Board Votes Expanded Program

In historic action taken May 11 at Farm Bureau Center, Lansing, the board of directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau voted to endorse a greatly expanded and strengthened Farm Bureau program.

To add emphasis to their action, the board moved to call a special delegate meeting for the purpose of considering such program expansion and necessary financing to carry it out.

Earlier, the board had received and accepted the official report of the "State Relationship Committee" which had been charged last November by Farm Bureau voting delegates to continue their year-long study of Farm Bureau finance and program structure.

At the time the delegate body asked that the committee make specific recommendations "to the Michigan Farm Bureau Board of Directors and membership" on adequate financing and program expansion.

In its prolonged study, the Relationship Committee examined present Farm Bureau programs and compared them with needs reported by local members in a series of county and multi-county Farm Bureau meetings held in all parts of the state during March and April.

Hundreds of suggestions for program expansion were listed in the county reports, with such practical advice offered as: "Farm Bureau must change and grow, and must be adequately financed to do more."

The committee emphasized the need for study into different methods by which Farm Bureau can serve members through such economic services as legal advice, taxation and management analysis.

Recommending an adequate dues structure to finance the proposed program expansion, the committee took into consideration a forthcoming 50c per member increase in American Farm Bureau membership dues.

In accepting the State Relationship Committee report, the Michigan Farm Bureau board of directors also accepted the recommendation that present dues be increased by eight additional dollars per year, three to be reserved for County Farm Bureau use; further, that a special meeting of the voting delegate body be called to consider these actions.

To be held in the Fairchild Theatre, M.S.U., East Lansing, this special meeting has been called for Monday, August 16, beginning at 10:00 a.m. Attending will be nearly 700 county leaders who make up the official House of Delegates of the Michigan Farm Bureau.

Program advances to be considered at that time will include added services to County Farm Bureau, strengthening the Community Group program, new moves in the fields of marketing, an enlarged legislative program and new methods of telling the story of agriculture to non-farmers.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Appointment of the 1965 Michigan Farm Bureau Resolutions Committee has been announced by President Elton R. Smith. Following the pattern adopted two years ago by former President Walter Wightman, the appointments of new members are made for two years. Committee members serving the even-number districts were appointed in 1964 and will continue to serve in 1965.

Committee appointments made by President Smith include: Adolph Dongvillo, Jr., Berrien county, District 1; Dwain J. Dance, Jackson county, District 2; W. Arthur Rowley, Macomb county, District 3; Gerald Waldeck, Kent county, District 4; Robert D. Zeeb, Clinton county, District 5; Alfred Goodall, Tuscola county, District 6; Lawrence Robinson, Mecosta county, District 7; Harmon Williams, Arenac county, District 8; Louis Hayward, Kalkaska county, District 9; Eugene Fleming, Otsego county, District 10; and Charles Donaldson, Jr., Menominee county, District 11.

Representing Farm Bureau Women on the committee will be: Mrs. LaVern Kramer, Hillsdale county; Mrs. Jerold Topliff, Ingham county; and Mrs. William C. Lockhart, Chippewa county.

Raymond Kocharek, Chairman of the State Young People's Committee will represent young-farmer interests. Appointed to positions "At Large" are Dean Pridegeon, Eugene Roberts, and Donald Ruhl, all members of the Michigan Farm Bureau Board of Directors.

ON THE INSIDE:

"MIGHTY MAC" — Michigan's famed five-mile Mackinac Bridge, symbol of summer travel and a growing tourist industry. Farm Bureau members join those who feel that present bridge tolls are excessive and that ways should be found to make the bridge available at lower cost. They were disappointed when a bill to do this failed to receive support in Senate Committee, and continue to urge action by the Legislature to provide a bridge refinance plan.

Michigan Tourist Council Photo
On The Move...

Farm Bureau is on the move in Michigan. At county-wide meetings in all parts of the state, busy, full-time farmers—with an eye to the future they intend to help mold—have been measuring Farm Bureau in terms of jobs they want done.

Their reports, made in "Farm Bureau of the Future" meetings, have been gathered, sorted and examined by a special county-wide study committee which has been working for nearly two years, and now has made its official report to the Michigan Farm Bureau board of directors.

That report, given in detail on the adjoining page, deserves the careful attention of every Michigan farmer. It represents the kind of vision which built Farm Bureau in the United States.

Bureau into new shapes of the future.

The kind of people who will now rise to the first place 50 years ago.

The report was presented to county Farm Bureau groups in the fall of last year. It was the result of a study of the capabilities of local Farm Bureaus in Michigan and of what the group believes will be the needs and requirements of Michigan Farm Bureau members in the years to come.

Farm Bureau people have the difficult task of measuring Farm Bureau as it now exists in Michigan against the tasks they feel lie ahead for organized agriculture.

In painstaking detail, committee members examined the structure and finances of the 71 County Farm Bureau organizations in our state. They made note of weaknesses and strengths in the Community Group program, which has been neglected by too many.

They heard reports of expanded programs and increased finances in other state Farm Bureau organizations. They compared service programs and facilities, and took special note of the responsibility Michigan farmers have in building and keeping strong a nationwide American Farm Bureau Federation.

They examined the social problems farmers face in telling their story to a busy non-farm majority. They judged future needs against the background of legislative apportionment and a government geared more to the appeal of the majority.

The list of past Farm Bureau accomplishments which they examined was so long that it threatened at times to blind the pathway to a future which will bring its own special needs in areas of Marketing, Legislation, Information and still unthought-of Economic Services.

Some suggested a new Farm Bureau Labor recruiting program to help offset the loss of Bracero workers. Legal, tax, farm management, counseling, accounting, estate planning, county zoning, credit advice—these and many more new service areas were examined as possibilities for organized farmers.

"Why not retain more control of what we as farmers produce?" Why not own and operate meat-packing facilities?—retail food store outlets? Why not handle more of the products we create instead of turning these over to others for processing and distribution?

Some of the ideas suggested might be called "way out" by some, such as the suggestion for cooperative purchase of land for recreation, or a Farm Bureau "elevator" in Europe for grain cooperative purchase of land for recreation, or "way out" by some, such as the suggestion for processing and distribution?" Why not retain more control of what we as farmers produce? Why not own and operate meat-packing facilities?—retail food store outlets? Why not handle more of the products we create instead of turning these over to others for processing and distribution?

Some of the ideas suggested might be called "way out" by some, such as the suggestion for cooperative purchase of land for recreation, or a Farm Bureau "elevator" in Europe for grain cooperative purchase of land for recreation, or "way out" by some, such as the suggestion for processing and distribution?— retial food store outlets? Why not handle more of the products we create instead of turning these over to others for processing and distribution?

The stylized flower-symbol of this fact is to be seen "growing" everywhere, on grocer's shelves, in dairy store windows, in restaurants and every other fertile ground for June dairy promotion.

The farmers can be proud of their part in planting the "seeds" from which it springs. The American Dairy Association has grown from an idea in the minds of dairy leaders to a successful nation-wide effort. June Dairy Month is just one of the promotions that has become part of the American scene.

The Department of Agriculture and the American Farm Bureau Federation have received the commendation of all dairy leaders at the recent meeting of the National Dairy Council. Dairy promotion groups are everywhere, in restaurants and every other fertile ground for June dairy promotion.
Report Accepted

The Board of Directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau passed the way for a period of accelerated Farm Bureau growth in accepting and endorsing a report made to it by the "State Relationship Committee".

Last Fall, voting delegates to the Michigan Farm Bureau annual meeting charged this committee with the task of studying Farm Bureau finances and program structure and to make an action-report to the Board for its guidance.

Meeting May 10, in Lansing, the 11-member committee agreed upon contents of this report, which in its final form included a general broadening of Farm Bureau activities, within Community Groups, in County Farm Bureau programs and within the Michigan Farm Bureau itself.

In accepting the report in its regular session, May 11, the Michigan Farm Bureau board expressed confidence in the work of the committee and supported its program-expansion recommendations.

Implicit within the planned expansion is an eight-dollar membership dues adjustment needed to adequately finance the areas of growth which were first listed for the Relationship Committee by local Farm Bureau members and county Farm Bureau boards.

The need for more dues money to support this growth became evident when additional work and service areas listed by local members were interpreted by the committee in terms of dollar-costs.

Proposed program advances recommended by the committee include placing more emphasis on Farm Bureau's legislative programs, an increase in legislation, and in creating interest in local political activity and the total election process.

"More emphasis needs to be placed on marketing, with the expansion of this program into new commodity areas," the committee members reported. They backed considerable added emphasis on research for legislative, marketing and information purposes.

They supported increased activity in areas of membership, Community Groups, in Citizenship and Young Farmers programs.

An examination of the total Farm Bureau information program pointed up a need for more broadcast activity, particularly a move into public service television programming. The committee noted that substantial offers of public service television time have made to Farm Bureau, most of which cannot be accepted with present staff and equipment. An expansion of the Farm Bureau information work into telecasting was one of the areas of advance, supported by the Relationship Committee.

As they moved to accept and work for this expanded work program, a member of the Michigan Farm Bureau board of directors summed up what appeared to be a general attitude: "We are all impatient with present progress. It is amazing that these gains for Farm Bureau can be made by an increase in dues which in the year total only about the price of recent increases for haircuts".

To serve farmers best, Farm Bureau must have "a positive attitude and definite goals." That is the opinion of Ionia County Farm Bureau members, who were among those from many counties of the state showing their own positive attitudes by listing goals to help shape Farm Bureau's future.

When submitted by Farm Bureau boards, these suggestions served to guide the State Relationship Committee in preparing its report dealing with future programs and finance to the Board of Directors of the Michigan Farm Bureau.

"Continue and expand work in the legislative area, especially on tax reform, to help lessen the burden of the school tax on property," was another Ionia county suggestion. Concerning Farm Bureau finances, the Ionia farmers said that any needed increase in dues should be sufficient to cover the cost of carrying program expansion for a period of years, thus eliminating the need for additional increases for some time to come.

"Farm Bureau has to change and keep changing," was the opinion expressed by members of the Washtenaw County Farm Bureau, who said that one of the main causes of failure is the lack of ability and knowledge to know when to change. Among changes recommended in the operation of Farm Bureau, the Washtenaw leaders suggested a closer tie between Farm Bureau marketing work to all farm products, with more study on the areas of price.

A similar feeling was expressed by members of the Livingston County Farm Bureau, who suggested that Farm Bureau members work together to keep government out of their business. "We need more information on hogs and feeder pig marketing, and possibly should organize a hog-marketing division similar to the processing-apple division of the MACMA," they said.

"Let's inform the public on the farmer's share of the food dollar," said Farm Bureau members of Montcalm County, who felt that group study meetings to examine their organization and its direction were worthwhile and that more should be held.

Much the same sentiment was expressed in Van Buren where, at a county-wide meeting of the membership, local farmers also urged improved communications between farmers, "urban people and members of the legislature."

"As we become more of a minority, our lobbying efforts will need to improve," observed farmers of Ingham county, who added, "We need more research and information about legislative issues. Training for Community Group leaders and an improved Discussion Topic system were other suggestions, along with "more information to the general public, with special emphasis on radio and television."

Four separate meetings with an attendance of 125 people who spent their time discussing state and county Farm Bureau problems, was the record in Kent county, where emphasis was placed on Farm Bureau working with allies, with possible "guidance to help like-groups of one commodity interest to merge into one strong group — such as pulling together the many milk associations."

"More money is needed in the County Farm Bureau to help finance expansion there," was the opinion of Emmet County farmers, who added that too many volunteers have been required to give of their time and transportation without reimbursement.

Members List Program Needs

Policy Resolution

The State Relationship Committee has been guided in its work by a clear-cut policy resolution adopted at the last annual meeting of the Michigan Farm Bureau.

In part, the resolution stated: "At the 1963 Michigan Farm Bureau Annual Meeting, the delegates called for a study of the financial and program structure of Farm Bureau. Both state and county levels were to be considered."

"The State Relationship Committee worked diligently on this matter during the year. They noted that most County Farm Bureaus are operating on a extremely close budget. With costs such as postage, supplies and repairs rising, most counties are curtailing spending on programs such as membership, information and Community Group promotion. The Michigan Farm Bureau is using some of its reserve funds accumulated after the dues increase in 1960."

"We commend the State Relationship Committee for its work. We ask that the study be continued in the coming year, and that specific recommendations be made to the Board on program expansion on the areas of financial and program expansion for Farm Bureau."
Special to Northern Michigan

Farm Bureau members living north of the Bay City-Muskegon line including the Upper Peninsula will be pleased with the legislative progress made so far on Farm Bureau resolutions regarding State and Federal forest taxation, swampland tax, snow removal, and "Big Mac" tolls. Legislative committees recommended passage of the following bills: S. 33, Introduced by Senators Mack, Schweigert and others would increase the swampland state payments from the present 15c to 20c per acre.

H. 3570 will, if passed, change the Commercial Forest Reserve (Pearson) Act to guarantee a 25c per acre annual payment to local government. Yield taxes would be retained by the state. The bill was introduced by Reps. Erlandsen and Jacobetti and had not been acted on by the Conservation Committee until Farm Bureau, two days before the deadline, testified and requested that it be reported out.

H. 3524 — Introduced by Reps. Erlandsen, Jacobetti, Hellman and Constantine, would allow counties in the Upper Peninsula to contract with citizens for snow removal. Farm Bureau appeared before the committee four times and finally succeeded in getting it reported out.

Efforts to refinance "Big Mac" in order to lower the tolls failed in the committee but chances are good that something can still be accomplished this session.

Legislative Action Report

Late reports prior to press-time list a number of bills supported by Farm Bureau have passed in the House of Representatives.

They include:

H. 1049 — Uniform Meat Inspection
H. 2024 — Extending the life of the Michigan Patoice Council
H. 2119 — Creating a Bean Commission
H. 2165 — Prohibiting Unfair Dairy Trade practices.

Reports are that all passed by nearly unanimous votes.

This victory for farmers can be made complete through active Farm Bureau member-support in urging Senators to vote for these bills when they come before that body.

Let your Senator know what these measures mean to farmers. Let him know what you think about these important bills!

Outlook in the House

The House Taxation Committee headed by Rep. Montgomery reported out and recommended for passage a package of bills which could finance state operations for the next two years.

Included are bills to impose the 4% sales tax on nearly all services including "everything but hospital bills." About $84 million a year would be raised and such services as haircuts, shoe repairs, auto and other repairs, dental bills, admissions, etc., would be taxed. The Business Activities tax would be changed to become a 5% tax on net income and which would increase revenues from the present $88 million a year to about $135 million. The tax on beer would be reduced from $8.61 per barrel to $4.10 per barrel or about 7/10 of a bottle and would cost about $14 million.

The Committee also reported out without recommendation and laid on the table a number of taxation bills which could lead to a complete tax reform program. Eight of the bills comprise a package and were introduced by Rep. Folks and others.

A flat rate income tax is included with rates of 3% on individuals, 5% on corporations, and 7% on financial institutions. Property taxes would be cut 85 per $1000 (5 miles) and would repeal intangibles and business activities taxes.
What Happened to Tax Reform?

$ What Next for Michigan? $

By: Associate Legislative Counsel Robert E. Smith

Michigan is again headed toward a fiscal nightmare unless the economic "facts of life" are recognized. Complain-

cency is the order of the day for too many people.

Governor Romney, speaking before 700 Michigan citizens
attending a meeting on the state's fiscal problems, pulled
no punches when he laid on the line the financial plight
facing the state within three years unless fiscal reform is
brought about. He indicated that an income tax will be
needed to balance the tax structure and make it equitable
to all citizens.

The picture at the moment appears rosy with the nearly
$100 million deficit of the late 1960's having been paid off
and the pleasant prospect this year of a $1 million or
more surplus.

However, the increasing population with 50,000 or more
added school children each year plus the need for expanding
educational programs at every level (elementary, high school,
and college) plus the growing numbers of elderly people,
plus additional services by government will mean that the
surplus will become a deficit by 1967.

The Governor's 1965-66 recommended budget totals $785
million, $94 million more than last year. However, this
record budget is a cut of over $200 million from the nearly
$1 billion requested by the various state agencies.

As this is written it appears that the Legislature will ex­
ceed the Governor's budget by at least $22 million and per­
haps as much as $70 million. Should this be the case, Michi­

gan could (without new revenue) be in the red $200 million
to $300 million by 1968.

The Legislature, of course, recognizes that new revenue
will be needed. The question is "Will total tax reform be
accomplished by the addition of a few more patches to
Michigan's fiscal cloak?"

Tax Reform Outlook in Senate

Early in this session Senator Brown took the leadership in
promoting tax reform and introduced a package of tax bills
identical to Governor Romney's tax program which was con­
sidered in a special Legislative fall session in 1963. The program
died in the then Republican controlled Legislature through "bi­
partisan inaction."

Senator Brown, upon introduction of the package, urged support
of the Governor's tax approach provided the voters were given an
opportunity at an early election, to decide whether or not the Michi­
gan Constitution should be changed to allow a graduated in­
come tax.

The Senate Committee also re­
ported out some tax bills without recommendation and laid them on
the table. Included is one of par­
ticular importance to farmers, S.
177. This bill would raise the
personal property exemption from
the present $1000 to $5000.

It is possible that interim study will be given to tax reform meas­
ures including farm land assess­
ments.

GERERAL OUTLOOK

Tax reform is still possible. It
will take work, understanding and
bipartisan support. For example, bills to do the job have been re­
ported out of the House Com­
mittee and laid on the table. A
majority-vote can, bring them up for action.

Public understanding of the need for tax reform can help. Citi­
en's groups throughout Michigan
have been formed to promote tax
reform, and most recently two
state-wide women's organizations
and two educational groups have
combined to circulate petitions
urg ing fiscal reform action.

SENATE LEADERS, — especially interested in tax reform are Senator Reul Brown, (left) Democratic Floor Leader of Highland Park, and Senator George Fitzgerald, D. Grosse Points Park, Chairman of the Taxation Committee. Both men have been tire­
less workers on behalf of tax reform.

MONROE PUSHES TAX REFORM

Monroe County Farm Bureau leaders are taking an active part in
a "Citizens for Tax Reform" movement which began in the county
and is beginning to spread
into surrounding counties.

County Farm Bureau President
Frank Smith is one of the offi­
cers of the movement and reports that the 5 point program is the same
at Farm Bureau's tax reform pro­
gram.

In addition to contacting
Legislators, the citizens group has
declared that "until tax reform is accomplished they will work to
defeat any extra voted millage
issues."

The group is not opposed to
improved schools but is insisting
that property can no longer carry
the load.

Action programs such as this throughout the state could result
in legislative action this year.

How about it?

Tariff Taxes
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"Cooperative" Cookbook

A project to promote Michigan agricultural products, while at the same time, put the name of Farm Bureau before thousands of homemakers throughout the state, has been initiated by the Farm Bureau Women, in the form of a "cooperative" cookbook.

The attractive, hard-covered recipe book will feature the "kitchen-tested" favorites of Michigan farm families, plus a short promotion and eye-appealing artwork on each product, and a resume of the activities of the state's largest farm organization.

County Women's committees have been notified to submit their choice of commodity by June 21. When commodity areas have been designated, each county will be asked to contribute six recipes using the particular commodity as the main ingredient. Deadline date: August 15.

"Editor-in-chief" of the Farm Bureau Women's cookbook is Mrs. Jerold Topliff, vice-chairman of the state committee and well-known for her own culinary abilities. Marketing specialist, Larry Ewing, Escanaba, and advisory department of the Michigan Farm Bureau, is assisting the women in this promotion project.

Release date for the cookbook has been set for October 1.

The decision to publish the attractive booklet came during Michigan Week, a fitting coincidence in that promotion of Michigan farm products will be featured throughout. Such products as Michigan peaches, beans, Michigan mushrooms, rhubarb, celery, Michigan cherries and other fruit, are considered "naturals" for recipe promotion.

Unusual uses of farm products will be stressed with the booklet reflecting both the personality of Michigan's products and people.

"Safety-Wise in '65"

Representatives from 21 Farm Bureau counties met May 3 at the Embers Restaurant, Mt. Pleasant, for a Safety Conference Workshop. Farm Bureau Women safety leaders from as far away as the Upper Peninsula attended this first meeting.

"Safety Wise in '65" was the theme of the workshop, under the direction of Mrs. Eugene DeMatio, West Branch, chairman of the Farm Bureau Women's state safety committee. The committee includes: Mrs. Don Root, Ithaca; Mrs. Harland Welke, Menominee; Mrs. George Woolf, Charlotte, and Mrs. Nelson DeGreg, Bellemore.

Featured speaker on the program was Mrs. Leota Westfall, traffic safety specialist from Michigan State University, who presented a four-hour presentation on driver improvement with emphasis on programs that could be conducted by county leaders in their own locality.

Also on the program was Robert Blankenship, Underwriting Manager, Farm Bureau Insurance. Bunker told the group that "always stand up and be counted. Faint heart never won a fair lady" has always been my motto. There is a place, big or small, for all of us and we are needed to accomplish the aims and goals we have set for ourselves in Farm Bureau."
Scandinavian Co-op Tour Planned

Air-Trip Offered By Co-op Council

Of special appeal to farm leaders throughout the state is a 23-day "Co-op Tour" to Scandinavian countries, scheduled for early fall. Sponsored by the Michigan Association of Farmer Cooperatives in cooperation with the Information Division of Michigan Farm Bureau, the tour is designed to give a first-hand look at farming methods and the operations of farmer cooperatives in Scandinavia.

Leaving Detroit by jet on August 30, the tour group will arrive in Oslo, Norway, the following day. Visits to the famous cooperatives in Scandinavia.

The second day in Finland will be spent meeting with representatives of the Federation of Finnish Farmers' Associations and visits to some surrounding farms.

A sightseeing tour of the Swedish seaport, Abo, will be followed by a boat trip to Stockholm. From there a chartered motorcoach will take the group through the beautiful province of Sodermanland and on to Ostergotland, an important agricultural province where a study visit will be made. Part of the tour will run along Lake Vatter, Sweden's second largest lake.

If Mr. Bell hadn't invented the phone a farmer would have had to!

Farm families like yours depend even more than most folks on the telephone.

You call downtown—or anywhere in the nation—for up-to-the-minute information to help you run the farm efficiently and profitably. Your wife counts on the phone to keep the family close to friends and relatives, however far away.

A wonderful invention, the telephone. And so low in cost.

Michigan Bell
Part of the Nationwide Bell System

Travel-LOG

NORTHEAST CANADA AND NOVA SCOTIA

EUROPE
Departing August 7 — Returning September 8. To England, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Denmark, West Germany, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Switzerland, with a couple days in Paris.

NORTHWEST CARAVAN

WORLD'S FAIR
Six days at the fabulous New York World's Fair, leaving by rail from Detroit in late August. This tour will include visits to Chinatown and the Battery and a boat trip around Manhattan Island. Cost — approximately $140.

Information Division, Michigan Farm Bureau
4000 North Grand River, Lansing 4, Michigan

SEND DETAILS OF TOURS AS CHECKED

Name—

Address—

County—

Name—

City —

State —

Phone—

Mail coupon today to

Information Division, Michigan Farm Bureau
4000 North Grand River, Lansing 4, Michigan
Tornado Progress Report...

Avenue for Action

"It will be years before some of the junk scattered over Michigan farms by the Palm Sunday tornadoes is picked up — and much of it never will be..." That is the opinion of storm victims, many of whom gathered in early May at a meeting held in Farm Bureau Center, Lansing.

Called by the Michigan Farm Bureau as a progress report, the meeting opened by president Elton Smith asking for a county-by-county listing of damage and clean-up results. Reports were heard from 11 counties, represented by nearly 50 persons.

Two concerned members of the Michigan legislature, both representing counties in which heavy damage occurred, attended the meeting and spoke to the group. They were Representatives Frederic Marshall, Allen, and James Folks, Horton. Marshall's district contained three of the heaviest hit counties, Branch, Hillsdale and Lenawee, where a total of 1,500 buildings were destroyed.

Kenneth Saunders of the Legislative Research Council outlined tax assessment problems, pointed out some of the chain-reactions which would result in re-assessing property to give tax relief to storm victims.

The group made a blackboard listing of priority items needing immediate attention and agreed to ask for direct state appropriations from the Legislature to provide 50 per cent personal property tax relief for storm victims.

They were reminded that our form of government tends toward deliberate slowness as a built-in safeguard against rash actions, a desirable quality under most conditions, but one which can allow hardship in times of emergency.

Most of the victims confessed that the work of Farm Bureau neighbors and total strangers organized to do clean-up jobs through County Farm Bureau coordination, proved a much greater help than "all of the promised aid from the government agencies combined..."
Deadlines Hit Legislature

Bills Must Clear Calendar

By: Legislative Counsel Dan E. Reed

With nearly 500 bills facing them on a calendar of record length, the Michigan Legislature started the race against time to pass bills through the house of origin by May 28. The Legislature had set this deadline for itself, and bills still on the calendar as of May 25 are dead.

As this is written, a few hours remain for legislative action to be completed. On its return after the Memorial Day holiday, the Legislature will spend much of its time in committee work, considering the bills passed by the house where the bill originated. All bills must clear the committees in the second house by Friday, June 11.

It now appears that the following bills, which have strong Farm Bureau support, will be facing committee review during these two weeks. House bills will be under consideration by Senate committees and Senate bills will be under review by committees of the House. All the measures needed strong support in committee or on the floor for the passage by the Legislature, called back from the Governor's office, and amended. The problem is to maintain and increase out-of-state markets for Michigan milk and dairy products.

H. 2165 prohibits unfair trade practices in the milk industry. Below-cost selling, under-the-table payments and favors have plagued the dairy industry and have had a harmful effect on milk prices. The bill does not provide "price fixing" as is sometimes charged by opponents, who like to use milk as a below-cost price leader.

H. 2094 provides for uniform labeling of the milk sold in the state. The bill would enable the Minimum Wage Act to exempt those who have picked done on a contractual basis when such contractual basis is of a piecework nature.

The Legislature should provide a strong program to The Michigan Wheat Growers' Association. In previous letters, the association's president, Howard Gilmer, offered the views of the association on the need for a strong program to aid the problem of soft wheat growers. The action is needed soon, before the next marketing season opens.

H. 2094 provides for uniform labeling of the milk sold in the state. The bill would enable the Minimum Wage Act to exempt those who have picked done on a contractual basis when such contractual basis is of a piecework nature.
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AGRICULTURE IN ACTION AROUND MICHIGAN

ALL IN FUN

SUGDEN SPEAKS

CONGRATULATIONS

MICROFILM WITH CREEP PANTEL—this is a lot of fun. Ed Good Jr., Nita Ziehm and Ranson Parker of Huron County’s "Lucky 75" Community Group still think it is a lot of fun.

CO-OP CONFERENCE

SPEED SKATING CHAMPION

MICHIGAN—every hog is now eligible to be a part of the Farm Bureau Community Group program up to 1968, according to Duane Sugden, before the American Farm Bureau Institutes. The cited Tuscola county as a prime example.

CITIZENSHIP SEMINAR candidates, Michael Mathis and Libby Hiley, are congratulated by Upper Peninsula regional representative, Hugo Kivi, following the announcement of the event at the annual Dairy Foods program sponsored by the American Dairy Association of Michigan in cooperation with 4-H officials and the MSU Dairy Department. McMurrin commended himself in training for the 1968 Olympic Games.

FARM BUREAU MARKET PLACE

SPECIAL RATE TO FARM BUREAU MEMBERS: 25 words for $2.00 each edition. Additional words, 10 cents each. Figures such as $12 or $12.50 count as one word. NON-MEMBER advertisers: 15 cents per word edition, two or more editions, 10 cents per word. Copy deadline: 20th of the month.
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2. FARMS FOR SALE

3. OPPORTUNITIES

4. DISCOUNTS AND SERVICES

5. DOGS

6. SELECTED ENGLISH SHEEP

7. FARM EQUIPMENT
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Local Governments, and Their Future

Changes Coming!

Take a look at me! I'm your County Government. Within a couple of years I am scheduled for a face-lifting operation. After that you may not recognize me any old features. They will be remodeled in a number of ways. In many local areas the operation may be painful.

In some counties the change can be quite complete — in others, less so. That can depend on how much change has taken place in the communities of the county. Some counties have grown into widespread urban centers. These will see broad changes in government make-up. But all counties will have some upset of their government applecart, without doubt.

These counties that grew into highly urbanized centers had problems. Community developments did not take any recognition of township lines. Urban communities overflowed township borders and even overflowed into more than one township, in some cases.

When the new constitution was drafted, these problems were recognized. The new document provided that a county may, if the voters approve, adopt a county "Home Rule Charter" form of government. Such a charter would put the county on a similar footing to a city, with many of the same powers and privileges. It could even be true that more than one county could join to form a single county, if the people voted for such a merger.

Let it be clear that no county is forced to adopt a Home Rule charter. Some people seem to have gotten that mistaken idea. A charter county would have to be approved by a majority vote of the voters of the county.

But even while they might approve it, it could not begin operating under a charter — yet. The necessary foundation of laws has not yet been passed by the Legislature. The constitution says that counties may operate as charter units of government "as provided by the laws of the state." Laws are needed to establish the rights of such governments to levy taxes, elect their officials and pass local ordinances, etc. So, the "Green Light" for Home Rule counties still waits on the action of the Legislature.

Two bills have reached committee in the Legislature to provide this basis of law. Under both of these bills, the charter county would become the only local unit of government. Township governments would be dissolved, except as geographic areas of a county. Some old township names might hang on.

These two bills (S 112 and S 333) are very much alike in content. One important difference exists between them. Court (S 333, the County Officers' bill) would require that members of the county legislative body must be elected from districts containing "as nearly as possible, an equal number of people. That idea has become uncontroversial, as we shall see.

S 112 (drafted by Wayne County interests) would allow a charter county to elect its legislative officers either by districts of equal population — or on an at-large basis. The voters could decide which way it would be done. It sounds very "democratic" until you look at it closely. Where's the catch?

It is quite clear that the cities and suburbs could control a majority of the votes to decide which way it would be done. Having decided that the election should be at-large, they could then, by majority vote, assure that every member of the county legislative body came from the city.

Quite clearly, the establishment of election districts would be more considerate of the people in all areas of a county, since each area would then be assured of some representation in the county's governing body.

Now the question comes up — how is any face-lifting going to happen in counties that do not become charter governments? This puts the important finger on another development that hits at their future.

As of now, it develops that a federal government ruling is reaching down into the citizen's front yard. Much ado has been made over the ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court of June 15, 1964 — and rightly. This ruling would compel all states to reapportion both houses of their legislatures "as nearly as possible" to provide an equal number of people in both the state senatorial and representative districts.

The Supreme Court took the position that its ruling was supreme over any vote of the people to apportion its legislature on any other basis. After the Court's decision, voters in Colorado approved an apportionment of their Senate on an area basis. The Court declared the vote to be "off base" — unconstitutional in its power to decide such a matter. So, in our time, the people can no longer make up their own minds about the makeup of their state governments. All this makes it appear that state governments have been operating illegally ever since the constitution was adopted 175 years ago! The Court disregarded 175 years of interpretation contrary to its decision.

Many states have been deeply stirred by the Court's ruling. It has been bitterly debated both in Congress and in state legislatures. Twenty-two state legislatures have passed resolutions asking Congress to call a Constitutional Convention. The object is to draft an amendment permitting states to apportion their legislatures according to the will of the people — with one house on the basis of some other factor than population. It would take action by thirty-four states to require the calling of such a convention.

It is interesting to note that Michigan's already revamped legislature has asked Congress to pay no attention to the resolutions of other states bearing on this question. But if thirty-four states made the demand, it would be unconstitutional, in itself, for Congress to disregard their demand. Are we no longer a nation governed by a Constitution?

This decision has moved right onto your front doorstep. In September of 1964, Judge Searle, of the Circuit Court of Wayne County, Michigan, ruled that the U.S. Court's decision applies to representation on the County Board of Supervisors. In other words, each supervisor must represent about the same number of people and counties must be redistricted for this purpose.

Judge Searle warned that if the Michigan Legislature did not act to change the laws to conform to the ruling, he would act on his own. This implies a supreme power both over the people and over the Legislature.

The Legislature is not in a position to do his work in the 1965 session. It is already buried under 1681 bills and 48 joint resolutions. It cannot work with its usual dispatch, with a large percentage of the seats being occupied by "freshmen" lawmakers who are not familiar with the "ropes" of procedure.

Some legislators say that it is absolutely necessary to ask Judge Searle to wait, at least until the 1966 session. A resolution is being proposed to request such a delay of action.

This resolution proposes that an interim study committee go to work on the complex body of law involved in the problem and to continue work during the 1965 session. Changes would be introduced in a special session.

This makes it clear that, if all these decisions stick, no county will escape a face-lifting of its government. The national and state issue has become a local issue.

For Discussion

1. What should our group members include in letters to our Congressmen asking for a national Constitutional Convention to assure the people the right to apportion their state and local governments according to the decisions of the people rather than of the Courts?

2. Should our group members encourage our state representatives and senators to request a delay of action in the ruling to apportion our County Boards of Supervisors by population districts?
Farm Bureau Agent Dave Adams is shown above with Jan and Nellie Lou Vosburg of R.R. #1, Climax — reviewing their insurance program to make sure it satisfies the family's ever-changing needs.

Your insurance needs are probably changing too. The program that was right for you and your family one year ago may be outdated today. But don't worry. Your Farm Bureau Insurance agent is going to review your policies — to make sure they're right for you!

Matter of fact, all Life, Farmowners, and Auto contracts are being reviewed during 1965. Perhaps your agent has already contacted you. If not yet, he will before your next renewal date. Are your present insurance coverages, classifications, and options "in line" with your present needs and family circumstances? Your Farm Bureau agent will help you answer this and other questions.

This company-wide review of all Life, Farmowner, and Auto contracts is just another service provided for Farm Bureau Insurance policyholders. There's no obligation, no cost. We're doing it to make sure your insurance protection is just what you would expect — the best your money can buy.
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