ders started during the de-pression years, when it be-came necessary to take effecpression years, when the came necessary to take effective steps in order to preserve our agricultural producers from economic destruction. Under one procedure, if the required majority of producers, handiers, or both, agree in a referendum vote to a proposed order controlling the marketing of a commodity, the order goes into effect, and thereafter is administered by the state department of agriculture. At present about 35 such orders are in effect, the products covered ranging from brussels sprouts to wine. The so-called "assent" procedure would be left as is.

dure would be left as is.

SEVERAL proposals for changes in the referendum method were introduced in the last session, but were referred to interim study. Recently the Assembly Committee on Agriculture held a hearing at which the need for such changes were explored.

Present law requires that 5 per cent of all producers of particular commodity who produce at least 51 per cent of its total volume must agree to a proposed marketing order for it to go into effect. The proposed change would substitute two alternatives for this provision. Under the first, an order could be made effective if approved by 65 per cent of the voting producers who grow a majority of the total grown by all those voting. The second would enable approval by 51 per cent of those voting who produce 65 per cent of the total grown by all voters.

FROPONENTS OF this amendment argued that it would simplify and make less expensive the process of conducting a referendum on an order without depriving anyone of his voice in determining the outcome. It was also said the change would bring our California law nearer to law on federal marketing orders, thus making life easier for everyone.

ders, thus making life easier for everyone.

One influential farm organization opposed this change on the ground that producers who don't vote still should not be ignored. The minority, i was contended, should not be permitted to control the majority as would be possible if the law were amended. This group reaffirmed its policy of opposition to amendment of the existing law.

ANOTHER CHANGE suggested would provide that if a marketing order affects only producers or handlers of a particular agricultural commodity, the board governing its operation need include only a majority of them as members. At present all members must be producers or handlers. Obviously, such an amendment would permit representatives of the general consuming public to serve as board members.

The committee was not surprised to have one staunchly individualistic farmer lash out vigorously at all marketing or

individualistic farmer lash out vigorously at all marketing orders. California agriculture would be better off without controls of any kind, he declared. Government should let the farmer solve his own problems. Without marketing controls, costs would decrease acreages in surplus crops would be reduced, and the small farmer would have a better opportunity to succeed. Prices to consumers would not be affected by removal of controls, he concluded.



Ad Taker To Help You! FA 8-4000

Ask for

