Proposition 14 would repeal existing law, remove legislative controls over it and mandate the legislature to spend whatever is 'necessary'

Never before has there been an initiative like Proposition 14 before the state's voters. Though the state constitution spells out that the legislature sets budget appropriations for state programs and agencies, Porposition 14 clearly avoids this in very precise language:

"The legislature shall appropriate the amounts to the Agricultural Labor Relations Board as may be necessary . . . "

What is necessary? Who will determine what is necessary, elected representatives or some bureacrat? Will expenses be justified? The answers to these very critical questions are staggering. The legislature must appropriate whatever is 'necessary,' according to the Proposition. Therefore, the

# Farmworkers have the right to vote

budgetary decisions of a multi-million dollar state agency rests with the directors of that same agency with no chance for legislative review. (Remember: the legislature is powerless to make any changes regarding the operation or the conduct of this agency. The only way any changes could be effected would be through another initiative or another ballot proposition). As for justification of expenses, according to the law whatever the amount of money it takes to implement the Board's actions is justification enough.

Early in the circulation drive to quality the petition for the ballot, soon after the ALRB went out of operation due to lack of funding, initiative supporters maintained the initiative was necessary to 'give farmworkers the right to vote.'

The fact is, farmworkers do have the right to vote.

The governor, legislators, the past chairman and current members of the ALRB have all acknowledged that the current law will have to be changed, perhaps often, to meet the needs of employees, employers and labor organizations. This initiative prevents the legislature from making such changes, since any modifications in the law require an additional initiative or ballot measure. Such inflexibility is fatal beinflexibility is fatal because labor rela-

### Inflexibility

tions legislation must respond to the changing needs and relationships of all parties. This has been true of all other federal and state labor relations laws.

The initiative removes from the legislature the necessary budgetary control, and ignores the drain this might impose on other vital state programs. This "blank check" financing goes to the same agency which overspent its 1975-1976 budget in less than six months. Allowing such non-elected

## Fiscal Irresponsibility

agency members to determine the tax rate of California citizens is dangerous and irresponsible and an invitation to increased taxes.

The initiative makes the infamous "access rule," a regulation still under

judicial challenge before the U.S. Supreme Court, a *permanent* part of the law. Thus, non-employee union organizers could trespass on private property, enter dairies, greenhouses, poultry production facilities, farms or other agricultural private property for up to three hours every working day without permission of the property owner, regardless of risks to health, safety and

# Basic Property Rights Would Be Destroyed

sanitation. The initiative allows this invasion of private property even though organizers engage in "disruptive conduct" — a frightening and dangerous precedent leading to the further erosion and destruction of property rights of all citizens.

### Duplication

The issue here is *not* whether farm workers should have the right to decide which union, if any, should represent them. That right *exists* under present law. The issue is whether the existing law will continue under the responsible substantive and budgetary control of elected representatives.

Food production is too vital to California and the nation, and agriculture too essential to the state's economy to permit such a cumbersome and impractical method of resolving agricultural labor relations issues.