

How seven organizations grade California lawmakers

BY JOAN R. REISS

With 936 lobbying groups in Sacramento, it shouldn't be too difficult to determine how a legislator's record squares with his rhetoric. Each year, lawmakers must cast thousands of votes that are recorded and available to the public. But a survey of 272 major lobbying organizations reveals that only 14 compile voting records of legislators and make their ratings public. From these, however, it is possible to determine from 1973 voting patterns where legislators might be placed on the political spectrum.

For purposes of comparison, the records compiled by seven organizations — ranging from the AFL-CIO to the California Republican Assembly — were selected to establish voting patterns for all 120 senators and assemblymen. Here are the organizations and the types of legislation that their respective surveys cover:

California Labor Federation AFL-CIO. 14 Senate and 11 Assembly votes dealing with employee-worker rights and benefits.

California Peace Officers Association (CPOA). Eight Senate and 10 Assembly votes in the field of law and order.

California Republican Assembly (CRA). 16 Senate and 16 Assembly votes dealing primarily with fiscal and criminal-justice issues.

League of Women Voters (LWV). 14 Senate and 17 Assembly votes covering human resources, equal rights, environmental quality, voting and education.

League of Conservation Voters (LCV). 54 Senate and 53 Assembly votes on environmental matters.

Legislative Birdwatchers (LB). 21 Senate and 24 Assembly votes on environmental issues.

National Organization for Women (NOW). 48 Senate and 52 Assembly votes on women's rights.

Weighing the votes

Of these seven groups, only the Republican Assembly and the League of Conservation Voters give some votes more weight than others. The other five organizations count all votes equally even though one bill may be far more significant than another. In the accompanying charts, the weight factors given bills by the CRA and LCV are retained. In some cases, it was necessary to convert scorecards giving only "good" and "bad" votes (in the rating organization's judgment) to percentages. In those cases where the organization did not give legis-

lators percentage ratings, the Legislative Birdwatchers system was used; that is, the number of favorable votes cast was divided by the number of voting opportunities.

In compiling these voting records, the most difficult

1973 Senate ratings

	Labor	CPOA	CRA	LWV	LCV	LB	NOW
Alquist (D)	86	0	15	79	89	76	73
Behr (R)	93	25	15	100	90	67	82
Beilenson (D)	79	38	10	93	100	86	84
Berryhill (R)	14	100	82	50	71	57	54
Biddle (R)	36	88	90	50	85	81	63
Bradley (R)	7	88	80	0	55	43	25
Carpenter (R)	21	88	84	36	69	48	32
Collier (D)	72	25	32	43	66	62	63
Coombs (R)	21	50	62	14	69	62	42
Cusanovich (R)	79	63	68	50	81	67	52
Deukmejian (R)	50	75	65	36	83	57	65
Dills (D)	100	50	31	86	72	71	88
Dymally (D)	86	0	15	86	100	90	71
Gregorio (D)	86	38	33	93	100	90	79
Grunsky (R)	79	63	55	72	92	86	69
Harmer (R)	7	38	84	21	58	38	15
Holmdahl (D)	93	38	31	86	82	90	69
Kennick (D)	86	13	37	86	90	76	69
Lagomarsino (R)	50	100	89	50	74	76	52
Marks (R)	93	38	20	86	78	90	86
Marler (R)	57	63	79	50	73	48	40
Mills (D)	86	0	9	79	93	86	84
Moscone (D)	79	13	15	93	90	71	65
Nejedly (R)	86	75	42	86	81	81	61
Petris (D)	93	38	3	79	96	95	73
Richardson (R)	0	63	90	7	57	19	17
Robbins (D)	100	38	21	72	95	76	67
Roberti (D)	100	25	15	93	94	95	71
Rodda (D)	100	25	20	93	98	100	80
Schrade (R)	64	50	65	29	77	62	52
Short (D)	36	0	3	57	87	71	57
Song (D)	72	38	16	79	86	71	61
Stevens (R)	43	38	48	72	72	52	63
Stiern (D)	100	38	37	72	62	67	73
Stull (R)	29	88	85	50	80	57	44
Walsh (D)	64	25	24	57	85	43	36
Way (R)	36	38	82	36	82	76	61
Wedworth (D)	79	63	44	64	77	62	50
Whetmore (D)	0	50	84	7	80	43	46
Zenovich (D)	79	25	31	86	67	62	71
Average:	64	47	44	62	81	69	60

The author compiles voting records in her capacity as president of Legislative Birdwatchers, a conservationist organization based in Sacramento. She was assisted by Diana Alves, a student at Sacramento State University.

problem is how to treat absences. The CRA applies a partial penalty for an absence. LCV eliminates all official absences and counts abstentions as negative votes only when a bill is defeated. Birdwatchers and NOW consider an absence or an abstention as a missed chance to vote "correctly" and, therefore, as a "wrong" vote. (This is the main explanation of why the two environment-oriented organizations — League of Conservation Voters and the Birdwatchers — came up with different percentages while using many of the same roll calls.)

These seven ratings show that by far the lowest average ratings belong to the two most conservative organizations, the Republican Assembly and the Peace Officers Association. These groups oppose more bills than they give support, and the most conservative lawmakers have the highest CPOA and CRA scores. Liberal legislators typically have low CRA and CPOA scores (less than 30 percent) and high scores with the other five organizations

(better than 80 percent with NOW and 90 percent higher from the other four groups). Using these seven 1973 scorecards as a guide, here are the most conservative and most liberal members of the California Legislature:

Most liberal. Assemblymen Alatorre, Berman, Brown, Burton, Fenton, Gonzales, Ingalls, Kapiloff, Knox, Papan. Senator Rodda. All are Democrats.

Most conservative. Assemblymen Antonovich, Burke, Wakefield. Senators Berryhill, Biddle, Carpenter, Lagomarsino (now a congressman), Richardson, Stull. All are Republicans.

The average percentages also show that the Senate is significantly more conservative than the Assembly. The statistics also indicate that groups with the highest overall percentages had the most success with the Legislature in 1973, specifically those organizations concerned with women's rights and the environment. For conservatives, it was not a very good year.

1973 Assembly ratings

	Labor	CPOA	CRA	LWV	LCV	LB	NOW		Labor	CPOA	CRA	LWV	LCV	LB	NOW
Alatorre (D)	91	20	20	94	100	100	87	Johnson, R. (R)	55	70	46	94	73	68	78
Antonovich (R)	9	90	89	53	68	60	60	Kapiloff (D)	100	20	20	94	100	100	93
Amett (R)	27	20	52	82	88	76	69	Karabian (D)	73	20	26	77	100	68	70
Badham (R)	0	60	68	18	56	32	48	Keene (D)	91	20	33	94	91	80	89
Bagley (R)	55	10	46	82	83	80	77	Keysor (D)	100	40	26	88	100	100	89
Bannai* (R)	—	—	74	72	73	67	78	Knox (D)	91	10	10	94	100	92	85
Bee (D)	100	30	40	100	86	80	81	Lancaster (R)	0	80	70	47	64	56	62
Berman (D)	100	10	15	94	100	100	91	Lanterman (R)	9	70	76	53	73	56	62
Beverly (R)	36	30	47	77	96	84	68	Lewis (R)	55	40	57	71	79	64	71
Boatwright (D)	100	50	31	100	100	100	87	Lockyer* (D)	—	—	—	64	100	—	—
Bond (R)	18	80	60	82	75	68	62	MacDonald (D)	73	10	16	82	98	80	77
Briggs (R)	27	50	36	71	90	64	58	MacGillivray (R)	9	40	70	82	71	64	66
Brown (D)	100	10	9	94	100	92	81	Maddy (R)	100	20	21	88	92	84	83
Burke (R)	0	90	84	18	48	20	45	Mc Alister (D)	100	90	45	100	90	92	89
Burton (D)	91	0	15	94	100	84	87	McCarthy (D)	100	10	21	100	100	100	79
Carter* (R)	—	—	47	50	73	60	59	Mc Lennan* (R)	33	60	79	25	54	37	53
Chacon (D)	91	40	45	94	84	72	79	Meade (D)	91	10	10	88	100	96	87
Chappie (R)	64	50	54	82	71	52	72	Miller (D)	55	10	17	71	100	60	62
Cline (R)	0	70	68	41	91	80	64	Mobley (R)	46	50	40	65	57	52	60
Collier (R)	9	80	74	18	64	36	43	Montoya (D)	100	20	34	88	100	80	68
Cory (D)	82	20	23	71	94	76	73	Moretti (D)	82	20	15	100	100	100	85
Craven* (D)	—	—	78	29	84	67	56	Murphy (R)	55	30	52	65	82	76	73
Cullen (D)	91	40	30	82	87	84	89	Nimmo (R)	9	20	52	47	61	52	64
Davis (D)	46	70	50	59	64	52	64	Papan (D)	100	10	20	100	91	92	87
Deddeh (D)	100	20	15	88	94	96	85	Powers (D)	100	20	31	94	90	92	87
Dixon (D)	82	10	16	82	100	80	85	Priolo (R)	18	40	54	82	99	88	79
Duffy (R)	55	30	42	65	68	52	70	Quimby (D)	64	10	18	71	98	56	56
Dunlap (D)	82	10	10	88	100	96	83	Ralph (D)	91	10	10	82	100	72	73
Fenton (D)	91	20	26	100	100	96	87	Russell (R)	0	90	73	35	74	72	58
Fong (D)	82	10	10	88	100	84	85	Seeley (R)	18	30	50	82	80	72	75
Foran (D)	100	20	3	88	100	88	83	Sieroty (D)	82	30	15	82	100	84	77
Garcia (D)	73	10	31	100	100	72	79	Thomas (D)	82	30	31	88	98	84	75
Gonsalves (D)	82	20	36	88	96	84	75	Thurman (D)	100	60	37	88	98	84	83
Gonzales (D)	91	10	16	100	98	100	91	Vasconcellos (D)	82	10	15	88	100	84	87
Greene, B. (D)	82	10	18	82	100	88	73	Wakefield (R)	9	90	92	12	45	24	35
Greene, L. (D)	73	20	20	82	100	92	85	Warren (D)	91	10	16	88	100	72	79
Hayden (R)	82	90	27	88	100	92	89	Waxman (D)	73	20	10	100	100	92	77
Holoman (D)	91	10	15	88	100	84	75	Wilson (D)	100	20	33	94	88	84	87
Ingalls (D)	100	30	21	94	100	100	83	Wood (R)	64	60	36	94	93	92	81
Johnson, H. (D)	91	20	32	82	96	80	75	Z'berg (D)	91	30	16	88	100	92	81
								Average:	67	35	36	76	88	77	75

Still No. 1 drug problem

ALCOHOLISM

By SHELLEY WOOD

Alcoholism is probably as old as alcohol, but in recent years the extent of the social problem it presents has been pushed out of public view by concern over the high incidence of narcotics experimentation. In the meantime, the abuse of alcohol has continued to rise and to increase also among females and teen-agers. Now, officials are beginning to acknowledge that California's number-one drug problem is still alcoholism. What has made the difference is a change in attitude: State agencies, the Legislature and even the police are moving away from treating alcoholics as criminals or degenerates and accepting instead the view that alcoholism is America's most untreated treatable disease.

Yet, this change in attitude hasn't been as far-reaching as it will apparently have to be in order to address the problem squarely statewide. Despite the fact that public drunkenness has been officially decriminalized and that rehabilitation efforts are being beefed up with some success, anti-alcoholism programs aren't always working out the way planners had hoped.

One of 12 Californians . . .

At least one million Californians — one of every 12 over the age of 20 — suffer from alcoholism. Few of these people fit the usual stereotype of the skid-row down-and-outer. In fact, public inebriates comprise only about four percent of the alcoholic population. The problem drinkers look on the surface pretty much like everyone else but while they remain undetected the scope of their problem spreads. As it does, California government and business lose at least \$400 million annually in lost wages — and probably a good deal more than that.

Even more critical is the cost to the alcoholics themselves. Although as a cause of death alcoholism still ranks tenth in California, the number of fatalities due to alcoholism among those aged 35 to 64 has risen sharply. Taking this figure into account, alcohol becomes the fourth major health threat in this productive age group. It is surpassed only by heart disease, cancer and mental illness. Even worse, recent studies indicate that drinking drivers are involved in at least one-third of all California highway traffic fatalities and in 20 percent of all injury accidents.

Drunkenness decriminalized

The first big official turn-around in the approach to alcoholism took place in 1971, when the Legislature passed Senator George Deukmejian's bill to decriminalize drunkenness. Although its implementation

The author, a student at the University of California at Davis and a Journal intern, wrote on the Legislative's Sergeants-at-arms in the February issue.

California's problem drinkers

Total Population	19,953,134
Population Over 20	12,251,431
Problem Drinkers	1,151,760
Arrests for Public Intoxication	254,877
Arrests for Drunk Driving	199,174

Source: Office of Alcohol Program Management

has been much less than widespread, the possibility now exists for counties to stop "the revolving door" court process of repeated jail sentences for public drunks with no effort at treatment of their drinking problem. Enactment also constituted a decision by the state to treat public drunkenness as an illness, instead of as a crime, it being thought that the law would provide an impetus for establishing a statewide network of centers to receive and treat people with an alcohol dependency.

Under this law, counties can eliminate public drunkenness as a crime. Instead of arresting a person found inebriated in public, a civil procedure can be followed; under it, an officer can take an inebriate into protective custody and place him in a local health facility for up to 72 hours. After detoxification there, the person is released but encouraged to seek further medical treatment, if necessary. The catch, however, is that drunkenness can only be decriminalized where detoxification centers have been established. And the funds for constructing them have so far been made available only in seven of the state's 58 counties — San Diego, Santa Barbara, Sacramento, Monterey, Santa Clara, San Mateo and San Joaquin. No funds have yet gone to the two counties with the highest incidence of drunkenness arrests: Los Angeles and San Francisco.

'Detox' centers

One of these detoxification facilities is in Sacramento, where it is called the Community Alcoholism Rehabilitation Center. Although unique in being the state's only privately run "detox" center, Sacramento's suffers from the same kinds of problems that beset the others. Despite its 70 beds (six for women) the center usually is full every night — in fact, by 4 o'clock in the afternoon — coincidentally, the start of the so-called happy hour of cut-rate cocktails at local bars. If any "happy hour" reveler is picked up, therefore, the chances are that there'll be no room at the center and he will be taken to the county jail, booked and taken before a judge. (Sacramento County authorities say that five to 30 people a night are thus jailed.)

Detoxification centers have come in for their share of criticism. Detractors point out that they are at best stop-gap measures that may allow the inebriate to sober up safely yet don't attack causes of drunkenness. These