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For Mayor

JOSEPH L. ALIOTO

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Joseph L. Alioto; My residence address is at No. 34 Presidio Terrace, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Attorney-Business Executive.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: San Francisco needs the freshest, boldest approaches to solve our serious problems — of crime, jobs, housing, taxes, race relations, transportation. I am a native son, active in legal and civic affairs, as well as former chairman of the Redevelopment Agency, former president of the Board of Education. My years fighting monopolies in behalf of cities and states have given me an intimate working knowledge of government — in Washington, Sacramento, San Francisco. My extensive business-management experience as president of the largest rice growers association also equips me to make prompt decisions to get the job done.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Attorney-Business Executive" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOSEPH L. ALIOTO.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Joseph L. Alioto are:

Ann Alanson, 65 Montclair Terrace, Democratic National Committeewoman
Frank L. Alioto, 3130 Lyon St., Restaurant Mgr.
Peter Boudoures, 1200 California St., Executive
John Yehall Chin, 913 Stockton St., School Principal
Mrs. Henry Grady, 850 Powell Street, Housewife
Vernon Kaufman, 25 Presidio Terrace, Merchant
Wm. H. Kilpatrick, 2491 - 24th Ave., Union Official - Civil Service Commissioner
LeRoy King, 75 Zampa Lane, Instr. Repr. I.L.W.U.
Cyril J. Magnin, 990 California Street, Merchant
Charlotte Smith Maillard, 2244 Vallejo Street, Housewife
William M. Malone, 1 Gabillon Way, Attorney at Law
Anita G. Martinez, 62 Madrone Ave., Latin American Civic leader
William E. McDonnell, 385 Castenada Avenue, Businessman
Howard N. Nemirovski, 250-32nd Avenue, Attorney
Mrs. Charles B. Porter, 142 - 27th Avenue, Housewife
Elmer E. Robinson, 1200 California Street, Judge of the Superior Court (Ret.)
James J. Ruden, 149 Chenery Street, Corporation Executive
Benjamin H. Swig, 950 Mason Street, Hotel Operator
Yori Wada, 565 - 4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Executive Director
Zeppelin W. Wong, 405 Davis Street, Attorney at Law
For Mayor

WILLIAM W. (Bill) BILLINGS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is William W. (Bill) Billings; My residence address is at No. 798 Post Street, #60, San Francisco; My business or occupation is School Teacher.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: By virtue of age, character, and personality, I seek my right to be elected to the Mayor's Office of San Francisco. San Francisco needs a Mayor with éclat and common sense. He must have legislative influence with the Board of Supervisors. He must have an attractive personality and appearance to represent, as figurehead, the People of San Francisco. He must have the savoir faire to go with the many social demands made upon the Mayor. And as a good executive, with the Mayor's considerable appointive power, he must have ability to delegate authority in responsible, intelligent, and honorable representatives. I possess these talents.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "School Teacher" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: WILLIAM W. (Bill) BILLINGS.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O'DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for William W. (Bill) Billings are:

Lawrence Lee Bath, 1115 Taylor Street, Businessman
Andy Chalmers, 7126 Geary Blvd., Salesman
Helen Elizabeth Dunn, 798 Post, Clerk
Donn Hinton, 31-35th Street, Self-employed, Health Service
Olive Alida Johnson, 1200 Gough St., Retired
William B. Lattimer, 62 Beaver Street, Teacher
Josephine A. Leewright, 798 Post St., Apt. 602, Housewife
Enid Ng Lim, 1155 Hyde St., Insurance Underwriter
Richard G. Shields, 60 Henry St., #4, Express Clerk—Western Greyhound
Frederick E. Smith, 125 - 3rd Ave., Public Accountant
Frank E. Zener, 798 Post St., Messenger
For Mayor

EARL DAVID (Maxie) BROWN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Earl David (Maxie) Brown; My residence address is at No. 377-Sixth Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Businessman-Retired.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have, as a successful businessman who believes in the free enterprise system, a deep sense and intense feeling of civic duty, my goal will be to see the great city of San Francisco become a finer, cleaner, more beautiful city in which to live. I pledge an around the clock administration in the war against the nefarious narcotic traffic, ten years of United States Naval service plus 10 years local business experience has given me the training to evaluate and supervise in many and varied fields, and to accept the responsibility that the office of mayor contains.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Retired-Businessman" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: EARL DAVID "Maxie" BROWN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O’DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Earl David (Maxie) Brown are:

Merrill E. Bailey, 246 Sussex St., Retired
Suzanne Cole, 2527 Turk St., Secretary
Margaret Duggan, 601 O’Farrell Street, Retired
Gugliemo Ferrari, 285 - 30th St., Businessman
Verdell Hopper, 289A - 30th St., B & G Club (Businessman)
C. P. Kreifels, 2345 - 15th Ave., Draying & Whrs. Owner
Frank W. Lucches, 1207C Turk St., Retired
David L. Mears, 1911 Funston Ave., Sales Mgr.
Henry E. Parodi, 146 Madrid St., Service Station Owner (50 - 29th St.)
Eugene Scott, 423 Frederick St., Cab Driver
Richard E. Turner, 835 Turk Street, Self-employed
James J. Vonk, 175 Casitas Ave., Attorney
For Mayor

ROBERT WAYNE DAVIS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Robert Wayne Davis; My residence address is at No. 4077-A 18th Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Taxi driver.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I was born, raised and work in San Francisco. I am a Socialist, endorsed by the Socialist Workers Party, and my qualification for Mayor is my program for solving problems of working people: Withdraw the troops from Vietnam — Vote yes on the resolution to bring our boys home now. Support the black freedom struggle—for black power. 100% tax on war profits. For automatic wage increases tied to the cost of living — A 30-hour week at 40-hour pay. No laws restricting the right to strike and demonstrate. For an Independent Labor Party. For a Socialist society.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Cab Driver” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ROBERT WAYNE DAVIS.

Subscribed before me and filed this 19th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Robert Wayne Davis are:

Ove Aspoy, 3641 - 16th Street, Lab. Asst.
Clyde Cumming, 625 Scott Street, Office Worker
Dianne M. Feeley, 798 Geneva Ave., #2, Teacher
Clare M. Fraenzl, 61-A Belcher, Teacher
Asher F. Harer, 149 Detroit St., Longshoreman
Robert Himmel, 545 Frederick St., Printer
James H. Kendrick, 724-A Masonic, Tariff Compiler Trainee
Stephen B. Meisenbach, 625 Ashbury, #12, Letter Carrier
Helen Meyers, 61-A Belcher, Student
Beverley K. Rutzick, 2030 - 34th Avenue, Clerical Worker
Merry Maisel Safier, 545 Frederick St., Editor
Bonnie Sheppard, 222 Schwerin St., Housewife
Harold Verb, 923-A Fulton St., Office Clerk
Sylvia Weinstein, 1249 - 6th Ave., Housewife
For Mayor

GEORGE M. DEL SECCO

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is George M. Del Secco; My residence address is at No. 3929 California Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Businessman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: 41 years old, father of 3 children, a San Franciscan of English and German descent adopted into an Italian family. Attended Mission Dolores and St. Anthony's grammar schools, Balboa High School and furthered his education at Golden Gate College. A veteran of WW 2 serving in the South Pacific 4 years. Successfully established a real estate and insurance business and is presently engaged in the development and manufacture of specialized underwater equipment. A former candidate for Assessor, thoroughly familiar with business procedures, people's feelings and needs. Attuned to San Francisco's tempo, he is the man for San Francisco's leadership!

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Businessman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: GEORGE M. DEL SECCO.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for George M. Del Secco are:

Mrs. Estella Barnett, 450 Lisbon Street, Typist Clerk—Civil Service
John C. Barnett, 450 Lisbon Street, Guard Bridge—Civil Service
Robert Stanley Comer, 1595 - 40th Avenue, Student
Wm. R. Coupe, 158 - 22nd Ave., Sales Mgr.
Efren S. Cucaion, 1312 Guerrero St., Digital Computer Operator
Filiberto Guerrero, 414 Cambridge Street, Machinist
Julio Guerrero, 2838 Folsom St., Carpenter
Kenneth G. Hall, 1938 Judah Street, Glazier
Audrey M. Lukaszevich, 29 Calgary St., Cook
Mary Lukaszevich, 29 Calgary St., Housewife
Horace Peter Nunez, 262 - 22nd Ave., Mechanic
Refugio Rondon, 420 Bartlett St., Housewife
George Teragawa, 117 Downey Street, Mover
For Mayor

HAROLD DOBBS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Harold Dobbs; My residence address is at No. 1601 Monterey Blvd., San Francisco; My business or occupation is Lawyer-Businessman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a practicing attorney and a businessman. I was a member of the Board of Supervisors (1951-1963) and was chairman of the Finance Committee. The cornerstone of my campaign is know-how. We need a new look in the Mayor’s office, not just a new face. I am familiar with the needs of labor. As Mayor, I will get action and offer leadership in the problems of spiraling taxes, safety in the streets, the lag in our cultural progress — our traffic mess — re-development—and the problems confronting our elder and less fortunate citizens.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Lawyer-Businessman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: HAROLD DOBBS.

Subscribed before me and filed this 11th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Harold Dobbs are:

Michael Riordan, 550 Laguna Honda Blvd., Attorney at Law
E.D. Schley, 3666 Baker St., Dir. of Marine Cooks & Stewards Union & Welfare Dept.
Joseph C. Tarantino, 2427 Bay St., President of Bell Smoked Fish Co.
Morris Weisberger, 22 Beachmont St., Sec.-Tres. Sailors Union of the Pacific, 450

Harrison Street.

George Christopher, 55 Stonecrest Drive, Businessman
Paul Edgecombe, 3628 Army St., President of the Operating Engineers Local Union #3
J. T. Esteve, 696 - 12th Ave., Publisher, The Mabuhay Republic (Filipino Newspaper
in S.F.)

Geo. B. Gillin, 295 Stratford Drive, Banker
John J. Goodwin, Jr., 2551 - 16th Ave., Savings and Loan Executive
Arthur Gradwohl, 285 Guerrero Street, Editor, California Senior Citizens News
Walter A. Haas, 2100 Pacific Ave., Manufacturer
Marco F. Hellman, 3515 Pacific Avenue, Investment Banker
Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 850 Chestnut St., Insurance Co. Exec. & Lawyer
Louis T. Kruger, 35 Miguel Street, Western Regional Director, Steuben Society of
America
Jack S. Kusaba, 4132 Anza Street, Bank Executive and Attorney
Elena Eyre Madison, 2930 Vallejo St., Housewife
Arch Monson, Jr., 2225 Broadway, Businessman
George W. Ong, 52 Almaden Court, Founding President of the Chinese American
Democratic Club

Mrs. Leola Puccinelli, 3040 - 23rd Ave., Community Leader
For Mayor

LLOYD KORENEFF DOWNTON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Lloyd Koreneff Downton; My residence address is at No. 335 Irving Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Promotion.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I can do a better job as mayor than any other candidate.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Promotion” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: LLOYD K. DOWNTON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O’DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Lloyd Koreneff Downton are:

Antoinette Bondanza, 1250 Clay St., #3, Secretary
Julius A. Buckler, Jr., 2439 Buchanan St., Real Estate Investments
Jacquemint Calder, 2445 Buchanan St., Real Estate
Glenn A. Dorenbush, 2805 Green St., Public Relations
Charles B. Nick Eldredge, 322 Elsie St., Film Editor
Howard K. Fisk, 253 Collingwood St., Writer
Sylvia Goldstein, 5 Anza Vista, Int. Typist Clerk
Claude Jarman, 440 Davis St., Public Relations
James T. Johnson, 2906 Broderick St., Attorney-at-Law
Clark Lawrence, 2843 Webster, #304, Salesman
Benjamin Maxwell, 1076 Connecticut St., Warehouseman
George T. Miller, 214 Clayton Street, Student
Thos. R. Williamson, 930 Bay St., Attorney
For Mayor

HAROLD B. HOOGASIAN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Harold B. Hoogasian; My residence address is at No. 318-26th Ave., San Francisco; My business or occupation is Florist.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have been a small businessman in San Francisco all my adult life. I now run a sidewalk flower stand at 250 Post Street. I have been in import-export, real estate, cleaning and dyeing, and toy inventions. I am a member of the Chamber of Commerce and have always been interested in city affairs. I listen to peoples' problems and their views on civic matters. I have developed a philosophy of simplicity in City government and simple solutions of issues. I believe it is wrong to make election promises that can not be kept.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Florist” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: HAROLD B. HOOGASIAN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Harold B. Hoogasian are:

Karoon V. Balian, 67 Inverness Dr., Deputy Clerk
Larry Cristiani, 1422 Haight Street, Florist
Bruce Heiser, 24 - 25th Avenue, Architect
Jeanne M. Heiser, 24 - 25th Avenue, Housewife
Ruby L. Helms, 500 Mt. Vernon Ave., Checker
Theresa A. Hoogasian, 318 - 26th Ave., Artist
George H. Penney, 2431 Yorba St., Insurance Claims Examiner, Calif. State Auto
Gladys M. Penney, 2431 Yorba St., Housewife
Conway E. Stamer, 5429 Judah Street, Registered Nurse
John R. Swenson, 141 San Aleso Ave., Lawyer
Mrs. Faye Turner, 311 DeLong St., Housewife
For Mayor

WILHELM JOERRES

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Wilhelm Joerres; My residence address is at No. 626 Kearny Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Entrepreneur-Actor.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have degrees in Mathematics and Business, served 3 years in U.S. Army Signal Corps, am union member, and am very young. I make real specific promises; here are some: to constructively combat social unrest and delinquency by opening places of recreation—like playgrounds in the evening, keep libraries open on Sundays; establish a traffic right court, raise salaries and improve training of the police; for individual rights and free enterprise, demand just compensation or not have redevelopment, ultimately remove Embarcadero Freeway, protect Chinatown from government meddling, demand BART give us the quality subway system we were promised.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Entrepreneur, Actor" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: WILHELM JOERRES.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O'DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Wilhelm Joerres are:

Dorothy D. Damon, 4336 - 20th St., Housewife
Alan Dienstag, 2149 Mason St., Writer
Carolyn Droeges, 583 Chestnut St., Director
Detlef Eymer, 780 Broadway, Chef
Adrienne E. Gallagher, 1653 Grant Ave., Estimator
William W. Hurley, 468 Fell Street, Artist
Michael H. Kelly, 728 Taylor Street, Library Clerk
Peter Maccan, 166 Hermann Street, Displayman
Kenna J. Morris, 1241 Kearny St., Dancer
Jon Pascaraosa, 1327 Grant Ave., Hair Stylist
Samuel B. Ridge, 142 Central St., Producer
Harry William Siegel, 814 Steiner St., Writer
For Mayor

SAMUEL KLINE

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Samuel Kline; My residence address is at No. 659-33rd Ave., San Francisco; My business or occupation is retired.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: (1) Immediate reduction of the staggering burden of the property tax on San Francisco home owners. (2) Fight to return a 5c car fare for Senior Citizens. (3) A proposal to return the first years salary to the city for distribution to Youth Recreation, Senior Citizens' centers and improvement Association. (4) A promise to work full time at the job of Mayor.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Retired" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: SAMUEL KLINE.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HIEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By PEGGIE CONNOLLY,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Samuel Kline are:

Leon Birman, 801 - 25th Avenue, Retired
Leo J. Champagne, 275 Justin Drive, Retired
Helena Culleton, 2351 Bay Street, Housewife
Jack L. Eisenberger, 2221 Noriega St., Contract Furnishing
John P. Ferry, 52 Paramount Terrace, Retired
Miss Clara L. Giller, 749 - 11th Avenue, Retired
Arnold Goldberg, 1399 - 30th Ave., Locker Attendant
Sarah H. Gradwohl, 285 Guerrero St., Housewife
Jon Greenberg, 446 Lansdale, Employed by City & County of San Francisco
Tillie Ginz, 3755 Folsom St., Housewife
Reuben N. Kaplan, 2254 - 27th Ave., Retired
Sophie Kline, 659 - 33rd Ave., Housewife
Harry L. Stuver, 358 Frederick St., Retired
Clarence J. Williams, 2451 Sacramento, Retired
For Mayor

ROBERT CHARLES LE BUGLE

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Robert Charles Le Bugle; My residence address is at No. 60 21st Avenue, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Restaurant Owner.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Candidate for peace, love, happiness. Local businessman, home owner, taxpayer—Supporter of youth devoted to the tradition, beauty and spirit of San Francisco.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Restaurant Owner" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ROBERT CHARLES LE BUGLE.

Subscribed before me and filed this 13th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By PETER LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Robert Charles Le Bugle are:

Elinor E. Beaulieu, 1719 - 10th Ave., L.V.N.—Private Duty
William P. Begeor, 3173 - 23rd St., Apt. 1 Bar Manager
Joan M. Begeor, 3173 - 23rd St., #1, Homemaker
Patricia Berelson, 19 Turquoise Way, Secretary
Simone S. Cano, 9310 Divisadero, Housewife
Edward Chang, 1841 Mason St., Waiter
Shul Kun Chang, 1841 Mason St., Housewife
Mrs. Pauline Dorff, 550 Battery St., Importer
Victor Guillermert, 60 Dawnview Way, Waiter
Marilyn E. Rabinovich, 307 Columbus Ave, Artist
Nadia Lauper, 1651 - 10th Ave., None
Alexis Tellis, 550 Battery Street, Real Estate Developer
Walter G. Tolleson, 318 San Benito Way, Orchestra Leader
B. Tuia Ventres, 1642 Noriega, Bank Employee
Valentine Jarrande Vontetsianos, 60 - 21st Ave., Manager "Charles" Restaurant
Barbara B. Wand, 126 Macondray Lane, Interior Designer
Mary Ann Werckenthien, 6350 Fulton St., Secretary
Terry Williams, 173 Belvedere St., Toll Collector
William S. Young, 28 Crestline, Apt. #3, Photographer Newspaper
For Mayor

GEORGE W. LOOBY

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is George W. Looby; My residence address is at No. 1358 Dolores Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Bartender.


Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Bartender" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: GEORGE W. LOOBY.

Subscribed before me and filed this 18th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for George W. Looby are:

Fred L. Alexander, 865 Eddy Street, Warehouseman
Dale L. Allen, 2254 Sloat Blvd., Bartender
Mrs. Noel C. Allen, 2254 Sloat Blvd., Clerk-typist, Housewife
Louis J. Britton, 1382 Dolores St., Retired
Mrs. Wm. M. Cutcomb, 450 Murray St., Housewife
Wm. M. Cutcomb, 450 Murray St., Accountant
Irving D. Fineman, 274-6th Ave., Accountant
Kathleen Gallegos, 1318 Dolores St., Housewife
Kathleen A. Hagopian, 3805 - 22nd St., Credit Clerk
Wm. R. Hawkins, 928 Sutter St., Cook
Mrs. Eloise Looby, 272 Eureka St., Waitress
Ivory P. Looby, 1358 Dolores, Housewife
James Looby, 2159 - 34th Ave., Bartender
Jeanette Looby, 2159 - 34th Ave., Clerk-typist, C.C.S.F.
Jerome J. Looby, 272 Eureka St., Bartender
S. C. Zipkin, 1942 - 30th Ave., Self Employed—Restaurant Supplies
For Mayor

BEN MAXWELL

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Ben Maxwell; My residence address is at No. 252 So. Ridge Rd., San Francisco; My business or occupation is Warehouseman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a warehouseman. Am a member of the Welfare People for Justice Group, work with New Careers Planning Committee and others. I am for moving our government ahead to meet the critical issues of transportation up Grade School Housing for all rights job opportunities for all races, a new plan for the youth and elderly and better planning for our neighborhoods.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Warehouseman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: BEN MAXWELL.

Subscribed before me and filed this 20th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Ben Maxwell are:

Robert Earl Anderson, Jr. 918 Minnesota St. Janitorial
Charles Clay, 668 Elizabeth St. Community Organizer
Helen M. Craft, 930 Broderick St. Housewife
Lloyd K. Downton, 335 Irving St., Promotion
Daryl E. Franklin, 1001 Sunnyvale Ave., Apt. 804, Masseur
Julia Newman, 789 Noe St., Bookseller
James W. Rowe, 501 Octavia St., Shipping Clerk
Louise Sanders, 1005 Golden Gate Ave., Orderly S.F.G.H.
Geraldine Tyson, 92 West Point Rd., Jr. Clerk
For Mayor

JERRY PATRICK MILLER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Jerry Patrick Miller; My residence address is at No. 4 Rayburn Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Messenger.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Peace on earth all good will towards men. This is one earth. There is nowhere to go. Legalize grass. Free food in everybody put down your guns. I love you. I love you. I love you. P.S. register to vote for every election people. This is our legal peaceful way. This is a grass root campaign.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Messenger" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JERRY PATRICK MILLER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 22nd day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Jerry Patrick Miller are:

Jack Mark Agins, 4052 - 19th Street, Lab. Assistant
Sara B. Berenson, 789 Noe Street, Copy Editor
Jerry A. Burns, 2462 - 47th Ave., Journalist
Mary M. Jacobson, 2901 Pacheco Street, Student
Douglas D. Ellis, 2621 1/2 Bryant Street, Student
Charles O. Lawson, 2249 Clement St., Apt. A, Unemployed
Terrance B. McDermott, 145 Foberster Street, Student
Henry J. Meals, 136 Newman Street, Social Worker
Claude W. Mitchell, M.D. 105 Behr Ave., Doctor of Medicine
Wayne L. Overton, 777 Noe Street, Actor-Director-Student
Richard L. Paup, 460 Noc St., Lab. Technician
Kenneth Valentine, 4502 - 18th St., Craftsman
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For Mayor

CLAUDE WILSON MITCHELL

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Claude Wilson Mitchell; My residence address is at No. 26 Adolph Sutro Ct., San Francisco; My business or occupation is Physician.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: (1) American Citizen (2) Resident of San Francisco for 5 years (3) 1 year electorate (4) Holder of A.B. Degree (5) Holder of M.D. Degree (6) 34 years old.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Doctor of Medicine” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: CLAUDE W. MITCHELL, M.D.

Subscribed before me and filed this 22nd day of September, 1967.

BASIL HIEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Claude Wilson Mitchell are:

Marilyn Boyd, 1040 Masonic Ave., Apt. #2, Registered Nurse
Shirley B. Brooks, 1651 Page Street, M. D. Ass't.
Vernon Collins, Jr. M. D. 31 Grafton Ave., Physician
Bessie M. Hawkins, 274 Broad Street, Barber
Raymond L. Ingram, 701 Noriega Street, Postal Clerk
Logett H. Jackson, 329 Los Palmos Dr., Housewife
Edwin T. Johnson, M.D., 373 - 9th Ave., Medical Doctor
John H. McFeeley, Jr., 4428 - 3rd Street, Attorney at Law
Jerry Patrick Miller, 4 Rayburn Street, Messenger
Loretta J. Myers, 90 Amethyst Way, Registered Nurse, retired
LaErma Rose, 415 Randolph Street, Secretary, Dr. Oscar L. Daniels
Arthur A. Sheridan, 1482 Post Street, Producer & Host "San Francisco Show"
Margie N. Walsh, 1700 Page St., Apt. 10, Secretary
For Mayor
JACK MORRISON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:
That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Jack Morrison. My residence address is at No. 44 Woodland Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Member, S. F. Board of Supervisors.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: City Hall is not for sale! Our destiny must not be controlled by narrow, downtown financial forces. We must reduce the tax burden on homeowners and renters with new business taxes. We must speed mass transit instead of freeways to reduce auto congestion and air pollution; preserve the beauty of our city; stop bulldozer redevelopment and provide better housing for citizens in their own neighborhoods at prices they can afford; modernize the police department to maintain harmony among our citizens; provide job training and jobs. Working together, we can begin a new era and establish a just society in San Francisco.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Member Board of Supervisors" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JACK MORRISON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 20th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Jack Morrison are:
Benjamin P. Agustin, 546 - 54th Ave., Filipino & American Society of Calif., President
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader, Conservationist
Willie L. Brown, Jr., 1524 Masonic Ave., Attorney at Law and State Assemblyman
John Burton, 674 Wisconsin, Member California State Legislature
Mary Anna Colwell, 2860 California, Wife & Mother
Merton R. Dushkes, 224 - 16th Avenue, Union Business Agent
Morris R.Evenason, 583 - 10th Ave., Painters Union Representative
Edward J. Farley, 225 Teresita Blvd., Office Worker
Rev. F. D. Haynes, 1832 - 16th Ave., Clergyman
Agar Jaicks, 62 Woodland Ave., Chairman, S.F. Democratic County Central Committee
Clifton R. Jeffers, 36 Thrift St., Attorney at Law
Nicomedes J. Martinez, 378 Arlington St., Real Estate Broker
George R. Moscone, 90 Landseale Ave., State Senator
William L. Porter, 1020 Union, Attorney
Helen B. Reynolds, 1030 Lombard, Housewife
Burton Rockwell, F.AIA, 1 Belmont Ave., Architect
Geronimo Serafin, 1067 Powhattan Ave., Warehouseman
James F. Thatcher, 3979 Washington St., Lawyer
Mrs. Elkan Voorsanger, 250 Laurel Street, Housewife
Mrs. Henry Ming Wong, 1224 Pacific Ave., Housewife
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For Mayor

HERBERT STEINER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Herbert Steiner. My residence address is at No. 1593 McAllister Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Organizer, Socialist Labor Party.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: The Socialist Labor Party endorses my candidacy. I maintain that racial tensions, juvenile delinquency, crime, corruption, job loss through automation, the awesome danger of a third world war are all signs of social decay and disintegration. Politicians cannot cure these capitalist blights. Socialism is the only answer. To achieve Socialism the working class must organize Socialist Industrial Unions to democratically administer and direct production of goods and services. These unions back up the Socialist ballot. The workers will carry on production for use—not profit. A vote for Socialism means economic security, peace and freedom for all people.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Organizer" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: HERBERT STEINER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 12th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By HAROLD J. O’DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Herbert Steiner are:

Clifford S. Beckman, 146 Hermann Street, Heat Treater
Mrs. Alice C. Carter, 359 - 20th Ave., Retired
Robert Gross, 42 Uranus Terrace, Retired
Patricia Forsyth, 164 Panorama Dr., Housewife
Ralph P. Forsyth, 164 Panorama Dr., Psychologist
Elmer A. Haas, 459 Haight St., Retired
Carl Jorgensen, 433 Ellis Street, Retired Carpenter
Allen J. Keefe, 4347-A California Street, Salesman
Millie Keefe, 4347-A California Street, Housewife
Charles J. Murdock, 145 Gough St., Apt. 3, News Vendor
Cynthia Rice, 725 - 21st Ave., Secretary
Robert D. Rice, 725 - 21st Ave., Sales Clerk
Jennie Sacridei, 1800 - 25th Ave., Apt. 1, Housewife
Jean Steiner, 1593 McAllister Street, Housewife
For Mayor

CHARLES D. WALKER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Mayor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Charles D. Walker. My residence address is at No. 1080 Chestnut Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Mfrg.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Our population has dwindled by almost 100,000. Unfortunately, those who have left are predominately homeowners, the backbone of our economy. The unfair burden of taxation on the property owner has been the straw that broke the camel's back, leaving less of us to support more on our relief and welfare rolls. As chairman of the San Francisco Fair Taxation Committee, I have led the fight for property tax limitation and deductions for home improvements. Twice I have rented the Civic Auditorium to help the cause of the homeowner. While others have talked, I have taken positive steps.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Manufacturer" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: CHARLES D. WALKER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O'DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Charles D. Walker are:

Jack Bartalini, 3130-24th Street, Electrical Contractor
Sophie M. Bartalini, 3130-24th Street, Housewife
Margaret I. Budy, 1475 Funston Ave., Sales Clerk
Choy J. Chung, 1427 Washington Street, Expeditor
Grace C. Denton, 2458 - 41st Ave., Receptionist
Carrie E. Gallagher, 248 Bonview St., Guest House Manager
Patricia M. Garcia, 683 - 49th Ave. Varitypist-Secretary
Robert E. Halsing, 541 Darien Way, Attorney at Law
W. Harry Johns, 555 Pierce St., #102, Real Estate Broker
Mary A. Lopez, 430-Third St., Blue Print Machine Operator
Frank P. Mcaugher, 2151-10th Avenue, Retired
Donald E. Morosi, 1285 Green Street, Public Relations
Elmer J. Trask, 248 Bonview St., Retired
Alma T. Rogers, 645 Stockton St., Retired
Mrs. Celestine M. Swanson, 711 Cambridge Street, Housewife
For Supervisor

JOHN ABRAHAM

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is John Abraham. My residence address is at No. 2980 26th Ave., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Businessman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: San Francisco is my home. I want it to be a city of which we can all be proud and in which I can raise my two daughters in safety, peace and comfort. San Francisco has given me opportunity to own a business and a home. As supervisor I can contribute in small part for this privilege to preserve and maintain the greatness of our city. For 20 years as a businessman I have provided service for taxpaying home owners in all San Francisco residential communities. I have special knowledge of and interest in the problems of my neighbors in these communities.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Businessman" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOHN ABRAHAM.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for John Abraham are:

Alma Abraham, 2990-26th Avenue, Housewife
Fred Apostoli, 3554-17th Street, Salesman
Reno Barsocchini, 1751 Green St., Restaurant Self-employed
Art Benjamin, 582-4th Ave., Business Agent, Sailor's Union of Pacific
Henry L. Cumber, M.D., 2022-16th Ave., Physician
Geo. B. Gillin, 285 Stratford Drive, Banker
Tommy Harris, 363 Marina Blvd., Restaurant Owner
Rev. F. D. Haynes, 1832-16th Ave., Clergyman
Nick Kontis, 307 Vicente St., General Contractor
Marguerite M. Krasak, 520 Roosevelt Way, Housewife—Volunteer Civic Worker
—Clubwoman
Raymond Lawless, 3220 Lawton, Publisher "Sunset News"
Chang W. Lee, 1512 Jones St., Dentist
Heurli Lewin, 1914-36th Ave., General Manager, S.F. Hilton Hotel
Larry E. Lewis, 4950 California, Waiter
William G. Menary, 150 Font Blvd., #7C, Merchant
William Moskovitz, 1901 California, Retired
Joseph Quan, 574-18th Ave., Travel Agent
Cyrus A. Samuel, 1357-17th Ave., Merchant
Henry Schindel, 34 Schwerin St., Executive Secretary
Ethyl Venturi, 109 Serrano Drive, Real Estate Saleswoman
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For Supervisor

IVY AMBROSE

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Ivy Ambrose. My residence address is at No. 3833 17th Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is housewife.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I feel fortunate in having learned some of the problems of working people. My husband was a carpenter in Local 22 before his accident and since then have made a personal study of some local problems.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Real Estate" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: IVY AMBROSE.

Subscribed before me and filed this 22nd day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Ivy Ambrose are:

Bernard M. Roden, 56 Sanchez, Retired, Rec. & Park Dept., S.F.
Antoinette Bondanza, 1250 Clay St., Secretary
Lloyd Downton, 335 Irving St., Promotion
Howard K. Fisk, 233 Collingwood, Writer
Mrs. Amelia Garcia, 869 Guerrero, Real Estate Salesman
W. Harry Johns, 855 Pierce St., #103, Real Estate Broker
Clark Lawrence, 2943 Webster, #304, Salesman
Rose D. Martinez, 1575-5th Ave., Ditto Operator
John H. McFeeley, Jr., 4420 Third St., Attorney at Law
Jerry Patrick Miller, 4 Rayburn, Messenger
Eva Parascandolo, 2694 McAllister, Real Estate Broker
Margaret V. Stewart, 1835 California St., Retired
Kenneth Valentine, 4502-18th St., Craftsman
For Supervisor

ALLEN E. ANDERSON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Allen E. Anderson. My residence address is at No. 4906 Fulton Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Lawyer.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: A severe blow has been dealt the economy of San Francisco. The homeowner of San Francisco is being taxed out of existence, and if relief is not granted, we will see a great exodus of those who support our city's economy. I have led the fight for property tax limitation in our city charter. This measure is now on the ballot. I advocate a $3000 deduction for home improvements. While others talk, I act. I am an attorney, born and raised in San Francisco and love my city enough to represent you, wholeheartedly.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Attorney-At-Law" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ALLEN E. ANDERSON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY, Registrar of Voters.
By HAROLD J. O'DONNELL, Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Allen E. Anderson are:

Donald R. Abrahamson, 1333 Gough Street, Attorney
Theo. S. Anderson, 318 Frederick St., Auto Mech.
Jack Bartalini, 3130-24th Street, Electrical Contractor
Harold W. Elliott, 3581 Sacramento Street, Attorney at Law
Roy C. Hall, 3119 Turk Street, Attorney at Law
John Janus, 440 Montecello St., Captain
John W. McAbey, 975 Burnett Ave., Regional Sales Mgr.
P. F. Millican, 1850-43rd Ave., Deputy Court Commissioner
Thelma L. Millican, 1850-43rd Ave., Homemaker
John A. Warckois, 417 Valley St., Insurance Broker
For Supervisor

WILLIAM R. BAYMA

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is William R. Bayma. My residence address is at No. 293 Edgewood Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Assessor's Business Property Auditor.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Veteran, graduate and Student Body President of University of San Francisco, employed by City Hall five years, assisted City executives in Budget preparation, assisted in securing State and Federal funds. For the past two years a business property auditor for the Assessor — recovering tens of thousands of dollars in escaped taxation for the City. I have an intimate understanding of taxpayers problems. The great clock in City Hall is inscribed with figures of future generations carrying the Torch of Progress. I intend to embrace that torch and carry out its meaning—to fight crime, equalize taxation and modernize City management.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Auditor” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: WILLIAM R. BAYMA.

Subscribed before me and filed this 22nd day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALFY,
Registrar of Voters.
By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for William R. Bayma are:

Antoinette Bonanza, 1250 Clay St. #3, Secretary
Julius A. Buckler, Jr. 2439 Buchanan St., Real Estate Investments
Jacquemiot Calder, 2445 Buchanan Street, Real Estate
Lloyd Downton, 335 Irving St., Promotion
F. J. Lucien Etchevery, 40 Sylvan Dr., Civil Service
Thomas J. Fiorella, 289 1/2 Edgewood Ave., Teacher
Clark Lawrence, 2843 Webster St., #204, Salesman
Steven Louie, 601 Sawyer Street, Civil Service
George T. Miller, 314 Clayton Street, Student
Phillip Moore, Jr. 730 Presidio Ave., Clerk
Paul T. Steele, 30 Ashbury Street, Credit Man—Union Oil of Calif.
For Supervisor

JOE BEEMAN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office. That my name is Joe Beeman. My residence address is at No. 846 Green Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Supervisor.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: My service on the Board of Supervisors has made clear to me that bold and imaginative solutions to the problems of tax relief, crime, jobs, housing and education must be found quickly if our City is to be a decent place to live. We must strive to correct the disastrous shift of tax assessments from downtown to residences authorized by AB 80, a bill I did not vote to endorse. We must also achieve greater efficiency and economy in government. I have been a Supervisor who has kept the people in mind. Please keep me in mind when you vote.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Incumbent Member, Board of Supervisors" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOE BEEMAN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By HAROLD J. O’DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Joe Beeman are:

Daniel G. Blum, 41 Amethyst Way, Certified Public Accountant
Peter Boudoures, 1200 California, Executive
Willie I. Brown, Jr., 1524 Masonic Ave., Attorney — Legislator
Marie DeMartini Bruce, 1520 Sloat Blvd., Union Representative
John Burton, 674 Wisconsin, Member California State Legislature
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Drive, Labor Representative
Louis Garcia, 370 Ellis, Attorney
Arthur Gradwohl, 283 Guerrero, Editor
Shirley Cabelman Burton, 2846 26th Ave., Public Relations Representative
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Drive, Labor Official
Abel Gonzalez, 1450 South Van Ness, Field Representative, Local 261
Albert James, 1283 Gillian Ave., Longshore Business Agent
Susan Kelly Kennedy, 2277-9th Ave., Secretary
Catherine Ruth Lee, 1036 Pacific, Housewife
Guido E. Nannini, 1870 Sacramento, Gardener
Samuel B. Ridge, 142 Central St., Producer
Gerard Rhine, 57 Beachmont, Sales
Timothy Twomey, 2026 Lawton St., Labor Union Representative
For Supervisor

DEAN L. BENDER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Dean L. Bender. My residence address is at No. 170 Westgate Drive, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney-at-Law.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a supervisor candidate supported by concerned San Franciscans. I am an independent candidate not committed to any special interest groups. My objectives are: Economy with realistic fiscal planning, fair distribution of tax burdens, effective law enforcement, nonvehicle subsurface transit not freeways, intensive housing rehabilitation with selective renewal—not bulldozer redevelopment, increased clean light industry, improved neighborhood schools, business district parking, City beautification, culture and the arts. I am an attorney and college instructor, native born, 38, married, two children, former Navy pilot. Vote for Dean Bender for realistic, sensible, energetic government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Attorney" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: DEAN L. BENDER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By WILLIAM SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Dean L. Bender are:

Phillip H. Arnot, 75 San Leandro Way, Physician and Surgeon
Erin H. Berberian, 26 Dorantes Ave., Housewife
Harold A. Chase, 2840 Market St., Concrete Contractor
Nick Constantinos, 1255-21st Ave., Retired
Helen M. Craft, 930 Broderick St., Wife & Mother
Joseph Ray Dettling, 321 Highland Ave., Physics Instructor
James L. Dillon, 115-7th Ave., Attorney
S. A. Donaldson, 800 Corbett Ave., Bail Bond Agent
Dorothy E. Durie, 2990-22nd Ave., Retired
Roy A. Erickson, 1900-24th Avenue, Salesman
Marvin W. Friedman, 83 Woodland Avenue, Attorney
Louis A. Gage, 274 Lobos St., Real Estate Salesman
Jerold D. Levin, 2300-22nd Avenue, Engineer
Elvira E. Moran, 1417-28th Ave., Retired
George J. Peoples, 32 Mars Street, Machinist
Robt. E. Ramsdell, 462 Vallejo St., Certified Public Accountant
Neil D. Reid, 70 Piedmont Street, Attorney at Law
Marilyn E. Rittgers, 107 Collingwood Street, Secretary
Margaret V. Stewart, 1855 California St., Retired
Robert Bruce Tara, 157 Santa Ana Avenue, Investigator
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For Supervisor

JAMES G. BOUDOURES

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is James G. Boudoures. My residence address is at No. 1770-20th Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Business Manager.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Humane, Common Sense & Non-Partisan, Liberal.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Business Manager" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JAMES G. BOUDOURES.

Subscribed before me and filed this 15th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for James G. Boudoures are:

Robert T. Barnacle, 25 Hamilton Street, Real Estate Salesman
Patricia A. Boudoures, 333 Stratford Drive, Housewife
Art B. Franklin, 103 Charter Oak, Truck Driver
Egon J. Haberichter, 2181 Revere Ave., Social Security Claims Examiner
Stanley Hinde, 100 Girard St., Retired
Lou Maldonado, 1958 Donner Ave., Real Estate Broker
Dominic Mifsud, 238 Somerset St., Pipe Fitter
Joseph L. Morris, 203 Ellis St., Longshoreman
Mae H. Koza, 625 Bacon St., Housewife
Cy Weitz, 192 Hamilton, General Building Contractor
For Supervisor

DAVID BREMAN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office. That my name is David Breman. My residence address is at No. 560 Gellert Drive, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Real Estate Broker.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Born, raised and educated in San Francisco. Married and have two daughters. Majoring in Business Administration at College. I have been a real estate broker since 1945 and I know the problem which affects the property owner and tenant. I am a member of the San Francisco Real Estate Board, member of the Commonwealth Club and past president of Lakeshore Park Improvement Club. I believe voters have the responsibility for electing supervisors who are dedicated to rigid budget control of city expenses. The present Board are collectively responsible for our high city taxes and voters should be cognizant of this one fact.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Realtor" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: DAVID BREMAN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters,
By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for David Breman are:

Mrs. Adrienne Breman, 560 Gellert Dr., Housewife
Dolores Ayala, 297 Richland St., Saleswoman
William G. Barnes, 3002 Baker Street, Loan Agent
Robert Barker, 1542 Masonic Ave., Building Inspector
Paul Chatom, Jr. 1880 Jackson St., Retired
Walter J. Danshy, 4745 Ocean Avenue, Retired
Mrs. Ben Farber, 272 Country Club Dr., Housewife
Mrs. Veral Gillett, 44 Melrose Ave., Sr. Clerk Typist
Rita Haas, 1606-27th Ave., Homemaker
Zel R. Kahn, 1250 Eucalyptus Drive, Wholesale Grocer
Abraham Levitt, 1227-12th Ave., Teacher, Spanish
Rhue Levitt, 1227-12th Ave., Homemaker
James D. Lucey, 2022 Balboa Street, Attorney at Law
Mrs. Lee E. Mussotter, 39 Country Club Drive, Homemaker
Mrs. Angelina Quatro, 816 Geary St., Housewife
Thomas J. Quatro, 816 Geary Street, Bartender
Bert Rosenthal, 111 Riverton Drive, Owner of Legal Messenger Service
Dorothy Rosenthal, 111 Riverton Drive, Housewife
Ann M. Smith, 908 Post St., Housewife
Cecil L. Smith, 908 Post St., Hotel Manager
For Supervisor

DONALD J. BRUCE

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Donald J. Bruce. My residence address is at No. 243 - 8th Ave., San Francisco; My business or occupation is Business Man.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Action! Late Senator McAteer said Action! I helped him to be Supervisor and Senator. Bruce was History Clerk of State Senate. Taxes too high, I will help the people. Economy will be my aim. Law and Order. I received 72,000 Votes — Supervisor now is a full time job. Ready to Serve. Elected to the County Committee — Public School — Family Man.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Business Man" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: DONALD J. BRUCE.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By HAROLD J. O'DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Donald J. Bruce are:

Bernard M. Boden, 56 Sanchez, Retired
John J. Carroll, 1524-36th Ave., Appraiser
Francis E. Cox, 75 Caselli Ave., Property Appraiser
Matthew Hall, 2081 Bush, Butcher
Marie A. LePleux, 570 O'Farrell St., #108, Artist, Doll Designer
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grand View Ave., Restaurateur
Alessio Morini, 1278 Market St., Unemployed
William O'Donnell, 2223 Yorba, Deputy Assessor
Daisy B. Smith, 1416-20th Ave., Homemaker
Willis Tom, 656-33rd Avenue, Auditor
Jack B. Winter, 2814 Ulloa Street, Real Property Appraiser
For Supervisor

ROLAND M. CAMARA

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Roland M. Camara. My residence address is at No. 1001 Franklin St., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Businessman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a disabled Korean Veteran, a property owner, citizen and voter of San Francisco. I support the Constitution of the United States and of the State of California. I further support the Charter of San Francisco and if elected, will perform my duties as a member of the Board of Supervisors in such a manner as to bring credit to my supporters, the City and County of San Francisco and to all of its citizens, be they elderly or young, poor or rich, or of whatever station in life.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Businessman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ROLAND M. CAMARA.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Roland M. Camara are:

Ralph L. Abel, 2441 Jackson St., Banker
Raymond Hans Andersen, 6 Van Buren, Photographer
Bud Billington, 400 Harrison St., Seaman
Edward C. Cannon, 545 Jones, Fleet Service Clerk, American Air Lines
Marcos A. Castillo, 1170 Hampshire, Musician
Donald H. Coffman, 540 Jones, Maître d’
Adolph M. Eisenberg, 285 Turk St., Retired
David A. Hanna, 817 Eddy St., Bar and Grocery Owner
Frederick Harris, 2120 Fillmore, Postal Clerk
You T. Lee, 189 Bernard St., Cook
Matt Lewis, 487 Justin Dr., Office Worker
Dominic McBride, 1214 Polk, Room 309, Manager, Classical Record Division, Columbia Music Co.
William Marlet Eldson, 344 Jones, Fireman - Retired
John William Page, 450 Ellis St., Retired
Jose V. Pereira, 259 Lexington St., IBM Comp. Reports Operator
Elgin Ray, 308 Eddy St., Truck Operator
Jack Risso, 278-27th Ave., Accountant, Realtor
Albert White, 216 Eddy St., Carpenter
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For Supervisor

JOSEPH CASEY

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Joseph Casey. My residence address is at No. 610 Polk Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Supervisor.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Born and reared in San Francisco; educated at Mission Dolores School, Sacred Heart College and Stanford University. Formerly auditor American Federation of Labor, now self-employed as Industrial Relations Consultant. As a member of the Board of Supervisors for the past twelve years, I have dedicated my uncompromising efforts to assuring the people of San Francisco full value for every tax dollar spent. I have represented all groups and interests fairly and to the sole end that San Francisco’s official affairs be conducted with wisdom, integrity and a keen eye to future growth and prosperity. My re-election will guarantee continuance of those policies.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Incumbent” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOSEPH CASEY.

Subscribed before me and filed this 13th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Joseph Casey are:
Jack Bartalini, 3130-24th Street, Electrical Contractor
Morris Bernstein, 1740 Broadway, Merchant
Allen M. Biagi, 1820 Vallejo St., Businessman
Aileen F. Butler, 2675-17th Ave., Housewife
John T. Butler, 2675-17th Ave., Retired - San Francisco Police Dept.
John J. Casey, 2339-41st Ave., Businessman
Francis Edward Coghlan, 100 Yerba Buena Ave., Insurance Broker
James Joseph Coen, 435 Sunnydale Ave., Insurance Agent
Joseph J. Diviny, 125 Cambion Dr., Labor Rep.
Gerald P. Haggerty, 524 Post St., Ins. Broker
John F. Hannan, 625 Cayuga Ave., Retired
Albert R. Imperial, 50 Hernandez Ave., Sales Administrator
Louis T. Kruger, 23 Miguel Street, Western Regional Director Steuben Society of America
Maurice J. Lynch, 1000 Broadway, Sales & Estimator
William Moskovitz, 1901 California St., Retired
Mary Riordan, 69 Rosemont Pl., Homemaker
Gabriel Salomon, 257 Cumberland St., Insurance Broker
W. J. Varley, 108 Stratford Drive, Public Relations Counselor
Siro J. Viscava, 435 Sunnydale Ave., Plumber
FOR SUPERVISOR

ROBERT ALFRED CHAMPLAIN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Robert Alfred Champlain. My residence address is at No. 1378-39th Ave., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I was born and educated in San Francisco and graduated from Polytechnic High School. I received the BA and Law Degrees from the University of California at Berkeley and was admitted the California Bar in 1962. I served 3 years as a commissioned officer in the Judge Advocate General’s Corps, U.S. Army and am presently in corporate practice in S. P. The number one issue in San Francisco as elsewhere is the breakdown of law, order, and societal discipline. I will fight for reinstatement of stern discipline in the schools, support for the police force, and strict enforcement of the law.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Attorney" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ROBERT A. CHAMPLAIN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By P. LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Robert Alfred Champlain are:

Anna Bonanno, 1384-39th Ave., Housewife
Jack Bonanno, 1384-39th Ave., Law Professor
Mary Bonanno, 2519-34th Ave., Admitting Office Clerk
Stephen P. Bonanno, 2519-34th Ave., Administrative Specialist
Patrick Bonanno, 1384-39th Ave., Retired
Harlan Leroy Smith, 2241-16th Ave., Real Estate Broker
Mrs. Esther Oppenheimer, 1775-31st Ave., Housewife
Manley Oppenheimer, 1775-31st Ave., Registered Pharmacist
Sven Petersen, Jr., 241 Winding Way, Clerk
Eugene Roberts, 2085 14th Ave., Teacher
Mrs. June T. Roberts, 2085-14th Ave., Housewife
Walter H. Stewer, 3714 Judah St., Printing Executive
For Supervisor

GARRETT CHAN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office. That my name is Garrett Chan. My residence address is at No. 35 Galilee Lane, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Furniture Store Owner.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am independent San Francisco businessman, army veteran, active member of numerous civic and social groups. I am thoroughly familiar with working and the problems of city government. As first American of oriental extraction to be a candidate for the Board of Supervisors I am in the unique position of knowing at first hand many problems and frustrations of San Francisco minority.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Businessman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: GARRETT CHAN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

BY HAROLD J. O’DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Garrett Chan are:

Manuel Ceballos, 1224 York St., Grocer
Chester Chew, 756-19th Ave., Social Worker
Charles Clay, 668 Elizabeth St., Community Organizer
James E. Cooke, 1 Amethyst Way, Attorney
Alice E. Ernst, 585-6th Avenue, Bookkeeper
E. J. Fitzharris, 2515-25th Ave., Public Relations
Cora C. Hungate, 1215 Castro St., Apt. 3, Retired
Shirley L. Hungate, 1970-46th Ave., Housewife
Mary Kindfather, 571-2nd Ave., Housewife
L. John Larsen, 971-Pacific Ave., Photographer
Raymond L. Resler, 730 Stockton St., Association Manager
Oliver E. Sraub, 4902 California St., Special Investigator of Freight Claims
Donald S. Tong, 375 Richland Ave., Photographer
Anthony Charles Young, 426% Ivy St., Store Owner
For Supervisor

JOSEPH CHANEY, JR.

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Joseph Chaney Jr. My residence address it at No. 625 Rhode Island St., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Computer Programmer.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Studied economics with a primary interest in Public Finance: the use of Economic Resources to solve city, state and national problems. Was an "air traffic control specialist" with the Federal Aviation Agency for three years. Have worked for the last five years as a Computer Programmer and a Computer Operator in the Bay Area. Have served in Civic Activities in San Francisco and was recently Chairman of the "Youth in Government Activities," sponsored yearly by the Junior Chamber.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Computer Programmer" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOSEPH CHANEY JR.

Subscribed before me and filed this 11th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By P. LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Joseph Chaney, Jr. are:

William L. Bradshaw, Jr., 146 Wood, Transportation Analyst
Eugene K. Green, 2845 Washington St., Counselor, Youth for Service, Neighborhood Youth Corps
Rev. F. D. Haynes 1833-16th Ave., Clergyman
Shirley E. Hughes, 1283 McAllister St., Housewife
Charles Junior, 325 Bright Street, Realty or Right-of-Way Agent
Edgar Rollins, 360 Frederick, #3, Food-Beverage Controller
James L. Stratteu, 602-15th Ave., Administrative Representative, California Y. G. Board
John M. Turner, Jr., 71 Walter St., Public Relations Radio
James P. Wilson, 78 Central Ave., Trade Association Official
Jerry F. Zacharatos 2522 Great Highway, Insurance
For Supervisor

CHARLES CLAY

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Charles Clay. My residence address is at No. 668 Elizabeth Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Community Organizer.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I, Charles Clay, have filed for election to the Board of Supervisors because I am a resident and registered voter in the City and County of San Francisco. I am an Organizer, working directly with the people, and I know their problems relating to city government. The problems of poor citizens in this city are neglected and I feel that I can best represent them and their points of view, thereby, giving them a voice in city hall. Our city cannot depend upon old faces to solve old problems. If we reelect the same individuals we can look forward to another four years of problems without solutions.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Community Organizer" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: CHARLES CLAY.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By HAROLD J. O'DONNELL,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Charles Clay are:

Margaret Ann Galvez, 495 Vermont St., Intake & Referral Assistant Supervisor
Helen Fauss, 29-A Guy Pl., Housewife
Cardelia Jeffers, 28 South Park, Housewife
Allee S. Kavanagh, 3226-A Washington Street, Community Organizer & Director of
Central City Hospitality House
Claude W. Mitchell, M.D., 106 Bohr Ave., Physician
Loretta J. Myers, 80 Amethyst Way, Registered Nurse
Elsie Salas, 736-A Natoma St., Intake & Referral Assistant, E.O.C. Central City Area
Marlene Weaver, 148 Russ St., Housewife
Phillip B. Ziegler, 447-19-17th Street, Attorney at Law
Gordon H. Finn, 675 O’Farrell St., Social Worker
For Supervisor

BRUCE CONNER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Bruce Conner; my residence address is at No. 34 Carl Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Nothing.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: The light of the body is the eye; therefore when thine eye is single, thy whole body also is full of light; but when thine eye is dark, thy body also is full of darkness. Take heed therefore that the light which is in thee be not darkness. If thy whole body be full of light, having no part dark, the whole shall be full of light, as when the bright shining of a candle doth give thee light. For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known...

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Nothing" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: BRUCE CONNER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Bruce Conner are:

Florence Virginia Allen, 1824½ Union Street, Hostess
Joan Brown, 37 Saturn St., Instructor
Jean Conner, 34 Carl Street, Housewife
Lieso Lynne Cahagan, 325 Lombard Street, Secretary for Architectural Firm
William R. Maginnis, Jr., 71 Whitney St., Musician-Electronics Technician
Dave Haselwood, 1403 Gough Street, Printer
Peter Hopkinson, 2430A Polk St., Architect
Robert T. Hunter, 287 Central Avenue, Free Lance Artist
Andre T. LaBordg, 2250 Vallejo St., Attorney
William C. Masun, 1570 Haight Street, Businessman
Michael McClure, 264 Downey St., Poet
Margaret Anne Pettus, 2436 Steiner Street, Advertising
Wylie R. Sheldon, 438-A Lombard St., Lawyer
Jo Anne Toft, 566 Lombard St., #7, Accounting Clerk—U. S. Marshal’s Office
For Supervisor
LEE COUSINS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:
That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Lee Cousins; my residence address is at No. 3441 Balboa Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Truck Driver.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a native of San Francisco, I feel that the problems of the Haight-Ashbury and other spots in our community must be remedied. I want better education, lower taxes and more community support for the police department of San Francisco.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Truck Driver” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: LEE COUSINS.
Subscribed before me and filed this 20th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters,
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Lee Cousins are:
Robert F. Andersen, 1287 Osco St., Junior Clerk
Norman L. Bennett, 696 Diamond St., Plumber
James Cadin, 1371 Dolores St, Beer Bottler
Eileen Cousins, 3441 Balboa St., Typist
Howard Raymond Driscoll, 3660 - 22nd St., Stationary Engineer
Edward Hopkins, 79 Montezuma St., Asphalt Foreman
Robert J. Kiser, 3861-25th St., Machinist
James M. Knight, 1428 - 9th Ave., Bartender
Robert W. Mangini, 939 Guerrero St., Teamster
Michael J. Monahan, 644 - 44th Ave., Mixer Dryer Man
Joseph G. Murphy, 592 - 12th Ave., Bartender
John P. O'Connor, 2094 - 18th St., Asphalt Worker, D.P.W.
William P. Quinn, 4131-23rd St., Plumber
Robert Spencer, 440 - 23rd Ave., Asphalt Worker
Harvey E. Tobelman, 1711 - 7th Ave., Mixer-Dryerman
Arthur Trine, 37 Concord St., Mixer-Dryerman
Charles A. Winkler, 1412 Market St., Salesman
For Supervisor

CLYDE CARTER CUMMING

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Clyde Carter Cumming. My residence address is at No. 625 Scott Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Office Worker (Stenographer).

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a socialist candidate for Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, endorsed by the Socialist Workers Party. As an Afro-American woman I think I can best represent the needs of the black community. My qualification is my program for solving problems of working people: Withdraw the troops from Vietnam—Vote Yes on the resolution to bring our boys home now. For Black Power—For black control of black communities. For a 30-hour week at 40-hours pay to create more jobs. No laws restricting to strike and demonstrate. For an Independent Black Political Party.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Office Worker (Stenographer)" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: CLYDE CUMMING.

Subscribed before me and filed this 19th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Clyde Carter Cumming are:

Ove Aspoy, 3041-10th St., Lab. Asst.
Robert Davis, 4077-A - 18th St., Cab Driver
Dianne M. Feeley, 796 Geneva Ave., #2, Teacher
Clare M. Fraenzl, 61-A Belcher Street, Teacher
Asher F. Hater, 149 Detroit Street, Longshoreman
Robert Himmel, 545 Frederick Street, Printer
James H. Kendrick, 724-A Masonic Ave., Tariff Compiler Trainee
Stephen E. Meisenbach, 625 Ashbury, #12, Letter Carrier
Helen Meyers, 61-A Belcher St., Student
Mrs Beverley K. Ratzick, 2030 - 24th Ave., Clerical worker
Meny Maisel Safier, 545 Frederick Street, Editor
Bonnie Sheppard, 222 Schwerin Street, Housewife
Harold Verb, 923-A Fulton Street, Office Clerk
Sylvia Weinstein, 1249 - 6th Ave., Housewife
For Supervisor

NICHOLAS H. DAHER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office. That my name is Nicholas H. Daher. My residence address is at No. 2746-38th Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is General Contractor.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Am a licensed general contractor active in building trade since 1933. Involved in Boy Scouts of America, Troop #43. Corpus Christi School 10 years. Feel that member of the Board of Supervisors must have ability to act with experience, initiative, and growing insight in the flourishing progress of this great metropolis. Am particularly anxious to contribute my time and talent to the future growth and concern of San Francisco, so that the youth of today may have a better city to live, worship, and appreciate, and that each family may find a fulfillment of family life in our great city.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County. I desire that the following designation “General Contractor” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: NICHOLAS H. DAHER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 12th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Nicholas H. Daher are:

George Anthony, 640 Junipero Serra Blvd., Real Estate Investment
David Joseph Astone: 60 El Verano Way, Insurance Broker
J. A. Ayoub, 312 Junipero Serra Blvd., Executive
Richard J. Barbitta, 420 Colón Ave., Sunset Scavenger Co.
Manuel Dudum, 1245 - 31st Ave., Real Estate Broker
William J. Gedon, 62 Taraval, Attorney
Elías Habeeb, 668 Huron Ave., Unit Supervisor, Pacific Gas & Elec. Co.
Victor A. Habeeb, 2039 - 10th Ave., District Manager, Weibel Winery
Patrick J. Kelly, 2759 - 38th Ave., Pressman
Michael Khouri, 2927 - 28th Ave., Grocer (Produce Buyer)
June L. Levy, 55 Lagunitas Drive, Housewife
Mable H. Lowe, 1362 - 47th Ave., Sales Clerk
Thomas Newman, 62 Rosewood Dr., Loan Agent, Savings & Loan
W. J. Welter, 271 Kensington Way, Electrical Contractor
For Supervisor

JOHN A. ERTOLA

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is John A. Ertola. My residence address is at No. 219-32nd Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney-at-Law & Businessman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Native and lifetime resident of San Francisco. Served on every important Supervisors' committee past three years. Dedicated to effective law enforcement; have activated an energetic program to combat crime and assure safety in streets. Waging unrelenting fight to lower governmental costs; actively sponsor reasonable measures to lighten tax burden. Enlightened civic planning, esthetically and socially, with better housing, living and working conditions, are key commitments. Firm sponsor of legislation which will bring and retain jobs and industry for our City. Married; two teenage children in local schools; home-owner; attorney-at-law; World War II veteran; two decades of intense, constructive activity in civic affairs.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Incumbent" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOHN A. ERTOLA.

Subscribed before me and filed this 15th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for John A. Ertola are:

Mrs. Shirley Ertola, 219 Thirty-second Ave., Homemaker
Mrs. Victor Gatti, 134 Westgate Drive, Homemaker
Nick Ciccosta, 662 Cayuga Ave., Scrap Dealer
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Dr., Labor Rep.
Syd Goldie, 553-42nd Ave., Newspaper Columnist
John E. Gurich, 2010 Pacific Ave., Real Estate Broker
M. C. "Sam" Hermann, 321 Molimo Drive, Retired
Joseph I. Kelly, 400 Magellan Ave., Public Utilities Commissioner
J. Rufus Kiawans, 27 Avila Street, Attorney
Louis T. Kruger, 23 Miguel Street, Western Regional Director Steuben Society of America
Mrs. Harry W. Low, 104 Turquoise Way, Housewife
John C. Molinari, 1268 Lombard Street, Insurance-Company Executive
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grand View Ave., Restaurateur
Leo J. Murphy, 61 Annapolis Terrace, Banker
Edward F. Sextus, 25 Heather Ave., Professional Engineer
J. M. Tonkin, 2121 Broadway, Management Consultant
Edison Uno, 515 Ninth Avenue, Business Manager
Nick A. Verveos, 201 Argonaut Ave., Insurance Broker
Thomas Wu, D.D.S., 598 - 38th Avenue, Dentist
For Supervisor

TERRY A. FRANCOIS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall be a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Terry A. Francois. My residence address is at No. 20 Taraval Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have been a member of the Board of Supervisors since 1964 and am presently serving on the Finance & Fire, Safety and Police Committees and am Chairman of the Governmental Services Committee. I authored: Charter revision proposal; legislation establishing Tax Appeals Board and creating Embarcadero Center $150,000,000 development. I Supported: Tax relief for homeowners; billboard controls; master plan for Chinatown and Hunter’s Point; accelerated utilities undergrounding and tree planting. I Opposed: Destructive freeways; second bridge deck. I have been a practicing attorney since 1950. My wife Marion and I are the parents of five children.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Member of the Board of Supervisors” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: TERRY A. FRANCOIS.

Subscribed before me and filed this 14th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Terry Francois are:

Ann Alanson, 65 Montclair Terrace, Democratic National Committeeewoman
Rev. Hamilton T. Boswell, 45 Cleary Ct., Clergyman
Mrs. Willie L. Brown, 1324 Masonic Ave., Housewife
J. K. Choy, 810 - 43rd Ave., Banker
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumashore Dr., Labor Representative
Morriss R. Evenson, 553 - 10th Ave., Union Official
William L. Ferdon, 132 Commonwealth Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Louis Garcia, 370 Ellis. Attorney
Mrs. Granveld A. Jackson, 257 Kensington Way, General Supervisor,
Elementary School Education, Oakland Public Schools
James S. Kearney, 1871 - 30th Ave., Union Official
Elizabeth R. Kelley, 656 O’Farrell St., Business Union Local 46
Joseph I. Kelly, 460 Magellan Ave., Attorney
Mrs. Harry W. Low, 104 Turquoise Way, Housewife
William McCabe, 2878 Jackson St., Union Official
Bertha Metro, 114 Ortega St., Financial Secretary-Treasurer, Local 283
Charlotte C. Poole, 90 Cedro Way, Housewife
W. M. Reddy, 365 Mangels Ave., Labor Representative
Salvatore Reina, 1150 Union, Pharmacist
Timothy Twomey, 2026 Lawton St., Labor Union Representative
Yori Wada, 555 - 4th Ave., Buchenay Y.M.C.A. Executive Director
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For Supervisor

WALTER HABEKOS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Walter Habekos. My residence address is at No. 941 Irving Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney-at-Law.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: My birth and residence in the City and County of San Francisco since 1915; Graduation from Lowell High School; B.S. degree from the University of California; L.L.B. degree with honors from the University of San Francisco Law School; An attorney admitted to the State Bar of California and in active practice since 1948; A public accountant licensed by the State Board of Accountancy; A retired Lieutenant Commander in the Naval Reserve; An elected member of the Church Council of my Lutheran church for years; Active participation in activities of the Boy Scouts of America and the Lions Club.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Attorney-At-Law” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: WALTER HABEKOS.

Subscribed before me and filed this 18th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By WILLIAM F. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Walter Habekos are:

Sylvester Barelkosky, 1427 - 43rd Ave., Retired
Charles L. Bunting, 1538 Filbert St., Vehicle Maintenance Clerk
Elise C. Clayton, 769 - 45th Ave., Social Work Supervisor
Hulda Collander, 391 Valencia St., Retired Dressmaker
Clara B. Habekos, 1538 Filbert St., Apartment House Owner
Jack Janian, 1338-9th Ave., Retired Cabinet Maker
Walter A. Mills, 1321 - 9th Ave., Hotel Clerk
Joseph N. Minahan, 1033 Irving St., Youth Consultant
Elmore E. Moran, 1417 - 20th Ave., Retired
James A. Mough, 200 Irving, #9, Invoice Clerk
Evelyn Mough, 200 Irving, Personnel Counselor
Louis Opswick, 1562 - 11th Ave., Retired
Luke O'Riordan, 1501 Lincoln Way, Retired
Edward F. Rathe, 919 Irving St., Retired
Scott M. Sheldon, 37 Sheldon Terrace, T.B.A. Biller, Phillips Petroleum
Juanita Skelton, 1424 - 6th Ave., Social Worker
For Supervisor

MARY E. HALL

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Mary E. Hall. My residence address is at No. 147 Upper Terrace, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Business Woman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: My many years experience as a business woman, a real estate broker, and a District Civic Leader, will be used to benefit the people of San Francisco, especially all property owners and their tenants. I will cut taxes by cutting unnecessary spending, without decreasing necessary city services. I will not approve any additional unwanted costly neighborhood redevelopment projects. I saved the taxpayers of San Francisco $30,000,000 by assisting in defeating the unwanted Mission District redevelopment plan. I will insist on fairness to all our Citizens by all of our Government Agencies.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Business Woman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: MARY E. HALL.

Subscribed before me and filed this 18th day of September, 1967.

RASII. HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By YICKS. WONG,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Mary E. Hall are:

Jack Bartalini, 3130 - 24th Street, Electrical Contractor
Richard M. Brown, 121 Burnside St., Maintenance & Repair
Bert Donlin, 727 Cole St., Longshoreman
Neal A. Fellom, 147 Upper Terrace, Attorney
Mary S. Gessert, 70 - 27th Ave., Homemaker
Anne M. Guth, 137 Rivoli, Homemaker
Mendel Herscowitz, 2155 Beach St., Retail Paint Dealer
Walter G. Jepsen, 314 Polaris Way, Photographic Supply Dealer
Benard P. Kelly, 239 Valley St., Real Estate Broker
Ted James Kukula, 287 Staples, Attorney-at-Law
Joseph J. Migliozzi, 16 Alvarado, Moving & Storage Co.
Philip N. Nabhan, 1079 Church St., Public Accountant
Albert Nissim, 1080 Pacheco St., Real Estate Broker
Michael Perri, 159 Lakeshore Dr., Real Estate
Renetta Smithcott, 310 Willard St., Housewife
Walter E. Stanton, M.D., 56 Bonview, Physician
Theodore Thrush, 50 Turk St., Advertising
Flora Torriano, 249 - 29th Street, Businesswoman
Yetta U. Vanderbyll, 22 Gladys Street, Typist-Clerk
W. C. Wanderer, 52 Levant, Civil Engineer
For Supervisor

E. KENNETH HARRIS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is E. Kenneth Harris. My residence address is at No. 16 Presidio Terrace, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Physician.


Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Physician" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: E. KENNETH HARRIS.

Subscribed before me and filed this 13th day of September, 1967.

BASIL IHEALEY,  
Registrar of Voters. 
By T. L. ANDERSON,  
Deputy Registrar of Voters.
For Supervisor

CURT HAYDEN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Curt Hayden. My residence address is at No. 200 Morningside Drive, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Partner, Clementina Ltd.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: An enlightened, businesslike approach to the city’s major issues is what we need and what a good Supervisor should provide. The tax load must be redistributed taking the burden off residents and renters. The budget warrants much closer attention, so that essentials of city life receive full financing while frills are rejected. We need massive training programs so unskilled and unwanted workers get fair chances. Intelligent action must encourage economic growth, but not at the expense of beauty. Crime, corruption and poor housing must be dealt with firmly. San Franciscans must hold first place; not commuters and conventioneers.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Businessman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: CURT HAYDEN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 15th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Curt Hayden are:

Alfred P. Baylaq, 611 - 34th Ave., Insurance Broker
Russel D. Carpenter, 290 Lombard Street, Retired
Alfred J. Cleary, 55 Rossmoor Dr., Businessman
William L. Fardon, 132 Commonwealth Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Oscar H. Fisher, Jr., 44 Forest View Drive, Chairman San Francisco Forward
Mrs. Andrew J. Gallagher, 1485 - 18th Ave., Industrial Director Southern Promotion Assn. & Realtor
Margaret L. Hayden, 325 Buckingham Way, Apt. 004, Secretary
Homer J. Helmstein, 353 Crestmont Drive, Insurance Broker
George Killion, 1090 Chestnut Street, Business Executive Chairman M.G.M.
Mary Alice Leland, 3966 Washington Street, Housewife
George R. Reilly, 2774 - 34th Ave., Member State Board of Equalization
A. R. Santucci, 350 Darien Way, Laundry Owner
Walde Velasquez, 130 Milton St., Businessman
For Supervisor

ADRIAN "Hap" HAZARD

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Adrian "Hap" Hazard. My residence address is at No. 2627-16th Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Paint Technician.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I believe in democracy and government by the people. In a democracy every citizen must concern himself or herself with the workings of government if democracy is to succeed. I stand willing to do my part and pledge to respond to the needs and wants of the individual citizens whose voice I propose to be. I therefore seek no endorsements from organized groups. The people being governed are the government and are best qualified to know what is best for them. My personal qualifications are thus the same as the individual voters I propose to represent as a supervisor.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Paint Technician" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ADRIAN "HAP" HAZARD.

Subscribed before me and filed this 15th day of September, 1967.

RASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Adrian "Hap" Hazard are:

Ida Louise Bauerlein, 1204 Mason St., Self-employed Decorator
Thomas M. Carson, 2808 Ulloa St., Retired
Robert M. Carson, 1840 Stockton, Ship's Clerk
Edward F. Gigliotti, 2170 - 28th Ave., Salesman
Maria C. Gigliotti, 1834 Mason St., Housewife
Vesta M. Gray, 235 - 14th Ave., Art Dealer
Daniel Hammer, 73-B Cervantes, Salesman
Mary Hazard, 2627 - 16th Ave., Housewife
Mendel Herscowitz, 2153 Beach St., Retail Paint Dealer
William E. Konde, 380 - 16th Ave., Painter
Lena Massucco, 2145 Larkin St., Housewife
Norman Rosenberg, 455 - 37th Ave., Toy Store Owner & President of Board
For Supervisor

EMIEL WILLIAM LEE

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Emiel William Lee. My residence address is at No. 1257 Bush St., Apt. 2B, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Dental X-ray Lab., 450 Sutter Street.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I hereby pledge to promote and support good government, law enforcement with emphasis on reducing juvenile delinquency, public health, labor organizations, City and County welfare, mental welfare, judicial, arts and culture. I will cooperate with civic-minded leaders for the betterment and improvement of City government and alleviate tax problems for the retired aged property owners by having good management and honest budgets. Organizing improvement clubs that will enhance the tourist trade and make our city a safe place to live and visit. I recommend that non-government efficiency experts be utilized to improve the efficiency of City and County government.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Radiodontist" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: EMIEL WM. LEE.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

Basil Healey,
Registrar of Voters.

By T. L. Anderson,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Emiel William Lee are:

Howard C. Day, 7 Rivas Avenue, Minister, First Baptist Church
Dorothy E. Holt, 528 - 20th Ave., Sales Person & Cosmetologist
Frances T. Jamison, 221 - 24th Ave., Secretary
Lura Kiteley, 1751 Market St., Retired
Mrs. E. W. Lee, 1257 Bush St., Housewife
Irene Nelson, 522 - 26th Ave., Housewife
Eva Parascandolo, 2694 McAllister, Real Estate Broker
O. Eugene Pitts, 1510 - 18th St., Educational Director
Irene E. Shields, 3314-A Sixteenth St., Housewife
Ellen A. Speacht, 55 Hermann St., Apt. #108, Secretary
Emma H. Spencer, 1745 Franklin St., Housewife
Henry Thiery, 254 Ivy St., Retired (formerly Furnace Repairman)
Anthony P. Trimboli, 127 San Juan Ave., Retired, S.F. Fire Dept.
Arthur S. West, 550 Stockton St., News Vendor
For Supervisor

ROBERT E. LEE

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Robert E. Lee. My residence address is at No. 960 Edinburgh Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Businessman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I was born in San Francisco, received my education in San Francisco public schools. I have a business background in real estate and property management as well as the restaurant business. If elected I will work for an elected Board of Education. I am opposed to busing solely for the purpose of busing. I will seek tax relief for our citizens. I favor attracting new industry in an effort to rehabilitate our city. I endorse fire and police protection and support for those who provide these emergency services. I believe San Francisco demands strong, honest, independent and aggressive leadership.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Businessman" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ROBERT E. LEE.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Robert E. Lee are:

Donna J. Bouvia, 447 Burnett Street, Claims Supervisor
Marsha Lynn Caulfield, 760 A Portola St., Presidio of S.F. Undergraduate
Thomas A. Vortmann, 1751 - 21st Ave., Political Science
Joseph B. Kindregan, 1023 - 14th Ave., Contractor C 61
Mrs. John F. Kerrigan, 11 Marview Way, Housewife
Dr. Carl E. Kreyer, D.C., 1145 Geneva Ave., Chiropractor
Margaret Anne Lee, 960 Edinburgh St., Registered Nurse
Thomas Lewsader, 61 Rockaway Ave., Self-employed (Advertising)
Bernard M. McShroy, 959 Edinburgh St., Retired Bender Rep.
Patricia M. O'Callaghan, 1150 Clayton St., Property Owner
Bruce E. Rianda, 388 Country Club Dr., Student
Sondra Russi, 1991 - 33rd Avenue, Dental Assistant—Dr. F. D. Saul
Evelyn B. Steers, 2745 - 33rd Ave., Saleslady
Walter C. Vortmann, Jr., 1751 - 21st Ave., Computer Programmer
For Supervisor

JAMES MAILLIARD

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is James Mailliard. My residence address is at No. 3850 Jackson Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Food Broker.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a candidate because I believe City Hall must find new ways to solve old problems rather than use old ways to cause new problems. The city's main problems are continuing ones—jobs, housing, lower taxes, crime prevention, transit, conservation, better education and upgrading of the resident citizen's voice in city affairs. I am dedicated to solving these problems through non-bureaucratic know-how. I prefer action to surveys, but prefer planning to piecemeal misuse of taxes for frivolous ends. I am a third generation San Franciscan, Navy veteran and have been endorsed by San Francisco Forward.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Businessman" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JAMES MAILLIARD.

Subscribed before me and filed this 14th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for James Mailliard are:

Dolores Ayala, 297 Richland St., Real Estate Saleswoman
Emil K. Bender, 3008 - 20th Ave., Retired Banker
Robert L. Bianco, 324 Gonzalez Drive, Attorney
Frank C. Colridge, 1123 Greenwich St., Retired Insurance Executive & Civic Leader
John Cordoni, 61 Collins, Bowling Lane Prop. & Car Barn Restaurant Prop.
George Christopher, 55 Stonecrest Drive, Businessman
Wm. Hunt Conrad, 1948 Pacific Ave., Businessman
Wm. B. Dohrmann, 2050 Jackson St., Business Exec. Executive
Samuel A. Ladar, 1918 Vallejo St., Attorney
Oscar H. Fisher, Jr., 44 Forest View Drive, Chairman, S.F. Forward
Lucretia DeValee Grady, 850 Powell St., Housewife
Walter A. Haas, Jr., 2000 Broadway, Manufacturer
E. A. Hills, 90 Lopez Ave., President Hill's Transportation Co.
William Kent III, 3196 Pacific Ave., Businessman-Insurance Broker
Earl S. Louie, 645 Grant Ave., Importer
Sally Mailliard, 3850 Jackson St., Housewife
James F. Thacher, 3979 Washington St., Lawyer
For Supervisor

LEO T. McCARTHY

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Leo T. McCarthy. My residence address is at No. 1934 Jefferson Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Member Board of Supervisors.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: San Francisco is a city in crisis. It is plagued by the same acute conditions that most American cities now face. Laws and policy resolutions I have authored in transportation, health, industrial growth and other fields, have provided useful direction in response to these tremendous problems. Demagoguery in this election year will not produce answers to our difficult problems of property taxation, school financing and unemployment. I enter this campaign for re-election because I believe in the future of this City in the capacity of its people to work out mutual problems harmoniously.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Member Board of Supervisors" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: LEO T. McCARTHY.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Leo T. McCarthy are:

Ness A. Aquino, 2220 · 23rd Street, Real Estate Broker
Allen M. Biagi, 1820 Vallejo St., Businessman
Marjorie W. Bissinger, 2500 Divisadero St., Housewife
James Brown, 1580 Masonic Ave., President, Haight-Ashbury Neighborhood Assn.
Frederic Campagnoli, 2600 Larkin St., Attorney
Patrick G. Corbett, 2379 Alemany Blvd., Painting Contractor
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 30 Chumasero Dr., Labor Rep.
Grace Duhon, 1582 - 30th Avenue, Public Relations
Phoebe Galgiani, 2626 Larkin Street; Director of Community Agency
Zuretti L. Goosby, 299 Maywood Drive, Dentist
Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 930 Chestnut St., Ins. Co. Exec. & Lawyer
Naomi C. Lauter, 23 Presidio Terrace, Housewife
Stephan C. Leonoudakis, 145 Uloa St., Attorney
Francis Louie, 1257 Jackson Street, Merchant
Mrs. Richard J. McCarthy, 1635 - 37th Avenue, Housewife
Roy Scalla, 1735 Beach St., Merchant
Charles J. Vassallo, 65 Vesta St., Real Estate Broker
Yuri Wada, 565 · 4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Exec. Director
Harold L. Zellerbach, 2288 Broadway, Executive
For Supervisor

ROBERT H. MENDELSONH

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Robert H. Mendelsohn. My residence address is at No. 11 Santa Monica Way, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Assistant to State Senator.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a graduate of the University of California, with a degree in political science, and was a Coro Foundation intern in public affairs in San Francisco. For the past four years, I was Administrative Assistant to the late Senator Gene McAteer. I worked closely with Senator McAteer on legislation vital to San Francisco in such fields as compensatory education, veterans' affairs, Bay conservation, and improved transportation. My knowledge of the problems facing San Francisco, and my experience in public service, qualify me for legislative leadership as a Supervisor. I will work to make all San Franciscans full partners in governmental action.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Assistant to State Senator" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ROBERT H. MENDELSONH.

Subscribed before me and filed this 13th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Robert H. Mendelsohn are:

Mrs. Ingrid Mendelsohn, 11 Santa Monica Way, Housewife
Timothy K. McAteer, 139 Santa Ana Ave.; Student
William L. Porter, 1020 Union St., Attorney
Louis Garcia, 370 Ellis, Attorney
Melvin M. Swig, 110 Cherry St., Real Estate Investor
Wm. Hunt Conrad, 1948 Pacific Ave., Businessman
Mrs. Harry W. Low, 104 Turquoise Way, Housewife
Joseph P. Mazzola, 127 Lakeshore Drive, Manager, Plumbers' Local 38
Dr. Wesley F. Johnson, 1960 Sutter St., Pharmacist
Ann B. Daley, 1125 Broadway, At Home
Yuri Wads, 565 - 4th Ave., Y.M.C.A. Executive Director
William E. McDonnell, 385 Castenada Ave.; Businessman
Mary E. Salazar, 246 Richland Ave., Counselor
Lionel M. Alanson, Jr., 65 Montclair Terrace, Businessman
Henry M. Wong, 1224 Pacific Ave, Sales Representative
John D. Monaghan, 21 Grand View Ave., Restaurateur
Mrs. Bernard B. Glickfeld, 145 El Verano Way, Homemaker
Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 930 Chestnut, Insurance Company Executive and Lawyer
Mrs. Thomas C. Lynch, 98 Clarendon, Housewife
William K. Coblentz, 10 Fifth Avenue, Attorney-at-Law
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For Supervisor

BILL NEWSOM

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Bill Newsom. My residence address is at No. 1284 Stanyan Street, San Francisco; My business or occupation is Attorney-At-Law.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a third-generation San Franciscan, 33 years old, married to the former Tessa Menzies and residing at 1284 Stanyan Street. A practicing attorney and businessman, I am a graduate of St. Ignatius, and the University of San Francisco, and hold graduate degrees in law and literature from Stanford. I have been active in many civic and conservation groups, and am deeply concerned with our unfair system of taxation, our fading cultural image, our outdated City Charter and our lack of far-sighted urban planning. I pledge to fight for a first-rate San Francisco.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Attorney-At-Law” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: WILLIAM A. NEWSOM.

Subscribed before me and filed this 19th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Bill Newsom are:

Nicholas Alaga, 1685 Chestnut Street, Lawyer
Allen M. Biagi, 1820 Vallejo St., Businessman
George A. Dondero, 3127 Octavia Street, Insurance
Edward J. Durkin, 1955 Broadway, Real Property Appraiser
Louis Felder, 2828 Steiner Street, Funeral Director
Gordon P. Getty, 2735 Green Street, Real Estate Investor
Doris W. Kahn, 3259 Clay Street, Housewife
Donald Beach Kirby, 875 Chestnut St., Architect
Mrs. George Moscone, 90 Lansdale Ave., Housewife
Michael L. Ohleyer, 135 - 14th Avenue, Attorney-at-Law
Edward M. Stadum, 980 Clayton St., Attorney
Joseph C. Tarantino, 2427 Bay Street, Merchant
For Supervisor

KEVIN O'SHEA

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Kevin O'Shea. My residence address is at No. 50 Allston Way, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Ins. Broker.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am a former president of the Board of Permit Appeals and am now president of the Air Pollution Control Board. Having been appointed to the Board of Supervisors in 1966, I now have the experience to put into effect many of my ideas. As a businessman I will continue to act as a watchdog on the city budget. As a Supervisor I am concerned with the problem of safety in the streets, the need for more jobs and better housing. As chairman of the Cultural Activities Committee I will continue to seek improvement of our artistic and cultural climate.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Incumbent" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: KEVIN O'SHEA.

Subscribed before me and filed this 20th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Kevin O'Shea are:

Albert E. Aubert, 271 Morningside Drive, Motel Owner
Allen M. Biagi, 1820 Vallejo St., Businessman
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Drive, Labor Representative
George Choppelas, 623 - 27th Ave., Attorney-at-Law
George B. Gillin, 295 Stratford Drive, Banker
John J. Goodwin, Jr., 2551 - 16th Ave., Savings & Loan Executive
J. Rufus Klawans, 27 Avila, Attorney
Louis T. Kruger, 23 Miguel, Western Regional Director, Steuben Society of America
William E. McDonnell, 395 Castanada Ave., Businessman
William Moskowitz, 1001 California, Retired
John Ohmura, 2074 - 12th Ave., Architect, Designer
Jeanne O'Shea, 50 Allston Way, Housewife
W. M. Reedy, 305 Mangels Ave., Labor Representative
John M. Riordan, 66 Vasquez Ave., Attorney-at-Law
Michael Riordan, 550 Laguna Honda Blvd., Attorney-At-Law
Cyrus A. Samuel, 1357-17th Ave., Merchant
Roy Scola, 1735 Beach St., Merchant
Mrs. John B. Sullivan, 23 Magellan Ave., Attorney-At-Law
Thomas Wu, D.D.S., 598 - 38th Ave., Dentist
For Supervisor

RONALD PELOSI

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Ronald Pelosi. My residence address is at No. 385 Magellan Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Businessman.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I was born in San Francisco, educated at St. Ignatius and Stanford. Married, with three children attending grammar school. As President of the City Planning Commission, I fought for enlightened planning, improved housing, closer communication with neighborhoods, and initiated the program to preserve our City’s historic landmarks. I serve on the Board of Directors of the Columbus Civic Club, Cameron House and Youth For Service. I pledge to relieve overburdened taxpayers; to bring new jobs and industry; to provide better parks and schools; to meet the needs of our senior citizens.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Businessman” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: RONALD PELOSI.

Subscribed before me and filed this 18th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By FRANK R. QUINN,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Ronald Pelosi are:

F. Campagnoli, 2609 Larkin Street, Attorney
Paul B. Fay, Jr., 3766 Clay Street, Stock Broker
Paul F. Pelosi, 3238 Webster Street, Businessman
Burton Rockwell, 1 Belmont Ave., Architect
Edward E. Serres, 132 Ewing Terrace, Attorney at Law
Albert Shumate, M.D., 1901 Scott Street, Physician
Ross M. White, 306 Delano Ave., Labor Representative
Anita G. Martinez, 62 Madrone Ave., Housewife
Paul A. Blusinger, Jr., 140 Jordan Ave., Businessman
Wm. Hunt Conrad, 1948 Pacific Ave., Businessman
Zeppelin W. Wong, 405 Davis Street, Attorney at Law
Stephan C. Leonoudakis, 145 Ulloa Street, Attorney
John L. Molinari, 1268 Lombard Street, Insurance Company Executive
E. Leveroni, 758 Green Street, Banker
Elaine M. Sundahl, 1230 - 19th Street, Housewife
John E. Sullivan, 69 West Portal Ave., Attorney
For Supervisor

JOHN RIORDAN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is John Riordan. My residence address is at No. 1426 Willard Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I propose implementation of recommendations of the Presidential Crime Commission Report, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society and a committee to review existing State and Federal legislation to insure that San Francisco obtains maximum funds. Such recommendations coupled with an equitable business tax will go far in lightening the oppressive burden on the home owner and tenant thereby insuring positive measures allowing San Francisco to retain middle income families and individuals. I oppose destructive freeway proposals and massive redevelopment projects and will work for more flexible answers to urban congestion and housing decay.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Attorney" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOHN RIORDAN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 19th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By P. LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for John Riordan are:

Geraldine Riordan, 1426 Willard Street, Housewife
Richard A. Bancroft, 350 Francisco Street, Lawyer
A. Marquez Bautista, 1240 Jones Street, Attorney at Law
Eugene B. Block, 2533 Turk Street, Editor
Franklyn K. Brann, 2 DeSoto Street, Attorney
John Yehall Chin, 913 Stockton Street, School Principal
Andrew H. D'Anneo, 212 Spruce Street, Lawyer
F. Everett Cahill, 150 Westmoorland Drive, General Research Supervisor - Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co.
Mrs. Herman Gallegos, 150 Corona Street, Housewife
Robert E. Halsing, 541 Darien Way, Attorney at Law
Dorrwin Buck Jones, 1960 Jones Street, Gerontologist
Nancy Burt Knickerbocker, 2437 Pacific Ave., Housewife
Kurt W. Melchior, 35 Hillcrest Street, Lawyer
Bertha Metro, 114 Ortega Street, Secretary
John D. Monaghan, 31 Grand View Ave., Restaurateur
Burton Rockwell, 1 Belmont Ave., Architect
E. Robert Scrofani, 362 Collingwood Street, Teacher
Lena Sheehan, 348 Harvard Street, Housewife
Michael C. Tobriner, 3069 Washington Street, Attorney
Yori Wada, 565 - 4th Ave., Buchanan YMCA Executive Director
For Supervisor

TOM ROSS

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Tom Ross. My residence is at No. 1515 16th Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Writer.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: As a columnist for the San Francisco Progress neighborhood newspapers I have fought for honest redevelopment programs stressing rehabilitation of housing rather than massive clearance, districting supervisors to give neighborhoods continuous representation in City Hall, upgrading the school system and Library, better supervision of probationers to reduce crime and delinquency, implementation of Grand Jury recommendations; neighborhood beautification through tree planting, undergrounding utility wires and sign control, getting more for your tax dollar by sound planning. San Francisco needs fewer studies and more action. I am a Marine Corps veteran, endorsed by San Francisco Forward and many civic and professional organizations.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Writer" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: TOM ROSS.

Subscribed before me and filed this 13th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Tom Ross are:

Lewis H. Butler, 44 Commonwealth Ave., Attorney
William D. Evers, 3451 Jackson St., Attorney
Oscar H. Fisher, Jr., 44 Forest View Drive, Chairman, S.F. Forward
Charles A. Fracchia, 2100 Jackson, Stockbroker
Phoebe Galgiani, 2626 Larkin, Director of Community Agency
Mrs. Grandvel A. Jackson, 287 Kensington Way, General Supervisor
of Elementary School Education, Oakland Public Schools
Mrs. Hans Klussmann, 260 Green St., Civic Beautification Leader
Alan S. Maremont, 2835 Washington St., Senior & Family Housing Specialist
Lucile V. Mohr, 2 Castenada Ave., Homemaker
Arch Monson, Jr., 2825 Broadway, Businessman
Alan H. Nichols, 101 Alton, Attorney
Peggy O'Brien, 740 Francisco St., Housewife
Nicholas Perkocha, 888 Douglass, Management Analyst
Morton Rader, 17 Alta, Architect
Helen B. Reynolds, 1030 Lombard, President, California Roadside
Council (Conservationist)
E. Robert Scrofani, 362 Collingwood, Chairman, SCRAPP, S.F. Committee
 to Reform Assessment of Private Property
Jerd Sullivan, 864 Francisco St., Banker
Alfred Tapson, 110 Walnut St., Educator
For Supervisor

JAMES J. ROURKE

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the
City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the
General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on Novem-
ber 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Fran-
cisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of
at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That
my name is James J. Rourke. My residence address is at No. 3691-17th
Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Teamster Business
Agent.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: 56 year resident of San
Francisco, living at 3691-17th Street. Business Agent Teamsters 85. Married,
having three children, born, raised and educated in City. Member 1966
Grand Jury, Juror’s Association, Knights of Columbus, South of Market
Boys, Y.M.I. Recipient of State Award, California Rehabilitation Workshops.
40 years in Scouting, Scout Master Troop 46, Mission-Dolores. For stronger
Courts, greater support for Police and Fire Departments. Civil obedience,
safely for all the citizens on our City Streets. Revision of City Charter,
Strong leadership in City Hall, particularly on the Board of Supervisors.
Lower Department Budgets, Lower Taxes.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and
County, I desire that the following designation “Labor Official” be placed
immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General
Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JAMES J. ROURKE.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for James J. Rourke are:

F. J. Buckley, 266 Country Club Drive, Teamster Local 85
John L. Cox, 149 Buchanan, Business Development
O. Patrick Crowley, 1521 - 20th Ave., Bar Manager, Olympic Club
Daniel A. Diez, 2251 - 35th Ave., Retired
Joseph C. Diviny, 125 Cambon Drive, Labor Representative
Theodore T. Dolan, 124 Juanita Way, Retired
Stephen J. Flahavan, 151 Buchanan Street, Police Officer, S.F. P.D.
Gordon H. Finn, 675 O’Farrell Street, Social Welfare Worker
Jay I. Fontaine, 1852 - 29th Ave., Semi-retired
Conrad J. Grieder, 2567 - 22nd Ave., Electrical Manufacturer
and Business Executive
Edward L. Humphreys, 2983-25th Street, Retired Teamster
Leonardi Jones, 68 Burlwood Ave., Savings & Loan Executive
Ray C. Lewsader, 61 Rockaway Ave., Store Manager, Lachman Bros.
Harold T. Lopez, 1521 - 20th Ave., Labor Official
Al J. Quinn, 32 Hidalgo Terrace, Public Accountant
Timothy Richardson, 1235 Dolores, Labor Official
Mrs. Barbara Rourke, 3691 - 17th Street, Homemaker
Margaret Rourke, 3691 - 17th Street, Sales Girl
Joseph M. Twomey, 1487 - 44th Ave., Teamster
Mary Walsh, 79 Norton Street, Secretary
For Supervisor

MARVIN L. SHELDON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Marvin L. Sheldon. My residence address is at No. 37 Sheldon Terrace, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Real Estate and Head of The Sunset-Parkside and Richmond Property Tax Protest Group.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: As head of The Sunset-Parkside and Richmond Property Tax Protest Group I will represent the active members together with the 45,000 additional property tax-payers of the above districts before the Tax Appeals Board. As a Supervisor I will be in a better position to fight the battles of the over burdened Tax Payers of all groups. In 1966 I was able to have the Taxes on my personal residence reduced by over $500.00. The same legal methods used then are available to all. The only way to reduce taxes immediately is to fight an ever rising City Budget.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Real Estate; Investments" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: MARVIN L. SHELDON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 22nd day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Marvin L. Sheldon are:

Alfred A. Camozzi, 1467 - 35th Ave., Waiter
Walter Habekoss, 941 Irving Street, Attorney at Law
Helen V. Hoffman, 1831 - 32nd Ave., Housewife
Rose Laude, 576 - 4th Ave., Housewife
Calvert C. Potter, 1226 - 10th Ave., Supervising Counsellor Juvenile Hall
S.F. Youth Guidance Center
Mildred Rosene, 2565 Washington Street, Civil Draftsman
Bernice Roth, 543 - 16th Ave., Housewife, Business Woman
Frieda Shapiro, 211 Morningside Drive, Housewife
Leib Schapiro, 1983-8th Ave., Linguist
H. Harvey Scholten, 314 Surrey Street, Contractor
Valerie H. Scholten, 314 Surrey Street, Housewife
Mrs. Betty M. Sheldon, 37 Sheldon Terrace, Housewife
Scott M. Sheldon, 37 Sheldon Terrace, T.B.A. Biller — Phillips Petroleum
Libby Singer, 2735 Rivera Street, Clerk-Typist
Hazel S. Tobin, 207 - 13th Ave., Housewife
For Supervisor

ARTHUR SHERIDAN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Arthur Sheridan. My residence address is at No. 1482 Post St., San Francisco. My business or occupation is

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Government, be it on the International level or the local level is the Problem, seeing and Problem solving body of the People. The business of government is serious — good government means life: I have lived and worked here in this City for a number of years — I studied International Relation at San Francisco State (B.A.)— Work for several years at the City Light Book store — where I got to meet and learn about People. In all walks of life — I am now producing and hosting “The San Francisco Show.” I edited a magazine Ad and Served as Consultant to the Peace Corp.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ARTHUR SHERIDAN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 19th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Arthur Sheridan are:

Jack M. Agins, 4052 - 19th Street, Lab. Assistant
Stuart Douglas Caldwell, 438 Broadway, Vendor
W. Michael Gibbons, 1482 Post Street, Salesman
Mary M. Jacobson, 2901 Pacheco, Student
Wilhelm Joerres, 626 Kearney, Entrepreneur-Actor
Charles O. Lawson, 2349 Clement, Apt. A, Unemployed
Dean Lipton, 539 Baker, Writer and Journalist
Valerie Leslie May, 1482 Post Street, Waitress
Jerry Patrick Miller, 4 Rayburn, Messenger
Claude W. Mitchell, 105 Behr Ave., Doctor of Medicine
Richard L. Paup, 450 Noe Street, Lab. Technician
Harry William Siegel, 814 Steiner Street, Writer
James O. Williams, 2034 Pine Street, Musician & Merchant Seaman
For Supervisor

DOROTHY SHINDER

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Dorothy Shinder. My residence address is at No. 1692A Green Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Volunteer Tax-Reform Advocate.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Correcting the wrongs by returning to American government. We are victims of an elaborate scheme to defraud taxpayers and have rightful claims. It’s time our government makes amends. Taxing churches earning billions in business enterprises, and oil depletion, will enable lowest property taxes; tax deductible apartment rents; depreciation and expenses yearly for Homeowners; Head of Household for Single Persons; full social security benefits at age 45 for self-supporting single persons whose limited incomes have been drained by 20-40 years’ over-taxation. Endorse methods restraining assessments and rents, saving your tax dollars and protecting the people. Investigate civil service questionable personnel practices.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Volunteer Tax-Reform Advocate” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: DOROTHY SHINDER.

Subscribed before me and filed this 12th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Dorothy Shinder are:

Donna Barnhill, 2730 Sacramento Street, #10,
Jr. College Instructor-English Journalism
Ruth Campbell, 895 Sutter Street, Apt. 108, Retired
John J. Dettmer, 123 - 12th Ave., Utility Worker
B. A. Donnellan, 238 Romain Street, Civil Engineer
Isaac Ehrenreich, 2049 Oak Street, Retired
Erving R. Feltman, 1278 La Playa Street, Principal Clerk
Madelyn Helling, 1538 Filbert Street, #1, Librarian
Almeda Jerome, 1402 Kearny Street, Housewife
Inez Kinnaman, R.N., 190 Funston Ave., Registered Nurse
Agnes Kohane, 1833 California Street, #210, Corsetiere
Esther S. Lawler, 2325 Van Ness Ave., Retired
Cecelia K. Leach, 123 - 12th Ave., Church Office Secretary
Jane Lerew, 1535 Francisco Street, Registered Nurse
Thomas R. Lincoln, 1135 Masonic Ave., Apt. 12, Proofreader
Elizabeth McDonagh, 1505 Gough Street, Apt. 23, Research Analyst
Robert McKinney, 969 Hayes Street, Advertising Agency Owner
Grace Motruni, 1402 Kearny Street, Registered Nurse
Eleanor A. Strand, 861 Post Street, Retired Military
Emmett S. Thompson, 925 Castro Street, Cashier/attendant at Garage
For Supervisor

HAROLD W. SMITH

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Harold W. Smith. My residence address is at No. 225 Castro St., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Insurance Broker-Accountant.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: 1. Enact legislation to provide tax relief to the senior citizens, pensioners, small homeowners and the small business man. 2. Give stronger support to our Police Department by establishing stiffer penalties to habitual criminals thus providing better protection to our public. 3. Suppress the so-called Hippy activities particularly in the use and sale of drugs and narcotics and child delinquency among them enacting greater restrictions upon them. To conduct thorough investigations into the sanitary conditions existing in the housing of this class of people.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “Insurance Broker-Accountant” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: HAROLD W. SMITH.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By WILLIAM E. SATTERFIELD,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Harold W. Smith are:

Alexander Adami, 409 Panorama Drive, Bartender
Eugene V. Borelli, 1652 Geneva Ave., Real Estate Salesman
Mary E. Corriea, 35 Parker Ave., Housewife
J. Robert Corriea, 35 Parker Ave., Wholesale Produce Dealer
James J. Cronin, 52 - 7th Ave., Attorney at Law
A. F. Enderlin, 19 Eureka, Retired (Banking)
James W. Harvey, 180 Miraoma Drive, Attorney at Law
Roger J. Huffman, 425s - 23rd Street, Real Estate Broker
Charles K. Leitz, 631 Panorama Drive, Insurance Adjuster
Art Mark, 1270 - 30th Ave., Cook
Paul P. Marracq, 260 Amber Drive, Restaurateur
Thomas W. Thompson, 1980 Sacramento, Insurance Broker
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For Supervisor

LELAND F. STANFEL

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Leland F. Stanfel. My residence address is at No. 227 Athens St., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Restaurateur.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: A native San Franciscan, father of four children, graduate of the University of Santa Clara, served our country as an Army Captain in World War II and the Korean War. A member of the Native Sons of the Golden West. My prime concern is to keep taxes down, and resolve matters where our other Supervisors have been dragging their feet. I am a business-man restaurateur, in tune with the pulse of our community. The kind of man who will make the extra effort which could mean the difference between victory and defeat for the general good of our community.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Restaurateur" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: LELAND F. STANFEL.

Subscribed before me and filed this 8th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Leland F. Stanfel are:

John D. Anderson, 667-32nd Ave., Newspaper Pressman
John S. Bufka, 1923 San Jose, Sta. Engr.
Terry Culin, 738 Miramar Ave., Teamster, Local 65
Elroy D. Joyce, 2927 Wawona, Sheet Metal Contractor
John B. Derenzi, 9 Mercury St., Bottler
James M. Hughes, 743 Avalon Ave., Chauffeur
Harry J. Merrill, 49 Castillo, Policeman
Joseph Rezak, 585 Kansas St., Printer-Shipping Clerk
Madeline Samardz, 479 Hoffman Ave., Office Manager
George W. Schonfeld, 635 Ulloa, Retired Judge of the Superior Court
Almon J. Walcott, 1614-27th Ave., State Treasurer, Native Sons of the Golden West
William J. Thomas, 1642-27th Ave., Retired Structural Ironworker
Joseph A. Yudnich, 752-27th Street, Safety Engineer
For Supervisor

EDWARD STERN

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Edward Stern. My residence address is at No. 66 Yerba Buena Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I am an attorney admitted to practice in California since 1949. I have practiced law in San Francisco since that time. I am a graduate of Harvard Law School. I will act to redistribute San Francisco's tax burden fairly and equitably, to provide job opportunities in both the public and private sectors of our community, to provide needed child care services in the neighborhoods, to encourage neighborhood organization to help residents participate actively in the life of their communities, and to move our city ahead to meet the critical issues of better transportation, housing, and education.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Attorney" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: EDWARD STERN.

Subscribed before me and filed this 19th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By P. LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Edward Stern are:

Dorothy Stern, 66 Yerba Buena St., Housewife
Mrs. George Moscone, 90 Lansdale Ave., Housewife
William L. Porter, 1020 Union Street, Attorney
Bernard Ducoff, 437 Castenada St., Rabbi
John Burton, 674 Wisconsin Street, Member California State Legislature
Susan J. Bierman, 1529 Shrader Street, Housewife
Willie L. Brown Jr., 1524 Masonic Ave., Attorney at Law and Assemblyman
Gilbert R. Sciacqua, 2612 Greenwich Street, Executive Secretary Musicians Union Local 6, A.F.M.
Kamini K. Gupta, 1910 Green Street, Lawyer
Mrs. Harry Low, 104 Turquoise Way, Housewife
Robert Alexander Pickering, 2360 Vallejo St., Manufacturer
James T. McDonald, 31 Malcorea Way, Attorney
Marie DeMartini Bruce, 1520 Slott Blvd., Union Representative
John E. Dearman, 217 Upper Terrace, Attorney
Naomi E. Lauter, 23 Presidio Terrace, Housewife
George S. Ishida, 52 Niantic Ave., Civil Engineering Draftsman
Joseph A. Filippelli, 813 Grove Street, Attorney
Wesley F. Johnson III, 1946 Baker St., Pharmacist
Dorwin Buck Jones, 1960 Jones Street, Gerontologist
Michael M. Schneider, 377 Mangels Ave., Electrician
For Supervisor

ROBERT VANDERBILT

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Supervisor for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is Robert Vanderbilt. My residence address is at No. 1333 Gough St., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Union Official-Counsellor.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Bachelor's, Master's, Doctor's Degrees. Graduate work law, finance. Union Official, Pres. Local AFL-CIO (Aff.), Board of Directors, Screen Guild, Council Chairman Labor Relations, Tax Specialist, President, California Democratic Assembly, Delegate CDC Convention, President, Vanderbilt Hotels Corp. President and Board Chairman, VIP — Vanderbilt International Productions. Human Rights Committee, Legislative Committees, Labor contract negotiator endorsed by Labor, Civic Groups, Political Clubs, Italian-American, Mexican-American, Chinese-American clubs. Interested in City Charter revisions; low cost housing, urban renewal, district medical clinics, apprentice training programs, Borough system, equitable taxes.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Union Official-Counsellor" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: ROBERT VANDERBILT.

Subscribed before me and filed this 11th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Robert Vanderbilt are:

Lucille E. Allen, 1480 Alemany Blvd., Housewife
J. Charles Bannon, 235 O'Farrell, Retired
Tony Garcia, 1690 Filbert, Bellman
Walter J. Graepp, 120 Ellis, Assistant Manager, St. Francis Theatre
Verna Winters Hyatt, 3343 Divisadero, Music Teacher
Glen H. Krippendorf, 140 Mason St., Retired
Martin E. Lagger, 161 Powell St., Apt 500, Barber
Richard E. Lane, 2136 California St., No. 16, Electrical Worker
Helen McClure, 247 Ney St., Housewife
Lovell McGrath, 2888 Folsom St., No. 3, Theatre Doorman
Victor Sangervasi, 17 Scotia, Newspaper Distributor
Roger Stephens, 399 Dolores St., Structural Steel Painter
Juanita Wilbur, 3122 Geary St., Saleslady, Macy's
For District Attorney

JOHN JAY FERDON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is John Jay Ferdon. My residence address is at No. 16 Sea Cliff Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is District Attorney.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Born in this city, graduated from local schools, the University of San Francisco, and Hastings College of Law. Served four years in the Army Counter-Intelligence Corps. For nineteen years engaged in the private practice of the law and taught at San Francisco Law School. For twelve years served as a Supervisor, twice as President. District Attorney since 1964, performing with integrity, considered judgment, constant advocacy in the interests of the entire community with full protection of the rights of all involved individuals. I pledge to maintain the high reputation of this office, gratefully acknowledge past support, and respectfully ask retention.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation “District Attorney” be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOHN JAY FERDON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 18th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for John Jay Ferdon are:

Nancy C. Ferdon, 16 Sea Cliff Ave., Housewife
Edward A. Barry, 1410 Portola Drive, Attorney
John R. Bryan, 160 San Buenaventura, Physician
William H. Crowell, 639-32nd Avenue, Realtor
William L. Ferdon, 132 Commonwealth Ave., Attorney at Law
Jack M. Lipman, 591 Spruce Street, General Contractor
Hadie Redd, 3151 California St., Investigator
Wilson Meyer, 2222nd Ave., Executive
D. J. O'Hara, Jr. 3414 Washington St., Funeral Director
Marcella M. O'Shaughnessy, 2671-17th Ave., Retired School Principal
Robert H. Pechoultres, 537 Marina Blvd., Real Estate and Insurance
Mrs. Charles S. Peery, 160 Castenada Ave., Homemaker
Henry Schindel, 54 Schwerin St., Furniture Store Owner
Charles J. Scollin, 370 Castenada Ave., Insurance Broker
Charles P. Scully, 200 Geilert Drive, Attorney
John H. Swanson, 3140 Mission Street, Bowling Alley Owner
Francis Q. Yee, 1555 Jones St., Dentistry
Harry D. Ross, 299 Edgewood Avenue, Retired Controller C & C of S. F.
Elena Lenci, 1740 Broadway, Housewife
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Dr., Labor Rep.

67
For District Attorney

JOHN H. McFEELEY, JR.

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of District Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is John H. McFeeley Jr. My residence address is at No. 4428 3rd Street, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Attorney-at-Law.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I oppose the War in Vietnam. We must get out and then settle our domestic crisis, poverty, crime and mental illness. I oppose capital punishment. I oppose all forms of racism; although I'm half San Francisco Irish, my mother's people, Yaqui Indians were here when the Europeans arrived, my wife is Negro. I specifically oppose the discriminatory enforcement of laws as now practiced in San Francisco. Fourteen years an attorney in all Courts, civil and criminal, I will prosecute the downtown tax criminals who have shifted illegally the burden of our city government on the small and neighborhood property owner.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Attorney-At-Law" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: JOHN H. McFEELEY JR.

Subscribed before me and filed this 20th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By T. L. ANDERSON,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for John H. McFeeley, Jr. are:

Timothy L. Forester, 158 Downey St., Counselor-San Francisco State College
Kenneth D. Johnson, 1261 Grove St. No. 6, Social Work
Diane Ruth Gotelli, 936 Elizabeth St., Social Worker
Donsdale A. Gontelli, 936 Elizabeth Street, Social Worker
Vernon Collins, Jr., M.D., 31 Grafton Ave., Physician
Everett L. Adams, 62 Lee Ave., Counselor Juvenile Court
Charles H. Lewis, 444 Lombard Street, Clergyman
Helen McFeeley, 1415 So. Van Ness Ave., Retired Teacher
Morris Lando, 61 Eagle St., Social Work Aid
Reuben Greenberg IV, 1230 Utah St., Probation Officer
Edna Pennington, 1415 So. Van Ness Ave., Housewife
Hannibal A. Williams, 839 Leavenworth St., Student
Mrs. Helene Bradreau, 3219 Harrison St., Housewife
Lloyd Downton, 335 Irving St., Promotion
Edward Chestam, 58 Lee Ave., Muni Operator
James Herndon, 126 Chenery Street, Attorney
For Sheriff

MATTHEW C. CARBERRY

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Sheriff for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office. That my name is Matthew C. Carberry. My residence address is at No. 1542 34th Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Sheriff of San Francisco.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Experience, and Proved Record of Performance. As sheriff for twelve years, I have been responsible for handling more than 120,000 prisoners and have collected millions of dollars under the law and in the 450,000 legal processes accounted for every dollar involved. Thirty-five years of experience in public and private administration. Native San Franciscan and graduate of the University of San Francisco. I ask your vote so we can continue our program of Economy and Efficiency, tempered with Humanity.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Sheriff of San Francisco" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: MATTHEW C. CARBERRY.

Subscribed before me and filed this 14th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Matthew C. Carberry are:

Stella Pisani Carberry, 1542 - 34 Ave., Homemaker
Edward A. Barry, 1410 Portola Drive, Attorney
Eugene B. Block, 2533 Turk St., Editor
Matthew J. Boxer, 2455 - 27th Ave., Executive Manager, S.F.C. & L.O.M.A.
Daniel F. Del Carlo, 50 Chumasero Drive, Labor Representative
Joseph J. Diviny, 126 Combon Drive, Labor Representative
Bert Donlin, 727 Cole Street, Longshoreman
Donn Fazackerley, 170 El Verano Way, Banker
Jack Goldberger, 210 Gellert Drive, Labor Official
Conrad J. Grieder, 2567 - 22nd Ave., Electrical Manufacturer
Fred H. Huie, 672 - 18th Ave., Stockbroker
Ben K. Lerner, 820 El Camino del Mar, Attorney at Law
Dan F. Landon, 335 Powell St., Hotel Executive
Cyril I. Maginn, 899 California Street, Merchant
James C. Purcell, 74 Ashbury Terrace, Lawyer
Albert Samuels, 1850 Jackson, Jeweler
Francis J. Smith, 299 Miramar Ave., Undersheriff of S.F.
Jerd Sullivan, 864 Francisco Street, Banker
Kazuo Togasaki, M.D., 1048 Buchanan, Obstetrician, Gynecologist
Emile D. Torre, M.D., 1688 Union, Physician & Surgeon
For Sheriff

DAVID JOHNSON

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Sheriff for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office: That my name is David Johnson. My residence address is at No. 77 Central Ave., San Francisco. My business or occupation is Job Training Specialist.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: I have had extensive experience in helping persons find jobs and job training opportunities. I speak the language of corporate heads, middle management and those of disadvantaged communities. I have also had administrative responsibilities as President of a labor union representing a membership of approximately one thousand members. I believe this unique set of qualifications has properly prepared me for the office I seek. In filing my candidacy for election as Sheriff, I respectfully call the voters' attention to the fact that the Sheriff's Department is a vital function of County Government. It needs and certainly deserves an effective program.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Job Training Specialist" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: DAVID JOHNSON.

Subscribed before me and filed this 21st day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.
By P. LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for David Johnson are:

John P. Black, 465 Alvarado St., Painter
Frank Courtney, 834 Portola Drive, Real Estate and Insurance Broker
Adria W. Garabedian, 191 Delmar Street, Homemaker
Anna M. Guth, 137 Rivoli Street, Homeowner
Richard Harrington, 227 Edgewood Avenue, Lawyer
Leon P. Harris, 1354 Waller Street, Clergyman
James Herndon, 126 Chenery Street, Attorney
Shirley E. Hughes, 1663 McAllister Street, Housewife
Raymond L. Ingram, 701 Noriega Street, Postal Clerk
Margaret M. Johnston, 7653 Geary Blvd., Merchant
Dorwin Buck Jones, 1960 Jones Street, Gerontologist
Leuward L. Klang, 750 Presidio Ave., Apt. 302, Social Worker
John C. Maher, 1463 - 4th Ave., Field Representative, Urban League
Mary C. Salazar, 248 Hichland Ave., Counselor
Addie N. Wallace, 609 Grafton Avenue, Supervisor-The Bank of California-Master

Charge
James F. Wilson, 79 Central Avenue, Trade Association Official
For Sheriff

LOUIS V. VASQUEZ

I hereby declare myself a candidate for the office of Sheriff for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California, to be voted for at the General Municipal Election to be held in the said City and County on November 7, 1967, and declare the following to be true:

That I shall have been a resident of the City and County of San Francisco for a period of at least five years and an elector thereof for a period of at least one year immediately prior to the time for taking such office; That my name is Louis V. Vasquez. My residence address is at No. 21 Dellbrook Avenue, San Francisco. My business or occupation is Lawyer, Welfare Commissioner.

My qualifications for said office are as follows: Jurist. Deputy Labor Commissioner. Attorney for Public Administrator. Mission High and Hastings, University of California graduate. Have fought thousands of big and small battles, as a lawyer, for fellow San Franciscans throughout the years. Presently a Social Services Commissioner. Upon my election as Sheriff, I will endeavor to abolish the position of Attorney for Sheriff; I will give you a humane, businesslike, economic and efficient administration. I will demand that our Supervisors implement the Work Furlough Law without further delay; I will make the work furlough program work, thus assuring a meaningful reduction in the Budget of the Sheriff's Office.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 175 of Charter of said City and County, I desire that the following designation "Lawyer, Welfare Commissioner" be placed immediately under my name as it will appear on all ballots at the General Municipal Election to be held November 7, 1967.

Signature of Candidate: LOUIS V. VASQUEZ.

Subscribed before me and filed this 20th day of September, 1967.

BASIL HEALEY,
Registrar of Voters.

By P. LEMONE,
Deputy Registrar of Voters.

The sponsors for Louis V. Vasquez are:

Ernestine I. Vasquez, 21 Dellbrook Ave., Homemaker
Jose Luis Alarcon, 92 Caselli Ave., Proprietor of Restaurant
Robert Amable, 353 - 30th St., Spanish Interpreter for Superior and Municipal Courts
Robert E. Burke, 336 Baltimore Way, Investments
Manuel Ceballos, 1224 York Street, Grocer
Maurice D. Cohn, 222 Stonecrest, Merchant
Romero Y. Cruz, D.D.S., 231 Ellis, Dentist
Robert E. Gonzales, 1231 Market, Attorney
Emmet F. Hagerty, 527 Arch, Attorney
Otilia R. Haro, 2806 - 21st Street, Self-employed (La Palma Market)
Helen V. Lenon, 53 Dellbrook Ave., Secretary
Richard C. Leon, 50 Aquavia Way, Civil Service Employee
Fernando Martinez, 62 Madrone Ave., Exporter
Frank P. Mateo, 179 Flood Ave., Brush Manufacturer
Rebecca A. Mateo, 179 Flood Ave., Housewife
Frances Rechquiner, 800 Poerster Street, Agency File Clerk
Rudolph E. Vasquez, 1261 - 8th Avenue, Law Student
Mrs. Rudolph E. Vasquez, 1261 - 8th Ave., Legal Secretary
PROPOSITION A
ORDINANCE CALLING SPECIAL BOND ELECTION

FILE NO. 246-67-1 (PROPOSITION A) ORDINANCE NO. 237-67

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1967, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSITION TO INCUR A BONDED DEBT OF THE CITY AND COUNTY FOR THE ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION OR COMPLETION BY THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO OF THE FOLLOWING MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT TO WIT: $98,000,000 FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF AIR TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; AND THAT THE ESTIMATED COST TO THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAID MUNICIPAL IMPROVEMENT IS AND WILL BE TOO GREAT TO BE PAID OUT OF THE ORDINARY ANNUAL INCOME AND REVENUE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY AND WILL REQUIRE AN EXPENDITURE GREATER THAN THE AMOUNT ALLOWED THEREFOR BY THE ANNUAL TAX LEVY; ALL IN ORDER TO DO AND PERFORM ANY AND ALL OF THE MATTERS HEREBIN ABOVE REFERRED TO; FIXING RATE OF INTEREST OF SAID BONDS AND PROVIDING FOR THE LEVY AND COLLECTION OF TAXES TO PAY BOTH PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST THEREOF; PRESCRIBING NOTICE TO BE GIVEN OF SUCH ELECTION AND CONSOLIDATING THE SPECIAL ELECTION WITH THE GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION.

Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

Section 1. A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of November, 1967, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposition to incur a bonded indebtedness of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount of $98,000,000 for the acquisition, construction and completion by the City and County of San Francisco of the following municipal improvement, to wit: Improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco by additions to and improvement of the San Francisco International Airport and construction of a Seaport in San Francisco to provide an air transportation link between San Francisco and the San Francisco International Airport, including land, buildings, facilities, utilities, equipment, and all other works, property and structures necessary or convenient for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

Section 2. The estimated cost of the municipal improvement described herein was fixed by the Board of Supervisors by Resolution No. 460-67, passed by more than two-thirds of said board, and approved by the Acting Mayor in the sum of $98,000,000, and such sum is, and was found by said resolution to be, too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the city and county in addition to the other annual expenses thereof or other funds derived from taxes levied for that purpose and will require an expenditure greater than the amount allowed therefor by the annual tax levy.
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The method and manner of payment of the estimated cost of the municipal improvement described herein are by the issuance of bonds of the City and County of San Francisco in the principal amount specified in Section 1 hereof.

Said estimate of cost as set forth in said resolution is hereby adopted and determined to be the estimated cost of said improvement.

Section 3. The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the result thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

Section 4. The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Municipal Election to be held Tuesday, November 7, 1967, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Municipal Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth, in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Municipal Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Municipal Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Municipal Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or about October 16, 1967.

Section 5. On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following:

"Airport Bonds, 1967. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $98,000,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco."

To vote for any proposition where ballots are used, and to incur the bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein, stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word "Yes." To vote against any proposition and thereby refuse to authorize the incurring of a bonded indebtedness to the amount of and for the purposes stated herein, stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word "No."

Where voting machines are used at said special election said voting machines shall be so arranged that any qualified elector may vote for any proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "Yes" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for the proposition, and by pulling down a lever over the word "No" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard, paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, shall constitute a vote against the proposition. Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with the provisions of law.
Section 6. If at such special election it shall appear that two-thirds of all the voters voting on said proposition voted in favor of and authorized the incurring of a bonded indebtedness for the purposes set forth in said proposition, then such proposition shall have been accepted by the electors, and bonds shall be issued to defray the cost of the municipal improvements described herein. Such bonds shall be of the form and character known as "serials," and shall bear interest at a rate not to exceed 6 per centum per annum, payable semiannually.

Section 7. For the purpose of paying the principal and interest on said bonds, the Board of Supervisors shall, at the time of fixing the general tax levy and in the manner for such general tax levy provided, levy and collect annually each year until such bonds are paid, or until there is a sum in the Treasury of said city and county set apart for that purpose to meet all sums coming due for the principal and interest on said bonds, a tax sufficient to pay the annual interest on such bonds as the same becomes due and also such part of the principal thereof as shall become due before the proceeds of a tax levied at the time for making the next general tax levy can be made available for the payment of such principal.

Section 8. This ordinance shall be published once a day for at least seven (7) days in the San Francisco Examiner, a newspaper published daily in the City and County of San Francisco, being the official newspaper of said city and county and such publication shall constitute notice of said election and no other notice of the election hereby called need be given.

Approved as to form:

THOMAS M. O'CONNOR,
City Attorney

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.
Read Second Time and Finally Passed—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, August 28, 1967.
Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Casey, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing ordinance was finally passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
PHILIP P. ENGLER, Acting Clerk
JACK MORRISON, Acting Mayor

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "A"

Airport Bonds, 1967. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $98,000,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

Vote Yes on "A" — No Tax to Pay

Proposition "A" provides a real break for San Francisco property taxpayers — and for the many thousands of San Franciscans as well who as renters are also affected by high property taxes.
Proposition “A” will enable San Francisco International Airport to continue to make money for all San Francisco citizens — and at no tax cost. If taxes are to be kept within reason in San Francisco, it is essential that we attract new businesses which broaden the tax base.

As the fourth largest airport operation in the country, San Francisco International Airport spurs this vitally necessary business expansion. And the Airport does more:

It provides jobs. Airport jobs and jobs linked directly to the Airport now number more than 25,000—a total payroll in excess of $200 million a year.

The Airport generates prosperity. Airlines and other Airport tenants currently spend more than $105 million a year for supplies, goods and services. And tourists and business visitors brought to San Francisco by air are responsible for the employment of thousands of San Franciscans in hotels, restaurants, stores and many other fields.

All told, San Francisco International Airport pumps more than a millions dollars a day into San Francisco’s economy!

Vote Yes on “A” — It Pays Its Way

Located a short distance south of the San Francisco county line, in San Mateo County, San Francisco International Airport is the aviation hub for all Northern California, southern Oregon and western Nevada. It is a primary link between the United States and the Orient and between the East Coast and the West Coast, and is a major contributor to San Francisco’s economy, both in terms of tourism and Airport-oriented jobs and businesses. Serving the entire bay region, the Airport is owned and operated by San Francisco, which as the core city of the area, reaps the greatest benefits.

The Airport is one city operation that more than pays its way—without any burden to the taxpayers. For the past decade, the Airport has been entirely self-supporting.

Proposition “A” authorizes $98 million in construction bonds to modernize and expand passenger and cargo facilities at the Airport. The cost of these bonds, including interest, will be entirely repaid from airport revenues — without a penny of cost to the taxpayers.

The Airport expansion program is urgently needed to maintain our Airport-based prosperity — it is necessary to save it. For without the improvements provided for by Proposition “A,” many business enterprises now located in San Francisco — and thousands of jobs — will be moved to Los Angeles and Seattle.

Our Airport has had a fantastic growth. Air passenger traffic has increased nearly 200 per cent in the past 10 years. Volume increase in air freight during the same period has soared by more than 400 per cent!

Right now, the Airport is operating very close to its present passenger terminal capacity of 12,000,000 people per year.

Not only is the Airport running out of facilities to handle existing traffic, of even greater importance, its present facilities are not capable of taking care of the new needs of the super jet age.

Let’s Get Set for the Superjets

Huge, stretched-out subsonic jets are now being readied for service. One new plane designed can carry 490 passengers; it has a wing span of 195 feet, a length of 227 feet; its tail will stand 63 feet — higher than a 5-story building.

By the mid-1970’s, supersonic transports, now under development, will travel at speeds of nearly 2000 miles per hour.
"Quick change" jets permit seats to be removed in a matter of minutes for conversion to cargo use; one design can handle a maximum cargo payload of 100 tons.

If San Francisco is to retain its valuable status as a major International Airport — if it is to keep the job producing businesses here that depend on up-to-the-minute air service — if it is to attract more of such major tax-paying businesses and provide increasing numbers of jobs for San Franciscans — the expansion and modernization program provided for by Proposition "A" must be undertaken at once.

The stark fact of the matter is that within two or three years time, these new "super" planes will be in use by the major airlines for transcontinental and international flights. They can't be handled by our Airport today. If we don't get ready to take care of them now San Francisco will be bypassed in favor of other Western air centers and will revert to the status of a secondary airport, with devastating loss of jobs, business volume and tax revenues.

A yes vote on Proposition "A" is necessary to keep San Francisco abreast of the times — to protect and expand its Airport-based prosperity.

Expand our Airport-Based Prosperity

Proposition "A" has been carefully prepared by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, approved by the Bond Screening Committee, and approved unanimously for submission on the ballot by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

It is the result of more than two years of study and planning by airport, engineering and architectural experts and consultants, taking into consideration the special needs of San Francisco as well as the latest developments in airport design among the major airports of the world.

The well-balanced expansion program provided for by Proposition "A" includes the construction of an entire new passenger terminal and two new passenger terminal "satellites" to provide new gate facilities capable of handling stretch jets and supersonic planes, as well as the modification of existing piers.

Major garage expansion is provided for.

Proposition "A" also will build a permanent, 200-acre Cargo Center with 600,000 square feet of warehouse space. There is also provision for improvement of roadways, field improvements, and various other improvements, including a downtown San Francisco heliport.

The entire construction program, which will be undertaken over a five-year period, is estimated to provide approximately 3 million man-hours of work per year in the construction and related trades.

Proposition "A" will bring San Francisco International Airport to a permanent maximum capacity of about 20,000,000 passengers per year. National transportation experts are agreed that this maximum capacity is practical and desirable; and that after that maximum capacity has been reached the long-range growth needs of future decades should be met within the framework of a regional airport system.

Proposition "A" requires no major Bay filling; only about 180 acres of fill is contemplated — chiefly to make use of an existing partially enclosed lagoon area previously dredged by the Airport for outmoded amphibian operations.

Every San Franciscan Benefits from Proposition "A"

In no sense a political issue, Proposition "A" is backed by a broadly-based citizens committee of San Francisco labor, business, civic and neighborhood leaders. It is supported by Mayor John F. Shelley, former Mayors
Elmer E. Robinson and George Christopher, and mayoralty candidates
Joseph Alioto, Harold Dobbs, and Jack Morrison.

Everyone in San Francisco, in one way or another, will benefit from
Proposition "A".

Without Proposition "A", our Airport will diminish in importance, jobs
and businesses will be lost to other areas, taxes will rise.

With Proposition "A", our Airport-based prosperity will continue to
expand, job opportunities will increase, and important tax-paying businesses
will be attracted to San Francisco.

All San Francisco citizens are urged to vote "Yes" on Proposition "A".

Citizens Committee For the Airport Bonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorary Co-chairmen</th>
<th>Civic Co-chairmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. John F. Shelley</td>
<td>Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Elmer E. Robinson</td>
<td>Robert E. Gonzales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. George Christopher</td>
<td>Rev. Frederick D. Haynes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
<td>Dave Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold S. Dobbs</td>
<td>Judge Joseph Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Morrison</td>
<td>Mrs. Hans Klussman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Co-chairmen</td>
<td>Percy II. Steele, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Bridges</td>
<td>Walso Velasquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel F. Del Carlo</td>
<td>Neighborhood Co-chairmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Diviny</td>
<td>Armond DeMartini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Johns</td>
<td>John D’Massimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Co-chairmen</td>
<td>Steven Dol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Ballin</td>
<td>Leo Issaef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin Cardoza</td>
<td>T. Kong Lee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Fazackerley</td>
<td>George Ong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Maginn</td>
<td>Michael Salarino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Mitchell</td>
<td>Mrs. Ignatius Trapani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmett G. Solomon</td>
<td>Marguerite Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Swig</td>
<td>Dr. Thomas Wu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the fore-
going argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967,
by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy,
Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "A"
Vote "Yes" on Proposition "A"

For a Greater San Francisco International Airport

The San Francisco Municipal Conference urges you to vote "Yes" on
Proposition "A" because:

1. The expansion of airport facilities is a good investment for all San
Franciscans and is vital to our growing economy.
2. Those using the airport will pay all the cost of these bonds — not
the taxpayers.
3. Passenger and freight traffic is growing rapidly and the projects in
this bond issue are necessary to accommodate them.

Vote Yes on "A" — A good investment in San Francisco's future.

San Francisco Municipal Conference
Apartement House Associations Consolidated, Inc.
Building Owners and Managers Assn.
California Northern Hotel Assn.
Down Town Association
Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Real Estate Board
Retail Dry Goods Assn. of San Francisco
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On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “A”
Vote “No” on Tax and Rent Increases — Already Sky High
Bread Winners & Senior Citizens Can’t Afford Further Taxation
Vote No on Airport Bond Issue “A.” No one can afford more drastic tax increases which the Airport Bonds will bring. Just as surely as night follows day, rent hikes follow property tax increases.

A Cruel Hoax — The Big Lie
Don’t be fooled by the phony propaganda line “—and there’s not a penny cost to the taxpayers.” Hog Wash: Nobody gets “something for nothing.” You know it — they know it.

The Big Lie Technique, thusly:— Tell a lie; tell it often or constantly; —and above all, tell it loudly; the promoters of the Airport Bonds are saying, “—and there’s not a penny cost to the Taxpayers.”

Phony as a $3 Bill
Like BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit District) costs. The Airport Bonds are a Hoax. It makes dupes and fools of S.F. Taxpayers while fattening San Mateo County — lightening their tax load — making ours heavier.

Humbug and Hogwash
For 30 years, 1927-1957, the S.F. Taxpayers subsidized the Airport. Since 1957 the Airport has shown a profit. Not a single dollar has ever been repaid the taxpayers; in fact, management this year vigorously opposed placing $21 1/2 million dollars of unappropriated profits in the general fund to give S.F. taxpayers an 11c reduction in their taxes. So-called “profits from the Airport operation” is a bald faced Humbug. And — “there’s not a penny of cost to the taxpayers” is smelly, sickening Hog Wash.

Vicious Booby Trap
Taxpayers: What the Airport Bond Committee doesn’t tell you is: This bond issue is only Phase One. Phase Two and Phase Three are to follow at an additional cost of $280,000,000, plus $89,000,000 in interest — for a Grand Total Airport Expansion Program costing $498,000,000 (almost a half billion dollars).

Reckless Gamble?
To date, the highest annual Airport earnings is quoted at $4,887,270. The Controller states: Airport must earn $6,008,421 each year to pay off interest and redemption of Phase One. Remember, Taxpayers: Phase One is this year’s Bond Issue; Phase Two and Phase Three would require $20,000,000 (Twenty Million Dollars) annually to service this huge debt.

Risky Long Shot
Taxpayers: Can you afford this reckless gamble. Can you risk a Long Shot Gamble which calls for present annual earnings of $4,887,270 to magically jump to 20 millions dollars? And remember: If this reckless gamble misfires (BART—Bay Area Rapid Transit is a good example) your taxes will skyrocket to absorb this whopping debt.
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Flight of Industry — Payrolls

Industry and payrolls flee San Francisco for more beneficial “Financial Climate” of San Mateo County, made possible, in part by the huge Airport Bond issue that will cost more than One Hundred and Twenty-nine Million Dollars.

Always a Gimmick in “Something for Nothing”

Without risking one Red Cent in liability, San Mateo and adjoining counties reap major benefits from the Airport which caused this bragging (but true) statement by the San Mateo County Development Association: “San Mateo and its political subdivisions annually receive over $5,000,000 in real and personal property taxes; and, in addition, $120,000 in fines and bail forfeitures for Airport traffic violations go into San Mateo County coffers, annually.”

A Cruel Hoax

San Francisco taxpayers do not receive One Dime for tax relief while San Mateo County benefits by The Millions each year to reduce its taxes. In land taxes alone — San Francisco County pays more than $737,000 annually to San Mateo County. And get this: San Francisco pays the salaries of the Fire and Police Forces at the Airport. Additionally, San Mateo derives lush sums from every improvement at the Airport. How come? Because San Mateo County has additional property to tax.

Dirty End of Stick for S.F. Taxpayers

| Total Employees at Airport | 31,250 |
| Living in San Mateo and nearby counties | 25,728 |
| Living in San Francisco | 7,522 |

San Mateo’s Huge Gain — Motel-Industrial Growth

San Mateo has gained 2,568 new plants or expansions since 1955, representing a total investment of almost $475,000,000 (nearly a Half Billion Dollars).

During the past 9 years, Hotel-Motel expansion within 2½ miles radius of the Airport has jumped from 152 units to more than 2,000 units with capital investments in excess of $20,000,000 (Twenty Million Dollars).

Industrial Parks in the Northern part of San Mateo County — employing many thousands of skilled professional workers — has been largely the outgrowth — directly or indirectly — of the nearby Airport.

Heavy Loss for San Francisco

Meanwhile — for more than 10 years — San Francisco has been steadily losing industries, payrolls, skilled and unskilled workers — chiefly because of high land costs, high taxes, high cost of home purchases, and high rentals. Wage earners — skilled and unskilled — move where work is available. Plants and industries move, drawing payrolls and employees like a magnet draws steel filings. Ergo: San Francisco’s loss is San Mateo’s gain.

Who Gets the Payroll?

San Francisco foots the bills and guarantees the bonds. Yet, San Mateo and neighboring counties get $190,000,000 of the payroll compared to $60,000,000 for San Francisco.

Who Foits the Bills?

Remember, Taxpayers: While other counties receive major benefits from the Airport, in case of loss they are not responsible, nor will they shoulder a Single Dollar Loss. San Franciscans should demand that other counties be responsible for debts in proportion to the benefits they receive.
Supersonic Jet Noise Hazard

It is public knowledge that the Airport is being readied for the new jumbo-size Supersonic Jets. With their ear-splitting noise problem in breaking the sound barrier, many cities here and abroad are considering legislation which would prohibit Super Jets flights over cities because of the noise and damage it would cause. This could make our Airport obsolete.

Why the Huge Slush Fund?

Last year supporters and promoters of the Airport Bonds spent nearly a quarter million dollars unsuccessfully — trying to slip this Bond issue over on the S.F. taxpayers.

This year, an even greater sum may be expected to be spent in a further attempt to hoodwink S.F. voters. Why this lavish outlay of funds? It's a "Bonanza." Wealthy individuals and banks reap excessive profits on City Bonds because they're 100 percent exempt from Federal and State Income Taxes. City Bonds — tax exempt — is a convenient, profitable tax "write off" a 100% Free Hideout for tax dodging wealthy individuals and firms.

Finance Airport Without Bonds

Reporter Robert de Roos, writing in the S.F. Chronicle, Feb. 19, 1967, has suggested "That the Public Utilities Commission could finance the Airport and collect $5 to $8 millions dollars annually by charging outgoing passengers $1. Ultimately, such a tax would produce Ten Million Dollars a year or more. Enough money, perhaps so that the voters would not have to be asked to guarantee new Airport bonds every few years."

Passenger traveling to foreign countries know this is common practice elsewhere. In France the outgoing charge is over $5.

Stop Tax Increases

Through new assessments your taxes have jumped this year to the highest payments in our history. Whether you rent or are a property owner, you are faced with a large increase.

Can you afford to believe the politicians word— "that the Airport won't cost a cent"? after the pitiful record of the Bay Area Rapid Transit System? — its huge debt and broken promise of a modern transit system? — its reduction to a shell of its original proposal, with the knowledge that the San Francisco Taxpayers will have to pay huge additional taxes just to salvage and complete a Skeleton System?

Demand Protection — Vote No

Proposition "A" does not consider Regional Government for the Nine S.F. Bay Area Counties. Proposition "A" is premature. S.F. Taxpayers have no protection against unlimited exorbitant tax increases for the private benefit of San Mateo and adjacent counties.

The establishment of a Regional Airport would place the tax burden upon all Bay Area Counties who presently reap the harvest from the Airport.

Stop the Big Spenders — Stop Blank Checks

As you look at your Tax Increase, or as you receive your notice that your rent has been raised, Stop and consider: Can you afford the additional Tax Burden that could be imposed by Proposition "A" the Airport Bond Issue?

Vote NO on this waste of public funds.

Vote NO on Tax and Rent Hikes.

Vote NO on Proposition "A" — the Airport Bonds.

This argument is sponsored by the Home Owners and Tenants Protective Committee.

THOMAS M. DILLON, Chairman
CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION “A”
Airport Bonds, 1967. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $98,000,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

Should the proposed bond issue be authorized and when all bonds shall have been issued on a fifteen year basis, and after consideration of the interest rates related to current municipal bond sales, it is estimated that approximate costs would be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond redemption</td>
<td>$ 98,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest requirement</td>
<td>31,360,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt service requirement</td>
<td>$129,360,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the work program submitted by the Public Utilities Commission, the estimated average amount required to pay the interest thereon and the redemption thereof would be approximately $6,808,421 annually for nineteen years.

In my opinion, the servicing of the proposed bonded debt will be paid from Airport revenues and will not affect the tax rate of the City and County of San Francisco.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION B

Adds Section 12.1: Provides that Board of Supervisors may appoint an analyst and sets forth his duties and authority for appointment of assistants.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 12.1 thereto, relating to establishing an analyst bureau in the Board of Supervisors.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 12.1 thereto, to read as follows:

Section 12.1. Analyst. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 12, the Board of Supervisors shall appoint, and at its pleasure remove, an analyst. The analyst, when directed by the Board of Supervisors or any of its committees, may inquire into matters affecting conduct of any department or office of the city and county in order to assist the Board of Supervisors or any of its committees in the analysis or review of the budget, appropriation ordinance or supplemental appropriation ordinances. The Board of Supervisors, subject to the restrictions contained in Section 22, shall provide by ordinance for such other duties and responsibilities for the analyst that it deems necessary. The analyst shall have power to appoint, and at his pleasure may remove, such senior and junior analysts in his office as may be provided by the budget and appropriation ordinances.
All other positions shall be filled by appointment by the analyst subject to the civil service provisions of this Charter.

Ordered submitted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, May 1, 1967.
Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras.

I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "B"

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "B"

High taxes represent the most critical problem facing the citizens of San Francisco today. Taxes are directly related to the costs of operating our City government — and those costs have been soaring.

Ten years ago the budget of the City and County of San Francisco was approximately $208 million. The 1967 budget was almost twice that amount—$404 million. This year's budget has been set at just under $446 million—an increase of over 10 per cent. A better budget is needed.

Vote "YES" on Proposition "B"... for Better Budgets

Better budgets will save money for the people. There is a built-in weakness in the budget-making of San Francisco which has contributed to uncontrolled spending and high taxes. That weakness is the budget review process of the Board of Supervisors. In a matter of just a few weeks the five members of the Supervisors' Finance Committee have to review a mammoth budget document over two thousand pages long. Even with round-the-clock sessions, often lasting into the early hours of the morning, these hard-working public servants find it impossible to make a meaningful review of every item in the budget. Usually there is time only to examine requests for increases in spending. As a result, there is little opportunity to study all the budget and to weed out waste and duplication. The Supervisors have asked for help in budget review. Proposition "B" will give it to them.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "B"... for Budget Watchdogs

Proposition "B" will clear up the budget weakness that now exists by giving the Board of Supervisors a small staff of legislative analysts. The legislative analysts will be specially trained budget "watchdogs" who will be on the job on a year-round basis making sure that the citizens of San Francisco get the most out of every dollar they spend for taxes. Their work will stem the rate of growth of spending and taxes by providing the people with better budgets.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "B"... for Greater Economy

Greater economy in government will mean tax savings. The legislative analyst approach to economy has been tried and proven effective in the government of the State of California under the direction of the highly respected A. Alan Post. The Speaker of the Assembly has said that the budget evaluation of California's legislative analyst "produces rich dividends for California every year." Tens of millions of dollars in taxes are saved each year as a result of the work of the legislative analyst. Professional help in evaluating San Francisco's budget will result in better budgets and savings for the taxpayers of San Francisco.
Vote "Yes" on Proposition "B"... for Greater Efficiency

Greater efficiency in government will give the people more for their money. Even though the last census revealed a sharp drop in San Francisco's population, the costs of City and County government have continued to rise. This means that fewer people are called upon to pay more taxes. Clearly, there is a critical need for better budgets — to provide essential public services at reasonable costs and to get the greatest possible mileage out of each tax dollar. The legislative analyst will pinpoint areas where economies can be made. The beneficiary will be the taxpaying citizens of San Francisco.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "B"... for Tax Savings

Bring back better budgeting. Vote "Yes" on Proposition "B".

Sponsored by: San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.


On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "B"

Vote "No" on Proposition "B"

This proposition should be soundly rejected. Taxpayers are being asked to write a "blank check." No one disputes the need for the service this proposition will afford the Board of Supervisors. But to authorize this service within the framework of this proposition is to extend an open invitation to the "Spoils System" in local government.

Members of the Board of Supervisors are elected public officials. They appoint a Clerk of the Board, who assumes responsibility for supervision of the employees of the Board’s Office. Proposition “B” by-passes the Clerk’s authority, creating an unnecessary, if not dangerous, division of authority in the Supervisor’s Office.

But perhaps more important, Proposition “B” extends unprecedented powers of appointment to a person whose initial appointment is made by the Board of Supervisors. Once this person is appointed by the Board, he is authorized to appoint as many analysts as he sees fit and all appointments will be non-Civil Service!

Here we have a classic example of the "blank check." The taxpayers have no idea how many persons will be appointed to these non-Civil Service jobs, nor how much the salaries will be.

Job appointments should be kept out of the arena of politics. Our Civil Service Merit System is the bulwark against these type appointments. It is the public’s only source of protection against the “Spoils System.”

Proposition “B” will open the door to widespread encroachments on our Merit System. Don’t write a "blank check" for an unsound proposal. Protect your Civil Service Merit System.
Vote "No" on Proposition "B"

This argument is sponsored by the Civil Service Association of San Francisco, Granville M. DeMerritt, Executive Secretary.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "B"

Vote "No" on Proposition "B"

Proposition B is a direct attack on our city and county civil service system and an open invitation to return to the repugnant and often corrupt "spoils system."

We in San Francisco have good reason to be proud of our civil service system, judged by many to be one of the finest in the country. One of the important reasons for its strength is that efforts to break it down by bits-and-pieces legislation have been vigorously resisted — by the Civil Service Commission, by the Board of Supervisors, and by the people of San Francisco.

Proposition B is another effort to drive a wedge into the city's merit system in that it would allow a new "Budget Analyst" to appoint such assistants as he may require, independent of the civil service system. This would mean that the so-called Analyst could set up a little kingdom of his own, with employees responsible to no one but himself — hired and fired by his whim. The Civil Service Commission, precisely for this reason, opposes this proposition. The Commission urges that all positions below that of the Analyst himself be filled on the basis of examination and maintained under the merit system.

Proposition B defeats the career concept in public service. It closes the door on open competition based on merit and qualifications. It threatens the continuity of the operation and administration that is made possible by the protected civil service.

We urge the voters of San Francisco to join with us and the Civil Service Commission in actively opposing this measure and in vigorously defending the merit system from attack.

Vote "No" on Proposition "B"

This argument is sponsored by the Municipal Improvement League.
KENNETH A. FINIS, President

A No vote on Proposition B is recommended by George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer of the San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION "B"

Adds Section 12.1: Provides that Board of Supervisors may appoint an analyst and sets forth his duties and authority for appointment of assistants.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, in my opinion it is estimated that the cost of government would increase not less than approximately $28,000 annually which amount, based on the 1967-1968 assessment roll, is equivalent to thirteen hundredths (0.13) of one cent in the tax rate; however, as a product of the proposal's future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION C

Amends Section 145: Provides that minimum age of applicant for entrance position in Police Department shall be 20 years and for appointment thereto 21 years.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 145 thereof, relative to age of applicants and appointees to entrance positions in the uniformed force of the Police Department.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 145 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Qualifications and Tests

Section 145. All applicants for places in the classified service shall submit to tests which shall be competitive, provided, however, that no test in either entrance or promotional examinations shall be deemed to be competitive unless two or more persons shall participate, except that any such examination may be held for one qualified applicant on recommendation of the civil service commission and approval by resolution of the board of supervisors, after a finding by the board that reasonable publicity of the proposed examination has been given by the civil service commission. Such tests shall be without charge to the applicants. The commission shall control all examinations and may employ suitable persons in or out of the public service to act as examiners. The tests may be written, oral, mechanical or physical, or any combination of them, practical in character and related to matters fairly to test the relative capacity of the applicants for the positions to be filled. The commission shall be the sole judge of the adequacy of the tests to rate the capacity of the applicants to perform service for the city and county. The commission may, for each examination, establish a passing mark or may determine the total number of persons who shall constitute the list of eligibles. The commission shall prepare from the returns of the examiners the list of eligibles, arranged in order of relative excellence. No question submitted to applicants shall refer to political or religious opinions or fraternal affiliations.

Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force ((s)) of the fire ((and police)) department shall be not less than twenty-one years of age, nor more than thirty-five years of age at the time of appointment and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in the United States Army, Navy and Marine Corps.
Applicants for entrance positions in the uniformed force of the police department shall not be less than twenty years of age at the time of taking the examination, nor less than twenty-one years of age or more than thirty-five years of age at the time of appointment and shall have the physical qualifications required for enlistment in the United States Army, Navy and Marine Corps.

Applicants for positions in the mechanical trades and occupations may, in the discretion of the commission, be rated solely on experience and physical qualifications which may be demonstrated by such evidence and in such manner as the commission may direct, and such applicants may be submitted to such further tests as the commission may require. Examinations of laborers shall relate only to physical qualifications and experience, and laborers establishing their fitness shall rank upon the register in order of priority of application.

The commission may remove all names from the list of eligibles after they have remained thereon for more than two years and all names thereon shall be removed at the expiration of four years. The commission may, however, provide in the scope-circular of any examination that the list of eligibles secured thereby shall automatically expire at a date not less than two or more than four years after the adoption of such list.

Veterans with thirty days or more actual service, and widows of such veterans, who become eligible for appointment by attaining the passing mark in any entrance examination, shall be allowed an additional credit of five per cent in making up the list of eligibles secured by such examination. The term "veteran" as used in this section shall be taken to mean any person who has been mustered into, or served in, the Army, or enlisted in, or served in, the Navy or Marine Corps, of the United States, in time of war and received an honorable discharge or certificate of honorable active service. In the case of promotive examinations, when the passing mark has been attained, a credit of three percent shall be allowed to veterans or to widows of such veterans when requested by such veterans or widows. When an eligible has secured a permanent appointment from a list of eligibles derived from an entrance examination in which he has been allowed additional credits of five per cent as herein provided, and has served the full probationary period therein as provided in this charter, such other additional credits of five per cent that have been allowed him on lists of eligibles derived from other entrance examinations shall be automatically cancelled, and his rank on such other list or lists revised to accord with his relative standing before such additional credits were added, and he shall not be allowed such additional credits in any other entrance examinations. If he has received a permanent appointment from a list of eligibles derived from a promotive examination in which he has requested and been allowed the additional credits of three per cent as herein provided, and has served the full probationary period therein as provided in this charter, such additional credits of three per cent that have been allowed him on lists of eligibles derived from other promotive examinations shall be automatically cancelled, and his rank on such other list or lists revised to accord with his relative standing before such additional credits were added, and he shall not be allowed such additional credits in any other promotive examinations. The civil service commission may, for serv-
ices or employment specified by the commission, allow general or individual preference, but not less than ten per cent, for entrance appointment of veterans who have suffered permanent disability in line of duty, provided that such disability would not prevent the proper performance of the duties required under such service, or employment, and provided that such disability is of record in the United States Veterans' Bureau.


Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "C"

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "C"

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "C" will assist the Police Department in the recruitment of police officers.

Proposition "C" retains the requirement that applicants for the Police Department must be at least 21 years of age at the time of appointment. At the same time, it allows men who are 20 to take the entrance examination. This change will materially aid the Police Department in its continuing efforts to attract desirable young men to the police profession.

Many young men honorably discharged from the armed forces or graduated from junior college are 20 years of age. They are seeking employment but are prevented from taking the police test. As it is now, rather than wait for a year to take the test they seek other employment. If they were able to take and pass the examination while 20 and could be assured of appointment at 21, many of them would take temporary jobs while waiting the few months for appointment as police officers. Because of this age restriction, men interested in becoming police officers, and men who would make good police officers, are lost to law enforcement.

A "Yes" vote on Proposition "C" will enable the Police Department to fill its many vacancies without lowering its qualifications for police officers.

A "Yes" vote for Proposition "C" is good for San Francisco.

Sponsored by:
San Francisco Police Commission

Endorsed by:
Chief Thomas J. Cahill, San Francisco Police Department

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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PROPOSITION D

Amends Section 134: Requires nominee to Board of Education to file statement of qualifications with registrar; requires Registrar to mail copy of said statement to each voter.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 134 thereof relating to the Board of Education.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 134 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

SCHOOLS

Board of Education

Section 134. All of the public schools of the school district of the city and county shall be under the control and management of a board of education, composed of seven commissioners, who shall be nominated by the mayor and be subject to confirmation or rejection by vote of the electors as in this section provided, and who shall be subject to recall, and to suspensions and removal in the same manner as elective officers, as provided by this charter. The term of each member shall be five years, commencing on the 8th day of January following their respective nominations, provided that each such five-year term shall begin at the expiration of the respective terms of members as existing at the time this charter shall go into effect. The compensation of each member shall be one hundred dollars ($100) per month.

Nominations of members of the board of education shall be made, subject to confirmation by the electors, by the filing by the mayor, with the registrar of voters between the first and tenth day of September in each year prior to the expiration of the term or terms of members, the name of one qualified citizen, or two, as the case may be, to serve as a member or members, respectively, of said board for the regular term or terms commencing on the 8th day of January in the succeeding year. Each nominee, not later than forty-five days prior to the election at which the electors vote to confirm or reject said nominee, shall file with the registrar a statement of qualifications in not to exceed one hundred words, subscribed by him before the registrar. The registrar shall forthwith certify to the said subscription and its date and retain and file the statement. The registrar shall cause said statement of qualifications to be printed and shall mail a copy of the same to each voter, at least five days prior to the election. This printed copy may be attached to any other matter required to be printed and mailed.
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The form of ballot shall be as provided in Section 184 of this charter and if a majority of the qualified electors voting on said nomination or nominations shall vote in favor thereof, said nomination shall be confirmed and the person or persons named shall take office on the 8th day of January next following. If a majority of the electors vote “No,” the nomination shall stand rejected, and such person shall not be eligible for nomination as a member of the board of education for a period of at least three years. If a majority of the electors vote “No,” the mayor shall appoint a qualified citizen to serve as a member of the board until the 8th day of January following the next general election or general municipal election, whichever shall first be held. Between the first and tenth day of September before such general election or general municipal election, the mayor shall nominate, subject to confirmation by the electors at such election, as herein provided, a qualified citizen to serve as a member of the board for the remainder of the five-year term for which the nomination first made by the mayor was rejected. Vacancies otherwise occurring on said board shall be filled by the mayor for the unexpired terms.

Ordered submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, August 14, 1967.

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “D”

Everyone agrees that the names and qualifications of Board of Education candidates should be printed and mailed to the voter before the election. The names of all other local candidates appear in the voter’s pamphlet. Nothing about the Board of Education nominees is mailed to the voter. This is an oversight and it must be corrected.

This information is badly needed to help the voter decide his “yes” or “no” vote.

This information is important to the voters and to San Francisco schools. A “yes” vote for Proposition “D” is a vote for good government in San Francisco.

Sponsored by:
League of Women Voters

Endorsed by:
San Francisco Alliance
San Francisco Federation of Teachers
Service Committee on Public Education (SCOPE)
San Francisco Committee to Reform the Assessment of Private Property
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

89
PROPOSITION E

Amends Section 151.4: Provides that employee with 15 or more years of continuous service shall be allowed an annual vacation of 20 days.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 151.4 relating to vacation allowances for city employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said City and County by amending Section 151.4 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Annual Vacation of Employees

Section 151.4. Every person employed in the city and county service shall be allowed a vacation with pay annually as long as he continues in his employment as follows:

(1) After one year’s continuous service, ten working days.
(2) After five years’ continuous service, fifteen working days.
(3) After fifteen years’ continuous service, twenty working days.

Ordered submitted—Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, August 21, 1967.

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “E”

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “E”

City employees lag behind their fellow employees in both private industry and other public jurisdictions in working conditions and fringe benefits. Comparative studies and surveys indicate clearly that a serious lag exists concerning vacation privileges.

Under current Charter provisions, City employees have not enjoyed a change in vacation privileges since 1949. At that time, the voters authorized 15 working days’ annual vacation after 5 years’ service. Since that date, significant improvements in vacation benefits have been widespread throughout private industry and other public jurisdictions.

For example, in private industry in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area, the proportion of employees covered by contracts with a four-week vacation clause rose from 22 per cent in 1961 to over 40 per cent in 1965. Studies show that 71 per cent of these employees earn four weeks’ annual vacation after serving 20 years or less.
On the government side, surveys conducted by the County Supervisors' Association and the League of California Cities show that San Francisco's employees lag considerably behind their counterparts in other public jurisdictions.

For example, Federal employees in San Francisco enjoy 20 working days' annual vacation after only 3 years' service. California State employees enjoy vacation privileges ranging from 15 days after 3 years' service to 24 days after 20 years' service.

Bay Area counties, notably Alameda, Contra Costa and Santa Clara Counties, after varying periods of service, also provide 20 working days' vacation to their employees. Los Angeles and San Diego Counties also similarly provide 20 working days' vacation privileges for their employees.

Finally, among California's largest cities, San Francisco fares poorly. Los Angeles City, San Diego City, Sacramento, San Jose, Long Beach City, and several other more populous cities, accord their employees 20 working days' vacation after specified years of service.

In short, the proposed amendment will accomplish one singular fact: To bring San Francisco into line with current vacation practices in both private industry and other public jurisdictions. Standing still since 1949, this amendment is only now, after 18 years, the first improvement in vacation privileges.

The record is quite clear that this proposed amendment is fair and reasonable, one which will erase a serious inequity and will restore vacation parity with private industry and other public jurisdictions.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "E"

Sponsored by:
Civil Service Association of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Municipal Improvement League
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183 PROPOSITION "E"

Amends Section 151.4: Provides that employee with 15 or more years of continuous service shall be allowed an annual vacation of 20 days.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based upon reports prepared and submitted to this office by the various departments of the City, and based on current salary levels, it is estimated that the annual cost of government would increase approximately $557,000.

Of the above amount, $521,000 will affect the tax rate. Based on the 1967-1968 assessment roll, said amount is equivalent to two and four tenths (2.4) cents in the tax rate annually.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
PROPOSITION F

Amends Sections 35.5.1, 35.5.2 and 36.2: Relating to the dates for surveying, certifying and revising rates of compensation of members of the Police and Fire Departments.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Sections 35.5.1, 35.5.2 and 36.2, relating to rates of compensation paid members of the Police and Fire Departments.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County of San Francisco at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Sections 35.5.1, 35.5.2 and 36.2 so that the same shall read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses))

Section 35.5.1. Not later than the 15th day of February of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen employed in the respective police departments in all cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.

Not later than the first day of April each year, the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix the rates of compensation for the members of the police department whose annual compensations are set forth in Section 35.5 of this charter and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective on the first day of July next following.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,
(a) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall not exceed the highest rate of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission;
(b) for the first, second and third year of service for police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same amount of adjustment as that used in fixing the rates of compensation for the fourth year of service for the same class;
(c) for said members of the police department other than police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers shall include the same per cent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for police officers in the fourth year of service; and
(d) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.
Not later than the (2nd) 1st Monday of (July) August of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen on the first day of (July) August of that year in the cities hereinbefore referred to. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have the power by ordinance to revise all of the rates of compensation as in this section provided. Said revised rates shall be effective from the first day of July of the then current fiscal year.

If the board of supervisors revises said rates of compensation, then it shall, not later than the 25th day of (July) August of the then current fiscal year, have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, but without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual salary ordinance and the annual appropriation ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for the then current fiscal year.

(On ratification of this section, the civil service commission shall immediately survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid police officers or patrolmen on the first day of January, 1952, in the cities referred to hereinbefore. The board of supervisors shall thereafter have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to adjust the rates of compensation for the fiscal year 1952-1953 for all of said members of the police department based upon said certified report and as in this section provided; and, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance for the fiscal year 1952-1953 to include the provisions necessary for paying said rates from July 1, 1952; provided, if additional funds are required, then provision shall be made for such payment out of such funds as the controller certifies are available for the purpose. Such funds as are made available shall first be applied to the payment of compensation for the period from the effective date of this section to June 30, 1953, and thereafter to the payment of such compensations for the period from the effective date of this section to July 1, 1952, and shall apply only to those persons who are members of the department on or after the effective date of this section.)

The expression "rates of compensation," as used in this section in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of "rates of compensation."

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the police department referred to herein only as it otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression "rates of compensation" as used in this section, shall mean "salary attached to the rank" as used in section 166 and, with the addition of fifteen dollars per month now provided in section 35.5.2 of the charter with respect to mem-
bers assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, shall also mean "compensation earnable" as used in section 168.1.1.

(For all purposes of the retirement system, the first adjustment of rates of compensation made by the board of supervisors after the effective date of this section shall be the rates of compensation for the members affected for the remainder of the fiscal year 1952-1953 following the month in which the ordinance making such adjustment becomes effective and the annual compensations set forth in section 35.5 shall be rates of compensation for said retirement purposes for the period from the beginning of the fiscal year 1952-1953 through said month.)

The term "police officers or patrolmen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed in the police departments of said cities of 100,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by police officers, police patrol drivers and women protective officers in the San Francisco Police Department.

Section 35.5.2. Not later than the fifteenth day of February of each year the civil service commission shall survey, and certify to the board of supervisors, any additional rate of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the respective police department of all cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest decennial census.

Not later than the first day of April of each year the board of supervisors shall have power, and it shall be its duty by ordinance to fix the additional rate of pay for the members of the police department who are assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, at a rate of pay not to exceed the highest rate of compensation paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission.

Not later than the (second) 1st Monday of (July) August of each year the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors any additional rate of pay to be paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty on the first day of (July) August of that year in the cities hereinafore referred to.

The board of supervisors shall thereupon have the power by ordinance to revise the additional rate of pay as in the section provided. Said revised rates shall be effective from the first day of July of the then current fiscal year.

If the board of supervisors revises said additional rate of pay then, it shall, not later than the 25th day of (July) August of the then current fiscal year, have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, but without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual salary ordinance and the annual appropriation ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the additional rate of pay for members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for the then current fiscal year.

(On ratification of this section the civil service commission shall immediately survey and certify to the board of supervisors the additional rate of pay paid to members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty on the first day of January, 1958, in the cities referred to hereinbefore. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have power, and it shall be its duty by ordinance to adjust the rates of compensation for the fiscal year 1957-1958
for members assigned to two-wheel motorcycle traffic duty, based upon said certified report and as in this section provided; and, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter it shall have power, and it shall be its duty, but without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance for the fiscal year 1957-1958 to include the provisions necessary for paying said additional rate of pay from January 1, 1958; provided, however, that if additional funds are required then provisions shall be made for such payment out of such funds as the controller certifies are available for the purpose. Such funds as are made available shall first be applied to the payment of compensation for the period from the effective date of this section to June 30, 1958, and thereafter to the payment of the additional rate for the period from the effective date of this section to January 1, 1958, and shall only apply to those persons who are members of the department on and after the effective date of this section.)

Said additional rate of pay shall be in addition to the rate of compensation provided for in section 35.5.1 of this charter.

In no event shall the additional rate so fixed be less than $15.00 per month.

Section 36.2. Not later than the 15th day of February of each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors rates of compensation paid firemen employed in the respective fire departments in all cities of 100,000 population or over in the State of California, based upon the latest federal decennial census.

Not later than the first day of April of each year, the board of supervisors shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to fix rates of compensation for the members of the fire department whose annual compensations are set forth or otherwise provided in sections 36 and 38.1 of this charter, and said rates shall be in lieu of said annual compensations and shall be effective on the first day of July next following.

The rates of compensation, fixed in said ordinance,

(a) for the fourth year of service and thereafter for firemen shall not exceed the highest rate of compensation paid firemen in regular service in the cities included in the certified report of the civil service commission;

(b) for the first, second and third year of service for firemen shall include the same amount of adjustment as that used in fixing the rates of compensation for the fourth year of service for the same class;

(c) for said members of the fire department other than fireman shall include the same per cent of adjustment as that established by said ordinance for firemen in the fourth year of service; and

(d) shall be set at the dollar amount nearest the fractional amount which may result from percentage adjustment specified in this section, half dollars being taken to the next higher dollar amount.

The rates of compensation set forth in the budget estimates, the budget and the annual salary ordinance shall be those fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided and appropriations therefor shall be based thereon.

Not later than the ((2nd)) 1st Monday of ((July)) August each year, the civil service commission shall survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid firemen on the first day of ((July)) August of that year in the cities hereinbefore referred to. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have the power by ordinance to revise all of the rates of
compensation as in this section provided. Said revised rates shall be effective from the first day of July of the then current fiscal year.

If the board of supervisors revises said rates of compensation, then it shall, not later than the 25th day of (July) August of the then current fiscal year, have the power, and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter, but without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual salary ordinance and the annual appropriation ordinance to include the provisions necessary for paying the rates of compensation fixed by the board of supervisors as in this section provided for the then current fiscal year.

(On ratification of this section, the civil service commission shall immediately survey and certify to the board of supervisors the rates of compensation paid firemen on the first day of January, 1952, in the cities referred to hereinbefore. The board of supervisors shall thereupon have power, and it shall be its duty, by ordinance, to adjust the rates of compensation for the fiscal year 1952-53 for all of said members of the fire department based upon said certified report and as in this section provided; and, notwithstanding any other provision of this charter, it shall have the power, and it shall be its duty, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance for the fiscal year 1952-53 to include the provisions necessary for paying said rates from July 1, 1952; provided, if additional funds are required, then provision shall be made for such payment out of such funds as the controller certifies are available for the purpose. Such funds as are made available shall first be applied to the payment of compensation for the period from the effective date of this section to June 30, 1963, and thereafter to the payment of such compensations for the period from the effective date of this section to July 1, 1952, and shall only apply to those persons who are members of the department on or after the effective date of this section.}

The expression “rates of compensation” as used in this section, in relation to said survey, is hereby declared to apply only to a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, and does not include such working benefits as might be set up by any other city by way of holidays, vacations, other permitted absences of any type whatsoever, overtime, night or split shift, or pay for specialized services within a classification or rank, or other premium pay differentials of any type whatsoever. The foregoing enumeration is not exclusive, but it is the intent of this section that nothing other than a basic amount of wages, with included range scales, is to be included within the meaning of “rates of compensation”.

Working benefits and premium pay differentials of any type shall be allowed or paid to members of the fire department referred to herein only as is otherwise provided in this charter.

For all purposes of the retirement system, the expression “rates of compensation,” as used in this section shall mean “salary attached to the rank” as used in section 169 and “compensation earnable” as used in section 171.1.1.

(For all purposes of the retirement system, the first adjustment of rates of compensation made by the board of supervisors after the effective date of this section shall be the rates of compensation for the members affected for the remainder of the fiscal year 1952-1953 following the month in which the ordinance making such adjustment becomes effective, and the annual compensations set forth in section 36 shall be the rates of
compensation for said retirement purposes for the period from the beginning of the fiscal year 1952-1953 through said month."

The term "firemen" as used in this section shall mean the persons employed, in the fire departments of said cities of 100,000 population or over or of the City and County of San Francisco, to perform substantially the duties being performed on the effective date of this section by drivers, stokers, tillerman, truckmen, or housemen, in the San Francisco Fire Department.

The expression "members of the fire department" does not include members of the fire commission.

Ordered as submitted: Board of Supervisors, San Francisco, Aug. 21, 1967.

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Boas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered as submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "F"

This Proposition would change the date of the Civil Service annual report on the survey of salaries of firemen and policemen in cities of 100,000 or more from July 1st to August 1st.

This Proposition would provide the same date of survey which the Carmen and other trade unions have at present.

There is no cost involved and the firemen and policemen urge a "Yes" vote.

Submitted by:
Fire and Police Committee
(San Francisco Fire Fighters, Local 798
San Francisco Police Officers Association)

Endorsed by:
Civil Service Association
San Francisco Police Commission
San Francisco Fire Commission
Municipal Improvement League

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION “F”

Amends Sections 35.5.1, 35.5.2 and 36.2: Relating to the dates for surveying certifying and revising rates of compensation of members of the Police and Fire Departments.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

97
PROPOSITION G

Adds Section 151.3.1: Relating to the method and conditions for setting compensation and other benefits of platform employees and coach and bus operators.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 151.3.1 thereto relating to compensation for platform employees and coach and bus operators of the Municipal Railway.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 151.3.1 thereto, reading as follows:

Section 151.3.1. Compensations of Platform Employees and Coach and Bus Operators of the Municipal Railway.

Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 151.3 or any other provisions of this charter, the wages, conditions and benefits of employment as provided for in this section of the various classifications of employment of platform employees and coach or bus operators of the Municipal Railway as compensation, shall be determined and fixed annually as follows:

(a) On or before the first Monday of August of each year, the civil service commission shall certify to the Board of Supervisors for each classification of employment the average of the two highest wage schedules in effect on July 1st of that year for comparable platform employees and coach or bus operators of other surface street railway and bus systems in the United States operated primarily within municipalities having each a population of not less than 500,000 as determined by the then most recent census taken and published by the director of the census of the United States, and each such system normally employing not less than four hundred (400) platform employees or coach or bus operators, or platform employees, coach and bus operators.

(b) The board of supervisors shall thereupon fix a wage schedule for each classification of platform employees and coach and bus operators of the municipal railway which shall be not in excess of the average of the two highest wage schedules so certified by the civil service commission for each such classification.

(c) When, in addition to their usual duties, such employees are assigned duties as instructors of platform employees or coach or bus operators they shall receive twenty (20¢) cents per hour in addition to the rate of pay to which they are otherwise entitled under the wage schedule as herein provided.

(d) The rates of pay fixed for platform employees and coach and bus operators as herein provided shall be effective from July 1st of the year in which such rates of pay are certified by the civil service commission.
(e) The terms wage schedule and wage schedules wherever used in this section are hereby defined and intended to include only the maximum rate of pay provided in each such wage schedule.

(f) At the time the board of supervisors fixes the wage schedule as provided in (b) above, the board of supervisors may fix as conditions and benefits of employment other than wages as compensation for platform employees and coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, conditions and benefits not to exceed those conditions and benefits granted by collective bargaining agreements to the comparable platform employees and coach or bus operators of the two systems used for certification of the average of the two highest wage schedules by the civil service commission. The board of supervisors may establish such conditions and benefits notwithstanding other provisions or limitations of this charter, with the exception that such conditions and benefits shall not involve any change in the administration of, or benefits of the retirement system, health service system or vacation allowances as provided elsewhere in this charter. For all purposes of the retirement system as related to this section, the word "compensation" as used in Section 165.2 of this charter shall mean the "wage schedules" as fixed in accordance with Paragraphs (a) and (b) above, including those differentials established and paid as part of wages to platform employees and coach and bus operators of the municipal railway, but shall not include the value of those benefits paid into the fund established as herein provided. Provided that when in the two systems used for certification as provided above, vacation, retirement and health service benefits are greater than such similar benefits provided by this charter for platform employees, coach or bus operators of the municipal railway, then an amount not to exceed the difference of such benefits may be converted to dollar values and the amount equivalent to these dollar values shall be paid into a fund. The fund shall be established to receive and to administer said amounts representing the differences in values of the vacation, retirement and health service benefits, and to pay out benefits that shall be jointly determined by representatives of the city and county government and the representatives of the organized platform employees and coach and bus operators of the municipal railway. The civil service commission shall adopt rules for the establishment and general administration of the fund as herein provided. Such rules shall provide for a joint administration of the fund by representatives of the city and county government, which shall include representatives of the public utilities commission and representatives of the organized platform employees, coach and bus operators of the municipal railway. Such rules may provide a procedure for final and binding arbitration of disputes which may arise between representatives of the city and county government and the representatives of the organized platform employees and coach and bus operators of the municipal railway. Such rules shall provide that all investments of the fund shall be of the character legal for insurance companies in California. Such rules and any amendments thereto shall be effective upon approval by the board of supervisors by ordinance.

(g) Not later than the 25th day of August, the board of supervisors shall have power and it shall be its duty, subject to the fiscal provisions of the charter but, without reference or amendment to the annual budget, to amend the annual appropriation ordinance and the annual salary ordinance as necessary to include the provisions for paying the rates of compensation and conditions and benefits other than wages fixed by the board of super-
visor as in this section provided for platform employees and coach or bus operators for the then current fiscal year.

On recommendation of the civil service commission the board of supervisors shall establish a rate of pay for trainee platform men and bus or coach operators at a level reflecting the current labor market but below the basic hourly rate for motorman, conductor and bus operator.

This amendment shall become effective on July 1, 1968.


Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Boas, Casey, Errola, Francols, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “G”

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “G”

Bus and trolley operators and other platform personnel of the Muni Railway have fallen behind most other City employees in their fringe benefits, such as shift differentials, paid holidays and health and welfare. They have also fallen behind in fringe benefits as compared to operators in other large cities with whom their basic wage rate is compared. The result is that the bus and trolley operators’ jobs, recognized as hard and demanding, are not getting their fair terms of employment.

The Municipal Railway renders a vital service to the community, carrying seven hundred thousand riders to work and to play each day. A fair return to the bus and trolley operators is essential to keep this system functioning efficiently. Proposition “G” permits these operators to catch up with other employees in their fringe benefits. Proposition “G” makes no change in the method of fixing wage rates.

Proposition “G” was recommended by the Mayor and approved by the Civil Service Commission. It is recognized as necessary by the management of the Muni Railway.

In the year ending May, 1967, there was an average of 86 vacancies on the Municipal Railway. These vacant jobs had to be covered by other operators working overtime. This cost the City thousands of dollars in overtime pay, and, in many cases, cut the service offered to the public when runs could not be manned. With fair terms of employment more operators will be recruited and fewer will leave.

In the year ending May, 1967, the turnover rate on the Muni Railway was a high 22%. Reducing this to levels which City officials find satisfactory would save the expense of recruiting, testing and training new employees. It costs thousands of dollars for each Civil Service examination. Ten examinations for operators were held since December, 1963 and yet not enough men were recruited. It costs approximately $1,100 to train each new employee. Reducing turnover on the Muni to the level of other City and County departments would save more than $150,000 per year. Proposition “G,” by giving fair terms of employment, will reduce turnover.

The citizens of San Francisco suffer when busses are unmanned and higher operating costs result, which increase the Muni deficit. Increasing
the fringe benefits for operators may well be cheaper in the long run than the increased indirect expenses and reduced services which result from the present unfair situation. Instead of disgruntled employees and labor unrest, there will be satisfied employees and labor peace on the Muni. Proposition "G" is the lawful, peaceful way of ensuring fair compensation for the operators and better service for citizens using the Muni Railway.

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "G".

Sponsored by:
San Francisco Transportation League

Endorsed by:
San Francisco Labor Council
Federation of Public Employees
San Francisco City & County Employees Union, Local 400, AFL-CIO
Civil Service Association
Municipal Improvement League

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Bons, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "G"

Adds Section 151.3.1: Relating to the method and conditions for setting compensation and other benefits of platform employees and coach and bus operators.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application, additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN R. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION H

Amends Section 145.01: Further defines time of war for civil service veteran preference to include period for which campaign or expedition medal is authorized.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 145.01 relating to time of war.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the
charter of said City and County by amending Section 145.01 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

**Time of War**

Section 145.01. In the administration hereafter of the provisions of section 145 of this charter, the terms army, navy or marine corps of the United States shall be deemed to include the army, the air corps, the navy, the marine corps, and the coast guard of the United States, and for the purpose of determining whether any person was mustered into, or served in, the army, the air corps, the navy, the marine corps, or the coast guard of the United States, in time of war, the expression, time of war, shall include the following periods of time:

(a) The period of time from the commencement of a war as shown by any declaration of war of the Congress of the United States, or by any statute or resolution of the Congress a purpose of which is to declare in any manner the existence of a state of war, until the time of termination thereof by any truce, treaty of peace, cessation of hostilities, or otherwise.

(b) The period of time during which the United States is or has been engaged in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared.

(c) The period of time during which the United States is or has been assisting the United Nations or any nation or nations in accordance with existing treaty obligations, in active military operations against any foreign power, whether or not war has been formally declared.

(d) The period of time during which the United States is engaged in a campaign or expedition in which a medal has been authorized by the government of the United States; provided, however, that no person shall be eligible for the benefits provided for veterans in section 145 unless he shall have been eligible to receive such a medal.


Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Roas, Casey, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

**ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “H”**

VOTE “Yes” ON PROPOSITION “H”

This amendment expands the definition of “veteran” to include Vietnam veterans and all servicemen who serve in “cold war” areas for which the United States of America issues a campaign or expedition medal or ribbon.

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet of November 7, 1967, by the following vote:


ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

102
PROPOSITION I

Adds Sections 165.2.2, 165.2.3, 165.2.4 and 172.0.1: Relating to disability benefits, retirement and death allowances of certain employees in the sheriff's office.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding thereto Sections 165.2.2, 165.2.3, 165.2.4, and 172.0.1, relating to disability benefits and retirement and death allowances respecting certain employees of the Sheriff's Office.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding thereto Sections 165.2.2, 165.2.3, 165.2.4, and 172.0.1, reading as follows:

Section 165.2.2 Any member under the provisions of Section 165.2 or Section 165 who is an officer or employee of the Sheriff's Office and whose duties are the duties now performed under the titles of Confidential Secretary (provided that such officer or employee has permanent status in one of the classifications listed hereafter), Assistant Chief Deputy, Chief Deputy, Property Keeper, Deputy Sheriff, Senior Deputy, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Undersheriff, and Sheriff who becomes incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of bodily injury received in, or illness caused by performance of such duties, whether or not performed within the limits of the city and county, shall be retired, and if he is not qualified for service retirement, shall receive a retirement allowance, in lieu of any allowance payable on account of such incapacity under any other section of the Charter or ordinance, equal to seventy-five per cent of the average final compensation of said member, as defined in Section 165.2. Said allowance shall be paid to him until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the position held by him at retirement and after said date the allowances payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than one-half of the average monthly compensation he would have received during the three years immediately prior to said date.

If on the date of retirement under this section he is qualified as to age and service for retirement, he shall receive an allowance equal to the retirement allowance which he would receive if retired for service on said date, but not less than fifty per cent of his average final compensation as defined in Section 165.2. The question of retiring a member under this section may be brought before the retirement board on said board's own motion, by recommendation of the head of his department, or by said member or his guardian. If his disability shall cease, his retirement allowance shall cease, and he shall be restored to the service in the position or classification he occupied at the time of his retirement. "Qualified for service retirement,"
“qualification for service retirement,” “qualified as to age and service for retirement,” as used in the section, shall mean completion of at least ten years of credited service and attainment of the age of sixty years, or attainment of the age of sixty-five years regardless of credited service. Contributions being required of the city and county currently, as percentages of salaries of persons who are members under Section 165.2, shall be increased by an increase in said percentages determined by the actuary as necessary to pay the benefits under this section.

Section 165.2.3. If any member under the provisions of Section 165.2 or Section 165 who is an officer or employee of the Sheriff’s Office and whose duties are the duties now performed under the titles of Confidential Secretary (provided that such officer or employee has permanent status in one of the classifications listed hereafter), Assistant Chief Deputy, Chief Deputy, Property Keeper, Deputy Sheriff, Senior Deputy, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Undersheriff, and Sheriff shall die before or after retirement by reason of any injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of such duties, whether or not performed within the limits of the city and county, a death allowance, in lieu of any allowance or other benefit payable on account of such death before retirement under any other section of the Charter or ordinance, shall be paid beginning on the day next following the date of death to his surviving wife, throughout her life or until her remarriage. If a member, at the time of death, was qualified for service retirement, but had not retired, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance which the member would have received if he had been retired for service on the day of death, but such allowance shall not be less than one-half of his average final compensation as defined in Section 165.2.

If death occurs prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be equal to the compensation of said member at the time of his death, until the date upon which said member would have qualified for service retirement had he lived and rendered service without interruption in the position held by him at death, and after said date the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance said member would have received if retired for service on said date, had he lived and rendered service as assumed, but such allowance shall not be less than one-half of the average monthly compensation he would have received during the three years immediately prior to said date.

If he had retired prior to death for service or for disability resulting from injury received in, or illness caused by the performance of duty, the allowance payable shall be equal to the retirement allowance of the member, except that if retirement was for such disability, and if death occurred prior to qualification for service retirement, the allowance payable shall be reduced upon the date at which said member would have qualified for service retirement in the same manner as it would have been reduced had the member not died.

If there be no surviving wife entitled to an allowance hereunder, or if she die or remarry before every child of such deceased member attains the age of eighteen years, then the allowance which the surviving wife would have received had she lived and not remarried shall be paid to his child or children under said age, collectively, to continue until every such child dies or attains said age, provided that no child shall receive any allowance after marrying or attaining the age of eighteen years. Should said member
leave no surviving wife and no children under the age of eighteen years, but leave a parent or parents dependent upon him for support, the parents so dependent shall collectively receive a monthly allowance equal to that which a surviving widow otherwise would have received, during such dependency. No allowance, however, shall be paid under this section to a surviving wife following the death of a member unless she was married to the member prior to the date of the injury or onset of the illness which results in death.

"Qualified for service retirement," and "qualification for service retirement" as used in this section shall mean completion of at least ten years of credited service and attainment of the age of sixty years, or attainment of the age of sixty-five years regardless of credited service. Contributions being required of the city and county currently, as percentages of salaries of persons who are members under Section 165.2, shall be increased by an increase in said percentages determined by the actuary as necessary to pay the benefits under this section.

Section 165.2.4. That portion of any allowance payable because of the death or retirement of any member under the provisions of Sections 164.2.2 or 165.2.3 which is provided by contributions of the city and county shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under the Workmen's Compensation Insurance and Safety Law of the State of California and because of the injury or illness resulting in said death or retirement. Such portion which is paid because of death or retirement which resulted from injury received in or illness caused by performance of duty shall be considered as in lieu of all benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to or on account of such person under said law of the State of California, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligation of the city and county to pay such benefits.

Section 172.0.1. Whenever any member under the provisions of Section 165.2 or Section 165 who is an officer or employee of the Sheriff's Office and whose duties are the duties now performed under the titles of Confidential Secretary (provided that such officer or employee has permanent status in one of the classifications listed hereafter), Assistant Chief Deputy, Chief Deputy, Property Keeper, Deputy Sheriff, Senior Deputy, Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Undersheriff, and Sheriff is incapacitated for the performance of his duties by reason of any bodily injury received in or illness caused by the performance of his duty, whether or not performed within the limits of the city and county as determined by the retirement board, he shall become entitled, regardless of his period of service with the city and county, to disability benefits equal to and in lieu of his salary, while so disabled, for a period or periods not exceeding twelve months in the aggregate, with respect to any one injury or illness. Said disability benefits shall be reduced in the manner fixed by the board of supervisors by the amount of any benefits, other than medical benefits, payable to such person under the Labor Code concurrently with said disability benefit and because of the injury or illness resulting in said disability. Such disability benefits as are paid in the absence of payments of any benefits, other than medical benefits, under the workmen's compensation laws included in said Labor Code shall be considered as in lieu of such benefits payable to such person under the said Code concurrently with said disability benefits, and shall be in satisfaction and discharge of the obligations of the city and county to pay such benefits under the said
Labor Code. Medical treatment which may become necessary to relieve or
cure said member from the effects of the injury or illness shall be furnished
by the city and county in the same manner that such treatment is furnished
under said Labor Code, but without first requiring continuing awards of
such treatment by the Workmen's Compensation Appeals Board of the
State of California, relating to impairments of permanent or of extended
and uncertain duration.

The provisions of this section shall be administered exclusively by the
retirement board, and the city and county shall pay to the retirement
system during each fiscal year an amount equal to the total disability ben-
efits paid by said system during that year.

A member shall receive credit as service, under the retirement system,
for time during which he is incapacitated for performance of duty and
receives disability benefits as herein provided. Contributions for the retire-
ment system shall be deducted from said benefits in the same manner as
they would be deducted from salary paid to him, and the city and county
shall contribute, in addition to its other contributions provided herein, to
the retirement system on the basis of said benefits in the same manner as
it would contribute on salary paid to said member.

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy,
Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.
I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted
by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.
ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “I”

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “I” to protect widows and orphans of Dep-
uty Sheriffs (full-time employees) who are killed in performance of their
sworn duty.

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “I” to provide disability allowances to Dep-
uty Sheriffs (full-time employees) who become fully disabled in perform-
ance of their duties, in accordance with program voted years ago and still
in practice under our Charter for Police Officers.

Deputy Sheriffs are peace officers required to bear arms and perform
a hazardous duty. San Francisco Deputy Sheriffs handle more than 10,000
prisoners every year, with more than 3,000 of them felony prisoners.

Deputy Sheriffs handle thousands of civil processes and criminal com-
mitments each year and often expose themselves to serious assault and the
possibility of sudden death. One Deputy has been shot three times in per-
formance of his duty. They have only limited protection under our existing
law. These Deputies should have the basic protection already provided by
our citizens for Police Officers.

A “Yes” on Proposition “I” provides no increase in service retirement
benefits for employees.

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “I”. Provides only protection of widows
and orphans for death in line of duty and disability in line of duty—of full-
time Sheriff's Deputies.
Sponsored by:
Deputy Sheriffs’ Association, Inc. of San Francisco

Endorsed by:
Matthew C. Carberry, Sheriff
Civil Service Association
Building and Construction Trades Council
Teamsters’ Joint Council, No. 7
Warehouse Union, Local 860
Federation of Public Employees
S. F. City & County Employees Union, Local 400, AFL-CIO
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 6
S. F. Joint ILWU Legislative Council
Municipal Post No. 429, American Legion
Hotel Employers Association of San Francisco
Plumbers & Steamfitters Local Union #38
Municipal Improvement League

On September 10, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet of November 7, 1967, by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertula, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER’S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183

PROPOSITION “I”

Adds Sections 165.2.2, 165.2.3, 165.2.4 and 172.0.1: Relating to disability benefits, retirement and death allowances of certain employees in the sheriff’s office.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, based on an actuarial report submitted by the Employees’ Retirement System, it is estimated that the annual increase in the cost of government would be approximately $82,000. Based on the 1967-1968 assessment roll, this estimated annual increase is equivalent to twenty-four hundredths (0.24) of one cent in the tax rate.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION J

Amends Sections 115, 116 and 117.2 and adds Section 115.1: Relating to the duties and responsibilities of the planning department, its director and employees, authorizes exempt appointment of certain employees.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 115, adding Section 115.1 thereto, and amending Sections 116 and 117.2 thereof relating to the organization of the Department of City Planning, the Director of Planning, the Master Plan and the Zoning Administrator.
The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 115 thereof, adding Section 115.1 thereto, and amending Sections 116 and 117.2 thereof, so that the same shall read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

CITY PLANNING

((City Planning Department Established))

Department of City Planning

Section 115. There is hereby established a department of city planning which shall consist of a city planning commission, a director of planning and such employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions and duties of said department. The city planning commission shall consist of seven members, five of whom shall be appointed by the mayor. The chief administrative officer and the manager of utilities, or their designated deputies, shall be members ex officio.

TERMS OF MEMBERS

The terms of appointive members of the commission shall expire one each at twelve o'clock noon on the 15th day of January in the years 1949, 1950, and 1951, and two at said time in the year 1948. Thereafter, the term of each appointee member shall be four years. ((Present appointees shall continue in office without change of incumbency for the existing terms thereof.)) The mayor shall fill all vacancies in office of appointive members of the commission occurring either during or at the expiration of terms.

((PRESENT COMMISSION CONTINUED))

((Neither the foregoing provision for addition of members to the commission, nor the addition thereof, nor any change herein provided in the powers and duties of the commission shall be deemed to affect the continuity of the existence of the commission as such or the status of any matter pending before it. All recorded actions of the commission shall remain in force and effect unless and until changed by ordinance or by other legal means.))

COMPENSATION

Ex officio members of the commission shall serve as such without compensation. The compensation of appointive members of said commission shall be fifteen dollars ($15) for each meeting of the commission actually attended by said members, provided that the aggregate amount paid all the members shall not exceed five thousand dollars ($5,000) per year.

DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

Section 115.1. The city planning commission shall appoint a director of planning who shall hold office at its pleasure and who shall be a person of adequate technical training and administrative experience in city planning. The director of planning shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of city planning. The position of director of planning shall not be subject to any provisions of this charter prescribing a residence qualification for officers or appointees, provided, however, that during his incumbency the appointee to the position shall reside in the city and county. The commission may also appoint a secretary, which appoint-
ment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. Subject to the provisions of section 86 of this charter, the commission may also contract with architects, city planners, engineers, or other consultants for such services as it may require.

Subject to the approval of the commission, the director of planning shall have power to appoint an assistant director of planning, an administrative assistant, a professional planner above the level of senior planner, and a zoning administrator, and to remove such appointees; provided, however, that any person who has performed the duties of assistant director of planning continuously for one year prior to the date of approval of this amendment by the electorate and who on said date shall be performing said duties, shall continue in said position and shall continue to hold the same pursuant to all civil service provisions of this charter. All such appointees of the director of planning shall have adequate professional qualifications, and all such appointive positions shall be subject to classification by the civil service commission in accordance with the duties and responsibilities assigned by the director of planning.

Section 116. (The planning commission shall appoint a director of planning who shall hold office at its pleasure and who shall be a person of adequate technical training and administrative experience in city planning. The director of planning shall be the administrative head and appointing officer of the department of city planning. The position of director of planning shall not be subject to any provisions of this charter prescribing a residence qualification for officers or appointees, provided, however, that during his incumbency the appointee to the position shall reside in the city and county. The commission may also appoint a secretary, which appointment shall not be subject to the civil service provisions of this charter. Subject to the provision of section 86 of this charter, the commission may also contract with architects, city planners, engineers, or other consultants for such services as it may require.)

THE MASTER PLAN

It shall be the function and duty of the commission to adopt and maintain, including necessary changes therein, a comprehensive, long-term, general plan for the improvement and future development of the city and county, to be known as the master plan. The master plan shall include maps, plans, charts, exhibits, and descriptive, interpretive, and analytical matter, based on physical, social, economic, and financial data, which together present a broad and general guide and pattern constituting the recommendations of the commission for the coordinated and harmonious development, in accordance with present and future needs, of the city and county and of any land outside the boundaries thereof which in the opinion of the commission bears a relation thereto.

SCOPE OF THE MASTER PLAN

The master plan shall show the general location, character, and extent of existing and proposed street railway, bus, railroad, air, water, and other transportation routes and terminals, public ways, grounds, and open spaces, and the general location of major buildings, structures, and facilities constructed thereon or proposed, and shall include a land-use plan showing the proposed general distribution and the general location and extent of housing, business, industry, recreation, education, and other categories of public and private uses of land, and recommended standards of population
density and building intensity, with estimates of population growth and a
general description of the amount and general classes of industrial, business
and other economic activities for which the commission deems that space
should be supplied within the territory covered by the plan, all correlated
with the land-use plan. It shall include proposals for the acquisition, exten-
sion, widening, narrowing, removal, relocation, vacation, abandonment, sale,
or change in the use of any of the foregoing public ways, routes, grounds,
open spaces, buildings, or structures.

PREPARATION OF THE MASTER PLAN

In the preparation of the master plan or any amendment thereto, the
department of city planning is authorized to make or cause to be made
such investigations, studies, maps, charts, exhibits, and reports as it may
decem to be required.

PROCEDURE FOR AMENDMENT

The master plan may be amended to include at any time modifications
and extensions thereof. Before the commission may adopt any substantial
extensions of the master plan adopted prior to the passage of this amend-
ment or any substantial amendment or addition thereto which in the
judgment of the commission constitutes a major alteration in the plan, it
shall hold at least one public hearing thereon, notice of the time and place
of which shall be given by at least one publication in the official newspaper
of the city and county not less than twenty days before the day of hearing.
Adoption of the master plan or portions thereof or amendments, extension
or additions thereto shall be by resolution carried by the affirmative votes
of not less than a majority of all the members of the commission. Such
resolutions shall refer expressly to the reports, plans, or descriptive and
other matter intended to form the whole or part of the plan, and the action
taken shall be recorded on such documents and an attested copy thereof
shall be certified to the mayor and the board of supervisors.

ADDITIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

The department of city planning may make such reports and
recommendations to the mayor, the board of supervisors, and other officers
and agencies as it may deem necessary to secure understanding and a sys-
tematic effectuation of the recommendations of the master plan. The
department shall have the power to promote public interest in and under-
standing of the master plan and may publish and distribute copies of the
plan or any portion thereof or of any report and may employ such other
means of publicity and education as it may deem to be in the public interest.

The department shall act in an advisory capacity to the board of
supervisors and other departments, commissions and agencies of the city
and county in any matter affecting the physical improvement and develop-
ment of the city and county. All public officials shall upon request furnish
to the department of city planning such information as it may require for
its work and the department of city planning shall furnish to all depart-
ments and officials of the city and county such information as said
departments and officials may require concerning the master plan. In gen-
eral, the department shall have such powers as may be necessary to enable
it to fulfill its functions.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The department of city planning shall be governed by the provisions
of section 69.1 of this charter pertaining to capital improvement projects.
Zoning Administration

Section 117.2 There shall be in the department of city planning a zoning administrator (appointed subject to the civil service provisions of this charter) who shall administer and enforce the zoning and set-back ordinances (and) all other portions of the city planning code except as otherwise provided by ordinance. He shall receive and investigate all applications for proposed amendments thcreto and shall submit his ((report and)) recommendations thereon to the director of planning prior to the hearing by the commission thereon. The director of planning may designate any officer or employee of the department to carry out any function of the zoning administrator in cases where, due to absence, incapacity, conflict of interest or other sufficient reason, action by the zoning administrator would be infeasible or inappropriate.

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Boas, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.
Noes: Supervisors Blake, Ertola, O'Shea.

I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “J”

The basic purpose of Proposition “J” is to give the Director and Planning Commission flexibility to assemble the key people in a top-notch staff to carry out the dynamic planning program the City needs for its future physical development. Proposition “J” would fully protect the permanent civil service status of existing employees.

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “J”

Because — this proposal would involve absolutely no added cost to the taxpayers, no additional personnel on the City payroll, and no pay increase to any City personnel.

Because — at this critical time in San Francisco’s history, the City needs a dynamic planning program, and this means the Director should have the flexibility to select a top-level policy team sharing his own goals and dedication.

Because — the Planning Department’s tasks are unique in City government. The work of most City departments is clearly defined, with rigid rules controlling their operations. By contrast, very few of the Planning Department’s tasks are routine in nature. It reviews and coordinates all activities that affect the future physical development of the city; and it must aggressively lead in resolving an extraordinary variety of City problems.

Because — the key top staff members in the Planning Department must have a combination of skills not easily measurable by the civil service process. Above all, they require the intangible qualities of creativity, imagination, and initiative. The more of these qualities city planners have, the more chance they have of shaping San Francisco into a better place to live while retaining its present beauty.

Because — limited power of appointment already resides with certain other chief executives of City departments.
Because — qualified high-level city planners are in exceedingly short supply throughout the United States. If San Francisco cannot act quickly to offer appointments to these top planners, they will go elsewhere and the City will be the loser. Nationally, the trend in large cities is toward a more flexible personnel team. San Francisco is in a competitive situation and we simply must compete in today’s market.

Because — the top personnel team, like the Director himself, would be subject to approval by the Planning Commission, which is itself responsible directly to the Mayor and ultimately to the citizens of San Francisco.

Because — this proposal would allow for early promotion of exceptional employees to top-level positions. This would increase incentive. Proposition “J” recognizes that there are times when flexibility is needed in the interests of the City and its future. The highest personnel standards would be maintained, since appointees of the Director would have to be professionally qualified.

Vote Yes on Proposition “J”

The City Planning Commission has proposed this Charter amendment so that it can more effectively carry out the program for which it is responsible to you, the citizens of San Francisco.

Sponsored by:
Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning

Endorsed by:
SPUR (San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association)
San Francisco Examiner
San Francisco Committee to Reform the Assessment of Private Property
San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet of November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisors Ertola, O’Shea.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION J

Vote No on Proposition J

Voters of San Francisco, reject this proposition! It is unsound legislation, piecemeal in character, and contrary to the best interests of the San Francisco Career Civil Service System.

San Francisco has good reason to be proud of its Civil Service System, judged by many to be one of the finest in the United States. Efforts to break down the system have been vigorously resisted — by the Civil Service Commission, by the Board of Supervisors, and, most importantly, by the people of San Francisco.

Proposition J is another such effort to weaken the City’s Merit System. Certainly, if the Director of Planning were empowered to appoint four persons to positions outside the controls and regulations of Civil Service, every city department head will promptly move to acquire the same power. The first serious disruption of Civil Service would be achieved!
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Proposition J promises to be a costly proposition to the taxpayers. City planners are a highly mobile and transient group. Wherever the most attractive positions lie, the transient city planner will gravitate to it. When our current Director of Planning pulls up stakes for a more lucrative position, as our Chief Librarian just did, and the Director takes his appointive staff with him, who’s left holding the bag? The people of San Francisco!

Proposition J defeats the career promotional system. It closes the door on open competition on the basis of merit and fitness. It threatens the continuity of operations and administration made possible by protected Civil Service. It is precisely for this reason the Civil Service Commission Staff opposes this proposition.

But its greatest sin lies in the invitation it offers to progressive weakening of the Civil Service System by setting a precedent for the removal of still other city positions from the Merit System.

We urge the voters of San Francisco to defeat this costly proposition. Vote “No” on Proposition “J” in order to protect a Civil Service System designed solely by and for the people of San Francisco.

Vote “No” on Proposition “J”

This argument is sponsored by the Civil Service Association of San Francisco, Granville DeMerritt, Executive Secretary.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “J”

Vote “No” on Proposition “J”

Proposition J is a direct attack on our city and county civil service system and an open invitation to return to the repugnant and often corrupt “spoils system.” It would allow the City Planning Director to fill four top positions outside the civil service structure. These four persons would be responsible to the Director alone.

Proposition J is another effort to drive a wedge into the city’s merit system. Qualified professionals in the City Planning Department would not be allowed to compete in fair, impartial competitive examinations which are now open to them. This is the reason the staff of the San Francisco Civil Service Commission urged rejection of this proposition and that the four positions be filled on the basis of examination and maintained under the merit system.

Proposition J defeats the career concept in public service and closes the door on open competition on the basis of merit and qualifications. It threatens the continuity of the operation and administration that is made possible by protected civil service, but its greatest sin lies in the invitation it offers to progressive weakening of the civil service system by setting a precedent for the removal of still other positions from the merit system.

We urge the voters of San Francisco to join with us in actively opposing this measure and in vigorously defending the merit system from attack.

Vote “No” on Proposition “J”

This argument is sponsored by the Municipal Improvement League. KENNETH A. FINIS, President.

A No vote on Proposition J is recommended by George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO.
PROPOSITION K

Amends Section 61: Relating to authority of the Director of Public Health to make exempt appointment of Administrator of San Francisco General Hospital.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 61 relating to appointment of the Director of Public Health of an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the Charter of said city and county by amending Section 61 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

Administrative Departments Under Chief Administrative Officer

Section 61. From and after twelve o’clock noon on the 8th day of January, 1932, the functions, activities and affairs of the city and county that are hereby placed under the direction of the chief administrative officer by the provisions of this charter, and the powers and duties of officers and employees charged with specific jurisdiction thereof, shall, subject to the provisions of section 2 and section 20 of this charter, be allocated by the chief administrative officer, among the following departments:

Department of Finance and Records, which shall include the functions and personnel of the offices of tax collector, registrar of voters, recorder, county clerk and public administrator, and shall be administered by a director of finance and records who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and hold office at his pleasure. The public administrator shall appoint and at his pleasure may remove an attorney. He may also appoint such assistant attorneys as may be provided by the budget and annual appropriation ordinance.

Purchasing Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the bureau of supplies, the operation of central stores and warehouses, and the operation of central garages and shops, and shall be administered by the purchaser of supplies who shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office at his pleasure.

Real Estate Department, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of the right-of-way agent as established in the bureau of engineering at the time this charter shall go into effect, and also the control, management and leasing of the exposition auditorium.

Department of Public Works, which shall include the functions and personnel of the department of public works, as established at the time this charter shall go into effect, with the exception of functions and personnel which are established by this charter under the management, direction and control of the public utilities commission, and which department shall
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also include the functions and personnel of the telephone exchange. This
department shall be administered by the director of public works, who
shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office
at his pleasure.

Department of Electricity, which shall include the functions and per-
sonnel of the department of electricity as established at the time this
charter shall go into effect. The department shall be administered by a chief
of department who shall, from and after twelve o'clock noon on the 8th
day of January 1932 have the powers and duties of the joint board of fire
and police commissioners composing the joint commission in charge of the
department of electricity, at which time the joint commission shall be
abolished.

The premises of any person, firm or corporation may, for the purpose
of police or fire protection, be connected with the police or fire signal or
telephone system of the city and county upon paying a fair compensation
for such connection and the use of the same, provided that any such con-
nection shall require the approval of the chief of the department of elec-
tricity and shall not in any way overload or interfere with the proper and
efficient operation of the circuit to which it is connected. The conditions
upon which such connection shall be made and the compensation to be
paid therefor shall be fixed by the board of supervisors by ordinance upon
the recommendation of the chief of the department.

Department of Public Health, which shall include the functions, institu-
tions and personnel of the department of public health as existing at the
time this charter shall go into effect. Said department shall be adminis-
tered by a director of health, who shall be a regularly licensed physician
or surgeon in the State of California, with not less than ten years' prac-
tice in his profession immediately preceding his appointment thereto. He
shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer and shall hold office
at his pleasure, provided that the incumbent health officer at the time
this charter shall go into effect shall be deemed appointed to such office.
The director of public health shall have and continue the powers and duties
of the health officer and the board of health, from and after twelve o'clock
noon on the 8th day of January 1932 at which time the terms of members
of said board shall terminate, and such board as theretofore existing shall
be abolished.

The chief administrative officer shall have power to appoint and to
remove an assistant director of public health for hospital services, who
shall be responsible for the administrative and business management of
the institutions of the department of public health, including, but not lim-
ited to, the San Francisco General Hospital, Laguna Honda Home, Hassler
Health Home, and the Emergency Hospital Service, and who shall be ex-
empt from the civil service provisions of the charter. The position of assis-
tant director of public health for hospital services shall be held only by a
person who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and
experience necessary to manage the institutions of the department of pub-
lic health.

The director of public health shall have power to appoint and remove
an administrator of San Francisco General Hospital, who shall be exempt
from the civil service provisions of the charter, provided that the person
who has performed the duties of administrator continuously for one year
immediately prior to the effective date of this amendment and who on
said date shall be performing said duties shall be deemed appointed to
such position and shall not be subject to removal except for cause under
the procedures set forth in section 154 of the charter. The position of administrator shall be held only by a physician or hospital administrator who possesses the educational and administrative qualifications and experience necessary to manage the San Francisco General Hospital.

Health Advisory Board. There is hereby created a health advisory board of seven members, three of whom shall be physicians and one a dentist, all regularly certificated. Members of the board shall serve without compensation. They shall be appointed by the chief administrative officer for terms of four years; provided, however, that those first appointed shall classify themselves by lot so that the terms of one physician and one lay member shall expire in 1933, 1934 and 1935, respectively, and the term of one member in 1936.

Such board shall consider and report on problems and matters under the jurisdiction of the department of public health and shall consult, advise with and make recommendations to the director of health relative to the functions and affairs of the department. The recommendations of such board shall be made in writing to the director of health and to the chief administrative officer.

Coroner's Office, which shall include the functions and personnel of the existing office of coroner as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.

County Agricultural Department, which shall be administered by a county agricultural commissioner and shall include functions established by state law and those assigned to it by or in accordance with provisions of this charter.

Department of Weights and Measures, which shall include the functions and personnel of the office of sealer of weights and measures as established at the time this charter shall go into effect.


I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "K"

Proposition "K" will not cost the taxpayers one single penny. The present Administrator of San Francisco General Hospital must retire May 1, 1968, when he reaches the age of 65. This Charter amendment will allow the Director of Public Health to appoint the new Administrator rather than have the new Administrator chosen by Civil Service examination.

Vote Yes on Proposition "K"

San Francisco General Hospital is one of the most complex county hospitals in California. Day in and day out, the San Francisco General Hospital takes thousands of cases that other hospitals are either unwilling or unable to handle. These 175,000 cases per year include accident victims and victims of violence. It includes cases of tuberculosis and contagious disease. It includes psychiatric cases—a vastly increased category since the days when this hospital was built. It includes alcoholics. It includes those who can't afford private medical care. In addition, the hospital has a comprehensive teaching program in cooperation with the University of California Medical Center.
Vote Yes on Proposition “K”

It will be difficult to find a qualified and experienced hospital administrator to accept the position of Administrator of San Francisco General Hospital because of the very large and complex responsibilities. It would be even more difficult to attract qualified applicants for the position if they must take long written examinations in our Civil Service procedure. Also, under Civil Service, there is a six-month probationary period. At the end of this time a person can either be given a permanent appointment or dismissed. Six months is definitely too short a time to judge a person in this kind of job.

Vote Yes on Proposition “K”

Many other positions in San Francisco’s City and County government are also appointive. Some of these positions have much less responsibility than the Administrator of San Francisco General Hospital. Practically every other city government has a number of appointive positions. Making this one position appointive does not threaten the civil service merit system.

Vote Yes on Proposition “K”

Many steps are being taken to improve San Francisco General Hospital. A new $33,670,000 hospital has been approved by the voters, and planning for the new hospital is underway. The Medicare and Medi-Cal programs require many changes in the way health care is provided at San Francisco General Hospital. It is necessary to attract the best qualified administrator possible, and this Charter amendment will help us to get the best person for this very important and demanding job.

Sponsored by:
Thomas J. Mellon, Chief Administrative Officer

Endorsed by:
San Francisco Health Advisory Board
San Francisco Mental Health Advisory Board
William E. Dauer, Executive Vice-President, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet of November 7, 1967, by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Roas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “K”

Vote “No” on Proposition “K”

Proposition “K”, like Proposition “J”, is another serious attack on the city’s career Civil Service System.

In 1960 the voters approved Proposition “E”, authorizing the Chief Administrative Officer to appoint an Assistant Director of Public Health for Hospital Service exempt from Civil Service. The results were disastrous. The country was searched for an appointee. One was found in Louisiana — he was appointed and fired within a year! The taxpayers paid handsomely for this blunder.

Since that time the taxpayers have continued to pay handsomely. The starting salary of this job in 1961 was $1337 per month. Today the salary is $2321 per month!
And now Proposition "K"! Are we inviting the same blunder as we did in 1960? Apparently so. But proponents of this proposition say, "Making this one position appointive does not threaten the Civil Service Merit System." This has a familiar ring — the ring of 1960, when the same argument was stated on behalf of Proposition "E".

Voters of San Francisco, protect your interest in the Civil Service Merit System. Don't give up your legacy — appointment to public positions by merit and fitness as determined by our competent Civil Service System. Keep this job out of politics. Our General Hospital deserves the best administrator, and the best is obtained only through our Civil Service Merit System.

Vote "No" on Proposition "K"

This argument is sponsored by the Civil Service Association of San Francisco, Granville M. DeMerritt, Executive Secretary.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "K"

Vote "No" on Proposition "K"

Proposition K is a direct attack on our city and county civil service system and an open invitation to return to the repugnant and often corrupt "spoils system."

We in San Francisco have good reason to be proud of our civil service system, judged by many to be one of the finest in the country. One of the important reasons for its strength is that efforts to break it down by bits-and-pieces legislation have been vigorously resisted — by the Civil Service Commission, by the Board of Supervisors, and by the people of San Francisco.

Proposition K is another such effort to drive a wedge into the city's merit system. The Administrator of the San Francisco General Hospital was appointed to his position through competitive civil service examination. He is about to retire. It is proposed to exempt his successor from the civil service provisions of the charter and allow the Director of Public Health to make an appointment.

This is only one of a series of similar efforts to remove promotional and entrance top jobs from qualified contestants under the civil service system.

Proposition K defeats the career concept in public service. It closes the door on open competition based on merit and qualifications. It threatens the continuity of the operation and administration that is made possible by protected civil service, but its greatest sin lies in the invitation it offers to progressively weaken the civil service system by setting a precedent in the removal of still another city position from the merit system and allowing the use of patronage power in the gaining of political influence in the city and county.

We urge the voters of San Francisco to join with us in actively opposing this measure and in vigorously defending the merit system from within.

Vote "No" on Proposition "K"

This argument is sponsored by the Municipal Improvement League.

KENNETH A. FINIS, President

A No vote on Proposition K is recommended by George W. Johns, Secretary-Treasurer of the San Francisco Labor Council, AFL-CIO.
PROPOSITION L

Adopts Section 101.1: Relating to the incurring of a municipal indebtedness for the purpose of providing funds to furnish loans for rehabilitation of private residential property.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding thereto Section 101.1 relating to the incurring of municipal indebtedness for the purpose of establishing a revolving fund to furnish loans for the rehabilitation of private residential property in San Francisco.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by adding thereto Section 101.1 reading as follows:

Section 101.1. Whenever the Board of Supervisors by resolution adopted by two-thirds vote of all its members determines that it is in the public interest to make loans or cause loans to be made to owners of residential property in the City and County of San Francisco to finance rehabilitation required to make the property conform to applicable code requirements and that the establishment of a fund for such purpose will require the incurring of a bonded debt, the Board at any subsequent meeting may by a two-thirds vote of all its members pass an ordinance calling an election and ordering submission to the qualified electors of the city and county the proposition of incurring a bonded indebtedness for the said purpose. Such election shall be called and held in the same manner as other bond elections of the city and county. If the proposition receives the assent of two-thirds of the qualified electors voting in favor thereof, the bonded indebtedness may then be incurred for said purpose in accordance with the procedures set forth in the general laws of the State of California authorizing the incurring of bonded indebtedness by cities.

The term “rehabilitation” as used in this section means the repair or improvement of a structure or facilities in connection with a structure and shall include the provision of such sanitary or other facilities as are required by applicable codes to be provided by the owner of the property.


Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrisson, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

Noes: Supervisor Blake.

I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "I."

Vote "Yes" on "I"—It's Tax Free!

This measure is not a bond issue. It is a Charter amendment which will make it possible in the future—with further approval by the voters—to obtain funds through the issuance of bonds so that low interest loans can be made to home owners for the purpose of physically rehabilitating residential property up to the modern structural and sanitary standards now required by our amended code provisions.

The loans to property owners will be repaid and the funds will be made available on a continuing basis for property rehabilitation, and the program will be self-supporting.

It is contemplated that loans will be repaid promptly and that any bonds issued will be retired at maturity without any expenditure of taxpayers' money. The program will have the benefits of careful management, keeping in mind the future needs of our people as well as the present.

A prudent reserve may be accumulated through payments made in excess of costs.

Without this type of program, many people, through no fault of their own, will not be able to maintain their homes properly during critical periods of their lives, and the low interest loans will render assistance which is far superior to actual cash grants and yet will not add to the taxpayers' burden. These loans will supplement, not compete with, loans from other sources, since those eligible for them would otherwise be financially unable to obtain funds from the normal sources.

The city will benefit private enterprise in the operation of this residential property rehabilitation loan program—private investors will provide the money through the purchase of City and County bonds; labor and materials for the rehabilitation will be furnished by the building trades and building materials industry; and the entire economy of San Francisco will experience the beneficial impact of a resurgence in physical rehabilitation of property. The city provides management only, which will be paid for by those who participate in the program.

This is a worthwhile self-supporting program for thousands of San Francisco residential property owners which will be beneficial for every citizen of San Francisco.

Endorsed by: San Francisco Committee to Reform the Assessment of Private Property.

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

120
PROPOSITION M

Adds Section 36.10: Establishes procedure for advisory arbitration of disputes on work schedules or working conditions between Fire Commission and representatives of members of department.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said city and county by adding Section 36.10 thereto, establishing a procedure for arbitration of disputes between the Fire Commission and the Arbitration and Grievance Committee of Employees.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by adding Section 36.10 thereto, so that the same shall read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by (double parentheses).

Section 36.10. In the event of a dispute or grievance over work schedules or working conditions within the power of the fire commission to grant or establish, which is not resolved by discussions in good faith between the fire commission and the arbitration and grievance committee of the employees, hereinafter referred to as the parties, either party may submit the dispute to an arbitration board composed of a member of the fire commission, a representative designated by the arbitration and grievance committee of the employees and a third member to be appointed by the mayor after consultation with both parties. If the parties cannot agree on the third member, the mayor shall request the conciliation service of the department of industrial relations of the State of California to submit the names of five (5) arbitrators. Each of the parties shall eliminate two (2) names from the list to determine the person who is to serve. Upon submission of the dispute to the arbitration board, the board shall hold a hearing or hearings concerning the dispute and the findings of the majority of the members of the board in such arbitration shall be advisory only. The expenses of the third member shall be borne equally by the parties. Each party shall bear the expense of its own presentation. Procedures for designation of the membership of the arbitration and grievance committee of the employees shall be set forth in an ordinance of the board of supervisors.


Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "M"

Vote "Yes" on Proposition "M"

Public employees without the right to strike are entitled to "alternative" procedures for settling disputes, U. S. Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz told the State, County and Municipal Employees convention. He said it is unfair and absurd not to establish alternative procedures such as fact-finding, mediation and arbitration when the employees have no other recourse for settling grievances.

The Secretary, addressing the convention just a few blocks away from his office in Washington, said that a public employee union's participation in the administration of the employment relationship should be "to at least as full an extent as has developed under private collective bargaining, including full provision for independent arbitration of unresolved differences . . ."

San Francisco Fire Fighters should have all of the rights as stated by Secretary W. Willard Wirtz.

This argument is sponsored by:
San Francisco Fire Fighters Local 798.

FRANK I. MINAHAN, President
ROBERT F. CALLAHAN, Secretary

Endorsed by: San Francisco Fire Commission, Municipal Improvement League, San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce.

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the foregoing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet for November 7, 1967, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183
PROPOSITION "M"

Adds Section 36.10: Establishes procedure for advisory arbitration of disputes on work schedules or working conditions between Fire Commission and representatives of members of department.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, create any additional costs but as a product of its future application additional costs may be created that are not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller
City and County of San Francisco
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PROPOSITION N

Amends Section 24: Repeals prohibition against imposition of license tax upon any seller or manufacturer of goods, wares or merchandise operating at a fixed place of business in San Francisco.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of the said city and county by amending Section 24 thereof relating to license tax.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said city and county at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the charter of said city and county by amending Section 24 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

Permits and Inspections

Section 24. The board of supervisors shall regulate, by ordinance, the issuance and revocation of licenses and permits for the use of, obstruction of, or encroachment on public streets and places, exclusive of the granting of franchises governed by other provisions of this charter; and for the operation of businesses or privileges which affect the health, fire prevention, fire fighting, crime, policing, welfare or zoning conditions of or in the city and county, and for such other matters as the board of supervisors may deem advisable.

Such ordinance shall fix the fees or licenses to be charged, which shall not be less than the cost to the city and county of regulation and inspection; provided, that insofar as the regulation and inspection of food-stuffs or articles of food for human consumption are concerned, the fees or licenses to be charged for such regulation and inspection shall be as determined by the board of supervisors, but the same shall not exceed the cost of said regulation and inspection. Said ordinance shall also specify which department shall make the necessary investigations and inspections and issue or deny and may revoke the permits and licenses therefor.

The chief of police in the performance of police duties shall have power to examine at any time the books and premises of pawn-brokers, peddlers, junk and second-hand dealers, auctioneers and other businesses designated by the board of supervisors, and the tax collector shall have power to examine the books of any business for which a license is issued and a fee charged on the basis of the receipt of such business, and for these purposes such officials shall have the power of inquiry, investigation and subpoena, as provided by this charter.

Permits and licenses shall be issued by the departments as designated by ordinance, only after formal application for such permit or license. No such permit or license that is dependent on or affected by the zoning,
set-back or other ordinances of the city and county administered by the
city planning commission shall be issued except on the prior approval of
the city planning commission. If any application for a permit or license is
denied by the department authorized to issue same, the applicant may
appeal to the board of permit appeals.

(No license tax shall be imposed on any seller or manufacturer of
goods, wares or merchandise operating at a fixed place of business in the
city and county, except such as require permits or licenses in accordance
with or under authority of any local health, sanitary or other ordinance
under the police power.)

Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy,
Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify that the Charter amendment was ordered submitted
by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “N”

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “N”

At the present time the Charter prevents the Board of Supervisors from
imposing a license tax upon any seller or manufacturer of goods, wares or
merchandise operating at a fixed place of business.

This restriction on the action of your elected representatives grants
preferential treatment to a small segment of the business community to the
detriment of other industries.

In light of the increase in taxes which each property owner will be
forced to pay it is imperative that every action be taken to broaden the tax
base for the purpose of assuring additional revenue so as to keep any addi-
tional tax increase to a minimum.

The present language was written into the Charter in 1932 and, while
it was necessary at that time, is now obsolete and prevents the establish-
ment of a program whereby all businesses and industries will contribute on an
equitable basis to the payment of the cost of government, and to afford the
property owners relief from their heavy tax burden.

Endorsed by: San Francisco Committee to Reform the Assessment of
Private Property. San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce.

On September 18, 1967, the Board of Supervisors authorized the forego-
ing argument for inclusion in the election pamphlet of November 7, 1967,
by the following vote:
Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy,
Morrison, O’Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION “N”

Vote “No” on “N”

More Taxes—Higher Prices for You

Proposition “N” would allow the free-spending Board of Supervisors
to tax manufacturers and sellers. This tax will be passed on to you—the
consumer—in higher prices. “NO” on “N”.
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Beware of new and unknown taxes which could drive business and industry from the city and keep new firms from locating here. "No" on "N". We need more job opportunities in San Francisco, not fewer jobs. "No" on "N".

Los Angeles has a license tax on almost 200 businesses and occupations—the ordinance covers more than 75 pages. Don't let the supervisors put this tax burden on you. "NO" on "N".

The charter has wisely prohibited these taxes for over 30 years—don't give the supervisors authority to add new taxes now. What we need is economy in spending. "NO" on "N".

RUSSELL D. KEIL, Chairman, Citizens Committee for Fair Taxation.

CONTROLLER'S STATEMENT PURSUANT TO CHARTER SECTION 183 PROPOSITION "N"

Amends Section 24: Repeals prohibition against imposition of license tax upon any seller or manufacturer of goods, wares or merchandise operating at a fixed place of business in San Francisco.

Should the proposed charter amendment be adopted, it is my opinion that it would not, of itself, affect the cost of government but as a product of its future application, the annual requirement for taxes may be decreased which is not determinable at this time.

NATHAN B. COOPER, Controller City and County of San Francisco

PROPOSITION 0

RESOLUTION CALLING SPECIAL ELECTION

FILE NO. 367-67-1 RESOLUTION NO. 599-67

CALLING AND PROVIDING FOR A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ON TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1967, FOR THE PURPOSE OF SUBMITTING TO THE VOTERS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO A PROPOSAL PRESENTED THROUGH INITIATIVE PETITION TO AMEND CHARTER SECTION 78 RELATING TO THE TAX LEVY.

WHEREAS, On September 11, 1967, there was filed with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, an initiative petition to amend Section 78 of the Charter relative to the tax levy; and

WHEREAS, Said petition was referred to the Registrar of Voters for verification of signatures and certification, and he has certified that said petition was signed by 42,907 qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco, which number is in excess of that required by law for submission to the electorate of said petition to amend the Charter as aforesaid; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, A special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City and County of San Francisco on Tuesday, the 7th day of November, 1967, for the purpose of submitting to the electors of said city and county a proposal to amend Section 78 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco as set forth in the aforesaid initiative petition.
The special election hereby called and ordered to be held shall be held and conducted and the votes thereat received and canvassed, and the returns thereof made and the result thereof ascertained, determined and declared as herein provided and in all particulars not herein recited said election shall be held according to the laws of the State of California providing for and governing elections in the City and County of San Francisco, and the polls for such election shall be and remain open during the time required by said laws.

The said special election hereby called shall be and hereby is consolidated with the General Municipal Election to be held Tuesday, November 7, 1967, and the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for said General Municipal Election be and the same are hereby adopted, established, designated and named, respectively, as the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election for such special election hereby called, and as specifically set forth in the official publication, by the Registrar of Voters of precincts, polling places and election officers for the said General Municipal Election.

The ballots to be used at said special election shall be the ballots to be used at said General Municipal Election and reference is hereby made to the notice of election setting forth the voting precincts, polling places and officers of election by the Registrar of Voters for the General Municipal Election to be published in the San Francisco Examiner on or about October 16, 1967.

On the ballots to be used at such special election and on the voting machines used at said special election, in addition to any other matter required by law to be printed thereon, shall appear thereon the following:

"Amends Section 78 relating to the tax levy; provides new limitation on property taxes; eliminates many present exceptions; provides that sales tax revenue be first used for bonded debt service."

To vote for any proposition where ballots are used, stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word "Yes." To vote against any proposition, stamp a cross (x) in the blank space to the right of the word "No."

Where voting machines are used at said special election said voting machines shall be so arranged that any qualified elector may vote for any proposition by pulling down a lever over the word "Yes" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, and said act shall constitute a vote for the proposition, and by pulling down a lever over the word "No" under or near a statement of the proposed proposition appearing on cardboard paper or other material placed on the front of the machine, shall constitute a vote against the proposition. Said voting machines and the preparation of the same shall comply in all respects with the provisions of law.


Ayes: Supervisors Beeman, Blake, Boas, Ertola, Francois, McCarthy, Morrison, O'Shea, Tamaras, von Beroldingen.

I hereby certify the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk
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PROPOSITION O

Amends Section 78: Relating to the tax levy; provides new limitation on property taxes; eliminates many present exceptions; provides that sales tax revenue be first used for bonded debt service.

CHARTER AMENDMENT

Describing and setting forth a proposal to the qualified electors of the City and County of San Francisco to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 78 thereof relating to tax levy.

The Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco hereby submits to the qualified electors of said City and County at an election to be held therein on November 7, 1967, a proposal to amend the Charter of said City and County by amending Section 78 thereof to read as follows:

NOTE: Additions or substitutions are indicated by bold-face type; deletions are indicated by ((double parentheses)).

TAX LEVY

Section 78. On or before the 15th day of September of each year, the board of supervisors by ordinance shall levy a tax, the estimated proceeds of which, together with the total amount of receipts and revenues estimated to be received from all sources, will be sufficient to meet all appropriations made by the annual appropriation ordinance.

Revenue to meet current annual interest and redemption or sinking fund for outstanding bonds shall always be provided out of the tax levy; provided, however, that to the extent to which funds are appropriated by the public utilities commission, and available for annual interest and redemption or sinking fund on bonds issued for acquisition, construction or extension of any utility, no tax shall be levied therefor.

((The tax levy shall not exceed the rate of one dollar and sixty-five cents ($1.65) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of the property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, exclusive of the following items: (1) State taxes, and taxes for the interest and sinking fund on bonded indebtedness of the city and county; (2) the cost of constructing, maintaining and improving (a) schools, (b) libraries, which tax shall not be less than four cents on each one hundred dollars, (c) parks and squares, which tax shall be not less than ten cents on each one hundred dollars, (d) playgrounds, which tax shall be not less than seven cents on each one hundred dollars, (e) for the art commission for the purpose of maintaining a symphony orchestra one-half cent on each one hundred dollars of said assessed valuation, (f) streets, sewers and buildings; (3) the cost of (a) elections, (b) civil service, which tax shall not be less than one-half cent on each one hundred dollars, (c) obligations imposed by state legislative or constitutional enactment and (d) obligations imposed by vote of the people of the city and county.))

The tax levy shall not exceed the rate of six dollars and fifteen cents ($6.15) on each one hundred dollars ($100) valuation of the property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, exclusive of the following items: (1) State taxes, and taxes for the interest and sinking fund on bonded indebtedness of the city and county, whether such taxes or bonded indebted-
ness is created before or after the effective date of this charter amendment; (2) any costs or expenditures of any other governmental entity empowered to levy or which can legally compel the board of supervisors to levy property taxes on property assessed in and subject to taxation by the city and county, whether or not such governmental entity exists on the effective date of this charter amendment; (3) obligations imposed by state legislative or constitutional enactment; (4) obligations imposed by vote of the people of the city and county after the effective date of this charter amendment.

Within the tax limitation provided above but not as an exception thereto, the tax for the cost of constructing, maintaining and improving libraries shall be not less than four cents on each one hundred dollars; such tax for parks and squares shall be not less than ten cents on each one hundred dollars; such tax for playgrounds shall not be less than seven cents on each one hundred dollars; such tax for the art commission for the purpose of maintaining a symphony orchestra shall not be less than one-half cent on each one hundred dollars of said assessed valuation; the tax for the cost of civil service shall not be less than one-half cent on each one hundred dollars.

Revenues from the purchase and use (sales) tax shall be applied first to bond interest and redemption before any property tax revenues are used for this purpose, and any surplus revenues from the purchase and use (sales) tax after applying to bond interest and redemption shall be applied to the general fund.

The provisions of this section shall be applicable and fully effective for the first fiscal year commencing after the effective date of this section and the board of supervisors shall take whatever action is necessary to make adjustments in the annual appropriation ordinance of the next fiscal year immediately following the effective date of this section to make the limitation effective.

This section shall control other provisions of the charter which may conflict in any way with its provisions.


I hereby certify that the foregoing charter amendment was ordered submitted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

ROBERT J. DOLAN, Clerk

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION "O"

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “O”
Hold the line on Property Taxes

The purpose of this charter amendment is to place a tax rate ceiling of $6.15 on that portion of property taxation which is now entirely under control of the Board of Supervisors for all city and/or county purposes. Not included in the restriction are school funds, bond interest and redemption, Bay Area Rapid Transit and Bay Area Pollution Control District commitments.

This amendment provides permanent restraints on the free-handed spending in city government administration.

Vote “Yes” on Proposition “O”
Stop Property Tax Escalation

For many years the property tax burden, borne in large part by home
owners, has been increasing. In the past six years the portion determined
by the Board of Supervisors has increased 7.052% each year on the average.
This amendment will save millions of dollars for property owners year
after year.

Although the tax rate would be limited, the total source of property
tax revenue would not remain static. Natural growth of the city will in-
ccrease aggregate property values and provide additional money for neces-
sary city expansion.

Here is your opportunity, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, to vote on taxes. Take
advantage of this rare opportunity to place a ceiling on taxes.

This agreement is sponsored by Citizens Committee for Property Tax
Limitation.

EVERETT C. McKEAGE, Chairman
CHESTER R. MacPHEE, Treasurer
DOUGLAS DORN
VICTOR B. LEVIT

DECLARATION OF POLICY

PROPOSITION P

DECLARATION OF POLICY: SHALL IT BE THE POLICY OF
THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRAN-
CISCO THAT THERE BE AN IMMEDIATE CEASE FIRE AND
WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. TROOPS FROM VIETNAM SO
THAT THE VIETNAMESE PEOPLE CAN SETTLE THEIR OWN
PROBLEMS?

An initiative petition pertaining to the above declaration of policy hav-
ing been presented to the Registrar of Voters, and having been verified as
containing the required percentage of registered voters to qualify for sub-
mission to the electorate, said declaration of policy is hereby submitted to
the electorate so that the electors can express their preference for or
against said declaration of policy by voting “Yes” or “No” thereon.

BASIL HEALEY
Registrar of Voters

ARGUMENT FOR PROPOSITION “P”

Haven’t We Voted Against This War Once Before?

Three years ago, a presidential election was held in which the prin-
ciple issue was the Vietnam war.

It was a smaller war, then, though a horribly bloody one. Even so,
Americans voted by 2-1 for the man who promised he would not involve us
further. However, he has followed his opponent’s war program so well that
Senator Goldwater, when asked if President Johnson was employing his
position said, “It is the position I advocated in my campaign and he is fol-
lowing it almost to the letter.” (Interview in “Arizona Republic,” Septem-
ber 17, 1967.)
Having voted against the “Goldwater Position” once before — against expanding this war — the majority of Americans are left with a degree of uneasiness unequalled in recent memory. For despite the vote, we’ve all watched helplessly while in a few brief years the following has taken place:

1. A half million young Americans have been sent to Vietnam. 15,000 of them have bled out their lives there, and more than 85,000 have been wounded.

2. Many more Vietnamese have died, most of them innocent civilians. And Vietnam — already dreadfully poor after 25 years of war — has been ravaged.

3. Last year, the Administration allocated 30 billion dollars to the war. Meanwhile, urgent programs which could correct the terrifying situation in our cities died for lack of funds. Now in a new burst of enthusiasm for present policy, the Administration hopes to collect 10% more on next year’s income tax, from each of us. This chart indicates about how much money this war costs you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxable Yearly Earnings</th>
<th>Income Tax</th>
<th>Vietnam Cost</th>
<th>Vietnam Cost With Proposed New 10% Surtax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>2,940</td>
<td>3,010</td>
<td>955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. We have witnessed the depressing spectacle of a President being caught by the press and other elected officials in countless falsehoods while attempting to justify his policy, undertaken in our names.

Things have progressed to the point where many of the country’s most respected men have acknowledged their disillusionment and warned that we may soon find ourselves at war with China, and possibly Russia, and that such a war would be an atomic holocaust. These include Generals Ridgeway and Gavin; Ambassadors Galbraith and Reischauer; scores of professors including Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (who was President Kennedy’s chief advisor); senators, Democrat and Republican alike, such as Mansfield, Morton, Case, Percy, Aiken, Kennedy, Javits, McGovern, Hartke, Cooper and others. Hundreds of religious leaders have denounced the war’s immorality, from the National Council of Churches to Bishops Sheen and Myers.

Despite these objections, the war goes on.

We Are Told We Must Continue Fighting

We are told we must continue fighting to assure the South Vietnamese freedom of choice and the prerequisites of democracy.

As our historical note (which follows) will remind us, past American actions in Vietnam would seem to contradict these apparently worthy motives.

To put the questions briefly: If we are there to support the “true national aspirations” of the Vietnamese, why does the South Vietnamese army virtually refuse to fight; leaving Americans to do almost all the fight-
ing? Why do thousands of Buddhists and students riot in the cities? Why do peasants freely support the National Liberation Front? Why is there such hatred of Ky and Thieu? Why was the election found to be worthless by the official election committee of the South Vietnam Assembly?

The answer is painfully clear:

South Vietnam’s former Ambassador to the United States admitted recently, “80% of the people of South Vietnam would rather the Americans would go home.” Even President Eisenhower has written, “I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable (on Vietnam) who did not agree that had elections been held (in 1956, when we helped Diem block them) possibly 80% of the population would have voted for Ho Chi Minh.”

Then whose “true aspirations” are we defending?

**We Are Told We Must Fight Now, or Later**

Another familiar argument is that if we do not fight communism in Vietnam now, we will only fight it later to defend a nearer ally.

That is a gib enough assumption but the point is, it may not be true. Almost every American ally — the very countries we say we are defending against a future holocaust — are convinced we are wrong. They feel that world communism is not the singleminded unified force it once was, and that the war in Vietnam is a national struggle of liberation from hundreds of years of colonial domination. Indeed, judging by the reactions of our allies, it would seem that the only nation which is scared-to-death that communism is about to take over the world is the United States; the world’s strongest power.

(There are also many people who say, “However we got into this mess, we must support our men over there.” The only foolproof way to assure that American men will not die miserably in some swamp is to bring them home.)

**Nagging Doubts**

With all these nagging doubts about the propriety and morality of American behavior in Vietnam, and its inherent lack of logic, it is little wonder that America has never fought a war with so little popular enthusiasm.

Even among those who generally back Mr. Johnson’s position, most do so halfheartedly. Yet, this low level of support combined with his election victory three years ago, is seen by Mr. Johnson as sufficient mandate to carry on the bloodiest, most costly, and most dangerous war in history.

**Protests Not Heeded**

Until now, all attempts at informing the Administration of the overwhelming doubts and outright opposition to this war have gone unheeded; letters receive stock answers, mass protests are explained away. The result is a level of general despair and feeling of loss of control of our “representatives” that is unsurpassed in American history.

The vote of a major urban population — in effect divorcing itself from the behavior of Washington — cannot be similarly ignored. Therefore, more than 22,000 San Francisco citizens petitioned to place this question on the ballot.

It is with hope that the people will no longer be ignored on questions of war and peace, that we urge you to vote to — stop the killing, stop the spending, stop the war — Vote Yes on P.

Thank you.
A Brief History of U.S. Involvement in Vietnam

The U.S. first became involved in Vietnam after World War II. Despite assurances we would support Vietnamese independence, we instead backed French efforts to re-establish themselves as a colonial power in Vietnam.

The French refusal to grant independence led to an eight-year war against the Vietnamese led by Ho Chi Minh. This war, which resulted in the death of one million Vietnamese was paid for largely by the United States.

The French-Vietnamese war ended with the signing of the Geneva Agreements in 1954. These Agreements provided for the temporary division of Vietnam for two years; then, an election to unify Vietnam under one government. It was specifically noted that North and South Vietnam was one country; the division was merely for military purposes — to allow the French to withdraw their forces from Saigon. The U.S. government pledged that it would not use "Force or the threat of force" to disturb the agreements and stated that "Peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that (the U.S.) will not join in an agreement which would hinder this."

Soon after, however, we violated the Geneva accord by establishing a puppet government under Ngo Diem in South Vietnam and making it into a separate state. Diem, who had not even been in Vietnam during the war of independence, had no support among the people. He could not have won the popular election scheduled in the Geneva Agreements for 1956, so he simply refused to allow them. The reason for this was clear; Ho Chi Minh, who had led the fight for independence against the French, was the national hero of all of Vietnam and (as President Eisenhower admitted) he would certainly have been elected as head of the nationwide government. Instead Diem began, with the full support of the American government, to eliminate his political opposition. He instituted a reign of terror in the countryside. Popularly elected village chiefs were replaced by military officers. Suspected opponents of the regime, "communists" and non-communists alike, were rounded up and jailed — or shot. Villages were destroyed and peasants forced into "strategic hamlets" surrounded by barbed wire and armed guards — which were effectively concentration camps. By the end of his reign of terror in 1963, Diem had put millions of peasants in these "strategic hamlets." This is the kind of "freedom and democracy" the U.S. government found itself trying to establish there. Without American aid and military intervention, the government could not have lasted one week. Nor could the present one. None have had the support of South Vietnamese people.

It was because the independence promised in the Geneva accords was denied, that the peasants organized the National Liberation Front ("Viet Cong"). It consisted of non-communists and communists alike who shared only one overriding concern: to fight the illegal Saigon regime and get the U.S. military to leave the country. When large numbers of American fighting men were introduced in South Vietnam the N.L.F. had to turn North for help.

(Once again, it is important to remember that North and South Vietnamese are countrymen, and would now be under one flag if America did not prevent the scheduled elections. General Ky for example, was born in
Hanoi, North Vietnam, and the Premier of North Vietnam, Pham van Dong, was born in the South. It is little wonder, therefore, that countrymen in the South would turn for help in the North."

North Vietnamese cannot be "aggressors" in their own country; and there are no Chinese or Russian soldiers fighting.

The Vietnamese people have made it clear that they do not want us on their soil, and history demonstrates that our involvement has done more to prevent the free choice we believe in than to achieve it. We can only lose more "face" by remaining. We can only save "face" by allowing the Vietnamese to work out their own solution to their own problem. The French got out, and they gained world stature for it; we should do no less.

Vote "Yes" on "P"

Citizens For a Vote on Vietnam,
EDWARD FARLEY,
MARYLOUISE LOVETT,
Proponents.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "P"

Vote "No" on Proposition P

Korea taught the Communists that they could not win by open battle, alone. Viet Nam has convinced the Communists that to divide is to conquer.

Today we live in a nation divided; not because Americans are any different in principles and love for their country; but because many have been duped by a professional propaganda and infiltration campaign, effectively utilizing our youth and minorities as weapons against us.

We hear talk of love, peace and withdrawal from Viet Nam, and this cannot help but mellow us, for every American who loves our boys in Viet Nam is deeply saddened by continual losses.

But what of the principles we have fought 7 wars to preserve? And what about those boys who have died in battle for these principles, as well as our boys who are dying now?

Long ago: the United States was committed to the defense of Viet Nam. This commitment arose from our determination to preserve South-east Asia from Communist domination. We were determined that the Mao Tse-tung variety of wars should not be allowed to spread from Asia to later haunt us at the doorstep of America.

If we withdrew from Viet Nam without an honorable settlement, no country could ever again have confidence or trust in us. We have given our word; thousands of boys have given their lives. We must win, not only on the Viet Nam front, but in the controversy of withdrawal that has created the most crucial division in our country since the Civil War.

San Franciscans must begin by urging an honorable and victorious peace in Viet Nam. This can be accomplished by constructive and intelligent support of our war effort. We can begin by enlightening our youth that we have made a firm commitment in Viet Nam; that the entire world is watching; that we have made this commitment, because it is here that we must face our Communist foes who would control and regulate the enterprise and exercise allowed in a free way of life.

As I am filing this petition, I now truly realize why I am a candidate for Mayor. It seems appalling to me that those who wish to represent us are either for withdrawal in Viet Nam, or wish not to take an open stand. These men wish to provide leadership; yet I was the only candidate to speak out. Those who would represent us have 200 to 300 thousand in cam-
campaign funds; yet none could seem to find the 300 dollars, nor the interest to support our fighting men in Viet Nam against the adherents of a white flag policy. Where are these so-called leaders when we need them?

San Francisco, "the city that knows how," must begin by dealing Proposition P a loud, resounding "No" vote. America and the world will be watching San Francisco.

CHARLES D. WALKER,
Candidate for Mayor.

A No vote on Proposition P is recommended by the San Francisco Junior Chamber of Commerce.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "P"

Vote "No" on P

The first requirement of American Foreign policy should be the defense of the United States and our citizens. Our nation enters into agreements and treaties with foreign nations for our mutual benefit. NATO and SEATO are examples of mutual defense aid pacts of nations under threat of external invasion and internal subversion by such declared aggressors as the Soviet Union and Red China. It is, ultimately, to the benefit of the United States that these "perimeter" nations be kept free of Communist domination and tyranny. For the ultimate achievement of a lasting and prosperous peace in the World, the freedom of the peoples and vulnerable nations of the world becomes our interest.

In Southeast Asia, the "domino" theory is valid. If the United States withdraws its force of reaction against the pressures of Communist territorial conquest, and allows the wholesale slaughter of tens of thousands of freedom loving Vietnamese, whose only crime is the act of defense of their homeland and freedom, then it is a sure thing that the rest of Asia will fall. Malaysia, Japan, Taiwan, the Philippines, and Australia-New Zealand will soon come under the same guns and subversion that now plague South Viet Nam and Laos.

Admittedly, many mistakes in judgment have been committed by the present administration in the handling of the Viet Nam war. Allowing an enemy a sanctuary for replenishing its death-dealing abilities is unheard of in the annals of war. The idea of "gradualism" in battle tactics is likewise new to warmaking, particularly when our boys must be sacrificed to those tactics. But, because this administration fights poorly and continues to base itself on error is no reason for letting all of Asia fall prey to the murdering pillage of the modern hordes of a Ghengis Khan of Red China.

It is folly to believe that the Vietnamese war is nothing more than a civil war. The depth of intervention by the Soviet Union and its Red Chinese allies has been long lasting and extensive. History is not lacking adequate proof of this or of the declared intentions of world domination by those forces. Terror, chaos and turmoil are the by-products of Communist aggression, and are the principal causes of civil unrest and the inability to establish American style democracy.

The United States is not the aggressor, the Communists are. The Communist forces are international in ideology and are declared enemies of nationalism and human freedom. The United States is in Viet Nam because of a contractual commitment to the South East Asia Treaty Organization. If the United States were to withdraw, the power of the Communist Inter-
national warmaking machine would soon be brought to bear on all those nations bordering the Pacific Ocean. Such a conquest by the Soviets and Red China would leave the entire Pacific to our western shores vulnerable to any action by these aggressive and offensive forces.

We are, by our nature, a people committed to defense and not aggression. This provides any aggressor with the opportunity to land the first blow. We should not be anxious to provide easy access to our shores, wherein that first blow could be final to our own life, liberty and nationality.

Support Servicemen, Vote "No” on P

TOM COLLINS.

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION "P"

The eyes of the world will be on San Francisco Nov. 7 as we cast our vote to support or repudiate the policy of the United States Government of aiding the people of South Viet Nam in defending themselves from the savage butchery of a Communist takeover and the chains of Communist slavery.

To check the sweeping tide of Communist forces in Southeast Asia and to provide an additional bulwark for the security of this nation, the United States Senate by a vote of 82-1 in 1955 ratified the SEATO Treaty. This Treaty obligates each member nation to use appropriate means to counteract any action which endangers the freedom, sovereignty or territorial integrity of one of the signatories to the Treaty or a protocol member thereof. South Viet Nam was specifically included within the protocol area of the SEATO Treaty. In 1964 the United States and House of Representatives reaffirmed this nation's determination to halt Communist aggression in Southeast Asia by passing Public Law No. 88-408 with a combined vote of 504-2. This Law has not been repealed or amended.

The United States Constitution confers the power and responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs upon the President and the Congress. They alone have the authority and the vital information to provide the safety and security of this nation.

A "Yes” vote on Proposition “P” to withdraw our armed forces from Viet Nam will not affect the policy of the United States Government; but it will strengthen the determination of Ho Chi Minh to fight on, with each day adding to the loss of American lives.

Since Proposition "P” omits any condition for honorable withdrawal, it is a snare to entrap well-meaning but uninformed voters. It should not receive a single “Yes” vote. But of course it will receive the vote of every Communist, every pro-Communist and some loyal and sincere citizens who fail to understand the tragic consequences of our withdrawal before our solemn commitments have been fulfilled.

Do not be deceived — a “Yes” vote on Proposition “P” will not hasten the end of the Vietnamese conflict—it will only prolong it. On the other hand, a “No” vote reaffirms our nation's policy to uphold our international agreements and maintain our national integrity.

Vote “No” — and uphold America's historic dedication to justice and freedom.

COMMITTEE AGAINST PROPOSITION "P"

18 VOTE EARLY
POLLs OPEN FROM
7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting Machine Will Record Votes
ONLY Where The Pointers Are Left
DOWN, Covering Names of Candidates.

YES
PROPOSITION
A
AIRPORT BONDS, 1967. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $98,000,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
B
ADDS SECTION 12.1: Provides that Board of Supervisors may appoint an analyst and sets forth his duties and authority for appointment of assistants.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
C
AMENDS SECTION 145: Provides that minimum age of applicant for employment position in Police Department shall be 20 years and for appointment thereto 21 years.

NO

YES
PROPOSITION
D
AMENDS SECTION 134: Requires nominee to Board of Education to file statement of qualifications with Registrar; requires Registrar to mail copy of said statement to each voter.

NO

YES

PRC

M A Y O R
VOTE FOR ONE

1-A
JOSEPH L. ALIOTO
Attorney-Business Executive

2-A
WILLIAM W. BILLINGS
School Teacher

3-A
EARL DAVENPORT BROWN
Retired Businessman

4-A
ROBERT WAYNE DAVIS
Cab Driver

5-A
GEORGE M. DEL SECCO
Businessman

6-A
HAROLD DOWNS
Promotion

7-A
LLOYD KORENNEFF
Florist

8-A
HAROLD B. HOOGASTAN
Florist

9-A
WILHELM JORES
Entrepreneur, Actor

10-A
SAMUEL KLINE
Retired

11-A
ROBERT CHARLES LE BEGLE
Restaurant Owner

12-A
GEORGE W. LOOBY
Bartender
DIRECTIONS
FOR VOTING

1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice, pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

3rd. TO VOTE for a person whose name does not appear on the BALLOT LABEL CARD, raise numbered slide at top of machine corresponding to number of office on OFFICE TITLE CARD, and write name of candidate on paper under slide. (Do not pull down pointer over name of any other candidate.)

4th. TO VOTE CONFIRM.
ify candidate in office group in which you intend to write a candidate, except for the office of Supervisor in which writing in one or more names of candidates, you may pull in number of pointers over the printed names of candidates the aggregate will not exceed six, the number of candidates you are entitled to vote.)

**FOR** or **AGAINST PROPOSITIONS** or **FOR** or **AGAINST**

**FOR** or **AGAINST ADMISSION OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF EDUCATION**, pull **DOWN** pointers over the words "**YES**" or "**NO**" as you may to vote and **LEAVE THEM DOWN**.

5th. **LEAVING THE POINTERS DOWN** as you have placed them, the **RED HANDLE LEVER** of the **VOTING MACHINE** to the as far as it will go and you have voted and your vote is regist

**IF IN DOUBT AS TO OPERATING THE VOTING MACHINE**, **REQU**

**INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR OR JUDGE OF THE ELEC**

**BOARD BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO VOTE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMENDS SECTIONS 115, 116 and</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>and ADDS SECTION 115.1:</strong> Relating to the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Department, director and employees, author-exempt appointment of certain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMENDS SECTION 61:</strong> Relating to the authority of the Director of Public Health to make exempt appointment of Administrator of San Francisco General Hospital.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDS SECTION 101.1:</strong> Relating to the incurring of a municipal indebtedness for the purpose of providing funds to furnish loans for rehabilitation of private residential property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADDS SECTION 36.10:</strong> Establishes procedure for advisory arbitration of disputes on work schedules or working conditions between Fire Commission and representatives of members of Department.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSITION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMENDS SECTION 24:</strong> prohibition against imposition of license tax upon any seller or facturer of goods, wares or chattels operating at a fixed business in San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SUPERVISORS**

**VOTE FOR SIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAVID BREMAN</td>
<td>DONALD J. BRUCE</td>
<td>ROLAND M. CAMARA</td>
<td>JOSEPH CASEY</td>
<td>ROBERT ALFRED CHAMPLAIN</td>
<td>GARRETT CHAN</td>
<td>JOSEPH CHANEY, JR.</td>
<td>CHARLES CLAY</td>
<td>BRUCE CONNER</td>
<td>LEE COUSINS</td>
<td>CLYDE CARTER</td>
<td>NICHOLAS H. DAHER</td>
<td>JOHN A. ERTEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realtor</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Computer Programmer</td>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
<td>Truck Driver</td>
<td>Office Worker</td>
<td>General Contractor</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROBERT H. MENDELSJOHN</td>
<td>BILL NEWSOM</td>
<td>KEVIN O'SHEA</td>
<td>RONALD PELOSI</td>
<td>JOHN RIORDAN</td>
<td>JAMES J. ROUKE</td>
<td>MARVIN L. SHELDON</td>
<td>ARTHUR SHERIDAN</td>
<td>DOROTHY SHINDER</td>
<td>HAROLD W. SMITH</td>
<td>LELAND F. STANFEL</td>
<td>EDWARD SHERMAN</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to State Senator</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>Incumbent</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Labor Official</td>
<td>Real Estate Investments</td>
<td>Volunteer Tax-Refund Advocate</td>
<td>Insurance Broker-Accountant</td>
<td>Restaurateur</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SAMPLE BALLOT

### GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION

**NOVEMBER 7, 1967**

### CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

**VOTE YES OR NO ON EACH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMENDS SECTION 78</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATION OF POLICY</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Vote for One

- **42-A**: TERRY A. FRANCIS
  - Member of the Board of Supervisors
- **40-A**: WALTER HABEKOS
  - Attorney at Law
- **41-A**: MARY E. HALL
  - Business Woman

- **42-A**: JOHN JAY FERDON
  - District Attorney
- **43-A**: JOHN H. McFEELY, JR.
  - Attorney at Law

### SHERIFF

Vote for One

- **44-A**: MATTHEW C. CARBERRY
  - Sheriff of San Francisco
- **45-A**: DAVID JOHNSON
  - Job Training Specialist
- **46-A**: LOUIS V. VASQUEZ
  - Lawyer, Welfare Commissioner

### MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

- **47-A**: YES
- **48-A**: NO

- **47-A**: DR. ZURETTI L. GOOSBY
- **48-A**: CLAIRE B. LILIENTHAL

### MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

- **49-A**: YES
- **50-A**: NO
**VOTE EARLY**

**POLLS OPEN FROM**

7 A.M. to 8 P.M.

The Voting Machine Will Record Votes ONLY Where The Pointers Are Left DOWN, Covering Names of Candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Makeup</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION A</strong></td>
<td>AIRPORT BONDS, 1967. To incur a bonded indebtedness in the sum of $90,000,000 for improvement of air transportation facilities for the City and County of San Francisco.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION B</strong></td>
<td>ADDS SECTION 12.1: Provides that Board of Supervisors may appoint an analyst and sets forth his duties and authority for appointment of assistants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION C</strong></td>
<td>AMENDS SECTION 145: Provides that minimum age of applicant for entrance position in Police Department shall be 20 years and for appointment thereto 21 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPOSITION D</strong></td>
<td>AMENDS SECTION 134: Requires nominee to Board of Education to file statement of qualifications with Registrar; requires Registrar to mail copy of said statement to each voter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAYOR**

**VOTE FOR ONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-A</td>
<td>Jack Morrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>Herbert Steiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-A</td>
<td>Charles Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-A</td>
<td>Joseph L. Alioto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-A</td>
<td>William W. Billings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-A</td>
<td>Earl David Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-A</td>
<td>Robert Wayne Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-A</td>
<td>George M. Del Secco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-A</td>
<td>Harold Dobbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-A</td>
<td>Lloyd Koreneff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-A</td>
<td>Harold B. Hoogasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-A</td>
<td>Wilhelm Joerres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DIRECTIONS FOR VOTING

1st. MOVE RED HANDLE LEVER of VOTING MACHINE to the RIGHT as far as it will go and LEAVE IT THERE.

2nd. TO VOTE FOR CANDIDATES of your choice, pull down the POINTERS over the names of the CANDIDATES for whom you wish to VOTE and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

3rd. TO VOTE for a person whose name does not appear on the BALLOT LABEL CARD, raise numbered slide at top of machine corresponding to number of office on OFFICE TITLE CARD, and write name of candidate on paper under slide. (Do not pull down pointer over name of candidate in case after down such so that th-

4th. TO VOTE CONFIRM.
...candidate in office group in which you intend to write a candidate, except for the office of Supervisor in which writing in one or more names of candidates, you may pull number of pointers over the printed names of candidates aggregate will not exceed six, the number of candidates you are entitled to vote.

JR or AGAINST PROPOSITIONS or FOR or AGAINST ACTION OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF EDUCATION, pull

DOWN pointers over the words "YES" or "NO" as you may desire to vote and LEAVE THEM DOWN.

5th. LEAVING THE POINTERS DOWN as you have placed them, raise the RED HANDLE LEVER of the VOTING MACHINE to the I as far as it will go and you have voted and your vote is registered.

IF IN DOUBT AS TO OPERATING THE VOTING MACHINE, REQUIRE INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE INSPECTOR OR JUDGE OF THE ELECT BOARD BEFORE ATTEMPTING TO VOTE.

---

**PROPOSITION J**

AMENDS SECTIONS 115, 116 and 117 and ADDS SECTION 115.1: Relating to the duties and responsibilities of the Planning Department, Director and employees, authorizes appointment of certain officers.

---

**PROPOSITION K**

AMENDS SECTION 61: Relating to the Director of Public Health to make exempt appointment of Administrator of San Francisco General Hospital.

---

**PROPOSITION L**

ADDs SECTION 101.1: Relating to the incurring of a municipal indebtedness for the purpose of providing funds to furnish loans for rehabilitation of private residential property.

---

**PROPOSITION M**

ADDs SECTION 36.10: Establishes procedure for advisory arbitration of disputes on work schedules or working conditions between Fire Commissioners and representatives of members of Department.

---

**PROPOSITION N**

AMENDS SECTION 24: Repeals prohibition against impositional license tax upon any seller or manufacturer of goods, wares or chattels operating at a fixed place of business in San Francisco.

---

**SUPERVISORS VOTE FOR SIX**

- **26-A**
  - AROL W. Smith
  - Insurance Broker
  - Accountant

- **27-A**
  - LELAND F. Stanfield
  - Restaurateur

- **28-A**
  - EDWARD Stern
  - Attorney

- **29-A**
  - ROBERT Vanderbilt
  - Union Official
  - Counsellor

- **30-A**
  - JOHN Abraham
  - Businessman

- **31-A**
  - IVY Ambrose
  - Real Estate

- **32-A**
  - ALLEN E. Anderson
  - Attorney
  - at Law

- **33-A**
  - WILLIAM R. Bayma
  - Auditor

- **34-A**
  - JOE Beeman
  - Incumbent Member
  - Board of Supervisors

- **35-A**
  - DEAN L. Bender
  - Attorney

- **36-A**
  - JAMES G. Boudoures
  - Business Manager

- **37-A**
  - DAVID Breman
  - Realтор

- **38-A**
  - DONALD Bruce
  - Businessman

- **26-B**
  - JOHN A. Erickson
  - Incumbent

- **27-B**
  - TERRY A. Francois
  - Member of the Board of Supervisors

- **28-B**
  - WALTER Habekos
  - Attorney
  - at Law

- **29-B**
  - MARY E. Hall
  - Business Woman

- **30-B**
  - E. Kenneth Harris
  - Physician

- **31-B**
  - CURT Hayden
  - Businessman

- **32-B**
  - ADRIAN "HAP" Hazard
  - Paint Technician

- **33-B**
  - EMIL WILLIAM Lee
  - Radiologist

- **34-B**
  - ROBERT E. Lee
  - Businessman

- **35-B**
  - JAMES Mailliard
  - Businessman

- **36-B**
  - LEO T. McCarthy
  - Member
  - Board of Supervisors

- **37-B**
  - ROBERT H. Mendelsohn
  - Assistant to State Senator

- **38-B**
  - BILL Newsome
  - Attorney
  - at Law
# SAMPLE BALLOT

## GENERAL MUNICIPAL ELECTION

**NOVEMBER 7, 1967**

---

### SAN FRANCISCO

**DOCUMENTS NOV 9 1967**

**SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC LIBRARY**

---

### CITY AND COUNTY PROPOSITIONS

**VOTE YES OR NO ON EACH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 39  | Yes         | **PROPOSITION O**
| 40  | No          | **PROPOSITION O**
| 41  | Yes         | **PROPOSITION P**
|     | No          | **PROPOSITION P**

**AMENDS SECTION 78. Relating to the tax levy; provides new limitation on property taxes; eliminates many present exceptions; provides that sales tax revenue be first used for bonded debt service.**

**DECLARATION OF POLICY: Shall it be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that there be an immediate cease fire and withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam so that the Vietnamese people can settle their own problems?**

---

### DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Vote for One

- **39-A** ROLAND M. Camara
  - Businessman
- **40-A** JOSEPH Casey
  - Incumbent
- **41-A** ROBERT ALFRED Champlain
  - Attorney

**42**

- **42-A** JOHN H. McFeeley, Jr.
  - Attorney at Law

**43**

- **43-A** JOHN JAY Ferdon
  - District Attorney

---

### SHERIFF

Vote for One

- **44-A** MATTHEW C. Carberry
  - Sheriff of San Francisco

**45**

- **45-A** DAVID Johnson
  - Job Training Specialist

**46**

- **46-A** LOUIS V. Vasquez
  - Lawyer, Welfare Commissioner

---

### MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

- **47**
  - **47-A** YES
  - **47-A** NO
  - Dr. Zuretti L. Goosby

- **48**
  - **48-A** YES
  - **48-A** NO
  - Claire B. Lilienthal

---

### MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Nominated by Mayor for Confirmation by Electors

- **49**
  - **49-A** YES
  - **49-A** NO

- **50**
  - **50-A** YES
  - **50-A** NO