dead center by filibusters over civil rights legislation, the Eighty-fifth Congress deserves, at the very least, a vote of thanks from the American people for breaking the blockade.

Now that civil rights legislation is out of the way, perhaps the Eighty-fifth Congress will be able at its second session, beginning in January, to clean up a great deal of vital unfinished business and to correct some serious shortcomings.

First and foremost on this list must be placed a comprehensive federal aid-to-education program. Our country desperately needs construction of new schools. We need improved standards for teachers. We need to increase facilities for higher education and to encourage talented young men and women to develop, through schooling and training, the scientific knowledge and skills which will enable them best to serve their country.

Congress did pass a housing bill, but an inadequate one. We urgently need an effective housing program which would get rid of city and farm slums and make it possible for families in the low and middle income groups to rent or buy decent homes at prices within their means.

The new immigration, mutual security and atomic energy laws were required, but all fell short of the nation's needs. Opportunity must be found to correct and strengthen these next year.

It is difficult to find an excuse for the failure of Congress thus far to act favorably on proposed legislation to extend the coverage of the minimum wage law to millions of workers still deprived of its protection, the failure to provide relief measures for economically depressed areas, the failure to enact tax relief for low and middle income groups, and the failure to protect the health and welfare funds of workers by

(Continued on Page 9, Col. 3)

### KNOWLAND SURPRISED BY KNIGHT WITHDRAWAL

By JUDGE MATRIX, The Computer Man

(Judge Matrix is the pen name for the author, who, for a number of years has applied the law of probabilities and other mathematical formula to analyzing election results and campaign strategy.)

Political experts in a position to know say that Knowland was not involved in any deal but was surprised when Knight withdrew.

John Despol, legislative representative for California CIO, has been reported as stating, "Common sense tells us that Senator Knowland, a conservative traditionalist, had hoped to defeat Knight (an Eisenhower middle-of-the-road Republican who has been a more progressive governor than most Democrats or Republicans expected) for a second term for governor."

Knight was "Zhukoved" by the political, financial and newspaper supporters of Knowland. The powerful behind-the-scenes backers of Knowland succeeded in persuading Knight to withdraw by using a combination of stratagems. Among other things, they showed Knight a random sample poll which indicated he would be defeated by Knowland in the Republican primary. They also cut off most of his financial support.

Now Knowland is in the position that he cannot use a primary election victory over Knight in the presidential dickering in 1960 if he becomes governor.

Ironically, it would also have been to Attorney General Pat Brown's advantage if Governor Knight had stayed in the gubernatorial contest without funds and big backing from organized Republican leadership—headed for what the California GOP party leadership thought was sure defeat. NIXON SETS UP "CAROM" SHOT TO KNOCK OUT KNIGHT-KNOWLAND

Behind the scenes in the Republican party, the boys in the "know" are whispering that the shrewdest cookie of them all in California's big triangle is one Richard Milhous Nixon, of Whittier.

Nixon, say the whisperers, has maneuvered Senator William Knowland into a position where he will be slaughtered by Democrat Pat Brown, and what will this do for the politically smart Vice President Nixon? Leave the field clear for him to trot up to the White House, of course.

If the lone Democratic candidate, State Attorney General Brown, defeats him, any presidential ambition Knowland may have—and who in the political leadership of the nation does not—will suffer a fatal setback.

"I am sure Governor Knight withdrew after making up his own mind," stated CIO's Despol, in pointing out that the Governor as a practical politician had been maneuvered into a position of risking defeat as a Republican. Other AFL labor leaders had pointed out that Governor

Knight's only real political alternative was to change his registration to Democratic and run for the Democratic nomination. If Knight had not been a loyal GOP party man he probably would, as a Democratic nominee, have been a real cinch to defeat Knowland in the general election in 1958.

In another comment the vocal State CIO secretary has stated, "Knowland is a man with very strong convictions who has not made a practice of introducing Congressional legislation of benefit to labor."

He has either been indifferent, lukewarm or hostile to the great social programs and industrial reform legislation of the past twenty years." Similar opinions have been expressed by the State AFL's Neil Haggerty who on several occasions has given a very caustic description of Knowland. The State AFL leader has said:

"It is apparent that Mr. Knowland doesn't know his own state. He has spent too much time out of California and not enough in it. Only a man ignorant of the state's magnificent industrial progress would now destroy responsible labor-management relations developed through decades of mutual patience and understanding."

Having intimate knowledge of how Knowland's mental processes work and realizing that Knowland's outlook on society constituted his Achilles heel, the Nixon strategists behind the scenes set the stage to mousetrap Knowland.

Here's what the wise ones in the smoke-filled rooms are saying—privately: Knowland was urged to get into the Governor race by many of Nixon's closest friends. They are confident he cannot and will not defeat Brown. If he doesn't, and has quit the Senate (as he said he would), Knowland will be dead, politically.

An important factor in the Nixon strategy is—hold your hats—labor. Nixon and his brain trust took into consideration something important that Knowland either forgot or ignored: Almost forty percent of labor in California are registered Republicans. Of that forty percent, just about NINETY percent are strongly opposed to any 'right-to-wreck' law—and, therefore, many of these Republican laborites will not vote for Knowland.

The Nixonites figure that Knowland can't concede a substantial portion of ninety percent of the Republican labor vote, and still win. They point out that an incumbent gets a normal 25-percent of the vote, simply because of being an incumbent. Also, a good hunk of middle-of-the-road Republicans are against Knowland because of his position against Federal-Aid-to-Education and his condemnation of Eisenhower's settlement of the Korean War.

The Nixon people are confident, therefore, that they have successfully maneuvered Knowland into sure defeat. In addition they have succeeded in getting Knowland to commit himself not to enter Presidential primaries in other states.

But what about Knight?

Governor Knight, figured the Nixonites who still remember Knight's anti-Nixon position in the 1956 presidential election, will be cooled off in the Senatorial primary. How? The Knight-Knowland battle which has already occurred will sharpen the intra-party conflicts between now and the primary election. The majority of the Knowland supporters will support Mayor Christopher of San Francisco in the Republican Senatorial primary. In the finals "Republican Senatorial nominee Christopher" (who has come out against Knowland's right-to-wreck-unions law) will provide a rallying point for the Republican labor vote for himself and all other similar-minded candidates—thus isolating the more rabid, more reactionary Knowland supporters who as political die-hards constitute a danger not only to Christopher's victory but to all Republican candidates in marginal districts. Part of the Nixonites

(Continued on Page 10, Col. 1)

### Politics and High Cost of Living

In this special issue of the CIO Scope Newsletter we will, as usual, publish the voting record of your Congressmen and United States Senators, your Assemblymen and State Senators. Nearly every vote directly affects your standard of living, your unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, your taxes, the schools your children attend, the kind of textbooks they will read, even your personal freedoms as guaranteed by our federal Constitution. The facts are here. It is the hope of your officers that you will read and study those facts and act accordingly.

#### DECISIONS ON GOOD AND BAD LEGISLATION

You will find that the Voting Record lists some votes as "good" and others as "bad". These votes are based on policy resolutions passed at the national AFL-CIO Convention, at State CIO Conventions, and at the International Union conventions of our affiliates. These policy decisions represent the best thinking and experience of your elected union representatives. Nevertheless, individual opinions sometimes differ from majority opinion as expressed in convention resolutions. For that reason we have listed the "good" and "bad" votes under either the "Aye" or "No" column so that if your opinion on some issue differs from that of the AFL-CIO convention delegates, you can see at a glance exactly how your Congressman, Senators or Assemblyman voted.

#### EVALUATE THE VOTING RECORD

In checking the "Good" and "Bad" votes of your state and national legislators it is a normal and natural inclination to make a mental note of the number of such good and bad votes, as well as the number of times your representatives have been absent or failed to vote.

In counting the number of "good" and "bad" votes the question will logically arise: "How many 'good' votes should a legislator have to classify him as one who should be supported by organized labor?" This analysis must be made, but it does not tell the whole story. It is necessary to check carefully on the issues involved. A legislator may well vote right on many issues, yet vote wrong on two or three major policy issues which can well transcend in community importance many of those issues on which he voted right.

Thus a combination of the NUMBER of right votes, and the KIND of right votes is necessary for a complete and accurate measurement of your Assemblyman, State Senator, Congressman and U.S. Senators. We urge your careful reading of this record in helping you make this analysis. You owe it to yourself so that you may be a better informed voter. An understanding of legislative votes will also help you to understand why the California CIO COPE places great emphasis on the voting record when endorsements are being considered.

#### ENDORSEMENTS BY AFL-CIO COPE

Early in 1958 candidates for public office will be endorsed by the California COPE State Convention. We suggest you make a careful comparison between these endorsements and the voting records of the incumbents listed in the California CIO COPE Newsletter. SAVE THIS ISSUE FOR FUTURE REFERENCE.

Endorsements will be made at county and state COPE conventions at which all unions have representation. Along with "electability," an important factor in these endorsements will be this voting record. In addition, all candidates who desire COPE endorsement will be interviewed, and the questions asked them will be based on this record and on resolutions passed at convention.

Through this procedure, individual union members, and others who may be interested, may have confidence in COPE recommendations which carry the moral weight of thorough investigation of both candidates and issues to appear on your ballot.

#### USE THE FACTS

JOHN A. DESPOL  
Legislative Representative

### "Right-to-Work" Proposal Slick Deception

Sponsors of the mis-named "Right-to-Work" law would like to have you believe that this measure would give the workers of the state the absolute "right" to hold a job. Nothing could be further from the truth. The measure takes away job security and other benefits and conditions established through years of free negotiations between management and their employees. The National Right-to-Work Committee even goes so far as to entitle its official booklet on "right-to-work" measures "Legislative Restrictions Upon Union Security Agreements". They admit the true nature of such legislation! This tricky, mis-named bit of legislation makes absolutely no guarantee of a job for anyone. In fact, it removes a substantial portion of a wage-earner's job security by undermining the security of his union.

#### WHO WANTS UNION SECURITY?

First of all, the employees want union security. From 1947 to 1951, a provision in the Taft-Hartley Act required that a majority of the employees in a given bargaining unit had to decide in favor of the union security provision before an employer could grant it. During those four years, there were 46,119 union shop elections, held under the supervision of the National Labor Relations Board. In those elections, the union shop was approved in 97.1 per cent of the elections. There were over four and one-half million votes cast FOR the union shops in those elections. Because of this overwhelming vote favoring union security, Congress did away with the election requirement, thus leaving employers and unions free to negotiate security clauses.

Many employers are on record favoring union security clauses as a favorable factor in sound management. A survey, conducted by the National Industrial Conference Board, a research agency wholly supported by employers, found that responsible management recognizes union security as a good and desirable thing. They stated: "Union security breeds responsible trade unionism; responsible trade unionism is what we want."

The National Planning Association, composed of leading industrialists and outstanding figures in professional and public life, also investigated the subject. It reports: "In all of the cases studied, the employers saw positive advantages in bargaining with a strong and well-disciplined union, and were convinced that they should take steps, directly or indirectly, to encourage workers to join and support the organization which represented them."

#### PROSPERITY HURT BY "RIGHT-TO-WORK"

You, and every other California man and woman will be hit where it hurts—in the pocketbook—if a "right-to-work" law is passed in this state. Eighteen states now have such a law on the books. Figures from the U. S. Department of Labor prove that in those 18 states, the workers don't make as much money as they do in California. In those states, raises come slower and they're smaller than they are in California. If the wage adjustment pattern in California had followed that of those 18 states, last year California workers would have received ONE BILLION DOLLARS LESS in their pay envelopes than they did.

The average income of the workers in the 18 states with this law is over 40% LESS than it is in California although the cost-of-living is JUST AS HIGH. Working conditions are poorer; jobs are fewer; workers have no union security. The "Right-to-Work" law forbids it.

#### DEFEAT PHONY SCHEME

A small group of selfish employers know that California workers won't vote to cut their pay checks. They will, therefore, attempt to secure your signature on a "Right-to-Work" or "Voluntary Unionism" petition in order to place a measure on the ballot, under these misleading titles, which will do exactly that—cut your pay check.

So don't be fooled by the propaganda of your enemies. Don't help cut your own pay check! Pass the word along. Don't sign any petition to put this phoney union wrecking "right-to-work" bill on the ballot.



KEY TO HOUSE AND SENATE VOTES

+ A vote which CIO believes to be in the best interest of working people.

- A vote which CIO believes to be contrary to the interest of working people.

+P A "PAIR" in favor of organized labor.

-P A "PAIR" against organized labor.

A A member absent or not voting.

(D) After member's name indicates Democrat.

(R) After member's name indicates Republican.

VOTING RECORD

CALIFORNIA CONGRESSMEN

85th CONGRESS, 1957

DISTRICT	PARTY	CONGRESSMEN	Tabulated Votes			CIVIL RIGHTS	WATER AND POWER		ATOMIC ENERGY		EDUCATION		LABOR — CUTS IN LABOR DEPT. APPROPRIATIONS						Hard Money Policy		VETERANS		FOREIGN POLICY				SOCIAL WELFARE																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																								
			Total Good Votes	Total Bad Votes	Absent or Not Voting	1. (H.R. 6127)—Motion to recommit Civil Rights Bill to insert a provision requiring jury trials in Civil Rights cases. Rejected June 18, 1957.	2. (H.R. 7221)—Flood Insurance. House refused to appropriate funds for flood disaster insurance. June 18, 1957.	3. (H.R. 9131)—Vote on motion to reduce funds for Tennessee Valley Authority. This was an attack on the concept of public power. Aug. 7, 1957.	4. (H.R. 8996)—Amendment to Atomic Energy Appropriation Bill eliminating authorization for construction of a natural uranium reactor plant and a plutonium recycling plant. Aug. 9, 1957.	5. (H.R. 1)—Vote is on motion to strike the enacting clause (kill) the school construction assistance act of 1957. July 25, 1957.	6. (H.R. 6287)—Vote is on amendment to cut \$204,000 from the appropriation for the Solicitor's Office of the Dept. of Labor. This office is necessary to the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act. April 4, 1957.	7. (H.R. 2687)—Vote is on amendment to cut appropriations for salaries and expenses of Wage and Hour Division employees, thus hampering enforcement of Minimum Wage Law. April 4, 1957.	8. (H.R. 2687)—Vote is on amendment to greatly reduce budget of the Food and Drug Administration of the Dept. of Labor. This is agency responsible for enforcement of Pure Food and Drug laws. April 4, 1957.	9. (H.R. 6287)—Vote is on amendment to delete appropriation to Department of Labor for grants to states for sewage disposal plants. April 4, 1957.	10. (H.R. 6287)—Vote is on amendment to cut \$12 million from appropriation for grants to states for unemployment compensation and other programs. April 4, 1957.	11. (H.Res. 85)—Vote on resolution calling for congressional investigation of Administration's Hard Money Policy. March 27, 1957.	12. (H.R. 3287)—Vote is on amendment to cut appropriation to operate Bureau of Veterans' Re-employment Rights. April 4, 1957.	13. Vote is on a proposal to further reduce U.S. contributions to international organizations. April 17, 1957.	14. Vote is on amendment to Foreign Aid Bill which, if passed, would have removed the Development Loan Fund from which underdeveloped countries draw. July 19, 1957.	15. House vote on conference report on Foreign Aid Bill. Passed August 14, 1957.	16. (H.R. 4249)—Vote is on motion to cut federal funds for state assistance programs substantial. Vy. Feb. 5, 1957.																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														
7	R	ALLEN	4	12	0																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																														</

Explanation of Congressional Issues

Here's a short description of each of the 16 key votes in the House of Representatives which are recorded above. Read the description of these issues, then see how your Congressman voted on them.

Civil Rights

1. Poff (R. Va.) motion to recommit the Civil Rights Bill (HR 6127) in order to insert a provision requiring jury trial in a criminal contempt action in civil rights cases involving punishment for disobedience to a Federal Court injunction.

This represented the fifth attempt by civil rights opponents to write this provision into the House bill.

Opponents of the amendment argued that Southern juries would be extremely unlikely to convict in a civil rights case and that this amendment would therefore substantially weaken the enforcement provisions of the bill.

The Poff amendment was opposed by 112 Democrats and 139 Republicans. It was supported by 45 Republicans and 113 Democrats (98 Southern Democrats). Rejected 158-251 on June 18, 1957. Yea—wrong; Nay—right.

Water and Power

2. FLOOD INSURANCE — Boland (D. Mass.) motion that the House concur in a Senate amendment providing \$14 million for the start of a Federal flood insurance program in the third fiscal 1957 appropriation (HR 7221).

In July 1956 Congress voted overwhelmingly for a program of flood insurance and appropriated \$500,000 to set up the Federal Flood Indemnity Administration.

Flood insurance is not available through private insurance companies, but the Federal program is set up to function through private companies, which would sell and service the policies with Federal supervision. The Federal government would 1) reimburse the private insurance companies for no more than the cost of handling the flood insurance, 2) share the payment of premiums with the policyholder (the policyholder would pay 60% and the Government 40%) and 3) be liable, through Treasury loans, for the payment of losses.

The 1956 measure limits the amount of insurance on one dwelling and its contents to \$10,000 and the amount on a single business or corporation to \$250,000. In addition to other exclusions these contracts would deduct \$500 plus 5% of the remainder of the loss.

The program is intended to become self-supporting over a period of years with the premium income from policyholders equal to the amount paid out in claims settlements. In addition, the program would save the Federal government funds it now pays out in emergency flood relief.

The Eisenhower budget message called for \$100 million for this program. When the budget request actually came to Congress this had been cut to \$50 million. The House Appropriation Committee cut this

item from the bill entirely. The Senate restored \$14 million for the purpose of getting the flood control program set up and underway. This motion was an attempt to get House agreement to the \$14 million provided in the Senate version of the bill. After defeat of this motion, the Senate agreed to dropping these funds without a roll call vote June 19, 1957.

This motion was supported by 127 Democrats and 59 Republicans. It was opposed by 129 Republicans and 89 Democrats (60 Southern Democrats). Rejected 186-218 on June 18, 1957. Yea-right; nay—wrong.

T.V.A.

3. T.V.A.—Taber (R. N.Y.), motion to recommit the First Fiscal 1958 supplemental Appropriation Bill (HR 9131) to reduce the funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority by \$9,784,000 (from \$13,317,000 to \$3,533,000).

The original request for TVA funds, \$14,782,000 was cut by \$1,467,000 by the House Appropriations Committee. Most of the funds requested were for the specific purpose of rebuilding a lock to make possible the proper navigation of the Tennessee River.

Supporters of this motion attacked TVA and the whole concept of public power. Opponents of the motion countered with a list of TVA's contribution to the nation in terms of money paid into the Treasury, millions of dollars of savings in an effective system of flood-control dams, efficient shipping to consumers of the area with savings for the shippers and the consumers, low cost power provided to such Federal government buyers as the Atomic Energy Commission, cheaper fertilizer and phosphorus for munitions from TVA's chemical plants.

This amendment was opposed by 219 Democrats and 25 Republicans. It was supported by 156 Republicans and 2 Democrats (Hebert D La., and Fallon D Md.) Rejected 158-244 on August 7, 1957. Yea—wrong; nay—right.

Atomic Energy

4. Van Zandt (R Pa.) amendment to bill authorizing appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission (HR 8996) to eliminate a \$40 million authorization for construction of a natural uranium reactor and a \$15 million authorization for a plutonium recycling plant.

Underlying this amendment was the disagreement between the Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission, on one hand, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, on the other over the government's role in the development of atomic power for civilian use. It is the Administration position that private power companies should receive government subsidies of various kinds to develop civilian atomic power from which they would then reap the profits. The majority of the Joint Committee hold the view that the government should take whatever steps necessary to make sure that the interests of the taxpayers, who have already invested millions in the atomic energy program, is

protected when such energy becomes available for civilian use.

Neither proposed plant involved the production or sale of public power. The Joint Committee urged the building of a natural uranium reactor to place the U.S. in a competitive position with Britain and Russia for the world market. Other countries developing atomic power for peaceful uses will be likely to use cheaper natural uranium in preference to the more expensive fortified uranium reactors now in use in the U.S.

Arguing against this amendment Rep. Holifield (D Calif.) said, "The only use plutonium today is in bombs and one of the reasons why we think we ought to have more plutonium is that it is a very necessary ingredient of cleaner bombs . . . We want to know how to turn our plutonium bomb stock into peacetime application . . . there are some great issues involved here. The President's atoms-for-peace program, the competition in foreign fields with natural uranium reactors is involved, the conversion of our bomb stock to peacetime fuel use is involved." (CR 9/9/57 p 12982).

This amendment was opposed by 182 Democrats and 6 Republicans. It was supported by 176 Republicans and 35 Democrats (21 Southern Democrats). Accepted 211-188 on August 9, 1957. Yea—wrong; nay—right.

NOTE: As passed by the Senate, this measure provided for both the natural uranium reactor and plutonium recycle reactor (Senate vote No. 8). The conference version which became law retained the plutonium reactor and authorized \$3 million for "development, design and engineering" work on the natural uranium reactor, directed the AEC to submit a report to the Joint Committee by April 1, 1958 and provided that construction on the reactor should not begin until authorized by Congress.

Education

5. Smith (D Va.) motion to strike the enacting clause (kill) the School Construction Assistance Act of 1957 (HR 1).

As it came to the floor of the House, this bill provided for \$1.5 billion program of grants to states over a five-year period. Half of the grant funds would be allotted to state education agencies on the basis of total school age population and half on the basis of need.

Two factors are generally blamed for the failure of this measure to pass—1) the acceptance without roll-call vote of the Wainwright (R N.Y.) amendment to prohibit the use of Federal funds in segregated school districts, and 2) the failure of President Eisenhower to give full support to this bill.

Wainwright, an avowed opponent of this bill (CR 7/25/57 p 11539), was successful in getting an amendment adopted similar to the Powell (D N.Y.) amendment of 1956. Some of the strongest supporters of the Civil Rights bill opposed this amendment as a device to kill the School Construction Bill and as being unnecessary since it was

up to the courts to enforce the Supreme Court decision banning segregation.

On May 21, 1957, the AFL-CIO Executive Council said, "The AFL-CIO urges the Congress to meet its obligation to America's children by promptly enacting H.R. 1 into law without crippling amendments."

While President Eisenhower had expressed support for some Federal assistance to schools, an expected release from the White House was not issued and the expected telephone calls from the White House to Congressional leaders were not made in support of this legislation. Much of the debate centered around the President's ambiguous position.

The Smith motion to kill the School Construction bill was opposed by 126 Democrats and 77 Republicans. It was supported by 111 Republicans and 97 Democrats (88 Southern Democrats). Agreed to 208-203 on July 25, 1957. Yea—wrong; nay—right.

Cuts in Labor Department Appropriations

6. Budge (R Idaho) amendment to cut \$204,000 for Solicitor's Office, Labor Department from fiscal 1958 appropriations for Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare (HR 6287).

The Solicitor's Office of the Labor Department handles litigation necessary in the enforcement of such laws as the Fair Labor Standards Act. Opponents of this amendment charged that failure to provide sufficient funds for this office would delay prosecution of employers who failed to pay workers the wages to which they are entitled by law.

This cut was opposed by 129 Democrats and 42 Republicans. It was supported by 153 Republicans and 88 Democrats (76 Southern Democrats). Agreed 241-171 on April 4, 1957. Yea—wrong; nay—right.

NOTE: As finally passed by both Houses and signed by the President, \$2,121,000 was appropriated for the Office of the Solicitor. This represented a restoration of \$100,000 of the \$204,000 cut by the Budget amendment above.

Wage - Hour

7. Hebert (D La.) amendment to cut \$288,000 from salaries and expenses of the Wage and Hour Division from the fiscal 1958 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare (HR 6287).

Arguing against this cut Rep. Fogarty (D R.I.) said, " . . . there will have to be an actual reduction in the level of operations. This at a time when the rate of back wages found due is at the highest level ever . . . Two years ago, this body . . . increased the minimum wage from 75c to \$1. Are we now saying that we do not want to enforce that minimum? Wage-Hour investigations show that 1 out of every 5 firms are violating the dollar minimum." (CR 4/3/57 p 4498).

This amendment was opposed by 150 Democrats and 55 Republicans. It was sup-

ported by 142 Republicans and 72 Democrats (Southern Democrats). Agreed to 214-205 on April 4, 1957. Yea—wrong; nay—right.

NOTE: As finally passed by both Houses and signed by the President, the provisions of the Hebert amendment were retained. The total appropriation for the Wage and Hour Division was \$10.6 million.

Food and Drug

8. Jonas (R N.C.) amendment to cut \$1,327,000 from funds for the Food and Drug Administration from fiscal 1958 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare (HR 6287).

Opponents of this amendment argued that this amendment "would bring to an abrupt halt the orderly program . . . to bring this agency to the point where it can do a decent job of protecting the American men, women and children from dangerous and filthy foods and drugs. It will stop this program that was initiated on the unanimous recommendation of a citizens committee appointed in 1954 to make and objective study of this problem." (CR 4/4/57 p 4498).

This amendment was opposed by 191 Democrats and 94 Republicans. It was supported by 99 Republicans and 31 Democrats (30 Southern Democrats). Rejected 130-285 on April 4, 1957. Yea—wrong; nay—right.

Sewage Disposal

9. Fisher (D Texas) amendment to delete \$5 million for grants to states for sewage plant construction from fiscal 1958 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare (HR 6287).

Opposing this amendment, Rep. Fogarty (D R.I.) said, "the cost of sewage disposal plants has multiplied since WW II while cities have an increased demand for all kinds of public construction. "Since counties, school districts, and special districts overlap the municipal incorporated area . . . the general financing problem may often reach the near crisis stage in many areas . . . The benefits of a municipal sewage treatment plant are much greater to downstream water users than to the city which builds the plant . . . So if the House upholds this amendment it will mean denying all the people downstream the protection from pollution that we promised . . . when we passed the new Water Pollution Control Act." (CR 4/4/57 p 4499).

This amendment was opposed by 186 Democrats and 45 Republicans. It was supported by 150 Republicans and 35 Democrats (33 Southern Democrats). Rejected 185-231 on April 4, 1957. Yea—wrong; nay—right.

NOTE: As finally passed by both Houses and signed by the President, \$45 million was appropriated for grants to states for sewage disposal facilities.

(Continued on Page 3, Col. 1)



VOTING RECORD

OF U.S. SENATORS FROM CALIFORNIA

85th CONGRESS, 1957

U.S. SENATORS	Tabulated Votes			WATER AND POWER		CIVIL RIGHTS						TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY	ATOMIC ENERGY	TAXES	AGRI-CULTURE	PUBLIC HOUSING	SLUM CLEARANCE	FOREIGN POLICY	
	Total Good Votes	Total Bad Votes	Absent or Not Voting	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.		
				(S. 555)—Vote on passage of Hell's Canyon Dam Bill authorizing construction of a single high dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon. June 21, 1957.	Vote on confirmation of Jerome Kuykendall to second term on Federal Power Commission. Aug. 15, 1957.	Vote is on parliamentary move to send Civil Rights Bill to committee headed by Senator Eastland (kill the bill). June 20, 1957.	(H.R. 6127)—Vote is on motion to delete Section III from Civil Rights Bill, limiting it to enforcement of voting rights only. July 24, 1957.	Rule 22—Vote is on motion to table (kill) a change in Rule 22 designed to curb the filibuster.	Senate vote to grant a jury trial in all contempt cases brought to punish refusal to obey Federal Court orders in Civil Rights cases.	Vote is on amendment to TVA self-financing bill. Amendment gives congress veto power over each proposed power producing project. Aug. 9, 1957.	(S. 2674, H.R. 8996)—Vote on amendment to provide \$500,000 for design of atomic reactor instead of \$40 million for construction of plant. Aug. 16, 1957.	Vote on amendment to aid small business by reducing normal corporate taxes and increasing surtax on larger corporations. March 23, 1957.	Confirmation of Dan Paarlberg as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Paarlberg has opposed all farm price supports. Aug. 15, 1957.	Senate vote to increase construction of low-cost housing units from 35,000 units to 200,000 units. May 29, 1957.	Senate voted to reduce Federal contribution for slum clearance. May 29, 1957.	Senate vote on motion to limit foreign aid to one year. June 14, 1957.	Vote is on motion to delete the development loan fund from foreign aid bill. June 14, 1957.		
KNOWLAND (R)	5	9	0	Aye 45	No 38	Aye 39	No 45	Aye 52	No 38	Aye 37	No 46	Aye 33	No 52	Aye 42	No 32	Aye 34	No 55	Aye 38	No 54
KUCHEL (R)	8	6	0	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —	— — —

Explanation of House Issues

Explanation of U.S. Senate Issues

(Continued from Page 2)

### Unemployment Compensation

10. Byrnes (R Wis.) amendment to cut an additional \$12,186,000 in funds for grants to states for unemployment compensation and other programs. From Labor and HEW appropriations. (HR 6287).

This amendment was opposed by 159 Democrats and 41 Republicans. It was supported by 156 Republicans and 64 Democrats (58 Southern Democrats). Agreed to 220-200 on April 4, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

### Hard Money Policy

11. Patman (D Tex.) resolution calling for a Congressional investigation of the Administration's monetary (hard money) and fiscal policies. (H Res. 85).

This resolution was supported by 172 Democrats and 2 Republicans. It was opposed by 187 Republicans and 38 Democrats (34 Southern Democrats). Rejected 174-225 on March 27, 1957. Yea-right; nay-wrong.

### Veterans

12. Badge (R Idaho) amendment to cut \$136,000 from funds for the Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights from the fiscal 1958 appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare (HR 6287).

Rep. Fogarty (D R.I.) called this the "most shocking" of the proposed cuts. Fogarty charged that the cut would force an actual reduction in the level of operations for "the only major readjustment device available to veterans." (CR 4/3/57 p 4498).

This amendment was opposed by 187 Democrats and 88 Republicans. It was supported by 107 Republicans and 30 Democrats (30 Southern Democrats). Rejected 137-275 on April 4, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

### Foreign Policy

13. Reduce U. S. Contribution to International Organizations—The House rejected a proposal to reduce the amount of funds our government contributes to multilateral international organizations. The Appropriations Committee had already made a substantial cut into the original request and this amendment would have been an additional 20 per-cent reduction. (A vote for the reduction in this contribution is marked minus; against, plus.)

Defeated 166-205, April 17, 1957.

14. Strike Development Loan Fund from Foreign Aid Bill — The House refused to strike the provision for a Development Loan Fund to give capital assistance to underdeveloped areas from the foreign aid bill. (A vote for striking the Fund is marked minus; against, plus.) See 14 Senate vote No. 14. Defeated 181-227, July 19, 1957.

15. Conference Report on Foreign Aid Bill —The House approved the Conference Report on the Foreign Aid authorization measure. The report provided a compromise between a restrictive House bill and a less restrictive Senate one. (A vote for foreign aid is marked plus; against, minus). Passed 226-163, August 14, 1957.

### Social Welfare

16. Lanham (D Ga.) amendment to Deficiency Appropriation for fiscal 1957 to cut funds for state and local administration of public assistance grants by \$17.7 million. (HR 4249).

This amendment was opposed by 147 Democrats and 21 Republicans. It was supported by 153 Republicans and 52 Democrats (42 Southern Democrats). Agreed to 205-168 on February 5, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

Here's an explanation of each of the 14 important votes above. Read the description of the issues—then see how your Senator voted.

### Water and Power

#### HELL'S — CANYON

1. Passage of Hells Canyon Dam bill, authorizing Federal construction of a single, high dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon (S 555).

Reversing a previous FPC decision, the Idaho Power Co., was granted an FPC license on August 4, 1955 to construct two and possibly three low-level dams for purely power purposes on the Snake River.

Public power advocates argued that the construction of these dams would force the permanent abandonment of plans for a single high dam which could provide twice as many kilowatts at a lower cost to the consumer, twice as much flood control protection, low cost fertilizer plants, and fish and wildlife, recreation and irrigation benefits not included in the Idaho Power project.

President Eisenhower favored the Idaho Power Co., on the grounds that the Federal Government would not have to make the initial outlay to build the single, high dam, notwithstanding the fact that the power users of the region would repay the Government with interest in 50 years an amount nearly double the cost of the Hells Canyon project.

In 1956 a bill which would have nullified the FPC license to Idaho Power and authorized the Hells Canyon dam was defeated.

In May, 1957, an anti-monopoly subcommittee revealed that Idaho Power had been granted quick tax write-off certificates which would have granted the company more than \$338 million in tax-paid subsidies over the following 50 years. Following adverse publicity, the company gave up these certificates.

Hells Canyon Dam was supported by 40 Democrats and 5 Republicans. It was opposed by 33 Republicans and 5 Democrats. (3 Southern Democrats). Agreed to 45-38 on June 21, 1957. Yea-right; nay-wrong.

NOTE: This bill was killed by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee by a vote of 16-14 as two Southern Democrats, Shuford (D. N.C.) and Haley D Fla.) voted with the Republicans on July 24, 1957. A letter dated July 19, 1957 from President Eisenhower to Westland (R Wash.), a Committee member, urged defeat of the Hells Canyon bill and said, "The Nation cannot and should not finance all water resource developments with Federal funds." (CQ p 885 7/26/57).

2. Confirmation of nomination of Jerome K. Kuykendall to a second term on the Federal Power Commission, ending June 22, 1962.

Opposition to Kuykendall's renomination to the FPC centered around his opposition to the proposed federal dam at Hell's Canyon, his support to the Dixon-Yates deal and his support of legislation to remove natural gas from FPC regulation. Senator Morse (D Ore.) said these were but a few of the instances "which show the nominee's bias in favor of the utilities and his failure to protect the consumers of America within the meaning and intent of the congressional legislation establishing the Federal Power Commission." (CR 8 15 57 p 13575).

Kuykendall's nomination was opposed by 23 Democrats and 2 Republicans. It was supported by 36 Republicans and 14 Democrats (10 Southern Democrats). Confirmed 50-25 on August 15, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

### Civil Rights

3. Parliamentary Move To Send Civil Rights Bill to Eastland Committee—The Senate voted to put the House-passed civil rights bill on its calendar ready for floor

consideration when it rejected a point of order which would have sent the bill to the Judiciary Committee. Senator Eastland, Chairman of that Committee, had kept a similar civil rights bill tied up in committee since April, 1956. (A vote to send the bill to committee is marked minus; against, plus. Defeated 39-45, June 20.

4. Anderson (D N.M.) - Aiken (R Vt.) amendment to eliminate Section 121 of Part III from the Civil Rights Bill (HR 6127).

Approval of this amendment limited the Civil Rights bill, as passed by the Senate, to the enforcement of voting rights only. The Anderson-Aiken amendment removed a broader section, previously approved by the House, which permitted the Attorney General to bring the power of the Federal Government to bear in the protection of all Civil Rights as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. Under this section of Part III the Attorney General, on his own initiative or by request, could go to a Federal Court seeking an injunction to enforce school integration decisions and civil rights laws generally.

This amendment was opposed by 13 Democrats and 25 Republicans. It was supported by 18 Republicans and 34 Democrats (22 Southern Democrats). Agreed to 52-38 on July 24, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

5. Rule 22. Johnson D Texas) motion to table (kill) the Anderson (D N.M.) motion to consider adoption of rules for the Senate of the 85th Congress.

The historic weapon of Southern Senators against civil rights legislation has been the filibuster (unlimited debate). Any effort to change the rules of the Senate to provide a more workable means of ending filibusters has itself been subject to filibuster.

The present cloture regulation, Rule 22, was adopted in 1949 and requires a two-third vote of all Senators (64) to shut off debate. This rule specifically exempts proposals to change the rules from its provisions.

In 1953 and again in 1957, Anderson (D N.M.) moved that the Senate consider adopting rules for the current sessions in order to permit a change in Rule 22. Southerners and others charged that the Senate was bound by the rules of the preceding Congress and could change them only through a resolution which would be handled in the same way as any other legislation.

As in 1953, the 1957 motion was killed by a motion to table. The Anderson motion was supported by 21 Democrats and 17 Republicans. It was opposed by 28 Republicans and 27 Democrats (21 Southern Democrats). Agreed to 55-38 on January 4, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

### Jury Trials

6. O'Mahoney (D Wyo) - Kefauver (D Tenn.) - Church (D Idaho) amendment to the Civil Rights Bill (HR 6127) to guarantee jury trials in all cases of criminal contempt and to provide uniform methods of selecting Federal Court juries.

This amendment provided that a case of criminal contempt, which involves punishment for disobedience to a Federal court injunction, must be tried before a jury.

Opponents of the amendment argued that Southern juries would be extremely unlikely to convict in voting right cases. Supporters claimed that the amendment's guarantee of the right of Negroes in the South to sit on Federal juries, which under this amendment would apply to all criminal contempt cases in a Federal court, would, in itself, be a major advance.

The AFL-CIO took the position that this amendment substantially limited the enforcement powers of the Civil Rights legislation.

This amendment was opposed by 9 Democrats and 33 Republicans. It was supported by 12 Republicans and 39 Democrats (22 Southern Democrats). Agreed to 51-42 on August 1, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

### Tennessee Valley Authority

7. Saltonstall (R Mass.) amendment to TVA financing bill (S 1869) to bar the issue and sale of bonds or use of bond revenues without Budget Bureau and Congressional authorization and to make all bond financing activities subject to the Government Corporations Control Act of 1945.

TVA is the sole supplier of power in an 80,000 - square-mile area covering most of Tennessee and part of six neighboring states. Electricity requirements in the area are increasing at a rate of nearly 15% each year. Demand for TVA power for Atomic Energy facilities and other government agencies has increased more than 15 times since 1950.

At the same time, Congress and the Administration have shown increasing reluctance to appropriate funds for the expansion of power facilities. In April, 1955, the TVA Board, submitted a plan for financing additional facilities through the sale of revenue bonds.

The Saltonstall amendment proposed to give the Bureau of the Budget and Congress veto power over the construction of each proposed additional power producing project. Opponents of the amendment argued that it would so hamper the self-financing proposal as to defeat the purpose of the bill.

This amendment was opposed by 35 Democrats and 11 Republicans. It was supported by 31 Republicans and 6 Democrats (5 Southern Democrats). Rejected 37-46 on August 9, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

### Atomic Energy

8. (Dworshak R Ida.) amendment to Atomic Energy Commission funds authorization (S 2674, HR 8996) to provide \$500,000 for design and engineering work on a natural uranium reactor, instead of \$40 million for construction of the reactor.

Underlying this amendment was the disagreement between the Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission, on one hand, and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, on the other, over the government's role in the development of atomic power for civilian use. It is the Administration position that private power companies should receive government subsidies of various kinds to develop civilian atomic power from which they would then reap the profits. The majority of the Joint Committee hold the view that the government should take whatever steps necessary to make sure that the interests of the taxpayer, who has already invested millions in the atomic energy program, is protected when such energy becomes available for civilian use.

Arguing against this amendment, which would have killed a \$40 million authorization for construction of a natural uranium, gas-cooled reactor at Arco, Idaho, Humphrey (D Minn.) told the Senate Britain expects to triple her kilowatts of nuclear capacity by 1965 while "we are now losing ground." (CR 8/16/57 p 13691).

Other countries developing atomic power for peaceful uses will be likely to use cheaper natural uranium in preference to the more expensive fortified uranium reactors. The U.S. is not now able to compete with Britain and Russia for the world market.

Senator Anderson (D N.M.) said, "AEC, instead of vigorously moving ahead, has followed a somewhat involved path of providing subsidies to private utilities to build atomic plants. Unfortunately . . . the AEC has become bogged down in negotiations of from 16 to 27 months with participants and still there are no firm contracts, except, with a private utility . . . The program we are recommending is indeed a very modest one. It will help keep our heads above water in international competition." CR 8/16/57 p 13688.

The Dworshak amendment was opposed by 37 Democrats and 3 Republicans. It was supported by 33 Republicans and 4 Democrats (3 Southern Democrats and Lausche, Ohio). Rejected 37-40 on August 16, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

NOTE: The House voted to omit the \$40

million for a natural uranium reactor (see House vote No. 4). The conference version authorized \$3 million for "development, design and engineering" work on the reactor, directed the AEC to submit a report to the Joint Atomic Energy Committee by April 1, 1958 and provided that construction on the reactor should not begin until authorized by Congress.

### Taxes

9. Amendment to aid small business. Fulbright (D Ark.) amendment to bill extending current 52% corporate income tax rate and certain excise taxes for 15 months to aid small business by reducing the normal corporate tax rate from 30% to 22%, and to compensate the Treasury by increasing the surtax applicable to corporations with incomes over \$25,000.

This amendment was supported by 28 Democrats and 5 Republicans. It was opposed by 37 Republicans and 15 Democrats (10 Southern Democrats). Rejected 33-52 on March 27, 1957. Yea-right; nay-wrong.

### Agriculture

10. Confirmation of Don Paarlberg as an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. Paarlberg's nomination was opposed because of his public stand against all farm price supports and his endorsement of Agriculture Department policies which worked to the disadvantage of the small, family-size farm.

Senator Kerr (D Okla.) said, "An administration which has devoted itself to increasing the price supports under interest rates on money 100%, and to destroying every semblance of price supports under the value of farm products has committed the two unpardonable crimes.

"The greatest of these insofar as human suffering . . . and damage to human dignity is concerned, has been the policy: Let the marginal farmer be eliminated . . . Paarlberg is the No. 1 architect of that farm program." (CR 8/15/57 p 13638).

Paarlberg's nomination was opposed by 30 Democrats and 2 Republicans. It was supported by 35 Republicans and 7 Democrats (6 Southern Democrats). Confirmed 42-32 on August 15, 1957. Yea-wrong; nay-right.

### Public Housing

11. Increase Authorization for Public Housing—The Senate committee had proposed that Federal aid to local communities for construction of low-rent public housing be limited to 35,000 units for one year. By this vote the Senate rejected a proposal to increase the authorization to 200,000 units for each of the next two years. (A vote for the increase is marked plus; against, minus). Defeated 20-54, May 29.

### Slum Clearance

12. Reduce Federal Aid to Slum Clearance and Urban Renewal Projects. The Senate kept Federal aid to local governments for slum clearance and urban renewal at 2/3 of the cost of each project. The provision in a committee-reported housing bill to increase the Federal contribution to 3/4 of the cost of each project was stricken by this vote. (A vote for the reduction is marked minus; against, plus. Passed 38-32, May 29.

### Foreign Policy

13. Limit Foreign Aid Program to One Year. The Senate rejected a proposal to limit foreign aid for defense support to one year rather than the two years provided in the committee-reported bill. (A vote for a one-year limitation on foreign aid is marked minus; against, plus.) Defeated 34-55, June 14.

14. Delete Borrowing Authority of Development Loan Fund. The Senate refused to delete the borrowing authority and the revolving character of the proposed Development Loan Fund from the foreign aid bill. (A vote for deletion of borrowing power of Fund is marked minus; against, plus.) Defeated 32-54, June 14. (See House Act No. 14).

### Key to Symbols for Assembly and State Senate Votes

- (+) a vote in harmony with labor policies
- (-) a vote contrary to labor policies
- A**: Absent or not voting
- D**: Democrat
- R**: Republican

The number next to the legislator's name refers to his district.

\*\* Assemblyman Uruh (D) Entered the following in the Assembly Journal of April 12, 1957. "Had I been on the floor yesterday I would have voted against tabling Mr. Masterson's Amendments to Assembly Bill No. 2812 and "AYE" on the final passage of A.B. 2812 . . .  
 \* Speaker of Assembly usually does not vote unless he is presiding.  
 \*\*\* Deceased. May 5, 1957.



VOTING RECORD

CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY

1957 REGULAR SESSION

DISTRICT	PARTY	ASSEMBLYMEN	Social Welfare		Taxes		Teachers		Tidelands Oil Revenue				Unemployment Insurance		Unemployment Disab. Ins.		Water & Power				Workers' Compensation				Minimum Wage		Mental Health		Welfare Plan Regulation	
			Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No		
29	R	ALLEN, BRUCE	67	0	39	20	49	19	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
63	D	ALLEN, DON A. JR.	32	11	3	3	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
71	R	BACKSTRAND	23	21	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
13	R	BEAVER	39	3	4	4	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
3	D	BEE	38	4	4	4	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
11	R	BELOTTI	18	19	9	9	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
12	D	BIDDICK	32	10	4	4	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
35	D	BONELLI	35	9	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
52	D	BONELLI	32	10	4	4	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
26	R	BRADLEY	28	32	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
28	R	BRITTSCHIG	18	20	8	8	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
30	D	BROWN	30	10	6	6	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
53	R	BURKE	11	33	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
20	D	BURTON	20	18	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
22	R	BUSTERUD	25	18	3	3	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
18	R	CALDECOTT	20	18	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
46	R	CHAPEL	25	19	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
54	R	COLLIER	54	5	5	5	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
57	R	CONRAD	57	10	6	6	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
27	R	COOLIDGE	17	19	10	10	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
14	D	CROWN	41	2	3	3	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
16	R	CUNNINGHAM	37	16	13	13	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
2	D	DAVIS	13	20	3	3	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
38	D	DILLIS	32	4	10	10	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
67	D	DONAHOE	35	2	4	4	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
10	D	DOYLE, DON D.	22	17	7	7	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
45	D	DOYLE, THOMAS***	45	1	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
40	D	ELLIOTT	45	1	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
50	D	ERWIN	11	27	18	18	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
35	D	FRANCIS	17	15	14	14	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
25	D	FREW	34	11	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
24	D	GAFNEY	37	7	2	2	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
49	R	GEDDES, ERNEST	16	27	3	3	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
5	D	GEDDES, SAMUEL	40	0	6	6	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
70	R	GRANT	20	22	4	4	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
75	D	HANNA	19	10	17	17	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
33	R	HANSEN	14	24	8	8	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
62	D	HAWKINS	39	7	0	0	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
77	D	HEGLAND	10	27	9	9	4	10	57	12	21	52	65	64	2	46	25	47	25	65	2	41	33	98	0	68	0			
32	D	HENDERSON	27	12	7	7	4	10	57	12																				



# Explanation of California Assembly Issues

## Assembly Rules

### Vote No. 1 (HR 18)

House Resolution No. 18 (O'Connell) sought to amend Assembly Rule 62 to remove requirement that all bills carrying any kind of an implied appropriation—no matter how small—go to the Ways and Means Committee. This rule has been consistently used to place road-blocks in the path of labor measures such as bills on unemployment insurance, unemployment disability insurance and workmen's compensation, as well as other liberal legislative proposals.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Adoption refused on March 11 by a vote of 32-42. A vote FOR adoption: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—)

## Civil Liberties

### Vote No. 2 (AB 1857)

AB 1857 (McGee) as introduced in the Assembly was a very bad bill relating to the law of arrest. It removed some basic protections against arrests without warrants.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Passed on May 21 by a vote of 43-20. A vote FOR passage: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+). As amended in the Senate and enacted, it is a completely revised bill, containing a few minor objectionable provisions and writing into statute a number of court decisions relating to the law of arrest. Chapter 2147.

## Civil Rights

### Vote No. 3 (AB 464)

AB 464 (Unruh and others), prohibited refusing to employ a qualified person solely because such person is older than the limit prescribed by such employer by agreement, employment policy, etc.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Passed on March 27 by a vote of 46-21. A vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—).

### Vote No. 4 (AB 464)

(See above for explanation of AB 464). Assemblyman Bradley (R), moved for reconsideration of the vote whereby AB 464 was passed.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Reconsideration of AB 464 was refused on March 28 by a vote of 24-43. A vote FOR reconsideration: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+). The measure was killed by the Senate Labor Committee.

### Vote No. 5 (AB 1150)

AB 1150 (Rumford and others), as introduced, provided for suspension of credentials for 3 years of any certificated school employee, charged with the responsibility of interviewing and recommending persons for employment in certified positions, who refuses to recommend any applicant for such a position because of race, color, religious creed or national origin. It also made a person liable in civil damages in an amount not less than \$500, and in addition, guilty of misdemeanor.

It was amended to contain revised penalty provisions providing simply for suspension of credentials and misdemeanor penalty.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Assemblyman Ernest Geddes moved that the bill be filed and the subject matter referred to the Committee on Rules for assignment to the appropriate interim committee for study. Motion defeated on June 1 by a vote of 15-21. A vote FOR filing and referral: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

### Assembly Vote No. 6 (AB 1150)

(See above for explanation of AB 1150.)

**ACTION TAKEN:** AB 1150, as amended, passed on June 1 by a vote of 49-14. A vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—). Measure was tabled in the Senate Labor Committee.

### Vote No. 7 (AB 2000)

AB 2000 (Hawkins and others) was the overriding civil rights issue of 1957 state legislative session. It called for a full-fledged fair employment practices law for the State of California.

The California Industrial Union Council joined in the all-out effort by the California Committee for Fair Employment Practices to achieve passage of this much needed state civil rights legislation.

As introduced, this measure declared that the opportunity to seek, obtain and hold employment without discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry is a civil right; specified what constituted unlawful employment practices including unlawful practices of labor unions.

AB 2000 also provided for the creation of a 5-member State Fair Employment Practices Commission, appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the State Senate, to formulate policies and make recommendations to effectuate purposes of the Act. The Commission was authorized to hold hearings and issue orders to prevent or correct discriminatory employment practices. Final orders of the Commission were subject to judicial review, except orders against the State of California, which were to be reviewed by the Governor.

Violations were made misdemeanors and employers of five or more employees, social clubs, charitable, fraternal, educational and religious associations or corporations not organized for profit and domestic workers were among those excluded from the provisions of the act.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Passed in Assembly on April 15 by a vote of 61-15; the original provisions relating to enforcement and judicial review were rewritten to place greater emphasis on methods short of issuance of orders and to establish more elaborate procedures for hearings prior to the issuance of orders or correct discriminatory employment practices.

On the Senate side, AB 2000 was amended to exempt apircultural employees. The Senate Labor Committee, repeating its 1955 performance, tabled AB 2000. The vote was on a party-line basis—Republicans voting to table, Democrats opposing

The California Committee for FEP worked long and hard in developing 'grass roots' support among the constituents of the Senators on the Labor Committee. Therefore, it can be said with validity that this grass roots drive for FEPC legislation produced the divisive tactics of Republican Senator John McCarthy who introduced SCA 41, proposing that a constitutional amendment embracing the fair employment practices provision of AB 2000 be submitted to the voters.

This was done as a "face-saving" political gesture to block FEPC legislation in the '57 session, with full knowledge that the proponents of FEPC could not financially counter the huge sums that would be expended to defeat such a ballot measure. For this reason, FEPC advocates opposed SCA 41 which was tabled at Senator McCarthy's request.

### Vote No. 8 (SB 1955)

SB 1955 as approved by the Senate and sent to the Assembly provided for exemption from the 8 hour law for minors in the employ of engineers engaged in survey work as part of a survey crew in the field.

It was amended in Assembly committee to restrict this exemption to minors over 16 years of age engaged in such work, and sent to the Assembly floor

Assemblyman Hawkins (D) then offered amendments providing for fair employment practice provisions. Although there were some variations with AB 2000, (the FEPC bill killed by the Senate Labor Committee), the Hawkins amendments to SB 1955 contained the essential provisions of AB 2000.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Assemblyman Bradley (R) moved that the amendments be tabled. Tabling motion defeated on June 7 by a vote of 10-38. A vote FOR tabling FEP amendments; bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

### Vote No. 9 (SB 1955)

Following the defeat of the motion to table the FEP amendments to SB 1955, the vote on adoption of these amendments came before the lower house.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The FEP amendments adopted on June 7 by a vote of 49-14. A vote FOR adoption: good (+); Against bad (—).

### Vote No. 10 (SB 1955)

On the day following, the adoption of the FEP amendments was challenged by a motion to reconsider their adoption.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Motion to reconsider adoption of the FEP amendments was defeated on June 8 by a vote of 19-43. A vote FOR reconsideration: bad (—); AGAINST (+).

### Vote No. 11 (SB 1955)

Efforts to kill the FEP amendments failed. The measure as amended, came up for a vote.

**ACTION TAKEN:** SB 1955, with the FEP amendments, passed on June 11 by a vote of 53-13. A vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST bad (—). SB 1955, as amended in the Assembly, was refused adoption on the Senate floor. (See Senate Vote No. 00).

## Election Reform

### Vote No. 12 (AB 38)

AB 38 (Rees and others) proposed the elimination of cross-filing for partisan office.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Assemblyman Rees (D) moved that AB 38 be withdrawn from committee. Motion defeated on June 2 by a vote of 30-36, thus measure died in Assembly committee. A vote FOR withdrawal from committee: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—).

### Vote No. 13

AB 2812 (Reese and others) as introduced, completely rewrote and strengthened provisions of the Elections Code regarding the reporting of campaign expenditures and contributions. The measure provided:

1. All official and unofficial campaign

committees, corporations, organizations and individuals making contributions in excess of \$50 would be required to make a complete report.

2. Required that all campaign committees, corporations, organizations and individuals making contributions in excess of \$50 keep a true account of their campaign contributions.
3. Required that all contributions must be made in the true name of the individual, organization or corporation making such contribution, and only to the duly authorized campaign treasurer.
4. Required that before campaign expenditures may be made, authorization must be obtained from the candidate and filed with the Secretary of State.
5. A provision permitting prosecution for perjury, in the event false campaign statements are filed.

As a result of intense partisan activities by legislative members of both parties it became riddled with crippling and weakening amendments. One effort to strengthen the measure through amendments was defeated.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Among the crippling or weakening amendments were those introduced by Assemblyman Chapel. His amendments were adopted on April 9 by a vote of 43-30. A vote for Chapel amendments: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

### Vote No. 14

AB 2812 (Allen amendments) Following the passage of the Chapel amendments, Assemblyman Bruce Allen (R) offered an additional amendment, similar in intent to one of the Chapel amendments.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The Allen amendment was adopted on April 10 by a vote of 53-15. A vote FOR the Allen amendment: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

### Vote No. 15

AB 2812 (Masterson Amendments) Assemblyman Masterson offered amendments, the most important and constructive of which was the State CIO Council proposal for public financing of campaigns based on 20c per registered voter contributions from the general fund of the State Treasury. The Amendment provided:

1. A clear statement of policy that disclosure of the sources of campaign expenditures will not, alone, benefit free and independent candidates; adequate means must be provided to enable qualified candidates to run for public office. This legislation provided for the use of public funds by eligible political parties in the State and by a candidates for office, to offset the undue emphasis on access to private wealth and communication media as a primary criterion for the availability and qualification of candidates.
2. That public funds should be made available to the State Central Committee of each eligible political party in an amount equal to \$0.20 for each person registered with the political party within the State. A grant of \$0.20 for each person registered with a party in the County shall be made to the County Central Committee of the eligible political party.
3. Granted to each nominee of each qualified political party for State offices, district offices, Congressional offices, and legislative offices, an amount equal to \$0.20 for each person registered with said political party who resides within the political district of the offices specified, with the provisions that the monies received shall be expended by the party nominee only for his campaign expenses and that all unexpended monies shall be returned to the general fund of the State Treasury; audit to be made and filed by a Certified Public Accountant. These public funds are to be a supplement to and not a substitution for reasonable private expenditures by the candidate.
4. These provisions applied only to political parties, each of which have registered as affiliated therewith, at least 10% of the total number of persons registered with all political parties in the state as of January 1 of the then current even-numbered year.

The California Industrial Union Council has repeatedly affirmed these principles of ethical financing of political campaigns at California conventions.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Assemblyman Bruce Allen moved that the Masterson amendments be tabled. Tabling motion adopted, April 11, 53-11. Vote FOR tabling, bad (—); Vote AGAINST, good (+).

In emasculated form AB 2812 passed the Assembly 68-8. When the measure, riddled with crippling amendments reached the Senate, the primary author asked that AB 2812 be dropped in order to "put it out of its misery." Thus it died in Senate Committee.

### Vote No. 16

AB 3877 (Caldecott and others) was the Fair Elections Practices Study Commission measure sponsored by the California Industrial Union Council. The purpose of the proposal was to establish an appoint-

ted non-partisan commission to study the need for legislation to assure fair elections and campaign practices, for the strengthening of the two-party system, and for strengthening party responsibility. The Commission appointed by the Governor, would have been required to make annual reports to the State Executive and legislature with recommendations for legislation to strengthen and improve the election laws. (Appropriation was provided.)

**ACTION TAKEN:** AB 3877 passed on May 31, 55-10. A Vote FOR passage, good (+); A Vote AGAINST, bad (—).

NOTE: Some Assemblymen voted against (—) because they felt there was not sufficient Democratic Party representation on the proposed Study Commission. The measure died in Senate Committee.

### Vote No. 17 (SB 458)

As introduced, SB 458 required initiative measures, referendum measures and legislative proposals in the order of adoption, to be placed on the ballot in the order named—rather than as determined by the Secretary of State.

It was amended to establish statutory order as follows: Legislative proposals in the order determined by the Secretary of State, followed by initiative measures in the order in which they qualify, and then referendum measures in the order which they qualify.

**ACTION TAKEN:** SB 458 passed on June 12 by a vote of 52-11. A Vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—). Chapter 2410.

## Farm Labor

### Vote No. 18 (HR 61)

House Resolution 61 (Ernest Geddes), under the guise of state's rights and adequate state standards, urged the President and Secretary of Labor to direct the Bureau of Employment Security to forego its new program of enforcing housing standards in labor camps used to house Mexican nationals imported into California.

**ACTION TAKEN:** HR 61 was adopted on January 25—during the bill introducing portion of the session—by a vote of 46-26. A vote FOR adoption: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

A similar resolution on the Senate side—SR 42 (Murphy and others)—was repulsed. The bill died on the Senate inactive file during the second half of the session. After proponents were unsuccessful in attempts to get sufficient votes to secure adoption.

## Public Health

### Assembly Vote No. 19 (AB 2359)

AB 2359 (Weinberger) proposed the creation of a cancer board with power to regulate and control the diagnosis, treatment and cure of cancer.

**ACTION TAKEN:** AB 2359 passed on March 29 by a vote of 60-6. A vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—).

A grossly watered down version was introduced in SB 2666 (Dolwig and others) following Senate committee rejection of the Weinberger bill. It merely made it a misdemeanor to represent, wilfully or falsely, a device, substance or treatment as an effective cure and a felony upon a third violation. It empowered the Department of Public Health, in cooperation with local health officers to enforce the bill. SB 2666 died in Assembly committee.

## Schools

### Vote No. 20 (AB 3045)

The CTA proposal calling for an increase in state school aid came up for the first test vote on a committee amendment making increased school aid dependent on cigarette and beer sales taxes.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The Committee amendment was adopted on April 27 by a vote of 40 to 25. A vote FOR committee amendment: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

### Vote No. 21 (AB 3045)

Following the adoption of the tax tie-in amendment, a motion was offered on the Assembly floor to reconsider adoption of said amendment in Roll Call No. 20.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The motion to reconsider was adopted on April 29 by a vote of 41-36. a vote FOR reconsideration: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—).

### Vote No. 22 (AB 3045)

As a result of reconsideration the tax tie-in amendment to school aid again came up for a vote.

**ACTION TAKEN:** This time the amendment was defeated on April 29 by a vote of 37-42. A vote FOR amendment: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

### Vote No. 23 (AB 3045)

Again a vote came up on the tax tie-in amendment after its defeat in Roll Call No. 22.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Reversing itself, the Assembly adopted the amendment on May 2 by a vote of 43-35. A vote FOR amendment: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

### Vote No. 24 (AB 3045)

An effort was made to remove the school aid sales tax tie-in provision adopted in Roll Call No. 23.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The motion to remove the tax tie-in was defeated on May 8 by a vote of 37-39. A vote FOR removal of amendment: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—).

Thus the bill reached the Senate with the tax tie-in provision.

On the Senate side it was amended to contain the essential provisions of the bill as it was finally enacted, without tax tie-in provisions—provided for an increase in state aid of \$37 million for the school year 1957-58, increased in subsequent years in proportion to increases in school enrollments, such aid to be primarily in equalization aid rather than basic aid as originally proposed by the CTA. It also increased the minimum salary for teachers from \$3400 to \$4200 a year.

Senate amendments were rejected by the Assembly. The bill went to a conference committee and as amended in conference and approved by both houses, contains the same provisions of the Senate version, plus a 2-year terminal date on increased aid, to be financed from the general fund and reserves, in place of consumer taxes proposed by the CTA. Chapter 1073.

## Social Welfare

### Vote No. 25

SB 1509 Increases Old Age Assistance to a maximum of \$105 per month and established a program of Aid to Permanently Disabled.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Passed the Assembly, June 11, 1957 by a vote of 67-0. A vote for adoption, good, (+).

(See complete explanation under Explanation of Senate Issues, Vote (22).

### Vote No. 26

SB 1391 Reduced the amount of Relative's responsibility for recipients of Old Age Assistance. This vote is on a motion to withdraw the measure from Committee.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Measure withdrawn by a vote of 43-20, May 14, 1957. A vote for withdrawal, good (+); A vote AGAINST bad (—).

## Taxes

### Vote No. 27 (AB 423)

The California Industrial Union Council, (in line with convention policy over the years) has opposed regressive taxation because it hits most unfairly those least able to pay. Therefore it supported AB 423 (Crawford and Luckel) which exempted drugs dispensed by pharmacists from state sales and use taxes (regressive taxes.)

**ACTION TAKEN:** The measure passed on May 30 by a vote of 56-16. A vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—). AB 423 died in Senate committee.

### Vote No. 28 (AB 3046)

Introduced by Republican Assemblyman Ernest Geddes, AB 3046 proposed the imposition of a 3c per pack cigarette tax as means of obtaining revenue for increased school appropriations proposed in AB 3045, his school aid bill (See Schools).

**ACTION TAKEN:** The motion to withdraw this regressive tax measure from committee was defeated on June 2 by a vote of 29-43. A vote FOR withdrawal: bad (—); AGAINST: good (+).

NOTE: AB 3047 (E. Geddes) contained the other half of the California Teachers Association proposal for raising funds for school aid proposed in AB 3045, listed under Schools. It proposed to increase the excise on beer (effective June 30, 1957) from 2c to 10c per gallon. It died in Assembly committee after failure of the attempt to withdraw AB 3046, (cigarette tax bill) and notice to withdraw AB 3047 was dropped.

### Vote No. 29 (AB 4159)

This ability-to-pay tax bill (Bee and others) was introduced late in the session to counter the regressive consumer tax measures. (AB 3046 and AB 3047), sponsor by the CTA.

AB 4159 proposed a \$65 million increase in the yield of the state personal income tax by increasing and extending on a progressive basis the tax rate on taxable incomes above \$7500.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The motion to withdraw the bill from committee was defeated on June 2 by a vote of 30-39. A vote FOR withdrawal: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—).

NOTE: This defeated proposal and the above mentioned consumer taxes are understood to fall within the scope of the tax study provided by ACR 206 (Coolidge). ACR 206 provides for a long overdue comprehensive study and review of the California tax structure including ascertaining of the impact of the state tax structure among income groups. An appropriation of \$100,000 was provided for a joint legislative tax committee for this purpose.

### Vote No. 30 (SB 192)

This measure, (introduced by Democratic Senator Robert McCarthy) as passed by the Senate, increased the state personal income tax deduction from \$400 to \$600 for each dependent. Organized labor has long sought an increase in the tax exemption for individuals.

**ACTION TAKEN:** The Assembly defeated SB 192 on June 10 by a roll call vote of 20-34. A vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST: bad (—).

(Continued on Page 7)



# Explanation of Assembly Issues

(Continued from Page 6)

## Assembly Vote No. 31 (SB 194)

As passed by the Senate, SB 194 (Robert McCarthy) allowed deductions from the state personal income tax for medical and adoption expenses in excess of 3% of adjusted gross income, instead of the present 5%.

It was amended on the Assembly side also to exempt the cost of medicine and drugs exceeding 1% of adjusted gross income.

**ACTION TAKEN:** SB 194 was defeated on June 10 by a vote of 25-34. A vote FOR passage: good (+); AGAINST: bad (-).

**NOTE:** Governor Knight had announced he would veto both SB 192 and SB 194 on the grounds of budget balancing. This, however, should in no way lead to the conclusion that therefore it is a mistake to "rate" a vote against passage as "bad" since the Governor would invoke his veto powers anyway. The responsibility of the legislature is to vote on the merit or demerit of a measure in the same fashion as the Governor reserves the constitutional right to veto or sign legislation.

## Vote No. 32 (SB 596)

SB 596 (Sutton and Erhart) removed the state sales and use tax (a consumer tax) on candy and confectionary.

**ACTION TAKEN:** This Senate-approved measure was passed in the Assembly on June 8 by a vote of 49-10. A vote FOR passage: Good (+); AGAINST: Bad (-). It was pocket-vetted by Governor Knight on grounds of budget balancing.

## Teachers

### Vote No. 33 (AB 1727)

AB 1727 (Masterson and Burton), as introduced, recognized the right of teachers to organize into organizations, associations or unions of their own free choosing—without coercion—for purposes of collective bargaining. The measure was amended to delete references to collective bargaining.

**ACTION TAKEN:** AB 1727, as amended, passed on April 16 by a vote of 49-19. A vote FOR passage: Good (+); AGAINST: Bad (-). It was tabled by the Senate Labor Committee.

## Tidelands Oil

### Vote No. 34 AB 47 (Miller and others)

In analyzing his opposition to the state tidelands oil bill, AB 47, by Assemblyman Allen Miller, D., Democratic Senator George Miller, Jr. cracked, "Drilling for oil is nothing more or less than a crap game." Despite the opposition of Senator Miller as lead-off spokesman against AB 47, the state legislature has passed and Governor Knight has signed the finest state tidelands oil royalty measure in the nation. The state senate passed AB 47 without changes from the assembly-passed version of the bill.

This measure would end the present give-a-way flat 12½% of production royalty plus a cash bonus and substitute a minimum 16-2/3% with a sliding scale upward royalty income geared to high producing wells. In addition to the mandatory sliding scale royalty requirement, the State Lands Commission also was provided with the option of employing provisions for cash bonuses in competitive bidding if the State Lands Commission deems it desirable.

Measured by the yardstick of the public welfare of the people of California and the interest of California taxpayers (including members of organized labor), AB 47 will mean substantially increased income to the state in the event that oil "bonanzas" are discovered on the state-owned tidelands. Assembly committee estimates indicate that at the very least AB 47 should mean additional hundreds of millions of dollars of tidelands oil royalty income paid to the state in the years to come. This means that you, as a taxpayer of California, will have to pay out that much less in taxes to meet the future costs of state government.

In urging support of AB 47, the Executive Council of the California Industrial Union Council pointed out that this was potentially the biggest single financial income issue in this session of the state legislature. In adopting its resolution in support of AB 47, the Executive Council had urged early this year that letters and messages of support be sent by the people of California and the members of organized labor to the state legislature. The California Industrial Union Council now urges those who have followed the passage of this important legislation to write letters of commendation to the members of the legislature who voted and worked for the passage of this income producing bill. Some estimates of the amount of income that may eventually be produced from the tidelands oil royalties run as high as the equivalent present annual state budget, namely, \$2,000,000,000.

It is regrettable that three of our most outstanding, able and hardworking state senators did not vote in favor of the state senate's bill or AB 47. Undoubtedly Senators Miller, Regan and Richards each had their own reasons for voting against AB 47. Senator Miller stated his in a well organized presentation on the senate floor. He declared: "We are asking the oil industry to buy a pig in the poke." Miller

argued that exploration of the state tidelands has already cost the oil industry \$70 million to date. He said he did not mean to suggest that the oil companies will not continue to explore the oil tidelands if AB 47 is passed but he went on to maintain that the mandatory royalty sliding scale perhaps is bad and would adversely affect the amount of exploration because the oil companies would have no way to compute their cost or secure assurance of getting their costs back when they strike oil in the state-owned tidelands. Other opposition arguments to AB 47 were based on the fact that other tideland oil states such as Louisiana and Texas have a flat 16-2/3% royalty with no graduated scale.

These were essentially unsound arguments. The opponents to AB 47 did not say that those states with a flat 1/6 royalty also have severance taxes which the oil companies must pay. California, as yet, has no severance tax on oil. The argument that AB 47 would place California at a competitive disadvantage becomes even more of a phoney argument when it is realized that measure would cost the unsuccessful oil explorer no more than the present law. This is so because when the oil companies hit a dry hole obviously there would be no royalties to pay. In fact, in the long run, AB 47 will mean increased exploration for oil in the state-owned tidelands. It will mean increased competition between the oil companies.

AB 47 will provide the people of California a greater percentage return than similar laws in any other state. It has the same minimum effect in other tideland oil states, namely, 1/6. Its graduated provisions help offset the absence of a severance tax in California. It would permit the state with its great financial needs in meeting the future problems of state government to share in the vast potential of its own resources. Oil companies would pay more only as they find more oil. It certainly is a vast improvement over the existing law, the Shell-Cunningham Act, which, to use Senator Miller's phrase has had the state in the position of "buying a pig in the poke" when the State Lands Commission signed oil leases with the oil drilling companies.

Senators Hugh Burns, Allen Short and James Cobey deserve the gratitude of organized labor and the people of the state for leading the fight that blocked a crippling amendment to AB 47 in the senate.

Assemblymen Allen Miller (D.), Bruce Allen (R.), Jess Unruh (D.), along with all the members of the assembly who voted against the Shell bill (supported by the major portion of the oil industry) deserve credit for their leadership in assuring a responsible performance by the legislature in the adoption of AB 47.

With the signature of Governor Knight the potential "give-away" of the oil resources of the state becomes a potential income producing measure which the State of California will badly need in solving the problems created by the explosive population growth.

**ACTION TAKEN:** AB 47 passed on May 7 by a vote of 57 to 12. A vote FOR passage: Good (+); AGAINST: Bad (-). The measure was passed in the eleventh hour on the Senate side. Chapter 2166.

### Vote No. 35 (AB 2237)

A B2237 (Shell and others), the oil-lobby-supported proposal, would have yielded substantially less in revenue from tideland oil royalties than the Miller bill AB 47. It did not contain provisions for a mandatory upward sliding scale. Like the Miller bill it called for a 16-2/3% oil royalty for both proven and unproven lands and in this respect was also an improvement over existing law.

**ACTION TAKEN:** A motion was offered to withdraw AB 2237 from committee. The withdrawal motion was adopted on April 29 by a vote of 54-21. A vote FOR withdrawal: Bad (-); AGAINST: Good (+).

**NOTE:** Following the withdrawal of AB 2237 from Committee, the Assembly voted AB 47 out of committee by a vote of 73-0.

### Vote No. 36 (AB2237)

Vote on passage of this oil-lobby-sponsored measure.

**ACTION TAKEN:** AB 2237 Passed on May 7 by a vote of 52-20. A vote FOR passage: Bad (-); AGAINST: Good (+).

**NOTE:** A comparison of the vote cast for passage of AB 47 (Roll Call Vote No. 34) and AB 2237 will show that many Assemblymen voted to adopt both measures, thus placing themselves on both sides of the fence—always an untenable and uncomfortable posture—and throwing the two conflicting views — as set forth in the 2 respective bills — to the upper house for decision. The Senate reported out AB 47, the measure supported by the California CIO Council, and it was adopted on June 9 by a vote of 23 to 15. AB 2237 died in Senate Committee. Governor Knight signed AB 47 into law.

### Vote No. 37 AB 3869

AB 3869 (Bruce Allen and others). Essentially this measure contained the same features as AB 47 which was enacted.

**ACTION TAKEN:** AB 3869 was passed on May 7 by a vote of 46-14. A vote FOR passage: Good (+); AGAINST: Bad (-). Because AB 47 was the vehicle through which the Senate Committee took action, AB 3869 was dropped with AB 47 being referred to as the Miller-Allen bill.

## Unemployment Insurance

### Vote No. 38

AB 687 (Munnell and others), as introduced increased the maximum weekly benefit amount from \$33 to \$55 based on a completely liberalized benefit schedule providing for a \$1.00 benefit increment for each \$15 high quarter earnings interval over \$150, starting with a minimum weekly benefit of \$10.

In its final form the measure came out as a "settlement" worked out by the California State Federation of Labor, Employer groups and insurance carriers. This settlement met with the approval of the California CIO Council. It should be noted however that many other Unemployment Insurance measures, both good and bad, were dropped in Committee because the legislators would not consider any bills not included in the "negotiated labor-management" agreed bill. This refusal to consider other bills unfortunately included the CIO sponsored "severance pay" bill of Assemblyman McCollister (R.) which permitted unemployed workers to collect unemployment insurance while receiving severance pay under union contracts.

The amended bill

- (1) Increased the maximum weekly benefit payment from \$33 to \$40—a \$7 increase.
- (2) Revised the employers so-called high contribution schedule to provide flexible contribution rates of 2.7% to 0.3%, in accordance with the individual employer reserve balances in a sixteen-step schedule, instead of the present flexible rate of 2.7% to 1% in accordance with a five-step schedule.
- (3) Wrote into law the present administrative practice of assessing a uniform 5-week disqualification against claimants who leave their employment voluntarily without good cause or who are discharged for misconduct.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Because of the compromise nature of AB 687, the labor-management agreed upon measure passed in the Assembly on May 17 by a vote of 65-0.

## Unemployment Disability Insurance

### Vote No. 39 (AB 233)

AB 233 (Beaver and Caldecott), as introduced, proposed to increase the maximum weekly benefit amount from \$40 to \$55 based on a completely liberalized benefit schedule.

This measure like the Unemployment Insurance measure was amended to incorporate the arrived at settlement made by the California State Federation of Labor, employer groups and insurance carriers, and supported by the State CIO. Among other things, the amended UDI bill

- (1) increased the maximum weekly benefit amount from \$40 to \$50 — a \$10 increase;
- (2) increased daily hospital benefits from \$10 per day for 12 days to \$12 a day for 20 days,
- (3) repealed the so-called 75 percent eligibility requirement which had heretofore disqualified employees in seasonal industries,
- (4) increased from \$3000 to \$3600 the taxable ceiling on wages for purposes of worker contributions,
- (5) continued for 2 more years a provision which waives the prohibition against private carriers selecting risks adverse to the state fund regarding the coverage of women in voluntary plans.

**ACTION TAKEN:** Because this was a compromise measure it passed the Assembly on May 6 by virtue of labor-management negotiated agreement with only 2 dissenting votes: 64-2.

## Water and Power

### Vote No. 40 (AB 100)

AB 100 (Lindsay and others) was an urgency measure calling for an appropriation of some \$25 million for construction and relocation of Western Pacific Railroad tracks and State Highway Route 21 in vicinity of Oroville Dam and Reservoir site. Prior to passage, an amendment was offered to insert excess land (160 acre limitation) provisions in the distribution of irrigation benefits.

**ACTION TAKEN:** A motion was offered to table the excess lands provision amendment. The amendment was tabled on January 22 by a vote of 46-25. A vote FOR tabling amendment: Bad (-); AGAINST: Good (+).

### Vote No. 41 (AB 100)

Following defeat of the excess lands provision amendment another amendment was offered calling for preference distribution of public powers to public agencies.

**ACTION TAKEN:** A motion was offered to table this amendment. The amendment was tabled on January 22 by a vote of 47-25. A vote FOR tabling amendment: Bad (-); AGAINST: Good (+).

## Workmen's Compensation

### Vote No. 42 (AB 3662)

AB 3662 (Bee) as passed by the Assembly merely provided that burial expenses, in the event there is no surviving dependent or heir, may be ordered by the Industrial Accident Commission to be paid by the proper person without administration.

It was amended on the floor of the Senate to include labor's program for workmen's compensation. The original measure carrying labor's program was SB 1767 which at the time was hung up in free conference committee. Thus in an effort to save the WC program the provisions sought in SB 1767 were incorporated in AB 3662 on the Senate side. (See Senate Votes No. 13 and No. 14).

AB 3662, as amended in the Senate, provided for

- (1) increases in the maximum weekly benefit amount payable for a temporary disability from \$40 to \$50—a \$10 increase,
- (2) increases in the maximum weekly benefit amount payable for a permanent disability from \$35 to \$40—a \$5 increase, and
- (3) increases in death benefits from \$12,500 to \$15,000 in a case of a totally dependent surviving widow with a dependent child, from \$10,000 to \$12,000 for all other cases of total dependency, and from \$10,000 to \$12,000 in the maximum benefit for partial dependency.

**ACTION TAKEN:** When the Amended version of AB 3662 reached the Assembly for concurrence in these labor supported amendments, the lower house concurred in the Senate amendments on June 10, 65-2. A vote for concurrence in Senate amendments: Good (+). A vote against bad (-). The increased benefits became applicable as of September 11, 1957.

### Vote No. 43

SB 68 (Abshire and others) as introduced and passed by the Senate, continued for 2 more years the 1955 restricting amendments to the subsequent injuries fund.

Following rejection of labor's Workmen's Compensation program in the Senate Labor Committee, this bill was amended on the Assembly floor to increase the weekly benefit for temporary disability from \$40 to \$55 and for permanent disability from \$35 to \$40—this move caught certain employer lobbyist off guard.

**ACTION TAKEN:** These labor-supported amendments were adopted, April 17, 1957, 51-14. A vote for amendments, good (+). A vote against, bad (-).

As amended, the bill was sent to the Ways and Means Committee where it was eventually amended to delete the increases amended into the bill on the floor, but only after it had served its purpose of securing Assembly amendment of SB 1767, leading it turn, when stalled in conference committee, to the final amendment and passage of AB 3662. (See Assembly Vote No. 42) SB 68, as originally introduced, was enacted into law. Chapted 2061.

## Minimum Wage

### Vote No. 44

AB 245 (Burton and others). To establish a Minimum Wage in California. See Explanation of Senate Issues, Vote No. 11.

## Mental Health

### Vote No. 45

SB 244 To Establish Community Mental Health Services. Assembly removed unduly restrictive amendment and passed bill, 68-0, June 10, 1957. A vote in favor, good (+).

(See Explanation of Senate Issues, Vote No. 20).

## Welfare Plan Regulation

### Vote No. 46

AB 1773 (Rees). One accomplishment at the 1957 session was the passage of the Rees bill containing the provisions of a workable law regulation employee health and welfare programs. As was the case at the 1955 session, organized labor was faced with a large number of regulatory bills to correct alleged abuses, some of which, although not necessarily bad in purpose, contained a number of ill-advised provisions which would have seriously impaired the efficient and continued operation of many funds.

The Rees bill and AB 256 sponsored by Donald D. Doyle immediately came under attack of the powerful banking and employer interests who had killed similar legislation two years ago, and who secured an amendment to exempt their unilaterally administered programs from regulation. The battle of the 1957 session, therefore, centered around getting a bill through that would apply uniformly in workable form. In an extended series of conferences, agreement was finally reached on the support of AB 1773 as the Rees-Doyle Act, with amendments to provide detailed regulatory authority without sacrificing the flexibility necessary for a workable law. The opposition of the banking interests and employers with unilateral plans was finally circumvented by carefully drawn language, which, while exempting their funds and

trustees from the provisions of the bill, nevertheless covers their "programs".

AB 1773 (Rees). As amended six times and enacted, contains the agreed provisions of a workable law regulating employee health and welfare programs: subjects to supervision and investigation of state Insurance Commissioner all health and welfare "programs" created by, or on account of contracts between labor organizations and employers, while excepting from such investigation and supervision the corporate trustee and the funds and insurance policy placed with such corporate trustee which is subject to the jurisdiction of the state Superintendent of Banks, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Controller of Currency in the United States; permits funds of health and welfare programs to be used and expended only for purposes authorized in the creating or governing instrument; requires registration with commissioner of covered health and welfare programs in accordance with rules and regulations which he may adopt, which rules may except from reporting and regulation any program which the commissioner finds (1) is a program in which there is no potential detriment to the beneficiaries, or (2) the number of persons employed in this state covered by the plan is less than 25, or (3) the trustees of the program, whose principal place of business is not in the state, are subject to and comply with requirements of any law or any other state or the United States with respect to registration, filing, examination, statements of reports, but at the same time permitting such exemptions only to the extent that the requirements are substantially complied with by the trustees of the programs complying with the other laws; permits commissioner to examine programs as often as deemed necessary, but not less than once every three years, with power to dispense with such examination wherever an employee health and welfare program is audited by a certified public accountant or a public accountant and the Insurance Commissioner is satisfied with the report, requires all covered programs to open books to commissioner, and gives commissioner authority to administer oaths and examine any person relative to the business of a program; requires commissioner to make a report of all examinations together with conclusions and recommendations, and requires such report to be on file for inspection of any bona fide beneficiary of the program or contributing employer or employee, but only after prior service of the report on the management of the program examined, which must be given opportunity to file with the commissioner additional information and objections with reference to the facts, conclusions or recommendations of the report; requires each program to file an annual report with the commissioner in accordance with his rules and regulations; gives commissioner additional power to address to any employee health and welfare program or its officer or agents any inquiry in relation to its transactions or condition etc., under conditions of compulsory response; requires program management to make annual report to every contributing employer and covered employee who requests the report; contains stringent provisions against kick-backs in any form to participating employers or labor organizations or agents officers or employees thereof from insurance companies, insurance brokers, or suppliers of medical services in connection with the solicitation, sale, service, or administration of a contract providing employee benefits under the program; provides for enforcement and appointment by Governor of an advisory council to make recommendations to the Insurance Commissioner concerning supervision of programs; appropriates \$326,000 from Insurance Fund for administration; contains terminal date of June 30, 1960. Chapter 2167.

No "Mandatory full disclosure" of finances and administration of all health and welfare plans is contained in this law. The CIO urged such full disclosure features be added. This is the same position the AFL-CIO has taken with respect to national legislation when it recommended support of Senator Douglas's "full disclosure" bill in the U.S. Senate.

**ACTION TAKEN:** After numerous amendments and conferences (on which there is no recorded vote) this measure passed both houses virtually unanimously. A vote for the measure is marked good, (+).

OFFICERS  
of the  
CALIFORNIA CIO COUNCIL  
ON POLITICAL EDUCATION

MANUEL DIAS, President  
7208 E. 14th Street  
Oakland 21, Calif., LCckhaven 2-4825  
JOHN A. DESPOL, Sec'y-Treas.  
117 W. 9th Street  
Los Angeles 15, Calif., TUCKER 3187

VICE PRESIDENTS  
JACK BRUHL (OCAW)  
ROBERT CLARK (USA)  
SAM EUBANKS (ANG)  
AL KING (CWA)  
JEROME POSNER (ACWA)  
ED SHEDLOCK (UWUA)  
DeWITT STONE (UAW)  
HERBERT WILSON (URW)

EDITOR: G. Lashin



# Make a Date in '58—Register and Vote

## VOTING RECORD CALIFORNIA STATE SENATE 1957 REGULAR SESSION

**KEY TO HOUSE AND SENATE VOTES**  
+ A vote which CIO believes to be in the best interest of working people.  
- A vote which CIO believes to be contrary to the interest of working people.  
+P A "PAIR" in favor of organized labor.  
-P A "PAIR" against organized labor.  
A A member absent or not voting.  
(D) After member's name indicates Democrat.  
(R) After member's name indicates Republican.

DISTRICT	PARTY	SENATORS		Total Good Votes		Total Bad Votes		Absent or Not Voting		Tabulated Votes	
		Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No	Aye	No
1		SB 233—To allow forcible entry in serving search warrant.	13	23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2		SB 234—To allow search warrant to be based on information from confidential informant.	14	17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
3		SB 235—To allow serving of search warrant at any time, day or night.	6	17	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4		SB 1839—School Book "Censorship" Bill.	23	11	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5		SB 1955—To establish fair employment practices, as inserted in Bill by Assembly.	21	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
6		SB 2566—To permit State Board of Education to establish commission to aid local school districts in problems of discrimination in hiring.	21	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7		SB 458—To prohibit Secretary of State arbitrarily to determine placement of measures on ballot by establishing statutory order of placement.	22	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8		SB 1932—To prohibit cross-filing in primary elections.	13	24	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9		SCA 7—To reapportion Assembly and Congressional Districts.	10	23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
10		AB 1773 (Rees)—Law regulating health and welfare plans.	38	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
11		AB 245—To establish State Minimum Wage Law with certain exemptions.	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12		AB 245—Vote on motion to refer measure back to Senate Labor Committee.	16	13	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13		AB 3622—Workers' Compensation special benefits was inserted.	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14		AB 3622—Vote on adoption of basic amendments to liberalize Workers' Compensation benefits following defeat of tabling motion on previous roll call.	23	7	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15		AB 3622—Vote to kill Workers' Compensation program as amended into bill by re-referring back to Senate Labor Committee.	15	23	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
16		SB 2410—Bill to allow business and industry rapid tax write-offs of plant and equipment expenditures. Vote on passage. (27 votes needed.)	21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
17		SB 2410—Vote on passage after failure in previous roll call of May 1. (27 votes needed.)	27	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
18		SCR 7—To urge Congress to adopt "Millions' Tax amendment to Federal constitution.	21	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
19		AB 47—Vote on motion to table amendments substituting Oil-Lobby provisions of AB 2237 in place of provisions of AB 47.	23	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
20		SB 244—To establish community Mental Health services.	30	6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
21		AB 198—A Bill to permit ownership of \$500 of personal property to recipients of county aid.	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
22		SB 1509—Increase Old Age Assistance up to maximum of \$105 per month. Establishes aid to permanently disabled.	38	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
SOCIAL WELFARE											
MENTAL HEALTH											
TIDELANDS OIL											
TAXES											
WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION											
LABOR CODE CHANGES											
WELFARE PLANS											
ELECTION REFORM											
CIVIL RIGHTS											
CIVIL LIBERTIES											
SENATORS											
PARTY											



# Explanation of California Senate Issues

(Continued from Page 8)

## Election Reform

**7. SB 458 (Richards).** As introduced, required initiative measures, referendum measures and legislative proposals in the order of adoption, to be placed on ballot in the order named, rather than as determined by the Secretary of State. As amended and enacted, established statutory order to be legislative proposals in the order determined by the Secretary of State, followed by initiative measures in the order in which they qualify, and then referendum measures in the order in which they qualify. This measure eliminates the authority of the Secretary of State to discriminate against initiative measures on the state ballot.

**Action taken:** Bill passed 22-2, May 28, 1957. Vote for adoption, good (+). Vote against adoption, bad (-).

**8. SB 1932 (Miller and Erhart).** Like AB 38 (Rees and others), eliminated cross-filing for partisan office. Refused passage on Senate floor by roll call vote of 13-24, thus dying on the Senate floor.

**Action taken:** Refused passage 13-24, May 29, 1957. Vote for adoption, good (+). Vote against adoption, bad (-).

**9. SCA. 7 (Richards).** Proposed Constitutional Amendment providing for reapportionment of assembly and congressional districts to (1) apportion congressional districts on the basis of population with the population variation not to exceed 10 per cent between districts, (2) apportion assembly districts on the basis of three districts to each congressional district with the population variation not to exceed 15 per cent between districts (thus increasing assembly seats to three times number of congressional districts), and (3) grant state Supreme Court original jurisdiction in all cases challenging the validity of reapportionment.

**Action taken:** Bill refused passage 10-23, May 3, 1957. Vote for adoption, good (+). Vote against adoption, bad (-).

## 10. Welfare Plan Regulation

(AB 1773 Rees). See explanation under Assembly Vote 46.

## Labor Code Changes

**11. AB 245 (Burton and others).** California Minimum Wage Law as introduced, established a statutory minimum wage of \$1.25 per hour for all employees in all occupations, trades, or industries; provided that minimum wage fixed by order of Industrial Welfare Commission for women and minors shall not be less than the statutory minimum.

Amended in Assembly committee, to reduce proposed statutory minimum to \$1.10 and to exclude from coverage domestic service employees except those employed to do house cleaning, cooking or house repair and maintenance work, outside salesman, public employees, employees of religious and non-profit organizations, switchboard operators in exchanges with less than 750 stations, and motel managers of unspecified number of units.

As such, bill was sent to the floor of the Assembly where it was further amended to exempt minors covered by orders of the Industrial Welfare Commission, agricultural workers, including after harvest occupations involved in the canning and processing of agricultural products and dairy products, and motel managers of less than 31 units.

In this form, bill was passed by roll call vote of 41-33 and sent to Senate, where it was further amended three times in the Senate Committee on Labor and once on the Senate floor to reduce the proposed statutory minimum further to \$1.00, exempt all motel managers, broaden exemption for minors to include all persons under 21 years of age regardless of whether covered by Industrial Welfare Commission order, broaden domestic service exemption to exclude all domestic servants, and further exclude from coverage any person being rehabilitated or trained under rehabilitation or training programs in charitable, educational or religious institutions, as well as any member of a religious order, and any individual employed by a motion picture exhibitor.

In this form, bill was taken up for passage on the Senate floor, but was referred to the Senate Labor Committee, where it died, by roll call vote of 16-13, following rejection of an amendment by Abshire to insert the provisions of his defeated bill SM 127, exempting occupations of a professional, technical or clerical nature from the women's 8-hour law.

The CIO supported this minimum wage bill even in its amended form. Convention resolutions made it clear that CIO members approved the policy of establishing the principle of a substantial minimum wage law, even though it would take considerable effort to improve it in years to come. No minimum wage law exists in California except for women.

This bill was amended because the author found that such amendments had to be accepted in order to secure enough votes to get the bill out of Committee. The CIO opposed the amendments, but was unable to muster sufficient votes to secure passage of the bill in its original form. The CIO took the position that a bill which benefited at least 200,000 workers was better than no bill at all.

Vote 11 on the record represents the attempt by Senator Abshire to amend the bill to exclude all employees of a technical, professional or clerical classification from the women's 8-hour law.

**Action taken:** Amendment defeated by vote of 7-15 on June 12, 1957. Vote for amendment, bad (-). Vote against, good (+).

12. The motion to re-refer A.B. 245 back to the Senate Labor Committee, thus killing it for the session.

**Action taken:** Motion to re-refer adopted 16-13, June 12, 1957. Vote to re-refer, bad (-). Vote against, good (+).

## Workmen's Compensation

**12. AB 3662 (Bee).** As passed by the Assembly, merely provided that the burial expenses, in the event there is no surviving dependent or heir, may be ordered by the IAC to be paid to the proper person without administration. Labor's liberalized program was amended into this bill on the floor of the Senate.

13. The motion to table (kill) the liberalizing amendments.

**Action taken:** Motion to table defeated 10-24, June 7, 1957. Vote for motion to table, bad (-). Vote against, good (+).

14. The adoption of the liberalizing amendments. The amendments accomplish the following:

- (1) Increases the maximum weekly benefit amount payable for a temporary disability from \$40 to \$50;
- (2) Increases the maximum weekly benefit amount payable for a permanent disability from \$35 to \$40; and
- (3) Increases death benefits from \$12,500 to \$15,000 in a case of a totally dependent surviving widow with a dependent child, from \$10,000 to \$12,000 for all other cases of total dependency, and from \$10,000 to \$12,000 in the maximum benefit for partial dependencies.

**Action taken:** Amendments adopted 23-7, June 7, 1957. Vote for amendments, good (+). Vote against, bad (-).

15. Represents the attempt of labor's opposition to re-refer (kill) the amended workmen's compensation bill to the Senate Labor Committee.

**Action taken:** Motion to re-refer defeated 22-15, June 8, 1957. Vote in favor of re-referring, bad (-). Vote against, good (+).

The amended bill was then passed by the Senate by a roll call vote of 34-2. It was concurred in by the Assembly and signed by the Governor. Increased benefits apply to disabilities commencing September 11, 1957.

## Taxes

### S.B. 2410 (Breed)

This bill proposed to give large corporations a tax reduction bonanza by permitting the rapid tax write-off of expenditures for plant depreciation and equipment. The bill embodied the provisions of the Eisenhower tax revision bill of 1954 and gave substantial tax savings to large corporations while leaving the small tax-payer to make up the deficit.

16. Represents the first attempt to pass this measure through the Senate. It needed 27 votes and received only 21.

**Action taken:** Bill failed of passage 21-12, May 1, 1957. Vote for measure, bad (-). Vote against, good (+).

17. Occurred the next day. Proponents of the measure felt sure the necessary 27 votes were present and again brought the measure on the floor.

**Action taken:** Bill passed, 27-9, May 2, 1957. Votes for bill, bad (-). Votes against, good (+).

**Result:** This measure then went to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee where it was refused favorable consideration and thus died for the session.

**18. SCR 7 (Desmond and others).** Millionaires' tax amendment: as adopted by the Senate by roll call vote of 21 to 17, petitioned Congress to draft and submit to the legislatures of the states an amendment to the U.S. Constitution imposing an unspecified ceiling on federal income, gift and inheritance taxes. Refused favorable consideration in Assembly Committee and referred to interim committee for further study.

**Action taken:** Resolution passed Senate 21-7, May 28, 1957. Vote for resolution, bad (-). Vote against, good (+).

## Tidelands Oil Bill

(See explanation and vote of Tidelands Oil, Votes 34 to 37, on California State Assembly Record).

19. The Senate retained A.B. 2237 in Committee and reported to the floor of the Senate A.B. 47 (Miller), the oil revenue bill supported by the CIO. On the Senate floor, Senator Cunningham moved a series of 21 amendments which would have substituted all of the provisions of A.B. 2237 (supported by the selfish faction of the Oil Lobby) for the original provisions of A.B. 47. After the amendments had been read, Senator Collier moved that all amendments be laid on the table. Senators Cunningham, Beard and Kraft demanded a roll call.

**Action taken:** Amendments were laid on the table (defeated for this session) 23 to 15, June 9, 1957. A vote to lay the amendments on the table, good (+). A vote against tabling, bad (-).

After the amendments of part of the Oil Lobby had been laid on the table, the Senate voted on the original A.B. 47. The measure passed, 33-2. The only Senators voting against the measure were Senators Cunningham and Kraft.

## Mental Health

**20. SB 244 (Short and others).** As amended and enacted, provides financial encouragement and assistance to local governments in the establishment and development of mental health services, including services to the mentally retarded, through locally administered and locally controlled community mental health programs.

Harsh eligibility provisions in the Senate version restricting eligibility to those meeting county hospital admittance requirements were amended out on the Assembly side so as to permit services to any one unable to obtain private care. Chapter 1989.

**Action taken:** Assembly Amendments, removing undue restrictions placed in bill by Senator Desmond, were concurred in. Passed, 30-6, June 11, 1957. A vote for adoption, good (+). A vote against, bad (-).


## Social Welfare

**21. AB 198 (Kilpatrick and others).** Provided that possession of burial insurance policies to cash surrender value of \$250 or less, shall not be grounds for refusing aid to indigent persons.

**Action taken:** Defeated, 10 Aye to 20 No. A vote for adoption, good (+). A vote against, bad (-).

**22. SB 1509 (Sutton).** Provides up to \$16.00 a month increase to maximum of \$105.00 in grant to recipients of old age security who have special needs requiring this amount and do not have outside income to meet such special needs; establishes a new public assistance program for aid to the totally and permanently disabled as follows: definition of disabled person limits program to persons so disabled as to require "constant and continuous care," strictly construed; amount of grant to be based on need budget up to maximum of \$105.00, prohibiting income from being added to this maximum; establishes eligibility standards in addition to disability to require applicants to be 18 years of age or over, citizen or resident of the United States since 1932, resident of state five out of last nine years, \$600 personal property less encumbrances of record, and \$5,000 real property less encumbrances of record; provides final administration of eligibility to be made by Department of Social Welfare based on reports filed by counties. Chapter 2411.

**Action taken:** Bill passed, June 12, 1957, 38 to 0. Vote for passage, good (+).



### Special Edition


This Special Edition of the California CIO Council on Political Education

### SCOPE

is printed for distribution to union members and interested liberals.  
Additional copies are available

**PRICES:**  
**10c a Copy**  
**50 for \$4; 100 for \$7; 500 for \$30; 1000 for \$50**

**Orders, together with check or money order, should be mailed to the California CIO Council on Political Education. 117 W. Ninth Street, Los Angeles 15, California.**



# Much Still To Be Done

(Continued from Page 1)

passing the full disclosure bill urged by the AFL-CIO Congress should act promptly on these measures in January.

Also the Eighty-fifth Congress at its second session must give serious consideration to constructive changes in the Taft-Hartley Act and to further improvements in the social security laws.

On the plus side of the ledger must be entered the courageous action of Congress in voting badly needed pay increases for postal and classified government employees despite threats from the White House of a certain Presidential veto. The President carried out this threat soon after adjournment. It is incumbent upon Congress to reenact the pay measures early enough in the next session to permit action to override a second Presidential veto.

Clearly, the record of the first session was a mixed one. Certainly Congress did not accomplish all that the public had a right to expect. At the same time, it is not fair for the President to blame Congress for failing to pass legislation which he recommended only in token fashion.

The political tug of war that occurs when the White House and Congress are controlled by opposing political parties develops some strange situations. But it would be well for the President and Congressional leaders to realize that the American people are more interested in results than in who gets the blame for failure.

# A Good Look at Man Who Wants To Be Governor of California

Senator Knowland has a record in the Senate of the United States. Can we expect it to be any better as Governor of California?

## Senator Knowland's Record On Peace and Freedom—

1. He voted AGAINST funds for Point IV technical assistance to backward countries so they can help themselves. (May 5, 1950).
2. He voted to cut European Recovery program funds by \$500 million, weakening Europe's post war effort to attain a sound economy, and thus encouraging the spread of Communism. (May 5, 1950).
3. He voted AGAINST restoring funds for the Voice of America program which tells foreign nations about democracy and counteracts Russian propaganda. (June 7, 1949).
4. He voted AGAINST Senator Fulbright's amendment to increase funds for Voice of America programs. (July 13, 1950).
5. He voted AGAINST General George Marshall as Secretary of Defense. (September 15, 1950).
6. He voted to tie General Eisenhower's hands by limiting the number of troops that could be used in an emergency in Europe to 4 divisions. (April 2, 1951).
7. He voted that "strings" be attached to the India Famine Relief Bill when members of the Atomic Energy Committee made it clear that such strings would terminate the voluntary arrangements by which India is sending strategic metals and ores to the United States and would mean that India would send nothing, or worse, that she would sell her atomic ores to Russia. (May 16, 1951).
8. Senator Tom Connally, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said: "The Senator from California has certainly never made any contribution that I know of, of any great consequence, to the bi-partisan situation." (June 26, 1950).

No Senator is always wrong. We have agreed with the Senator on the following:

9. On a Senator's motion to limit expenditures for the Mutual Security Agency to \$5.6 billion (this represented a large reduction in funds needed to combat poverty and communism abroad) the Senator voted "Nay." (July 29, 1953).
10. A motion was made in the Senate to recommit the bill to committee which would have given statehood to Alaska. The senator voted against the motion to send the bill back to committee. (Feb. 27, 1952).
11. On a vote to reject the last chance to cooperate with Canada on the St. Lawrence Seaway and power project, the CIO opposed such rejection. It was passed 40-43. Senator Knowland voted "Nay." (June 18, 1952).

## Senator Knowland's record on Public Welfare and Education—

1. He voted AGAINST National Science Foundation funds for publicly supported institutions in each state. (May 15, 1947).
2. He voted AGAINST increased funds for research and training for mental institutions. (April 27, 1949).
3. He voted AGAINST any kind of public assistance for the needy disabled. (H. R. 6000, June 20, 1950).
4. He voted AGAINST the Magnuson Amendment to increase Public Health Service research for fighting cancer, heart disease, mental and other diseases. (Aug. 3, 1950). On Aug. 4, 1950, Senator Knowland moved that this matter be tabled.
5. He voted AGAINST the Professional Health Training Act to encourage education of doctors, dentists and nurses. (S 337, Oct. 4, 1951).
6. He voted to over-ride a Presidential veto and thereby remove 750,000 people from the benefits of Social Security. (H J. Res. 296 June 14, 1948).
7. He voted to cut Federal Security Administration appropriations (Health, Education and Housing) by 5% after committee cuts had already been made. (April 28, 1949).
8. He voted against additional funds for school surveys and construction. (May 10, 1951).
9. He voted to permit states to open up the relief rolls to public inspection, thus making second class citizens out of the unfortunate. This program has had no effect on chislers on the relief rolls, according to the head of the Indiana State Social Security Department where it was tried. (July 19, 1951).
10. He voted to eliminate low-rent public housing and farm housing from the Housing Act of 1949. (April 21, 1949).
11. He offered an amendment to HR 6000 which would have had the effect of throwing federal aid to state unemployment compensation programs into the courts and thus diminishing this aid to persons temporarily out of work. (June 20, 1950).
12. A bill authorizing federal aid to local communities to initiate and expand public health units passed the Senate (38-35) March 16, 1951. The Senator voted in favor of this good measure.
13. A motion was made in the Senate to cut the authorization for public housing from 50,000 units to 5,000 units. It was defeated 25-47. Senator Knowland voted to defeat this measure. (June 20, 1951).

## Senator Knowland And the Small Tax-Payer—

1. Senator Knowland voted to give the largest corporation with excess profits of \$50 million a tax exemption by moving up the dates that tax would be effective. (September 26, 1951).
2. The Senator's theory that the poor should pay a greater share of their income in taxes than the rich — even though the rich have money for essentials and luxuries anyway — is clearly shown in the following votes. On H. R. 4473 A Committee amendment gave tax relief to various corporations and not others. Knowland votes Yes. The bill passed 70-15 on Oct. 25, 1951. An Amendment was proposed to reduce the mineral depletion allowance for avoiding taxes. Knowland was against it. Oct. 28, 1951.

## Senator Knowland And the Small Businessman—

1. A bill passed which allowed railroads to get together on rate problems despite anti-trust laws. The bill was vetoed. The Senate voted to override this veto 63-25. Senator Knowland voted to override the veto. June 16, 1948.
2. The Senate voted to appropriate funds for a steam plant to improve TVA service. It passed 45-37 on June 15, 1948. The Senator voted in favor of this measure.
3. The Senate voted on a measure to kill the Small Defense Plants Administration and substitute for it a big-business controlled Small Business Administration. This measure was defeated 42-47 on June 22, 1953, but Senator Knowland voted in favor of the big business controlled agency.
4. The Senator voted to eliminate appropriations for Shasta Dam switching yard and transmission lines which would serve REA's, locally owned utility districts and cities in northern California. Dec. 15, 1949.
5. Senator Knowland failed to vote in favor of the Merchant Marine Act Amendment (S 241) which encourages ship construction and maritime trade. August 2, 1951.
6. Senator Knowland voted against extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act for three years, thus preventing long term foreign trade contracts. May 4, 1955.
7. Senator Knowland voted in favor of placing FHA and GI Housing under the Federal Reserve Board, where the larger bank influence would govern the type of credit extended. August 21, 1950.

## Senator Knowland and the Farmer—

1. The Senate voted to increase the lending power to the Commodity Credit Corporation to help farmers finance the selling of crops. The vote was 35-35. Senator Knowland was opposed. June 26, 1950.
2. The Senate voted on a measure to limit immigration of farm workers until American workers were fully employed. The CIO is for such limitation, but the measure was defeated 12-59 on May 1, 1951. Senator Knowland opposed the measure.
3. The Senator voted against an increase in funds for the soil Conservation Program. This essential legislation passed 38-37 on June 5, 1953, in spite of the Senator's opposition.
4. Senator Knowland has voted against the 90%-of-parity price supports for basic crops and has instead voted for the inadequate 75-90% so-called "flexible" parity formula for price supports. The nation's farmers are already in trouble.

## Senator Knowland's Record On Civil Liberties and Minorities—

1. He voted to LEGALIZE ENFORCED SEGREGATION of Negro and White schools in the south. The law would have approved southern state action circumventing Supreme Court decisions. (May 13, 1948).
2. He voted AGAINST funds for administration of a Fair Employment Practices Commission. (June 30, 1945).
3. He voted for the Taft-Hartley provision which unconstitutionally would prevent unions from speaking or writing or assembling in connection with a political candidate. (May 13, 1947).
4. He voted for a provision in the Displaced Persons Act, which had the effect of barring Catholic and Jewish and Polish refugees from entry into the U.S. (March 13, 1948; June 2, 1948 and June 1, 1948).
5. He voted for the Wherry Rule of Senate procedure which permits filibustering to prevent action being taken on a bill. This gives "veto power" to the Dixiecrats. (March 17, 1949).
6. During the 1953 session, an effort was made to change the Senate rules, including Rule No. 22, which permits a filibuster. A motion was made to table consideration of changes in Senate rules. The Senator supported the motion to table. (January 7, 1953).
7. A motion was made in the Senate to withdraw the Fair Employment Practices Bill from committee, and bring it to the floor for discussion. The motion to withdraw was defeated 33-55. The Senator voted to leave the bill in committee and not discuss it. (July 12, 1950).
8. The Senator voted against the censure of the late Senator McCarthy. (Dec. 2, 1954).
9. He voted in favor of the President's Civil Rights Program in this past session.

(Continued on Page 10, Col. 5)



VOTE TABULATIONS — 1951 - 1957

House of Representatives

Assembly

District	Party	CONGRESSMAN	1951		1952		1953		1954		1955		1957		TOTAL
			Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	
7	R	ALLEN	1	14	3	14	2	13	3	12	6	12	4	12	77
6	R	BALDWIN	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	11	7	13	3	10
23	D	DOYLE	14	1	15	1	13	3	15	0	16	2	15	0	88
2	D	ENGLE	12	2	9	6	12	4	12	3	13	3	14	2	20
10	R	GUBSER	★	★	★	★	5	11	3	11	4	13	9	5	40
14	D	HAGAN	★	★	★	★	14	2	13	1	17	1	15	1	59
21	R	HIESTAND	★	★	★	★	1	15	2	13	2	16	0	16	60
25	R	HILLINGS	3	11	4	10	3	11	3	11	2	9	4	11	63
19	D	HOLIFIELD	14	1	15	1	14	1	15	0	16	1	15	1	89
22	R	HOLT	★	★	★	★	2	14	3	12	4	13	5	11	49
18	R	HOSMER	★	★	★	★	2	13	3	12	3	14	6	10	49
16	R	JACKSON	3	11	3	13	2	14	3	12	2	14	2	14	78
17	D	KING	14	1	15	1	15	1	15	0	16	2	16	0	91
24	R	LIPSCOMB	★	★	★	★	★	★	3	12	4	14	1	15	41
4	R	MAILLIARD	★	★	★	★	4	12	4	6	10	6	6	10	34
15	R	McDONOUGH	4	9	4	13	3	13	3	12	6	12	3	12	71
11	D	McFALL	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	16	0	0
8	D	MILLER	13	1	15	1	15	0	14	0	14	2	16	0	87
3	D	MOSS	★	★	★	★	15	1	14	1	17	1	16	0	62
26	D	ROOSEVELT	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	17	1	15	0	32
29	D	SAUND	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	16	0	0
1	R	SCUDDER	1	14	2	13	3	13	3	11	3	14	7	9	74
5	D	SHELLEY	13	1	16	1	13	1	14	1	11	0	15	0	82
27	D	SHEPPARD	12	3	12	4	12	3	12	1	13	3	13	2	74
12	D	SISK	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	16	1	16	0	32
20	R	SMITH	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	1	15	15
13	R	TEAGUE	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	★	6	12	3	12	24
28	R	UTT	★	★	★	★	★	2	13	0	15	1	16	0	59
30	R	WILSON	★	★	★	★	★	4	11	4	10	3	13	6	40
9	R	YOUNGER	★	★	★	★	★	2	13	4	11	5	13	3	50

U. S. SENATE

Party	U. S. SENATORS	1951		1952		1953		1954		1955		1956		TOTAL
		Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	
R	KNOWLAND	4	11	6	9	3	13	2	18	0	16	5	9	76
R	KUCHEL	★	★	★	★	4	11	3	15	5	11	8	6	43

STATE SENATE

District	Party	STATE SENATOR	1951		1953		1955		1957		Total
			Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	Good	Bad	
12	R	ABSHIRE	6	10	2	15	6	11	5	16	52
1	D	ARNOLD	★	★	★	★	★	★	18	3	3
39	D	BEARD	★	★	★	★	★	★	20	0	0
9	R	BERRY	★	★	★	★	1	16	5	11	39
16	R	BREED	7	8	1	16	2	10	4	14	48
28	D	BROWN	2	8	6	10	4	7	6	14	39
30	D	BURNS	5	12	11	6	6	9	8	11	38
4	R	BUSCH	6	6	5	7	6	5	6	11	29
6	R	BYRNE	3	10	1	17	4	10	8	12	49
3	D	CHRISTIANSEN	★	★	★	★	★	★	14	7	7
24	D	COBEY	★	★	★	★	7	8	10	7	15
2	R	COLLIER	7	5	8	7	7	5	15	4	21
11	R	COOMBS	10	7	6	12	8	9	11	8	36
36	R	CUNNINGHAM	12	5	11	6	8	5	10	5	21
19	D	DESMOND	1	8	4	12	2	4	6	8	32
37	R	DILWORTH	3	9	1	16	7	9	3	15	49
21	R	DOLWIG	★	★	★	★	★	★	9	9	9
22	D	DONNELLY	11	7	11	5	7	7	14	7	26
34	R	DORSEY	7	3	7	4	5	6	10	8	21
29	R	ERHEART	4	6	4	13	6	10	11	8	37
25	D	FARR	★	★	★	★	10	2	18	0	2
15	D	GIBSON	5	8	5	8	4	9	8	10	35
23	R	GRUNSKY	★	★	1	17	4	12	9	10	39
31	D	HOLLISTER	★	★	★	★	★	★	15	6	6
10	R	JOHNSON, ED C.	4	12	5	7	8	8	8	11	38
7	D	JOHNSON, HAROLD T.	16	1	12	3	10	5	14	1	10
40	R	KRAFT	5	8	5	6	8	8	10	10	32
33	D	McBRIDE	8	8	7	6	5	6	7	5	25
13	R	McCARTHY, J. F.	7	10	6	10	7	9	6	9	38
14	D	McCARTHY, R. I.	★	★	★	★	13	2	14	4	6
17	D	MILLER	16	0	17	1	13	3	12	2	6
27	D	MONTGOMERY	★	★	15	3	14	3	19	2	8
35	R	MURDY	★	★	1	14	5	11	6	15	40
5	D	REGAN	12	1	15	1	11	2	13	4	8
38	D	RICHARDS	★	★	★	★	14	1	17	1	2
20	D	SHORT	★	★	★	★	12	3	18	0	3
8	R	SUTTON	6	12	6	5	6	9	12	5	31
26	D	TEALE	★	★	★	★	11	4	13	3	7
18	R	THOMPSON	2	15	2	15	5	10	10	9	49
32	R	WILLIAMS	8	8	1	16	3	11	2	15	50

★ Not in office

Knowland Surprised

(Continued from Page 1)

figure that some of the organized Republican voters under their subtle undercover influence will go to Democrat Pat Brown. The Nixonites have overlooked the probability that the battle inside the Republican party will help the Democrats slate in two basic ways: (1) It will help solidify the Democrats, who will be scenting victory in November. (2) It will sharpen the awareness of Democrats that they are Democrats, and either Knight or Christopher (despite their labor support) are after all Republicans, thus eroding the chance for either Knight or Christopher to win both Democratic and Republican votes which either one must have to win.

Apparently the Nixonite strategists have not taken into consideration what State Controller Robert Kirkwood will do or what effect it would have if he should decide to stay in the United States Senatorial race.

A look at just a few of the Republican fund raisers should be sufficient to impress any political observer with the

financial power of the California king-makers who, allied with the Los Angeles Times, use their ability and key positions to control campaign finances. Here's part of the GOP financiers Who's Who. The chairman of the Republican State Finance Committee is Justin Dart, chief executive of the Rexall Drug Co. Working in close cooperation with him is Charles S. Thomas, Chairman of the Republican National Committee. As a former Secretary of the Navy and a procurement officer, Thomas has awarded military contracts to California aircraft-missile companies running into millions and millions and millions of dollars. He is a strong link between national Republican financing and California Republican financing because before going to Washington he was a Trustee of the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. Another industrial financial link in the Republican king-makers' chain of command is Los Angeles industrialist John McCone, who is reputed to have set up the Eisenhower stage which prepared the way for Knight's withdrawal. The Chairman of the United Republican Precinct Organization is Walter C. Smith, a Vice President of Lockheed—quite a precinct worker! The Chairman of the Re-

publican Associates Executive Committee is Homer Preston, an official of Richfield Oil. Charles Blythe, an investment banker, rated one of Knight's leading financial fund raisers, is said to have had to go along with the decision to withdraw Knight from the gubernatorial race. Blythe's opinion, is said to be that the man who made the really key decision was Norman Chandler of the Los Angeles Times. Chandler has been openly frank in stating his objective. "I think Dick Nixon would make one of the finest presidents America has ever had," comments Chandler on his political objective. "Bill Knowland is a fine man, but if they are both candidates for the GOP nomination in 1960 Mr. Nixon will get the support of the Times."

Many analyses have been made of the new California trend which has shown up in the recent 64th Assembly District special election. In this election the Democratic vote increased 5% over the Democratic vote of 1954 and 1956, according to John Despol. In 1954 Republican McGee defeated this same Democrat, Roest, by 9,001 votes, in 1956 by 14,565 votes, and in 1957 Roest (the candidate with the Democratic label) lost by 1206 votes. More significantly, only

295 votes separated the total Democratic and GOP vote in the 64th Assembly District special election when you count the also-ran candidates' votes. It is clear that the "right-to-work" issue injected into the campaign by the Republican candidate and the Republican press did not produce any new votes but probably lost votes for the Republican candidate. The "right-to-work" proponents have no cause for jubilation from these election results. In fact, these election results will scare the majority of Republican candidates away from this issue in the 1958 elections. Bill Knowland will have very little company on this issue from his fellow Republican candidates on the Republican ticket.

If the same ratio of Republican-Democratic votes cast in the 64th Assembly District were projected statewide, at least 11 Republican Assemblymen, 4 Republican State Senators, and all statewide Republican party candidates would go down to defeat—even if some of the candidates nominated for statewide office by the California Democratic Council are completely unknown political names in February. For the first time in recent years in California the Democratic label after a candidate's

A Good Look..

(Continued from Page 9)

Senator Knowland's Record

AGAINST Organized Labor.—

1. He voted to repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act and to weaken the Wagner Act. This would have seriously crippled labor's ability to organize and bargain collectively. The bill passed the Senator and House and was voted by the President. (May 25, 1946).
2. He voted for legislation which would permit use of the U.S. Army to break strikes. (May 31, 1946).
3. He voted AGAINST federal assistance to state unemployment compensation programs. (Sept. 19, 1945).
4. He voted for the Taft-Hartley Act three times: the Senate version, the Conference Report and for the bill over the President's veto. (May 13, 1947; June 6, 1947 and June 23, 1947).
5. He voted to nullify portal to portal back-pay claims of coal miners. (March 21, 1947).
6. He voted AGAINST repeal of the worst provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law, including provision which could prevent unions from speaking, writing or assembling in connection with a political candidate. (June 28, 1949).
7. He voted for a law to permit use of injunctions against unions, and seizure of struck plants by the government. (June 30, 1949).
8. He introduced and voted for a measure to remove 250,000 retail clerks from protection of the minimum wage law. (Aug. 30, 1949).
9. He voted to cut Labor Department appropriations, including those used for the important Labor Statistics Bureau "Cost-of-Living" studies. (April 28, 1949).
10. Out of 17 labor issues in an AFL box-score, Knowland voted against labor 13 times between 1946 and 1950. Out of 39 issues in a CIO boxscore between 1945 and 1950, Knowland voted against labor 30 times.
11. A Senate resolution was introduced requesting the President to use the 80-day injunction against the proposed Steelworkers Union strike. The CIO opposed the 80-day injunction. Knowland voted for the resolution. (June 10, 1952).
12. Senator Knowland voted AGAINST increases in pay for the postal service employees twice. (March 25, 1955, and May 24, 1955).

Senator Knowland's Record On

Government Efficiency and Economy—

1. He voted AGAINST the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 to place the U.S. Employment Service under the Department of Labor in order to eliminate duplication and decrease overhead expense. Later recommended by Hoover Commission. (June 10, 1947).
2. He voted AGAINST the President's Reorganization Plan to consolidate the federal lending agencies and thereby eliminate duplication and overhead expense. Later recommended by Hoover Commission. (July 22, 1947).
3. He voted AGAINST funds for the National Science Foundation, a project later approved by the Hoover Commission, because it increased the efficiency of federal scientific research activities. (May 16, 1947).
4. He voted AGAINST consolidating the welfare agencies such as the public health service, social security, office of education, etc. under one department which would have saved administrative costs. Approved by the Hoover Commission. (August 16, 1949).
5. He voted AGAINST the Hoover Commission Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 which would have streamlined the Treasury Dept. (May 11, 1950).
6. He voted AGAINST the Hoover Commission approved Reorganization Plan No. 12 which would have made the National Labor Relations Board more efficient. (May 11, 1950).
7. He voted AGAINST the Hoover Commission Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1951 which would have made the Reconstruction Finance Corporation more efficient and more responsible to the public. (April 13, 1951).
8. He voted AGAINST separating airline subsidy from airmail contract payment, a measure approved by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. (Sept. 19, 1951).
9. He voted to place FHA and GI Housing under the Federal Reserve Board. This was in conflict with the Hoover Commission efficiency recommendations. (Aug. 21, 1950).
10. In justice to the Senator, has has voted for many of the recommendations for government efficiency and economy made by the Hoover Commission. Usually, however, they were the recommendations with little or no opposition.

name on the November general election ballot is a tremendous and perhaps decisive asset.

In any event, for some or all of the above reasons given in this analysis, the sly Nixonites reason Knight will lose in the primary; Knowland will lose in the finals. Results: Knowland, nothing; Knight fallen. Nixon, Uber Alles.