

VOTE YES ON PROPOSITION 14 CAMPAIGN

Directors Meeting -- Proposed Agenda

I. PLANNING PROPOSITION 14 CAMPAIGN

A. Voter Statistics

- ✓ 1. General Voter Statistics
- ✓ 2. Democratic Registration by Assembly District & Categorized
- ✓ 3. Democratic and Independent Registration by Assembly District & Categorized
- 4. Directors and Coordinators
 - a. Registration Data Per:
 - 1) Supervisorial District
 - 2) Congressional District
 - 3) Senatorial District
 - 4) Assembly District
 - 5) Cities

B. State Map with Overlay of Assembly Districts throughout State

C. Area Maps of Assembly Districts for:

- 1) Los Angeles
- 2) San Diego
- 3) Orange County
- 4) Northern California

✓ D. Written Materials on Proposition 14

- 1. Ballot Title and Summary for Proposition 14
- 2. Legislative Analysis
- 3. Proponent's and Opponent's Arguments on Proposition 14
- 4. Rebuttal Arguments
- 5. Cesar's letter to March Fong Eu
- 6. Secretary of State's Reply to Cesar's letter

✓ E. Fred Ross's Explanation of Proposition 14

F. Miscellaneous

- ✓ 1. Members of the Assembly: County and District
- ✓ 2. Representatives in Congress
- ✓ 3. Members of the State Senate
- ✓ 4. Grower Add

II. BACKGROUND TO CAMPAIGN

✓ A. Proposed Organizational Structure

B. Campaign Breakdown

- 1. Media
- 2. Public Relations
- 3. Fundraising

4. People Campaign - Action Program
 - a. Organizations
 - 1) Community, Unions, Churches
 - a) Endorsement Campaign
 - 2) College Campuses and Schools
 - b. People to People
 - 1) Mass Canvassing Program
 - 2) Mass Leafletting
 - 3) Door-to-Door Canvassing
 - 4) Mass Billboarding Operation
 - 5) Recruitment Program
 - 6) Misc. Campaigns -- Lawn Signs, Freeway Signs, T-Shirts, Street Stencilling, Sniping
 - 7) Farm Worker Mobilization
5. Administration

*teaching
people
directly*

Vote Registration

III. ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN & TIMETABLE

- A. Timetable of Events
- B. Campaign Roles
 1. Director
 2. Coordinator
 3. Assembly District Organizer/Coordinators
 4. Organizer
- C. Administration Program
- D. Determine Final Organizational Structure
- E. Assignments
- F. Area Analysis Completed in April Signature Campaign
- G. Assembly District Maps

IV. MEETING LOGISTICS

Contact: Fr. Terrance 456-6631

- A. Location - Serra Retreat House
Directions: Santa Monica Freeway (West) → Pacific Coast Highway (North) → go about 10 miles and thru Malibu. Just past Jack in the Box turn right at sign "Serra Retreat House" → until you reach house (about 1 mile)

B. Meals

	<u>Breakfast</u>	<u>Lunch</u>	<u>Supper</u>
Monday	--	--	--
Tuesday	8:00	12:00	6:00
Wednesday	"	"	"
Thursday	"	"	"
Friday	"	"	"

C. Sleeping Arrangements

- 1) Use 2nd Floor Only
- 2) Make sure all beds are made up and rooms are cleaned before you leave

D. Meeting Room

We will be meeting in Lounge on 2nd Floor

map

VOTER AND INITIATIVE STATISTICS

1) Latest vote totals are 8,240,289 total voters *as of 30 days before June primary*

Demos	Rep.	Decl. to state	Others
4,701,736	3,000,152	472,822	65,579
57.1%	36.4%	5.7%	.9%

2) Projected totals for November are 10,800,000 voters

Demos	Republicans	Decl. to state	Others
6,164,134	3,930,306	619,282	86,288

3) A good guess for voter turnout is 80% which means actual voting human beings will be 8,638,205.

4) We need 4,319,103 votes to win.

5) All Democrats in Targeted ADs (including volunteer committees and media only but not including field offices) are 4,157,054 votes. Decline to state votes in targeted ADs equal 418,074. Combined total would be 4,575,128. Subtract 8% given NO vote and we have 4,209,118 votes.

6) Demos in field office areas =	591,180
Demos in not covered areas =	197,968
Decline-to-state in Field office areas =	59,724
Decline-to-state in not covered areas =	19,908

Out of 80 Assembly Districts, we are covering :

	L.A.	So. Cal	No. Cal	Total	Total Voters	Demos & Decl. to state
Total ADs	24	13	22	59	8,240,289	5,174,558
Priority 1 & 2	9	5	18	32	3,416,412	2,315,433 = 44.7%
Priority 3	13	5	2	19	1,836,852	1,169,892 = 22.6%
Priority 4	2	3	2	7	729,046	393,914 = 7.6%
Demos & Decl. to State	1,435,328 27.6%	810,189 15.7%	1,662,947 32.0%			

Field Offices - Total voters
 1,173,833 = 14.2%
 Demos and Decl. to state ←
 710,197 = 13.7% ←

Others - Total Voters
 1,084,136 = 13.2%
 Demos and Decl. to State
 578,207 = 11.2%

On the boycott we need only 10-15% of the people to be effective over years. On the Initiative we needed signatures of 350,000 registered voters in a month. For Proposition 22 we need 4,319,103 votes to win on November 2, 78 days away.

Map

DEW-CRATS

page 2

#1 -- E-M (9)	#2 -- H-M (9)	H-L #3 -- M-M (22)	M-M M-L #4 -- L-M (11)	L-L E-L Out -- Other (17)
#4 Yolo 62.1% 69m	#5 Sact 61.7% 64m	#8 Mapa 58.1% 70m	#10 C.C. 53.5% 66m	#1 59.3% 74m
#6 Sact 62.6% 72m	#9 Mar 53.3% 68m	#19 S.M. 61.1% 56m	#24 S.C. 56.3% 60m	#2 59.4% 74m
#12 Alan 57.6% 84m	#11 C.C. 68.6% 66m	#21 S.M. 54.9% 55m	#20 S.M. 50.3% 60m	#22 46.1% 54m
#17 S.F. 65.4% 75m	#13 Alan 71.7% 67m	#23 S.C. 61.8% 53m	#58 L.A. 56.7% 66m	#34 53.6% 51m
#18 S.F. 69.0% 78m	#14 Alan 72.0% 66m	#25 S.C. 64.3% 57m	#78 S.D. 51.3% 61m	#56 49.7% 66m
#43 L.A. 61.1% 92m	#15 Alan 61.4% 61m	#28 S.C. 55.4% 67m	#71 Org. 55.4% 56m	#41 45.5% 40m
#44 L.A. 63.6% 78m	#16 S.F. 71.1% 60m	#35 S.E. 52.5% 64m	#72 Org. 52.5% 46m	#42 42.2% 49m
#45 L.A. 65.4% 80m	#40 L.A. <u>62.8%</u> 67m	#39 L.A. 62.0% 55m	#73 Org. 44.9% 61m	#51 45.3% 55m
#49 L.A. 74.0% 73m	#50 L.A. 71.7% 59m	#47 L.A. 32.6% 52m	#76 S.D. 40.9% 74m	#61 42.3% 45m
		#48 L.A. 83.0% 51m	#77 S.D. 48.4% 62m	#62 49.8% 54m
		#46 L.A. 59.9% 45m	#80 S.D. 54.5% 47m	#64 48.3% 51m
		#52 L.A. 60.6% 50m		#65 55.2% 42m
		#53 L.A. 69.3% 51m		#68 56.5% 52m
		#54 L.A. 76.6% 50m		#69 46.9% 53m
		#55 L.A. 66.5% 43m		#70 40.0% 50m
		#56 L.A. 77.9% 34m		#74 34.2% 55m
		#57 L.A. 61.2% 50m		#7 56.7% 72m
		#59 L.A. 66.3% 59m		
		#60 L.A. 67.9% 45m		
		#63 L.A. 60.3% 57m		
		#66 Sber. 65.3% 46m		
		#79 S.D. 60.0% 45m		
64.3% 703,143	65.3% 578,855	63.3% 1,157,458	50.5% 659,434	47.9% 874,002

Numbers

Percentore
 60% + = High
 50% - 59% = Med.
 50% - = Low
 Numbers
 70m + = High
 60m - 69m = Med.
 59m - = Low

1 + 2 + 3 = 3,809,103
 F.O. = 688,861
 Out = 874,002

56,000
688,861

+ = good
- = bad

Madeline

Members of the Assembly
County and District

<u>Senate Dist.</u>	<u>Assembly Dist.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>County or Counties</u>
1	1	<i>not running, another woman running</i> Pauline L. Davis (D)	Butte, Glenn, Lassen, Modoc Plumas, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity
2	2	Barry + Barry Keene (D)	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Sonoma
1	3	Eugene A. Chappie (R)	Butte, Colusa, Nevada, Placer Sierra, Sutter, Yuba
4	4	Vic Fazio (D)	Sacto, Solano, Yolo
3	5	Eugene T. Gualco (D)	Sacramento
3	6	Leroy F. Greene (D)	Sacramento
13	7	<i>bad</i> - John Garamendi (D)	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mono, Sacto, San Joaquin, Tuolumne
4	8	Alfred C. Siegler (D)	Napa, Solano, Sonoma
2	9	Michael Wornum (D)	Marin, Sonoma
7	10	- Daniel Boatright (D)	Contra Costa
7	11	- John T. Knox (D)	Contra Costa
9	12	<i>not running</i> Ken Meade (D) <i>Bates - good</i>	Alameda, Contra Costa
9	13	+ John Miller (D)	Alameda
8	14	- Bill Lockyer (D)	Alameda
8	15	- S. Floyd Mori (D)	Alameda
5	16	+ John Foran (D) <i>dit Agnes</i>	San Francisco
5	17	+ Willie Brown (D)	San Francisco
6	18	o Leo T. McCarthy (D)	San Francisco, San Mateo
6	19	Louis J. Papan (D)	San Mateo
10	20	<i>not bad</i> Dixon Arnett (R)	San Mateo
10	21	<i>not bad</i> Victor Calvo (D)	San Mateo, Santa Clara
12	22	- Richard Hayden (R)	Santa Clara
12	23	+ John Vasconcellos (D)	Santa Clara
11	24	<i>fair</i> Leona H. Egeland (D)	San Benito, Santa Clara
11	25	<i>same</i> - Alister McAllister (D)	Alameda, Santa Clara
13	26	Carmen Perino (D)	San Joaquin, Stanislaus
14	27	- John Thurman (D)	Merced, Stanislaus
17	28	- Frank Murphy Jr. (R)	Monterey, Santa Cruz
17	29	- Robert P. Nimmo (R)	Monterey, San Luis Obispo
14	30	<i>only won campaign</i> - Ken Maddy (R) <i>Ken Maddy running against him</i>	Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, Merced
15	31	- Ernest Mobley (R)	Fresno, Tulare
15	32	- Gordon Duffy (R)	Kern, Kings, Tulare
16	33	- William Thomas (R)	Kern
16	34	Larry Chimbole (D)	Inyo, Kern, L.A., San Bernardino
18	35	+ Gary Hart (D)	Santa Barbara
18	36	o Ken MacDonald (D)	Ventura
19	37	- Robert C. Cline (R)	L.A., Ventura
19	38	- Paul Priolo (R)	L.A., Ventura
20	39	+ Jim Keysor (D)	L.A.
20	40	? Tom Bane (D)	L.A.
21	41	- Mike Antonovich (R)	L.A.
21	42	Frank Lanterman (R)	L.A.
22	43	+ Howard N. Berman (D)	L.A.
22-	44	+ Alan L. Sieroty (D)	L.A.
23	45	+ Herschel Rosenthal (D)	L.A.

we go after all these guys

Members of the Assembly

<u>Senate Dist.</u>	<u>Assembly Dist.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>County or Counties</u>
23	46	+ Charles Warren (D)	L.A.
29	47	+ Teresa P. Hughes (D)	L.A.
29	48	+ Leon D. Ralph (D)	L.A.
30	49	Julian C. Dixon (D)	L.A.
30	50	Curtis R. Tucker (D)	L.A.
27	51	Robert Beverly (R)	L.A.
27	52	Vincent Thomas (D)	L.A.
28	53	Paul T. Bannai (R)	L.A.
28	54	Frank Vicencia (D)	L.A.
24	55	+ Richard Alatore (D)	L.A.
24	56	+ Art Torres (D)	L.A.
31	57	Mike Cullen (D)	L.A.
31	58	Fred W. Chel (D)	L.A.
26	59	+ Jack R. Fenton (D)	L.A.
26	60	+ Joseph Montoya (D)	L.A.
25	61	- # John Collier (R)	L.A.
25	62	William H. Lancaster (R)	L.A.
33	63	Robert McLennan (R)	L.A.
33	64	William Campbell (R)	L.A.
32	65	Bill McVittie, (D)	L.A., San Bernardino
32	66	Terry Goggin (D)	San Bernardino
34	67	Jerry Lewis (R)	Riverside, San Bernardino
34	68	Walter Ingalls (D)	Riverside
35	69	- John Briggs (R)	Orange
35	70	Bruce Nestande (R)	Orange
37	71	Paul Carpenter (D)	Orange
37	72	Richard Robinson (D)	Orange
36	73	Robert H. Burke (R)	Orange
36	74	Robert Badham (R)	Orange
38	75	- Tom Suitt (D)	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego
38	76	- William A. Craven (R)	San Diego
39	77	+ Bob Wilson (D)	San Diego
39	78	+ Lawrence Kapiloff (D)	San Diego
40	79	+ Pete Chacon (D)	San Diego
40	80	+ Wadie P. Deddeh (D)	San Diego

black mark

*Senators - Cranston
Sunney*

Representatives in Congress

<u>District</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>County or Counties</u>
1	Harold T. Johnson(D)	Butte, Glenn, Lassen, Modoc, Nevada Placer, Plumas, Shasta, Sacto, Sierra, Siskiyou, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba
2	- Don Clausen (R)	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mando- cino, Napa, Sonoma
3	John E. Moss(D)	Sacramento
4	<i>2 families</i> Robert L. Leggett(D)	Colusa, Sacto, Solano, Sutter, Yolo
5	+ John Burton(D)	Marin, San Francisco, Sonoma
6	+ Philip Burton (D)	San Francisco
7	<i>fan</i> George Miller(D)	Contra Costa
8	+ Ron Dellums(D)	Alameda, Contra Costa
9	+ Fortney Stark Jr.(D)	Alameda, Contra Costa
10	+ Don Edwards (D)	Alameda, Santa Clara
11	<i>fan</i> Leo J. Ryan(D)	San Mateo
12	<i>prob</i> Pete McCloskey(R)	San Mateo, Santa Clara
13	<i>fan</i> Norman Y. Mineta(D)	Santa Clara
14	o John J. McFall(D)	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mono, Sacto, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne
15	- B.F. Sisk(D)	Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Stanislaus
16	- Burt Talcott(R)	Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz
17	John Krebs(D)	Fresno, Kings, Tulare
18	- William Ketchum(R)	Inyo, Kern, L.A., Tulare
19	- Robert Lagomarsino(R)	San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventuara
20	- Barry Goldwater Jr.(R)	L.A., Ventura
21	OK James Corman (D)	L.A.
22	- Carlos Moorhead(R)	L.A.
23	Thomas Rees (D)	L.A.
24	Henry A Waxman(D)	L.A.
26	- John Roussetot(R)	L.A.
25	+ Edward Roybal(D)	L.A.
27	? Alphonzo Bell(R)	L.A.
28	<i>long talk a long time</i> + Yvonne Braithwaite Burke(D)	L.A.
29	+ Augustus Hawkins(D)	L.A.
30	? George Danielson(D)	L.A.
31	Charles Wilson(D)	L.A.
32	<i>maybe good</i> ? Glenn Anderson(D)	L.A.
33	Del Clauson(R)	L.A.
34	Mark Hannaford (D)	L.A., Orange
35	Jim Lloyd(D)	L.A., San Bernardino
36	+ George Brown Jr.(D)	Riverside, San Bernardino
37	Jerry Pettis(R)	Riverside, San Bernardino
38	Jerry Patterson(D)	Orange
39	- Charles E. Wiggins(R)	Orange
40	<i>fan</i> Andrew Hinshaw(R)	Orange, San Diego
41	- Bob Wilson (R)	San Diego
42	<i>fan</i> Lionel Van Deerlin(D)	San Diego
43	- Clair W. Burgener(R)	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego

Mod # Senate Districts are running

Members of the State Senate

<u>Senate Dist.</u>	<u>Assembly Dist.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>County or Counties</u>
1	1,3	<i>not good</i> - Collier (D)	Butte, Colusa, Glenn, Lassen Modoc, Nevada, Placer, Plumas Shasta, Sierra, Siskiyou Sutter, Tehama, Trinity, Yuba
2	2,9	<i>fair</i> Behr (R)	Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake Marin, Mendocino, Sonoma
3	5,6	+ Rodda (D)	Sacramento
4	4,8	+ Dunlap (D)	Napa, Sacto, Solano, Sonoma Yolo
5	16,17	+ Marks (r)	San Francisco
6	18,19	+ Vacancy → Foran (D)	San Francisco, San Mateo
7	10,11	Nejedly (R)	Contra Costa
8	14,15	<i>not good</i> + Holmdahl (D)	Alameda
9	12,13	+ Petris (D)	Alameda, Contra Costa
10	20,21	Gregorio (D)	San Mateo, Santa Clara
11	24,25	<i>same</i> - Alquist (D)	Alameda, San Benito, Santa Clara
12	22,23	+ Smith (D)	Santa Clara
13	7,26	- Berryhill (R) <i>not running</i>	Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mono, Sacto, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne
14	27,30	- Zenovich (D)	Fresno, Madera, Mariposa, Merced, Stanislaus
15	31,32	- Way (R)	Fresno, Kern, Kings, Tulare
16	33,34	o Stiern (D)	Inyo, Kern, LA San Bernardino
17	28,29	- Grunsky (R)	Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz Santa Barbara, Ventura
18	35,36	<i>fair</i> Rains (D)	L.A., Ventura
19	38,37	Cusanovich (R)	L.A.
20	39,40	+ Robbins (D)	L.A.
21	41,42	Russel (R)	L.A.
22	43,44	+ Bielsen (D)	L.A.
23	45,46	+ Roberti (D)	L.A.
24	55,56	+ Garcia (D)	L.A.
25	61,62	- Richardson (R)	L.A.
26	59,60	Song (D)	L.A.
27	51,52	Stayens (R)	L.A.
28	53,54	Dills (D)	L.A.
29	47,48	+ Greene (D)	L.A.
30	49,50	+ Holden (D)	L.A.
31	57,58	Deukmejian (R)	L.A.
32	65,66	<i>same</i> Ayala (D)	L.A., San Bernardino
33	63,64	vacant	L.A.
34	67,68	Presley (D)	Riverside, San Bernardino
35	69,70	Wheatsmore (R)	Orange
36	73,74	- Carpenter (R)	Orange, San Diego
37	70,71	<i>same</i> vacant	Orange
38	75,76	- Stull (R)	Imperial, Riverside, San Diego
39	77,78	- Schrade (R)	San Diego
40	79,80	<i>fair</i> Mills (D)	San Diego

BALLOT TITLE & SUMMARY FOR PROPOSITION 14

Madeline

on hand ballot

MANUAL TITLE

AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Repeals Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1975; reenacts as Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1976. Makes technical amendments to maintain status quo under 1975 Act, except requires new appointments to Agricultural Labor Relations Board. Additional amendments require: access for union organizers to property of employers for certain periods; minimum of 50% of employees to petition for decertification of union; Legislature to provide appropriations necessary to carry out the Act; Board to provide employer-supplied lists of agricultural employees to persons involved in elections. Permits Board to award treble damages for unfair labor practices. Financial impact: Proposition would result in minor, if any, increased costs to the state.

on VOTING MACHINE TITLE

largely this type

AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS. INITIATIVE STATUTE. Reenacts Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1975 with amendments and requires state legislative appropriations to implement. Financial impact: Proposition would result in minor, if any, increased costs to the state.

good

PROPOSITION 14

AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS INITIATIVE

Analysis by Legislative Analyst

"great impartial"

will appear in voter pamphlet

PROPOSAL:

Background:

The Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1975, which became effective August 28, 1975, gives agriculture workers the right to select and join unions of their own choosing for purposes of bargaining collectively with their employer and to participate in lawful union activities. These rights are similar to those given to nonagricultural workers in private employment under the National Labor Relations Act.

The Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1975 created a General Counsel and a five-member Agricultural Labor Relations Board. The board holds elections for agriculture workers to select the union of their choice. The counsel takes legal action against unions or employers which engage in unfair labor practices prohibited by the act such as discriminating against an employee for exercising his free choice to join a union and the failure of either party to bargain in good faith.

The board establishes rules and regulations for implementing the act. It also settles disputes regarding the holding of elections and charges of unfair labor practices. The board has the power to prescribe remedies in unfair labor practice cases and may direct the offending party to compensate injured parties for certain losses. Such remedies may include job reinstatement and restoration of lost wages. The board enforces its orders by court proceedings.

The board established under the 1975 law ran out of money in February 1976. Its program was stopped for the remainder of the 1975-76 fiscal year because no additional funding was provided. Funding after July 1, 1976 is now included in the 1976 Budget Act.

This proposition repeals and reenacts the Agricultural Labor Relations Act, retaining most of its basic functions with the following modifications:

grows opposing 1- inflexibility
2- unnecessary

Agricultural Labor Relations (continued)

Technical reason

governor can
appoint all same
people - growers
can oppose

- Provides for the appointment of a new Agricultural Labor Relations Board with new terms of office.
- Authorizes union organizers to enter an (employer's property) for purposes of campaigning for an election. The period of access would be limited to three hours per day at specified (non-work hours) times. This provision is similar to a regulation, established by the existing board, which has the effect of law.
- Provides that a new election cannot be held if, in addition to other conditions, an election was held under existing law within the twelve months immediately preceding the filing for the new election.
- Requires the board to make lists of employees available to persons who file notices of intention to petition for elections. The board obtains such lists from employers to determine workers' eligibility to participate in an election to select a union. (regulation to be determined by Bd)
- Allows the board to order payment of treble damages as a penalty for an unfair labor practice.
- Makes it more difficult to hold an election to remove a union which has previously won an election and which has been certified as the official bargaining representative of a designated group of workers. Petitions for holding such elections would require the signatures of 50 percent rather than 30 percent of the workers.
- Directs the Legislature to appropriate sufficient funds to allow the board to fulfill its responsibilities. The Legislative Counsel advises that this provision is directory, not mandatory upon the Legislature and does not constitute an appropriation. Therefore, regardless of its intent, it would not bind the Legislature to appropriate any specific amount of money.

being considered by Supreme Ct. -
"decisions handed by Supreme Ct." - if an
const. can be thrown out

elections we have are valid

we'll imp. for us
make by deal
of this all
hearings

harder for IBT &
growers to get hangup
of ~~these~~ voters -
don't waste taxpayer
money holding
fruitless elections

does give Leg. some
discretion
(not inflexible)

imp

very good

only fair
democratic

focus
guarantees
right to
vote

Makes Leg. deal with
"sufficiency of funds" not
blackmail or politics

funding:
guarantees of law
can't be negotiated so
funding won't be crucial
issue unless growers
want to go against "people of CA"

Agricultural Labor Relations (continued)

FISCAL EFFECT:

The Budget Act of 1976 appropriates \$6,688,000 from the General Fund for the administration of the Agricultural Labor Relations program during the 1976-77 fiscal year. Because this proposition largely reenacts provisions of existing law, it would not result in any significant increased cost to the state. Some features which differ from existing law would result in minor increased state costs, and others would result in savings. Any net increased cost could be absorbed within the amount currently budgeted to the board.

Because the proposition would not legally bind the Legislature to appropriate any specific amount of money for the board, the level of funding in future years would be determined by the Governor and Legislature through the state's regular budget process. In summary, the proposition would result in minor, if any, increased costs to the state.

> great

less than 1% of state budget

ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 14

The right to vote is one of our most cherished rights. And yet, as we celebrate our bicentennial, the right to vote is still at issue for the quarter million men, women and children in California who harvest the food we eat.

In 1935, when Congress granted working people the right to organize and choose their representatives by secret ballot elections, agribusiness persuaded lawmakers to deny those rights to farm workers.

Last year, Governor Brown decided to end forty years of discrimination by granting farm workers the same rights as other workers. So he sponsored the Agricultural Labor Relations Act which was endorsed by agribusiness, the Teamsters Union and the United Farm Workers.

The law was passed by the legislature...and it worked!

Gone were the bloodshed and violence which were part of California agribusiness since the turn of the century. There were no strikes or strife in the fields; more than 400 elections were held.

Yet within five months--after losing 93 percent of the elections--agribusiness demanded crippling changes in the law before legislators provided funds necessary to continue the voting.

The Teamsters Union, which had won only one-third of the elections, also lobbied to halt the balloting.

The California legislature was not strong enough to stand up to agribusiness-Teamster power and to permanently guarantee all of the people the most sacred American right--the right to vote.

The farm workers' only alternative was to bypass the politicians in Sacramento and to go directly to you, the people. They ask you to permanently guarantee their right to vote.

You can guarantee an end to the terrible hardships farm workers and their families have suffered. You can end squalid labor camps, malnourished farm worker children, and hazardous working conditions in the fields. Then farm workers need no longer face a life span far shorter than those of other Americans.

Argument in Favor of Proposition 14
Page 2.

Proposition 14 asks you, the people of California, to act so that those who work in our fields are never again deprived of their right to vote. Your "yes" vote for Proposition 14 will assure that.

Cesar Chavez, President
United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO

Mervyn Dymally
Lieutenant Governor of California

Richard Alatorre
Member of the Assembly, Co-Author
Agricultural Labor Relations Act

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF PROPOSITION 14

Passage of Proposition 14 would be an injustice to farmworkers, consumers and employers alike.

The issue is not the right of farmworkers to vote on union representation. Farm workers already have that right,

The issue is casting in concrete a farm labor law which simply hasn't been workable for either labor or management. Both sides have sought and are seeking changes.

Labor relations must be flexible. If the proposition passes, both labor and management will be burdened with a law which can be changed only by constitutional amendment.

Federal labor law has been successful in protecting rights of employees and employers because Congress has responded to necessary change as times changed. The California Legislature deserves the same opportunity. Tying its hands isn't good common sense.

Consumers, as well as workers and employers, will suffer if Proposition 14 passes. If the proposition passes, California farmers will be burdened with restrictions which farm and nonfarm employers elsewhere in the United States are not burdened with. The probable harm to consumers -- interference with the flow of farm products to market, an increase in the price of farm products -- is clear enough.

Don't be fooled by the misleading emotional appeals of the proponents of Proposition 14. Its passage will have disastrous consequences for everyone.

Kenneth L. Maddy
Assemblyman, 30th District

Harry Kubo, President
Nisei Farmers League

ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 14 -
THE AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT OF 1976

Proposition 14 is a hastily conceived and fiscally irresponsible abuse of your initiative process. California law (The Agricultural Labor Relations Act of 1975) already provides for the gains which the proponents of the initiative seek, subject to the responsible oversight and budgetary control of the legislature.

This initiative repeals the existing law, removing all legislative controls over it and mandating the legislature to spend whatever money necessary to administer the new law, notwithstanding any fiscal irresponsibility demonstrated by the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. The terms of the ALRA of 1976 could be changed only by repeating the expensive and cumbersome initiative process.

A NO Vote is imperative for the following reasons:

Inflexibility. The governor, legislators and the past chairman and current member 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 additional initiatives ~~which can be presented only every two years.~~ Such inflexibility is fatal because labor relations 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.

*can be presented
any election*

Fiscal Irresponsibility. ^{wrong} 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 agency members to determine the tax rate of California citizens is dangerous and irresponsible and an invitation to increased taxes.

*Legal
maintains
control*

Inflexibility - don't forget Prop 22 which growers wanted

Supreme Ct. decision will take precedence
→

Basic Property Rights Would Be Destroyed. 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 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.

Kenneth L. Maddy
Assemblyman, 30th District

John Garamendi
Member of the Assembly,
7th District

Harry Kubo, President
Nisei Farmers League

Chris says: "right" vs "opportunity"

REBUTTAL TO ARGUMENT AGAINST PROPOSITION 14

When agribusiness agreed to support Governor Brown's compromise farm labor law in May, 1975, all sides pledged to give the law a chance to work.

But agribusiness didn't like the way farm workers voted; growers lost 93 percent of the elections.

So, despite its earlier pledge, agribusiness demanded crippling changes in the law, including one denying the vote to many seasonal workers.

Agribusiness could not persuade a majority of legislators to support the changes it wanted. But a one-third minority of lawmakers can block appropriations. So California's richest industry used a cynical legislative minority to cut off funds for elections.

On February 6, farm worker voting suddenly came to a halt; Farm Labor Board offices shut down, and elections staff was laid off. The spring and summer harvests passed without farm workers having the right to vote.

The law has been funded this year only because agribusiness fears Proposition 14. Without Proposition 14, Governor Brown's farm labor law would be dead today. If Proposition 14 fails, growers will block funds for elections next year.

Agribusiness attacks the access rule--allowing workers to speak with organizers during non-working hours--but fails to say the rule has been upheld by the California Supreme Court.

The argument that Proposition 14 robs legislators of funding power is sheer fiction. The legislature retains final authority over appropriations.

Proposition 14 became necessary because agribusiness killed elections earlier this year. Only your vote for Proposition 14 will permanently ensure voting rights for farm workers.

Cesar Chavez, President
United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO

Mervyn Dymally
Lieutenant Governor of California

Richard Alatorre
Member of the Assembly, Co-Author
Agricultural Labor Relations Act



UNITED FARM WORKERS of AMERICA AFL-CIO

National Headquarters: La Paz, Keene, California 93531

(805) 822-5571

July 22, 1976

March Fong Eu
Secretary of State
925 L Street, Suite 605
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Ms. Eu:

Agribusiness' Argument Against Proposition 14 and its Rebuttal to Argument in Favor of Proposition 14 contain ~~several~~ misstatements of fact concerning the Farm Worker Initiative.

Paragraph Four of the employers' rebuttal alleges, "If the proposition passes, both labor and management will be burdened with a law which can be changed only by constitutional amendment." Proposition 14 is an initiative statute. It is not a constitutional amendment, and the growers misuse of terms to bolster their argument is an obvious misrepresentation of fact.

Paragraph Five of agribusiness' Argument Against Proposition 14 claims, "The initiative removes from the legislature the necessary budgetary control," and ignores the drain this might impose on other vital state programs." This is a false and misleading claim. Page 3 (Point 7) of the Analysis of Proposition 14 by the Legislative Analyst is explicit on the initiative's effect on appropriations of funds for the Agricultural Labor Relations Board: "The Legislative Council advises that this provision is directory, not mandatory upon the Legislature and does not constitute an appropriation. Therefore, regardless of its intent, it would not bind the Legislature to appropriate any specific amount of money."

Describing the initiative's fiscal effect, the Legislative Analyst states, "Because the proposition would not legally bind the Legislature to appropriate any specific amount of money for the board, the level of funding in future years would be determined by the Governor and the Legislature through the state's regular budget process. In summary, the proposition would result in minor, if any, increased costs to the state...Any not increased costs could be absorbed within the amount currently budgeted to the board."

March Fong Eu
July 22, 1976
Page 2

We request that your office investigate these misrepresentations in the opponents' campaign and direct appropriate corrections for the voters' information.

I would appreciate hearing from you on this request. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Cesar E. Chavez
President

CEC/mg



Office of the Secretary of State
March Fong Eu

111 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Executive Office	(916) 445-3371
Certification	(916) 445-1420
Corporation Index	(916) 445-3700
Corporation Records	(916) 445-1733
Election Division	(916) 445-0320
Legal Division (Corp.)	(916) 445-0320
Notary Public Division	(916) 445-3507
State Archives	(916) 445-1393
Uniform Commercial Code	(916) 445-0261

July 27, 1976

REC'D JUL 30 1976

Cesar E. Chavez
President
United Farm Workers
of America AFL-CIO
National Headquarters
La Paz, Keene, CA 93531

Dear Mr. Chavez:

In Ms. Eu's absence, I am pleased to respond to your letter of July 22.

The form, content, and style of the statewide ballot pamphlet are governed by the provisions of the Political Reform Act of 1974 (Proposition 9). Pursuant to that law, the Secretary of State has absolutely no discretion to pass judgment on the factual merit of any argument or rebuttal. We are not empowered to investigate alleged misrepresentations nor may we alter the arguments or rebuttals submitted to us by any party. Our function with respect to the ballot pamphlet is strictly ministerial.

Section 88006 of the Government Code does provide a 20-day public review period during which time any voter may seek a writ of mandate to require an alteration or deletion in the ballot pamphlet "upon clear and convincing proof that the copy in question is false, misleading, or inconsistent with the requirements of this chapter or the Elections Code, and that issuance of the writ will not substantially interfere with the printing and distribution of the ballot pamphlet as required by law". The 20-day review period began on July 20. It is emphasized that the Secretary of State is under critical time constraints relative to the printing and distribution of the ballot pamphlet and that any challenge pursuant to Government Code Section 88006 should be expeditiously pursued.

Cesar E. Chavez
Page 2
July 27, 1976

Should you or your attorneys have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me or our Chief Counsel Anthony Miller at (916) 445-6371.

I enclose Chapter 8 of Title 9 of the Government Code for your information.

Please accept Ms. Eu's best wishes along with my own.

Sincerely,

Michael S. Gagan

Michael S. Gagan
Deputy Secretary of State

MSG:sw

Enclosure

*Since then, went to court
+ got ruling on 2 in our favor*

*growers started right off with
lies & misrepresentations*

*- We can make issue of this -
make misrepresentation an issue, aside
from substance*

PROPOSED FREE ELECTIONS LAW
FOR FARM WORKERS

by Fred Ross

On June 5, 1975, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. signed the Agricultural Labor Relations Act giving farm workers the right to secret ballot elections in the fields.

THE GROWERS GAVE IN

The growers agreed to go along with this legislation. At the time, they were under tremendous pressure from the Boycott. They also knew they would be able to twist the Act to suite themselves simply by forcing a cut-off of funds for its enforcement until such time as they got their way. When the farm workers voted for the UFW on many California ranches--instead of for the Teamsters or no Union--the grower-controlled politicians did just that, and the elections ground to a halt.

THE FREE ELECTION LAW

To remedy this and prevent other abuses of the legislative process by the growers, the UFW urges a "YES" vote in November on Proposition 14 - The Free Election Law.

Under this proposed law:

1) The workers have the right to choose their own union through secret-ballot elections supervised by the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. Never before have they been able to do this.

2) Workers cannot be fired for supporting a particular union.

In the past, tens of thousands of workers have been fired for doing this - over a thousand in Oxnard alone last year.

3) Should any grower fire a worker for supporting a union, he may not only be forced to rehire him, but also pay the worker three times what he lost in wages.

"The law worked too well - we won too many elections so the growers..."

4) When a majority of the workers on any ranch have voted for a particular union, the grower will have to sit down and bargain in good faith for a contract.

In the past, growers have dabbled for months over the contract to avoid providing workers with the benefits covered by the contract.

5) The grower must respect the right of workers to talk to union organizers during lunch and before and after work. Unless they are permitted to be on the ranch at these times, the organizer will have no opportunity to explain to the workers why they should vote for the union.

In the past, growers have had organizers jailed for talking to workers on nearly every major ranch in California. As recently as last year, Gallo Wine Co., in addition to making such arrests, hired 25 "guards" whose function was to stay right on top of the organizers, from the time they entered the ranch until they left, and, to further intimidate the workers, they took pictures of every one seen talking to an organizer.

6) Workers cannot be kicked out of their camp or home for supporting a particular union.

As recently as 1973 Gallo Wine Co. got out eviction proceedings against its workers, and the Public Health Department found human feces in the water pipes where the sewage line had "accidentally" backed up into them.

7) Once the state has certified that a particular union has won an election at a ranch, that union cannot be decertified without the signatures of at least 50% of the employees.

This is simply to make sure that the democratic process prevails on the ranch.

8) Employers shall provide the union with lists of workers eligible to vote in ranch elections far enough in advance of elections to assure that organizers have had an opportunity to talk to workers about the benefits of the union before they vote.

During last year's farm worker elections, scores of growers throughout California purposely withheld such lists from union organizers so they would not be able to find the workers and explain the advantages of the union to them.

9) The legislature shall make a determination of the amount of money necessary to carry out the provisions of the law and shall appropriate that amount to the ALRB. But it will not be able to erode the guarantees afforded farm workers under this law without going back to the people.

In the past, growers and other destructive elements have been able to take a good piece of legislation and make of it a hideous, misshapen thing identical in character to themselves and their own corrupt interests, and, of course, diametrically opposed to the needs of the workers.

Without the safeguards provided by this law against such depraved practices, this law would surely suffer the same fate as most other attempts to protect the rights of the workers.

ENDORSEMENTS

Key

- + Church
- * Union
- # Political

1. +*# Volunteers:
 - a(+*#) Leafleting
 - b(+*) Bumper Stickers
 - c(+*#) Voting Day
 - d(+*#) Canvassing
 - e(+*) Delegates
 - f(#) Parochial Schools - Nov 1st.
2. +* Bumper Stickers Arrangements:
3. +* Money:
 - a(*) Gate Plant collections
 - b(+) Church
 - c(*) COPE
 - d(*) Local Treasury
 - e(*) Fund Raiser
4. Public Statements:
 - a(+*#) Press Conferences
 - b(+*#) Press Release
 - c(*) Union Paper & Publications
 - d(+*#) Local Paper Ads
 - e(+*#) Lawn/ Freeway signs
 - f(+) Sermons/ Pulpit Announcements
 - g(+*#) Mailings
 - h(+*#) VOTE YES ON 14 in all literature
 - i(+*#) Representatives at Farm Workers vigil
5. +*# Voter Registration:
6. PR Events:
 - a(*) AFL-CIO Convention
 - b(*) Workers Cafeterias
 - c(*) Picket Lines
 - d(+) Church Conventions
 - e(+) Big Masses
 - f(*) Other Union Conventions
 - g(+*#) Rallies
7. +* The first question for all politicians is on Prop 14 before endorsing them.
8. + Involve Parochial Schools - *Holy Day of Obligation - Nov. 1*
9. # Politicians:
 - a- All mailing
 - b- Door hangers
 - c- Vigil

REQUIREMENTS (con't)

10. Sponser a Bus:
11. Use "Yes On 14" stamp on all mail
12. Housing-- especially last 10 days