

California farm bureau monthly

June, 1972



urus
said. The
be able to
disaster on the
Further, the Ph

Plea. Hotel at the San I

BROWN JERALD B.
13925 FARMER RD
FL 331



Chavez And His UFW Forces Issue Ultimatum To Farm Bureau

By ALLAN GRANT, California Farm Bureau president

FOR A NUMBER OF YEARS now innuendos have been coming from the Chavez camp regarding Farm Bureau. The innuendoes have implied that Farm Bureau is the greatest foe to the United Farm Worker movement . . . that if it were not for Farm Bureau, particularly in California, the struggle to force all farm workers into the Chavez-led union would have been over long ago.

These innuendoes became irrefutable blazen facts April 26 when three leaders of the United Farm Workers National Union marched into the American Farm Bureau Federation's national headquarters in Park Ridge, Illinois, and demanded to meet with Farm Bureau officers.

Making the demand were the Rev. Wayne C. Hartmire, Los Angeles, with the California Migrant Ministry and one of the clergy in the forefront of the union's long siege of Delano; Leroy Chatfield of Delano, a member of the UFW board of directors; and Eliseo Medina, Delano-Imperial organizing and boycott coordinator.

During the meeting with President William J. Kuhfuss and three AFBF staff members, the UFW representatives issued an ultimatum. Either their list of demands be met by May 8 or UFW would mount a massive smear campaign against Farm Bureau in 40 cities across the nation and in Europe.

The major demand was that the American Farm Bureau cease efforts to obtain legislation which would give farm workers the right to vote on matters of union representation and which would outlaw the use of the secondary boycott in agriculture.

Specifically named were legislative efforts underway in Washington, D.C., in New York, Colorado, Arizona, Oregon and Wyoming. Also included was a demand for withdrawal of the current effort in California to place a farm labor relations initiative on the November ballot.

Additionally, the UFW spokesman demanded that Farm Bureau withdraw its support of nine Northern California wineries and growers supplying these—the wineries against which the Chavez-led union has carried on its most recent boycott campaign. The demand also was made that Farm Bureau cease showing the film, "The Road To Delano," a documentary in which bonafide farm workers express their feelings towards UFW and make a plea for the right to vote in matters of union representation.

UFW Makes One False, One Correct Assumption

We are well aware that the policies in UFW come from the top down. Chavez and other UFW leaders decide each move of the union, decide what shall be included in the contracts, what is "good" for the workers. The rank and file farm workers have no voice in UFW policies.

UFW falsely assumed the same to be true in Farm Bureau . . . that the officers of the American Farm Bureau determine policies, tell State Farm Bureaus what to do. What they did not realize is that the American Farm Bureau officers can do nothing more than carry out the policies established by the members through the policy development processes. And the members have ordered the American Farm Bureau to work for national farm labor relations legislation.

Furthermore UFW did not realize that the American Farm Bureau cannot tell State Farm Bureaus what to do. The American Farm Bureau is a Federation. It is made up of independent Farm Bureau organizations in 49 states and Puerto Rico. The members within each state set the policies of the state organizations.

Obviously a grassroots controlled organization is incomprehensible to the leaders of UFW or they

would not have presented their demands and threats to the American Farm Bureau.

However, the UFW leaders did make one correct assumption. Farm Bureau is the leading force behind efforts to obtain farm labor legislation in state legislatures across the nation.

Because efforts to obtain such legislation in Congress have been thwarted by political pressures exerted by UFW's parent organization, the AFL-CIO, two years ago Farm Bureau members across the nation called for a campaign to seek such legislation at the state level.

Primarily through Farm Bureau efforts, Idaho, Kansas and Arizona now have state laws which provide farm workers with secret ballot elections to decide if they want to be represented by a union and, if so, which one. The legislation also outlaws the use of the secondary boycott in agriculture. And the possibilities of other states passing such legislation are encouraging.

Farm Bureau is definitely the greatest threat to UFW's plan to force contracts on farm workers and growers.

California Initiative

Farm Bureau members in California have tried for seven years now to get the State Legislature to pass legislation to give the workers a vote in farm labor relations matters and to outlaw the secondary boycott in agriculture. We came very close to succeeding last year until the AFL-CIO brought insurmountable pressures on key urban legislative leaders.

OEO Rushes In Where Others Fear To Tread

FOR SEVERAL SESSIONS now the Legislature has had an education voucher system brought before it for consideration. The voucher system is highly controversial and it does contain constitutional conflicts. The state's lawmakers have looked long and carefully at the voucher system and thus far have concluded that its merits do not warrant recommending that the constitution be changed.

Last month the Office of Economic Opportunity announced it was making a Federal grant to start a voucher system next fall in the Alum Rock School District in Santa Clara County. Vouchers averaging between \$680 and \$970 (depending upon the grade level) for the 3800 students within the district will be awarded.

As initially announced, the vouchers could have been spent by the parents at any school within the district. When the OEO was reminded of state law, spending of the vouchers was limited to the six public schools in the district. **However, OEO officials have said they will work for a change in state law so the vouchers can be used in parochial and private schools.**

The voucher plan is a highly controversial subject. But since OEO does not have to answer to the citizens of California, it can rush in and institute such a program here.

Proponents of the voucher plan argue that privately funded schools are relieving taxpayers of a considerable burden in the number of students they educate. These schools are experiencing financial problems. If they should close, students now being served would be forced back on the public school rolls requiring far greater expenditures of tax monies for education. Thus, it is argued, private schools should receive some tax monies because of the service they are performing.

It is further argued that parents who send their children to private schools are being penalized by having to support the public schools whose services they do not use.

Hence the argument follows that it would be

Fortunately in California, when the Legislature fails to perform its job, the citizens of this state can take the matter directly to the voters through the initiative process. Chavez and his supporters know that the voters of this state will not deny farm workers so basic a right as the right to vote. And Chavez knows that once farm workers have the right of self-determination, UFW is going to be in trouble.

The UFW leaders saw as their only alternative in California threats against us in hopes we would be scared off on the initiative.

Chavez and his supporters need to be put on notice. No matter what they threaten, Farm Bureau members will not back down from pursuing what is right. Farmers will not be denied their constitutional right as citizens to seek legislation, to seek just treatment under the laws of this state and nation for all people in the agricultural community.

Because Farm Bureau is a grassroots controlled organization, Chavez in reality has issued his threats and ultimatum to you, the members. It is up to you to give him an answer. I know what your answer is going to be. However, we must do more than tell him to go jump in the lake.

Our best answer to Chavez and his cohorts is to place the California Farm Labor Relations Act on the November ballot with an overwhelming number of signatures on petitions. Contact your County Farm Bureau today. Pick up a petition, get it filled in and returned immediately to the Fair Labor Relations Committee. Give Chavez his answer!

much fairer to provide the parents of all school age children with vouchers representing the daily attendance costs of education. The money would not be used for plant facilities—these would be financed by other means.

Proponents of tax subsidized private schools further argue that the quality of education is higher in private schools than in public. The voucher system, they say, would induce an element of competition in education which would benefit all students.

Arguments against the voucher system center upon constitutional questions. Under the separation of church and state, public monies cannot be used to support church activities. The majority of private elementary and secondary schools in California are church sponsored.

The voucher system raises the question of whether taxpayers would thus be forced to support a religious faith not of their choosing. There is also the question of how taxpayers' interests could be represented in privately owned and operated schools.

A fear has been expressed that the voucher system would be used to by-pass integration requirements, that the vouchers could be used to support private segregated schools.

Additionally the constitution requires that a public education be provided for each child of school age within the state. Many public educators fear that a voucher system would siphon off support needed for what they term already under-funded public schools.

One thing can be said with certainty—the voucher system in education is a highly controversial issue. It needs careful study by all parents and by all taxpayers.

We must take a close look at the voucher system and decide where we stand on it . . . in light of the fact that the Federal government have put us on notice that . . . our state laws in this r

CFBF Board Reaffirms Support of Farm Labor Initiative

THE PICKETING OF Farm Bureau by Cesar Chavez and his United Farm Workers union was a reoccurring topic of discussion during the May 8 and 9 meeting of the Board of Directors of the California Farm Bureau Federation at Davis. By phone calls between counties and their directors, the Board had a running account of the May 9 picketing of County Farm Bureaus over the state.

If the picketing demonstration by the Chavez-led movement was intended to frighten Farm Bureau into backing off on the labor initiative, it certainly backfired with the CFBF Board of Directors. The picketing action and attempted smear campaign did nothing more than redouble the determination of the Board to 1) qualify the California Agricultural Labor Relations Act Initiative for the November ballot, and 2) work to get the voters of the state to pass the measure.

Highlight of the meeting was the announcement that with 59,896 members as of May 8, the California Farm Bureau had gone over its 1972 membership goal established by the American Farm Bureau Federation. However, the California Farm Bureau had yet to reach the goal it had set for itself which was some 500 members higher than the American goal. The Board voted to continue to receive 1972 renewal memberships until June 1 or until the California goal was reached, whichever occurred first. The Board also adopted a formula for establishing the state's membership goal in the future to bring the goal more in line with that set by the AFBF.

While the majority of the two-day meeting was devoted to reports on the progress being made in carrying out policies adopted by the House of Delegates at the November, 1971, meeting, the Board did take a number of actions.

The Delegates in November called for an all out effort to be made for the adoption of the Watson Property Tax Limitation Initiative and for the California Farm Bureau and County Farm Bureaus to support this Initiative with manpower and money. The Board had taken earlier actions

which helped qualify the measure for the November ballot.

At its May meeting, the Board set a goal of \$600,000 to be raised by Farm Bureau members in California for use in gaining passage of the Watson Initiative.

As a first step in the fund raising campaign, the Board recommended that a letter of explanation and solicitation be sent immediately to every Farm Bureau member in the state, pointing out that the Watson Initiative was the only hope for property tax relief and asking for financial support to publicize the merits of the measure so the voters would adopt it.

Following President Nixon's May 8 announcement of efforts to block supplies reaching the North Vietnamese, the Board went on record in support of the President's policies and his efforts for an honorable peace in Vietnam.

In other actions, the Board supported a current move by the poultry industry to establish a temporary state marketing order to deal with surpluses in the egg industry. The proposed marketing order, which would expire December 31, 1973, and would have to be approved by producers, would remove a percentage of eggs from non-human use to bring supplies more in line with demand. Each producer would be assigned a percentage of his production to route to the surplus pool. The order also provides that growers could meet this surplus requirement by removing hens from laying flocks. The Board in giving its support for the marketing order did qualify that support by stating that the order would have to be amended to entitle contract producers to also vote in the referendum.

Also coming before the Board was a proposed change in the California Beef Council Law under which funds are collected from producers to promote beef. Presently the law includes provisions under which producers may apply for a refund of those monies collected by handlers for the Council. The law also presently includes a provision that before a full mandatory program can be instituted, producers must approve such a program by referendum.



By coincidence the mail on the first day of the CFBF Board meeting brought in enough memberships to place the California Farm Bureau Federation over the goal assigned it by the American Farm Bureau Federation. Marking the occasion by posing for a photo to be forwarded to the AFBF were (from left), Luys Horn, manager of the CFBF Member Relations Division; CFBF President Allan Grant; and District 4 Director Leonard Warren, who chairs the CFBF Membership Committee.

The proposed changes would delete the refund provisions and would delete requirements for a referendum to be held before the program could be made mandatory.

The Board went on record in opposition to the proposed changes in the Beef Council Law. It was pointed out that the change should not be made through the Legislature, but rather all producers should vote on whether or not they want a mandatory program. The Law, the Board said, already contains the machinery to bring the matter before producers.

The Board also pointed out that this particular program had started as a totally voluntary one. Then, the Board said, its leaders went before the Legislature and obtained a change to have the funds deducted by the handler with any producers objecting being able to apply for a refund. Now, the Board added, the leaders are back trying to change the law once more to now make support of the program mandatory, and they are trying to by-pass a producers' vote in doing this.

In other actions, the Board voted

support of Assembly Bill 71, which would enable school districts to conduct educational programs in venereal disease but which provides that any parent by written request may prohibit his child from attending such instruction.

The Board also went on record with a statement that it believes that forcing inclusion of ethnic groups by percentages has no place in the 4-H program. The Board pointed out that the 4-H program over the years has done an outstanding job of erasing barriers between nationalities and races, of bringing all young members within a community together to work on common goals. To emphasize race by setting the program up on the basis of establishing quotas for each race as the U.S. Justice Department has ordered would be divisive, the Board said.

The Board also requested a committee be appointed to make a study of agriculture's research needs five and ten years ahead and to look for alternative means of funding such research in light of current efforts to curtail agricultural research funds within the University of California.

On the morning of the second day of the Davis meeting, the CFBF Board hosted a breakfast in Sacramento for legislators who are members of the Senate and Assembly Agriculture Committees and for key administrative leaders. District 8 Director Sam Chinn (left) is shown welcoming Assemblyman Robert G. Wood who represents Chinn's home area. Standing by waiting to exchange a few words with Wood is Richard W. Owens, CFBF Secretary.

District 12 Director George W. Schmiedt (left) talks with the Assemblyman from his home area, Robert Monagan. Sharing in the conversation is Fred Heringer, CFBF First Vice President. As Minority Leader of the Assembly, Monagan was one of the featured speakers at the breakfast. Following the event, all those in attendance received a gift pack representative of some of the State's finest farm commodities.

CFBF President Allan Grant, right, welcomes C. Brunel Christensen to the breakfast. Last month Christensen was appointed State Director of Agriculture, succeeding the late Jerry W. Fielder. The new director, a former member of the State Board of Agriculture and a Modoc County cattle rancher, has served on various state and national government advisory committees and has held leadership positions in numerous farm organizations.



UFW Supporters Picket Farm Bureau

CESAR CHAVEZ and his United Farm Workers forces have again learned that Farm Bureau won't be bullied, that no matter what the leaders of the Chavez movement threaten, Farm Bureau will continue to work for what its members believe is just and right.

On April 26, as reported in Mr. Grant's editorial in this issue, three leaders of the United Farm Workers union arrived at the American Farm Bureau Federation's headquarters in Park Ridge, Illinois, and demanded a meeting with President William J. Kuhfuss. During the meeting, the UFW leaders presented a list of demands and issued an ultimatum. If the demands were not met by May 8, the UFW would mount a massive smear campaign against Farm Bureau in 40 cities across the nation and in Europe.

On May 9, Chavez mobilized his forces to "attack and discredit" Farm Bureau. The American Farm Bureau reported picketing of State Farm Bureau offices in 23 states.

On that day in California, County Farm Bureaus in Imperial, Riverside, San Diego, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Kern, Tulare, Fresno, Madera, Santa Luis Obispo, Monterey, Santa Cruz, Santa Clara, San Mateo, Stanislaus, San Joaquin, Sacramento, Napa and Yuba-Sutter reported picketing of their offices. The state headquarters building in Berkeley also was picketed.

While Santa Barbara and Tulare did report another day of picketing, the UFW campaign consisted mostly of the one day thrust. Perhaps it was because the publicity UFW so thrives on was "backfiring"—newsmen were printing both sides of the story and the public wasn't taking kindly to

UFW's protests against giving farm workers the right to vote.

The number of pickets at County Farm Bureaus here varied. The Monterey County Farm Bureau office in the heart of the Salinas Valley reported the high with 600 pickets at one time.

San Luis Obispo reported arrival of a busload of pickets followed by a TV camera crew. The pickets marched for a few minutes, had their pictures taken, then got back on the bus and left.

Most pickets, however, stayed for several hours. Although noisy, the picketing was peaceful. Only two reports were received of pickets blocking doorways of county offices.

The picketing efforts at the Berkeley headquarters building were overshadowed by the anti-war demonstrations occurring the same day in the vicinity of the Berkeley campus of the University of California.

Farm Bureau Position

CFBF President Allan Grant in a written statement delivered to news media over the state by County Farm Bureaus pointed out that Farm Bureau welcomed the challenge by Cesar Chavez and his UFW forces. Grant said this "exposure" would bring before the public the true issues involved in farm labor organization.

Grant stressed that Farm Bureau would intensify its efforts to explain to the people the true issues and to get fair and constructive farm labor legislation to protect the constitutional rights of workers to be freely organized, and of farmers to be protected against the ravages of coercive boycotts that force them to sign over their work force or go out of business.

Accusations Answered

In literature handed out by the pickets, Farm Bureau was accused of racism—that is, of not admitting to its membership, or employing, Chicanos and Blacks. Farm Bureau also was accused of abusing its tax-exempt status by pursuing legislation and UFW literature demanded Congressional Committee investigation of the organization on this matter.

In being questioned on these points by newsmen, Grant pointed out in personal interviews that the mem-

This pistol-packin' picket with her elaborate sign was among UFW supporters picketing the Yuba-Sutter Farm Bureau office in Yuba City. The gun was apparently a toy one for nothing happened when she raised it towards some on-lookers and pulled the trigger.

Some of the younger UFW supporters turned out to picket the Fresno County Farm Bureau office where this photo was taken on May 9, during the one-day statewide demonstration against Farm Bureau.

bership of Farm Bureau is open to anyone wishing to pay the dues and join the organization. He did comment, however, that only those members who derive income from farming can vote on policy matters and only those members who receive the majority of their income from farming operations can serve as officers of the organization.

"Farm Bureau," Grant said, "is interested in people, not their origin." However, he added that the membership rolls would reflect a representation of all the nationalities and races in agriculture in the state.

Grant quipped to one newsman that it might be interesting for reporters to look into the membership and leadership of the United Farm Workers union to see if it was representative of all farm workers in the state.

Concerning the accusation that Farm Bureau was abusing its tax-exempt status, Grant said the United Farm Workers union, and all other unions, have the same tax-exempt status as Farm Bureau. He added that representatives of UFW frequently appear before legislative committees advocating or opposing legislation, just as Farm Bureau representatives do.

Grant told newsmen that Farm Bureau has nothing to hide and would welcome examination of its activities and records by any appropriate government agency. He reported that several years ago following similar accusations by the late Congressman Joseph Resnick of New York, the Internal Revenue Service rigorously examined Farm Bureau activities and financial records for the years 1968 and 1969. The IRS gave Farm Bureau a clean bill of health, he said, and a statement continuing its tax-exempt status.

Grant said that Farm Bureau hoped the tax-exempt UFW also would invite a similar examination of its records and activities. He said growers are particularly curious about the UFW's tax-exempt Robert F. Kennedy Health and Benefit Fund which is paid for by grower contributions. The report filed with the IRS for the period September 1, 1969 through August 30, 1970, showed a reported income of \$726,000 and payments of only \$67,617—with nearly half of the latter listed as administrative costs. Claims in health insurance programs, Grant said, normally run about 85% of the premiums collected.

Fifth Morgan Enters Membership Race

WOULD YOU BELIEVE still another Morgan horse will be awarded in this year's membership campaign? That's right! Mr. X, a two-year old registered Morgan gelding, is now running in his own separate race.

In the CFBF Derby, which started in March, County Farm Bureaus have been divided into four classes depending upon size. The counties in each class are racing against each other for the highest average percent of 1972 and 1973 membership goals. The top county in each of the four classes will win a two-year old registered Morgan filly. The filly, in turn, will be awarded to the volunteer worker in the winning county who signed up the most new members.

In establishing the rules for the Derby, the Board of Directors of the California Farm Bureau Federation felt it had set up a fair contest. However, at a recent meeting of the Board, the question arose: What if the top volunteer worker in the state doesn't happen to be in a winning county? The Board pondered this and decided in the event this should happen, some sort of recognition should be developed for the state's top membership worker.

After listening to the Board debate an appropriate alternate award, District 19 Director Forrest Jones volunteered to donate an additional Morgan horse—a registered two-year old gelding. It was Jones' donation of the original Morgan filly which launched the Federation into running the Derby and led to its purchasing three additional fillies from Jones in order to make it a fair race.

Now, about winning that fifth Morgan horse.

Since the fifth Morgan only recently appeared upon the scene, the Board decided that the race for it would be a separate race in which only volunteer membership workers would participate. And since the horse entered the race after May 1, the Board decided that only those new 1973 members signed between May 1 and December 10, 1972, would be counted in tallying up the score to win the gelding. The gelding along with the four fillies will be presented to the winners on December 11 at the California breakfast during the American Farm Bureau Federation's annual meeting in Los Angeles.

The Board did place one restriction on the new race—only one Morgan to a membership worker. If the state's top membership worker should also happen to be in the county winning a Morgan horse, he or she would have to choose between the gelding and the filly. In the event this should occur, the membership worker second in the state in total 1973 new members signed also would receive a horse.

So, if you want to win a registered Morgan horse, drop by your County Farm Bureau office, pick up a book of membership applications and hit the road. If you sign the largest number of new members between now and December 10, you will get the gelding for sure. You might even make your county a winner, which means you would have a choice between the gelding and a filly.

This year marks the 36th annual national observance of June Month. Few persons think of California as a large dairy state, ranks third in the nation in amount of

