

NOTICE

IF THE FILM IMAGE IS LESS CLEAR THAN THIS NOTICE, IT IS DUE TO THE QUALITY OF THE DOCUMENT BEING FILMED

Ukiah, CA
 (Mendocino Co.)
 Journal
 (Cir. 6xW. 8,350)

SEP 5 1978

Allen's P.C.B. 10 1978



from the desk

By Jim Garner

On the November ballot will be Prop. 3. In a nutshell, if approved, Prop. 3 would require separate sections for smokers and non-smokers in public places.

Carried to the extreme, Prop. 3 would force businesses to partition off sections for the non-smokers. One part of the proposition says, in effect, that only those individuals with an office can light up.

Prop. 3 is not a good piece of legislation. Certainly no one enjoys sitting in a restaurant and having someone blow smoke in his face.

This situation can usually be handled by merely asking the offending person to knock it off.

Prop. 3 reeks of Big Brother.

U.S. citizens still have the right to choose whether to smoke or not to smoke.

Most restaurants have a non-smoking section. Even the airlines seat the puffing culprits in a special area.

How Prop. 3 ever got on the ballot is a mystery. But it is there and you will vote on it.

If Prop. 3 is approved, what will follow?

How about a special section in restaurants for those with bad breath?

Or those who fail to use adequate underwear protection?

Or, worse yet, those who haven't learned what a daily change of clean socks can do for one?

Sure, these are ridiculous.

And so is Prop. 3.

San Jose, CA
 (Santa Clara Co.)
 Construction Labor News
 (Cir. W.)

SEP 16 1978

Allen's P.C.B. 10 1978

Trades Leader Is On The Record Against Prop. 5

Firmin T. Feurborn, executive secretary of Building and Construction Trades Council of Santa Barbara County, endorsed Californians for Common Sense, the volunteer organization fighting the smoking prohibitions initiative — Proposition 5 — on the November ballot.

"We are suffering already from high unemployment, and our growing labor force requires tens of thousands of new jobs to be created in this state every year, just to maintain our present level of employment," said Feurborn.

"Passage of the smoking prohibition would impose costly regulations that would further erode the state's ability to attract the new job-creating businesses we must have."

687017805

687017805A

687017805