

31st Democrats Newsletter

The Greatest Threat to the Small Farmer is Agra-Business
(Organized by R. Craig Sanders-email: z1n45rgiarc@netscape.com and Patricia Szot)

Let us all remember Ted Kennedy. His liberal voice will be missed.

ONGOING FOOD DRIVE

Please bring any food item (especially baby food) or toilet paper to the monthly meeting for our ongoing food drive to help others in our hard economic times.

The 31st L.D. Democrats will meet on Wednesday:
September 16, 2009

Program for September:

1) **Lisa Plymate, MD**- will come to discuss, as a physician, the whole health care issue. Dr. Plymate has been politically active in the Democratic Party for many years. Some of her political involvement includes: King County Committee women for 34th LD, PCO for 6 years, Health care involvement in King County Legislative Action Committee, King County Platform and Resolutions Committee. As a physician she is a Board member of the Physicians for a National Health Program, Washington State Director of Doctors for America and has run several forum concerning health care. She has practiced in Internal Medicine and Geriatrics since 1978 mostly in Tacoma and recently has moved to Seattle where she has helped migrant workers at Yakima Valley Farm Workers Clinics.

We will also be taping health care stories to be sent to our representatives. So come to discuss the whole health care issue and to tell your stories. Also we can discuss passing a resolution to support a strong public option as a LD.

- 2) **Don Meyer**-Candidate for Port of Tacoma Commission Pos. 4.
3) **Bob Blanchard, CPA**- Candidate for King County Assessor.

CORRECTION

Edgewood Gardens. In our rush to get out the August newsletter we inadvertently misspelled the names of our wonderful hosts at Edgewood Gardens. The correct spelling is Ilga Jansons and Michael Dryfoos (shown left). We are terribly embarrassed about this error, but this does give us another opportunity to again, thank them for sharing their home.

Thanks to Diane Kerlin for pointing out our error.



PAST EVENTS



Ingrid Curtis (left), Suzan DelBene's daughter (middle) and Suzan DelBene (right) at Bonney Lake Days in August. Suzan DelBene is running against Dave Reichert for the 8th CD. This is Suzan's second appearance at a function in the 31st.

The summer fairs are over, I want to thank all the wonderful volunteers I had at the booths. I could not do this without your help! You are the backbone of the 31st and I really appreciate your time and effort. Look forward to working with you next summer. Sincerely,
Patti Szot (Chair of Outreach)

Reichert Watch- In an interview July 1, 2009 with MYNorthwest.com radio talk show host David Boze, Dave Reichert defends his vote in support of cap and trade and discusses his solutions for the energy problem. The two main solutions that Reichert proposed were to increase “clean” coal production and to develop more “nuclear” energy. First, there is no such thing as “clean” coal. The most efficient method currently for mining coal is the “mountaintop removal” system, where they dynamite off the top of a mountain and send everything that’s not coal down the mountainside and into rivers and

streams. As we all know, this type of mining cripples the land and affects the lives of the people around these sites (pollutes the water, air and land). “Clean” coal sounds kind of like “clear skies”, which actually reversed some of the environmental protections that we already enjoyed. It is really easy for Reichert to support this since this isn’t done in our State, it just affects people in states like Virginia and West Virginia. Secondly, virtually nobody is talking about nuclear energy. Now, nuclear energy is truly a **fiscal nightmare**. The cost to build the facility and make it safe (against terrorist attacks) *PLUS* the cost of dealing with the radioactive waste (AKA “spent fuel rods”) means that nuclear energy will *NEVER* generate any money. Now, Republicans (like Reichert) feel that the companies that build nuclear power plants should not have to pay for the radioactive waste these plants generate, we the-tax payers should cover it so the companies could make a profit. Now, I am a responsible homeowner and **I PAY** for the waste (sewer, garbage, yard and recycle) my household generates. **WHY** can’t the companies that build nuclear power plants pay for the waste their companies generate. They should be responsible for their plants!!! The cost to “we the people” to cover the waste of nuclear power plants is unbelievable concerning money and repercussions on the environment. If we build nuclear power plants we will be burdening our children’s children, children, children, etc for hundreds of thousands of generations-HOW does one consider THAT fiscally responsible or environmentally sound? Now, Mr. Reichert must believe that the RAPTURE is coming soon and that the horrors of nuclear waste need not be worried about. As usual, Mr. Reichert as a Republican is supporting big corporations at the expense of “we the people” and this wonderful planet we live on. As typical, Republicans can only push the *old* programs/policies; they truly are stuck in a rut. They don’t know how to think outside the box. They are so narrow sighted! Mr. Reichert, come back down to earth and see the consequences of “clean” coal and nuclear energy.

You can hear the whole 30-minute interview at <http://kurulounge.blogspot.com/2009/07/dave-reichert-explains-his-vote-on-cap.html> .

PAID ADVERTISEMENT

Congressman Reichert your failure to help end America’s health care crisis shows your Party’s indifference to the plight of our citizens.
The Republican Congress-

Wasted the Clinton surplus, by spending billions on an illegal war;
Provided billions in tax breaks to corporations and the wealthy;
Deregulated financial institutions causing markets to collapse & billions in bailouts.

Rep. Reichert these steps will pay for healthcare-

Take the cap off of Social Security;
Roll back the Bush tax cuts for the rich.

We, the Executive Board of the 31st LD Democrats, expect that you and your fellow Republicans will continue to support corporate welfare and tax breaks for the rich and greedy. We call on everyone in Washington's 8th Congressional District to contact Dave Reichert and ask him how he can defend these financial choices and tell him you will only support a candidate who will ensure every American his or her basic right to affordable health care. <http://31stdistrictdemocrats.org>
Paid for by 31st LD Democrats Executive Board 20828 SR 410 #130, Bonney Lake, WA 98390

UPCOMING EVENTS

- 1) Approve 71 Community Organizing Meeting- September 15, 2009** (6:00 pm to 8:00 pm). Broadway Performance Hall, 1625 Broadway, Seattle, WA 98122-2498. Lets preserve the domestic partnership law.
 - 2) Free Movie Screening of "ON PAPER WINGS"-September 20, 2009** (4pm). 848 S 320th Street (Library), Federal Way, WA 98003
 - 3) Dahr Jamail-Iraq and Beyond: The Real Story-September 27, 2009** (6:30pm-8:30pm). University Temple United Methodist Church, 1415 NE 43rd Street, Seattle, WA 98103. This is a fundraiser for Coffee Strong.
-

The Next Big Fight

Headlines of late have been dominated by the debate over health care reform, but there is another big battle looming in Congress and all of the political dynamics that have made health care such a minefield will come into play when the Senate takes up the issue of how to address global warming and achieve energy independence.

As a candidate, Barack Obama promised strong leadership in the fight for health care for all Americans. As President, Obama has sometimes stated that a public option is central to real health care reform. But while single payer advocates watched in horror from the sidelines, Obama indicated that a public option was not "essential" and could be held in abeyance depending on the good behavior of the insurance industry. Similarly, Candidate Obama's call for a clean energy future has rung hollow in the ears of progressives when early concessions were made to the coal and oil industries in the first bill to be approved by either house in Congress to address climate change.

The Waxman-Markey bill (H.R. 2454), also known as the American Clean Energy and Security Act (ACES), will serve as the starting point for the climate debate in the Senate. The House approved the bill on June 26, 2009, by a vote of 219 to 212, and just as with health care reform, a Democratic majority was no guarantee of passage, with no less than 44 Democrats, including many from coal-producing states, voting 'No'. Passage would not have been possible without eight Republicans who voted in favor of the bill.

ACES does get some things right, but it misses the mark on others. The long-term emissions limit (cap greenhouse gas emissions at 83% below 2005 levels by 2050) agrees with limits suggested by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), but the short-term limits are not aggressive enough to make the long term goals achievable. UCS calls for a cap at 35% below 2005 levels by 2020 while the bill targets only 17%.

Emissions reductions are to be accomplished by implementing a cap and trade policy. Under such a policy, the government sets overall caps on carbon, and then sells allowances to industries that produce greenhouse gas emissions. Companies that need to increase their emission allowance must buy credits from those who pollute less. ACES provides that funds collected by the government be used to provide rebates to economically disadvantaged consumers to protect them from the

Local Note to Reichert Watchers: Dave Reichert (R. WA-8) was one of the 8 House Republicans who voted for H.R. 2454. But before you give the ex-sheriff kudos for his political bravery and dedication to environmental protection, you should know that before the bill passed, Reichert voted for an amendment to kill the bill by replacing it in its entirety with H.R. 513, aka the New Manhattan Project for Energy Independence, a series of multi-million dollar prizes for energy-related inventions. Seems like Dave was against the bill before he was for it.

increased cost of re-tooling necessary to achieve lower emissions. Unfortunately, this provision of the bill has been severely weakened by literally giving away as much as 85% of the allowances to coal and oil industries for the first decade, de-incentivizing carbon reduction. This is not cap and trade any more than a public insurance option is a single payer health care system. And just as a weak public option is worse than no health care reform, a weak cap and trade policy is worse than no carbon emission control program. This is true because passage of these kinds of half measures allow politicians to claim victory and stop working for real change.

Among other concessions to the coal industry, allowances for carbon capture and sequestration are made available, despite the fact that this technology is unproven and likely to be economically unfeasible. And while new power plants must meet more stringent standards for emissions, modifications to existing coal-fired plants that would result in increased emissions might not be subject to the same limitations. For no apparent reason, ACES removes the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to regulate carbon as a pollutant. Strong regulatory powers must be identified in any Senate bill closing loopholes such as these and ensuring that polluting industries are not able to game the system just as we should insist on accountability and oversight of the financial and insurance markets.

ACES does provide for a 20% renewable energy standard, mandating that at least 20% of the electricity generated in the U.S. come from renewable sources (the UCS calls for 25%), making possible loans and loan guarantees for development of new businesses and the new jobs they will create. Here again, concessions are being made, classifying trash incineration as “renewable” energy ignoring the fact that it contributes many types of harmful emissions to the atmosphere. Instead, we should include only truly clean renewable energy resources such as solar, wind, geothermal, and plant and animal waste. Taking the lead in these markets is crucial for our economy, as we can be certain that other countries will take advantage of our failure to act, just as the Japanese carmakers have benefited from the failure of U.S. automakers to produce fuel-efficient cars.

Implementing a strong policy to limit the effects of heat-trapping gases will put the U.S. in a much stronger position in the negotiations to be held at the Copenhagen Climate Change Conference in December. If we do not give away the entire cap and trade auction revenue to King Coal, we can allocate more of those funds for the preservation of tropical rainforests, and there is no other single step that will have more global benefits in the overall reduction of greenhouse gases than preserving the rainforests.

As with health care reform, we will have to combat lies and the lying liars who tell them (apologies to our newest Senator). The *New American* calls ACES “yet another massive intrusion into the everyday lives of Americans and the profitable operation of American businesses” and warns conservatives that campaigns by “environmental extremists are being joined with the machinations of the Washington elites in a pincer

movement that threatens what remains of our economy.” Getting the facts will dispel these rumors. The EPA points out in their report that the cap and trade policy proposed by ACES will have a relatively modest impact on U.S. consumers since the bulk of revenues from the program are returned to households. Not all environmentalists are enthusiastic (or extremist) about the bill, and it does have support from a broad range of people and organizations, including Al Gore, the United Auto Workers, General Electric, Dow Chemical Company, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and DuPont. With respect to the impact on the economy, Paul Krugman points out that “a commitment to greenhouse gas reduction would, in the short-to-medium run, have the same economic effects as a major technological innovation: It would give businesses a reason to invest in new equipment and facilities.” And new investment in clean energy means new sources of profits for American businesses.

When Congress is back for the fall session, the Senate must correct the failings of ACES and enact legislation that will provide genuine incentives for development of a new, green economy. Senators will have to look beyond the walls of the Senate chamber and listen to their constituents, not just to the vested interests of corporations making billions from dirty fossil fuels. As with health care, you and I must make our voices heard by calling and emailing our Senators and holding rallies in support of policies that move us toward a future where we use clean, renewable sources of energy, creating jobs for the coming generations and ensuring nothing less than the survival of life on Planet Earth.

Brian Gunn

Democratic Precinct Committee Officer

AUB 31-0062

<http://31stdistrictdemocrats.org/>

253-334-8614

Vote No on Initiative 1033

Well, the Republican golden boy, *Tim Eyman*, is back at it again. I-1033 is his latest proposal that is to reduce taxes on the wealthy to impair our public programs like *education, parks, police, fire or hospitals* that serve the VAST majority of the people. I guess Tim Eyman thinks are schools, our parks, the police and fire departments and hospitals (nursing homes) are doing just GREAT and really don't need any more money. Do *you* think our schools are doing great? Do our police and fire departments need more money to *protect* us? I-1033 is designed to LOCK IN all budgets cuts that the state and municipal governments are currently making. Simply- this initiative IS A JOB KILLER and a sure way TO KEEP THE RECESSION GOING!!!! We are experiencing the worst economic situation since the great depression. Washington State is having a great deal of difficulty in coming up with the revenues to cover all the public programs this state has. This initiative will kill any chance of an economic recovery. Leave it to a Republican to use *partisan politics* to try to destroy any good a Democratic President and a Democratic Governor would have. Tim Eyman is a typical Republican, he does not care about his fellow man-he has no humanity.

Colorado was the most recent state to pass such an initiative in 1992. Because of this proposal and the devastation it caused on its economy, Colorado has had to put it on hold in 2005 so that the state could recover economically. Similar initiatives have been defeated in Maine, Nebraska, Oregon and most recently California!!!

If this proposal passes it will be **illegal** for our state or our communities to spend more than what we spent the year before on services like schools, parks, police, fire, or hospitals (which wasn't enough to keep them functional). This proposal, if passed, cannot be amended for 2 YEARS without a 2/3 vote of the legislature.

You will hear supporters of the initiative say that a provision that exempts inflation and population growth from the limit has been included. This may sound fine initially, BUT Colorado had these exclusions in their proposal and it was still a disaster. There are many factors other than inflation and population growth that can cause an increase in the cost of providing public services year from year. Two examples are NEW DEVELOPMENT and DISEASE PREVENTION/TREATMENT. Can we say swine flu (H1N1 virus) pandemic!!! The 31st is also having a tremendous growth and many of the repercussions of this growth (traffic, sidewalks, police, fire and emergency medical response) have not been addressed here yet, and if this passes never will.

Flexibility is the key to any budget. We do need to fix our state's broken tax system, but this will only make things WORSE, not better. We need tax reform that improves stability and fairness in our tax system. Family farmers, homeowners, and regular people are paying their fair share in taxes, while wealthy corporations and wealthy Washingtonians push for more exemptions for themselves.

VOTE NO ON I-1033!!!!

Patricia Szot

Vice Chair King County
Chair of Outreach
AUB 31-5553

The curious and ongoing saga of Donald Siegelman

Imagine that you're a successful Democratic governor in a Republican state. The Republicans control the Congress and the White House. As tradition holds, the Bush Administration has also appointed many, if not all, of the US attorneys in the United States. Also suppose there were no rules that could not be broken in this Republican environment and that certain people wanted to get rid of this successful Democratic governor. Imagine being able to use the Justice Department to do it. This is what happened to Alabama governor Donald Siegelman.

Democratic Governor Donald Siegelman wanted to fund the public education of school kids. The idea that he came up with in 1999 was to start a state-run lottery. The proceeds from this lottery could buy computers and fund scholarships to keep the Alabama school kids up to date in their education. This was apparently contrary to the wishes of Republicans Ralph Reed and Jack Abramoff, who didn't want competition for the Indian-owned casinos that they were representing. In 2001, Karl Rove asked one of his Alabama operatives (Jill Simpson) to try to get pictures of Siegelman cheating on his wife. After months of following him, Simpson was told in 2002 that he would be taken care of by others. Thus began 5 years of Alabama US attorneys pursuing Siegelman with multiple investigations. Because of the bad publicity, Siegelman lost the 2002 gubernatorial election. In 2004, Siegelman began preparing to run for the 2006 election. Siegelman was then indicted on an alleged Medicaid scam. The first day of the trial, the judge called the prosecutors into his chambers and told them they didn't have a case and he threw the case out of court. The pursuit didn't let up and in 2006 Siegelman was brought to trial on bribery charges just as the primary was being held. By this time, Siegelman was tainted in the public's eye and he didn't make it past the primaries. The bribery charges stemmed from Siegelman's appointment of a man to a state board that regulated hospital construction. The man had given \$500,000 to Siegelman's campaign for re-election. There was no proof that Siegelman had pocketed any of this money for himself and three previous Republican governors preceding Siegelman had appointed the man to this same board. The prosecutions star witness was himself a criminal (facing 10 years) hoping to get a reduced sentence for extortion. This witness needed to go over and over his testimony with prosecutors, who met with him over 70 times. The jury foreman and another juror had already made up their mind before the prosecution had even finished and were actively recruiting other jurors to their views. The judge did not seem to think any of this misbehavior would jeopardize Siegelman's case and did nothing to correct it. Apparently, this time the fix was in and Siegelman was found guilty (after deadlocked twice) and sentenced to 7 years. Instead of the usual 45 days for presentation to the prison, Siegelman was cuffed, shackled and taken

straight to prison as though he were a killer or kidnapper. This treatment was not befitting of any white-collar criminal and certainly not fitting for a former governor. The US attorney involved in the indictment (Leura Canary) just happened to be the wife of the campaign manager (Bill Canary) for the Republican candidate that went on to win the gubernatorial election.

Remember when 7 or 8 US attorneys (including David Iglesias) were fired by the Bush administration for no apparent reason? It turns out that they were fired for not singling out Democrats for prosecution so that they would not be elected because they would appear to be criminals. The real story was the ninety something attorneys that weren't fired. During the Bush administration, Democrats would be 6-11 times more likely than Republicans to be targeted for prosecution. The US attorneys that were fired had either resisted or refused to target Democrats.

Time magazine said that Don Siegelman was targeted for prosecution. The New York Times said that what happened has never been considered a crime in America. CBS said that falsifications were submitted, documents had been withheld.

Now, it's all-fine to forgive and forget as President Obama seems to want to do. But Donald Siegelman is still being pursued even now (I believe that he is currently free on appeal). So much for forgive and forget. Additionally, these same Republican US attorneys are still in their official capacities. President Obama has not replaced them, as traditionally has occurred in the past. The politicization of the Justice Department should not occur in America. John Conyers and the House Judiciary Committee are investigating. **IF WE DO NOT ADDRESS THIS ABUSE NOW, THEN WE ARE GUARANTEEING THAT IT WILL HAPPEN AGAIN IN THE FUTURE.**

60 minutes did a story on Don Siegelman which is available at donsiegelman.com. Below is an open letter on his website explaining his current situation and what we all can do about it.

A LETTER FROM DON

So much has happened since I last wrote you. My legal options have narrowed, but my case has become more compelling.

I am appealing the case to the U.S. Supreme Court and I have a motion for a new trial pending. Unfortunately, my motion is before the same judge who had me hand cuffed, shackled, and put in solitary confinement! Even though we have evidence of massive prosecutorial misconduct, we still need this same judge to allow us to conduct a hearing! Fat chance of that happening!

In the meantime, there are many unanswered questions: Is President Obama's Administration looking into the abuse of the Department of Justice by the Bush Administration? Where is the House Judiciary Committee in its pursuit of Karl Rove? What's happening with the grand jury investigation of Rove? What will it take to get Eric Holder to investigate my case? 75 former state Attorneys General have asked for an investigation, but so far no investigation has taken place.

The bottom line is this: Why am I being prosecuted for something that has never been a crime in American politics?

As you can see, I still need your help. I am asking you to contact your governor and ask them to make an inquiry about "The Siegelman Case" with the U.S. Attorney General and the President.

PLEASE CONTACT YOUR CONGRESSPEOPLE AND YOUR GOVERNOR AND ENCOURAGE THEM TO TELL ERIC HOLDER TO INVESTIGATE THIS CASE. THIS IS A THREAT TO DEMOCRACY AND ABUSE OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT.

Phone: 202.514.2001 Fax: 202.307.6777 E-mail: AskDOJ@usdoj.gov

You can get additional information at donsiegelman.com

EDITORIAL-As | See It

By R. Craig Sanders

I became a Grange member the other day. I'm not a farmer, but I revere these people. Without farmers, we're all back to being hunters and gatherers. But small farmers are in trouble these days (and have been

for decades). Rather than fix the problem of small farms failing, we've chosen to put a positive spin on things by redefining "farms" in the last few years. So now, the good news is that somehow, 75,810 new farms have been created. The bad news is that only the definition of farm has changed and that we've actually lost 43,603 farms. When you have bad news, just change the details to make good news (reminds me of George Orwell's 1984 and Animal Farm).

When we think of farmers (if we think of them at all), we tend to think of that portrait of the man with the pitchfork standing alongside his wife toiling the land. These are the small farms and farmers that are being eradicated. Farming, in one way, is like any other business. These days, rather than relying on competition, it's easier for the large corporate farms to drive out the small farmers by gaming the rules and thus eliminating competition (think of Wal-Mart vs. the small shop owners). I used to naively think that all farms, large and small, worked together to feed America. Now I think that the thing most endangering a small farmer is a large, corporate farming group (Agra-business).

The small farmer used to be thought of as the backbone of America. They had a large number of members in the Grange and were very politically active. They were concerned with water conservation, soil erosion, and the decline in the number of small farms. Granges were also involved in creating public utilities (because the privatized urban utilities were gouging), providing insurance for farmers, and supporting the building of good roads for transporting their produce. I'm sure that there are other important concerns that I missed, but, as I said, I'm not a farmer. I suppose conservatives, nowadays, would have called them radicals for their ideas of equality and fair-play. There are still some activist farmers, but I'm afraid most have given up and sold out. Maybe they would have benefitted from forming unions and working together rather than against each other.

Corporate farms, on the other hand, seem to only be in it for the money. They say that they're feeding the world but, in truth, they're violating the planet in order to make huge profits. Like any corporation, they seem to only work for the short-term (one of their favorite sayings is "in the long-term, we're all dead"). Corporation farms use large-scale methods such as Genetically-Modified (GM) monoculture seeds and Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs). Unfortunately, it looks as though there's going to be some blowback from having large agra-businesses instead of small farming concerns. It turns out that agriculture, as practiced by agra-business, may end up being one of the biggest threats to the environment in the future. From 1961 to 1996, there has been a 700% increase in nitrogen fertilizer use worldwide, which, ends up threatening the oceans. There have been steady increases in fertilizer and pesticide use even after 1996, when GM crops were introduced (GM crops were supposed to be more hardy and pest-resistant). Also, it is estimated that 18% of the world's greenhouse gasses are produced by farm animals.

CAFOs are probably the scariest. These are pens designed to keep the most animals confined in the least amount of space for the sole purpose of providing meat on the hoof. Antibiotics are used liberally to keep the animals "healthy". Animal production like this also produces, literally, tons of manure that has been exposed to antibiotics and anti-virals. Sustained exposure to antibiotics and anti-virals may lead to drug resistance. We may have dodged the bullet this time. There are stories circulating that the latest swine-flu scare was the product of one of these CAFOs in Mexico. In fact, the original 1980's H1N1 swine-flu virus is said to have emerged from a CAFO in North Carolina. So, maybe this latest scare can be a wakeup call to change our lifestyles. I say that we may have dodged the bullet. Currently, officials are concerned that this latest swine-flu battle bears a similar pattern to the 1917-1918 influenza epidemic. The 1917-1918 epidemic apparently started out mild in the spring, but came back with a vengeance in the fall and winter. Preparations are currently being made as if this worst-case scenario may play out. The next political debate may be whether to make the new swine-flu vaccination mandatory or voluntary.

Small farming operations are good and should be encouraged and supported. Large-corporation agra-businesses are bad for the long-run and should be de-monopolized. Maybe we should all eat more local fruits and vegetables and less meat. Support your local farmer's markets. It's fresher, better for you and doesn't send your money out of the state to some corporate headquarters.

By the way, the powers that be are currently redefining “organic” now. They are doing this because the large agra-businesses have seen that there’s big money to be made if only they can muddy the waters and confuse people into thinking that their products are also “organic”. This would accomplish two things; first, it would get people who are ignorant of this issue to think that they are purchasing more healthy food and second, it would have a negative effect on the truly organic products. People are trying to vote with their pocketbook and show their disapproval of large-scale production methods. By changing the definition of “organic”, the large companies are gaming the system such that “organic” will ultimately mean nothing.

Our Representatives-how to get hold of them

Senators: Patty Murray (D) and Maria Cantwell

Patty Murray- DC office phone: (202) 224-2621

Seattle Office

2988 Jackson Federal Bldg.

915 2nd Avenue

Seattle, Washington 98174

Phone: (206) 553-5545

Fax: (206) 553-0891

Maria Cantwell- DC office phone (202) 224-3441

Seattle Office

915 Second Avenue

Suite #3206

Seattle, WA 98174

206-220-6400

206-220-6404 – FAX

Tacoma Office

950 Pacific Avenue, Suite #615

Tacoma, WA 98402

253-572-2281

253-572-5879 FAX

8th CD Representative-Dave Reichert (R)

Dave Reichert- DC Office phone (202) 225-7761

District Office

2737 78th Avenue, S.E. Suite #202

Mercer Island, WA 98040

(206) 275-3438

(206) 275-3437 Fax

9th CD Representative-Adam Smith (D)

Adam Smith-DC office phone (202) 225-8901

District Office

2209 Pacific Ave, Suite B

Tacoma, WA 98402

(253) 593-6600

(253)593-6776

State Senator-31st LD

Pam Roach (R)

POB 40431

Olympia, WA 98504

Office: 360-786-7660

Fax: 360-786-7173

Email: Roach.Pam@leg.wa.gov

State Representatives-31st LD

Chris Hurst (D)

POB 40600

Olympia, WA 98504

Office: 360-786-7866

Fax: 360-786-7317

Email: Hurst.Christopher@leg.wa.gov

Dan Roach (R)

POB 40600

Olympia, WA 98504

Office: 360-786-7846

Email: Roach.Dan@leg.wa.gov

Occupation Statistics (<http://www.antiwar.com/casualties>)

4,343 US Military Deaths (Iraq)

820 US Military Deaths (Afghanistan)

31,483 US Military Wounded (Iraq)

151,000-1,339,771 Iraq Civilian Deaths



DO YOU WANT TO PARTICIPATE IN OUR LOCAL POLITICAL SYSTEM?

YES!! Join us

Fill out the form below (questions are required by the state Public Disclosure Commission) and hand it in to one of our volunteers or mail it in (31st District Democrats, 20825 SR 410 E #130, Bonney Lake, WA 98391). You can pay dues now or later by check (made out to 31st District Democrats) or on-line by credit card. Dues are \$31 per year (January-December), but members can pay what they can afford with a minimum of \$5.

NAME _____

Street Address _____

Mailing Address (if different from above) _____

Telephone # _____

Email _____

Occupation _____

Employer _____