If you are in the midst of recovering from the shock of figuring your income, you may be trying to muster the energy to do it, you may not want to read further.

According to the Tax Foundation, Mr. Average American is married, has two children and makes about $9,500 a year. Like you and me, he is burdened with an array of taxes. He pays federal income taxes, Social Security tax, state income tax, property tax and maybe a city income tax.

This is only the beginning. He also pays a multitude of other taxes such as excise, gasoline and use taxes. The Tax Foundation claims if you add them all up, Average American pays an estimated $3,000 a year in taxes of all kinds. He is constantly being asked to pay more taxes for services and programs, promoted by some groups, that do not directly benefit him.

On the Federal level when money is not readily available in the U.S. Treasury for the programs voted by Congress, the size of the deficit increases.

During the last part of January, Congress was asked to approve the largest increase in the national debt ceiling — $50 billion for a total of $490 billion — since World War II.

On January 3, 1972, the amount of money that has been borrowed to operate our federal government had reached a grand total of $423 billion. Currently, it is estimated that at the end of the next fiscal year, June 30, 1973, the figure may reach $493.2 billion.

Our Federal debt is financed through the issuance of Government securities. In order to pay these securities for them out of current income in order to see if they are needed and whether we can pay for everything are added to the books with little, if any, regard as to how they shall be paid for. Mr. Average American is asked to dig into his wallet and pay more taxes.

We need to begin looking at all programs to see if they are needed and whether we can pay for them out of current income in order to balance the budget.

Carl Kentner
Marketing and Bargaining Bills
Introduced in Both Michigan Houses

Robert E. Smith

March 1, 1972

Senator Charles O. Zollar (R-Benton Harbor) has taken the leadership in the Michigan legislature and has introduced the Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act—S. 1225. The co-introducer is Senator William Ballenger (R-Ovid), Chairman of the Senate Agriculture and Consumer Affairs Committee.

Senator Zollar, with a broad background in agriculture and the world of business and industry, is to be commended on his leadership in recognition of the fact that modern agriculture must have some of the legislative marketing tools that other industries have to maintain their markets.

Some time ago, he came out in full support of the Six Bill, now in Congress, recognizing that federal legislation is also needed. The bill in the Senate legislation, S. 1225, tries, however, to go a long way toward solving agricultural marketing problems within the State of Michigan.

The legislation results from more than a year of study. Many of the provisions have been taken from other types of bargaining legislation that have proved to be successful in other parts of the country.

Senator Zollar, in introducing the bill in the Senate, said that agriculture has "... a long needed law such as this..." He said it will provide "a vehicle for sound distribution methods and will provide a means of working out any disputes that may arise between producers and handlers or processors of agricultural products."

Hearing on the bill will be held soon and all interested people will have an opportunity to have their views considered.

NOTICE
WANTED: Letters from property owners who have suffered property damage from snowmobiles and other All Terrain Vehicles. An attempt is being made to compile specific examples of damages to property caused by snowmobiles and other ATVs. Members desiring to furnish such information are requested to send full details including date, time, place, extent of damages, and other pertinent information to the Information Division, Michigan Farm Bureau, P. O. Box 900, Lansing, Michigan 48904.
MARKETING AND COMMODITIES

PRESIDENT ELTON SMITH introduced U. S. Representative Sisk of California (seated) at the MACMA annual meeting.

NOEL STUCKMAN, general manager of MACMA, and Congress- man Sisk chat at the MACMA annual meeting.

Congressman Bernie Sisk of California, the primary sponsor of the National Agricultural Marketing Act of 1971 (the Sisk Bill) addressed a combined luncheon of MACMA and ASA at their annual meeting held in Grand Rapids on February 18, 1972.

Congressman Sisk outlined three general areas of concern to agriculture producers. He spoke of the need for permanent legislation dealing with strikes that tie up the entire nation. Particularly the transportation industry in dealing with the recent dock strike.

He also called for federal legislation dealing with farm labor, citing recent problems in his home area of California with the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.

The major portion of his address dealt with the National Agricultural Marketing and Bar- gaining Act of 1971. According to Sisk, this bill will provide the necessary legal framework for farmers to bargain effectively for prices and other terms of trade through their own associations. This legislation would protect the individual rights of producers.

The legislation, commonly known as the Sisk Bill, has been introduced by Congressman Sisk and over one hundred other congressmen. Some have called it the most important and central vertical piece of farm legislation to be introduced this decade.

MACMA ANNUAL REPORT

Editor's Note: Following are random excerpts from the Management Report of Operations given at the 11th Annual meeting of the Michigan Agricultural Co-operative Marketing Association on February 18, 1972.

General Activities

During 1971 MACMA membership grew to the greatest number in its history. Along with an increase in membership came an expansion of the volume of commodities marketed.

Fruit and Vegetable Divisions

MACMA's eleven years began when growers of processing ap- ples, asparagus and pickling em- embers asked Farm Bureau to organize a marketing and bar- gaining association. The organi- zation was, at that time, designed to serve the needs of Farm Bu- rean members in several com- modity areas.

We have modified our pro- grams over the years and are continuing to do so to have a more positive marketing approach and to get desired pricing and sales for our members. Marketing committees are elec- ted from each division's member- ship to negotiate the sales terms of our members' products. They also have the duty of membership acquisition and maintenance for their division.

Our marketing committees and staff are committed to the imple- mentation of marketing programs to get profitable results. These programs need to be supported by an expanded membership. Legislative marketing aids will also be secured when necessary.

Processing Apple Division

There was an adequate and manageable supply of processing apples in Michigan this past harvest season. Our supply was such that, with the current demand situation, we could have and would have had better grower prices. In Appalachia, however, there was a bumper crop and our finest dishearteningly low prices came out of that area, just as they did last year. Michigan processors, which can regulate the volume of cherries to be marketed each year. They did not regulate cherries in 1971. MACMA had a major role in the drafting and passage of the new federal marketing order during 1969 and 1970. This new marketing order allows the total industry to work together for orderly marketing of tart cherries. The Red Tart Cherry Marketing Committee requested that a special committee be appointed to develop and implement a plan to cooperatively process and sell members' tart cherries in 1972.

Multi-Fruit Division

The Multi-Fruit Division is one of the newest divisions of MACMA. It is designed to assist mem- bers in the sale of peaches, plums and prunes. The Committee will work to improve marketing and pricing good for- ture for these crops depends upon crop failures, market demand and price levels in the areas where these crops are grown.

The Multi-Fruit Marketing Committee analyzed the crop and market conditions in the West this year and will enter a new pricing concept, the "volume-value price scale. The Committee will also be securing orders for these crops in 1971.

Apple Division

The 1971 potato contract with United States Potato Growers was reduced this year as two wineries had dropped out of the contract. This created economic chaos for producers in the area. However, the Committee has been able to secure orders from usual markets.

The Multi-Fruit Marketing Committee also has the duty of membership acquisition and development. The Committee is working on a special committee to be appointed to develop and implement a plan to cooperatively process and sell members' tart cherries in 1972.
Michigan Farm Bureau was one of the Farm Bureau organizations in the Florida Farm Bureau membership to respond to the requested direct method of "Florida's Best" oranges and grapefruit featured in Florida to thousands of Farm Bureau members in other states. The Bureau's experience gained can be beneficial to other farmers in the future. In the spring, a survey was conducted to find out the reasons for the sale of oranges and grapefruit. Over 2,500 cartons of citrus have been sold to date for the Farm Bureau members. The success of any product and service can be measured by repeat business. If this is true, the Farm Bureau citrus sale has been another great success story.

MAFMA has given the Florida Farm Bureau the responsibility of handling the orange and grapefruit sales; the Farm Bureau cooperatives will handle the sale of potatoes and apples. It is possible that other Michigan Farm Bureau chapters may also sell the "Florida's Best" orange and grapefruit.

**Summary**

Mechanical harvesting of fruits and vegetables will be successful in all likelihood, particularly those especially grown only for the farm-related employment at harvest. As mechanization and expansion of the farm labor force increases, migrant workers will find their opportunities fewer. The human factor will continue to be strong in the future. Hired workers must be challenged by the producing public.

**Cross-Blue Shield Reopening**

Marie Drew

Who says you can't jump the banks? You can if you're already enrolled. You can join the thousands of Farm Bureau members who enrolled in the Farm Bureau membership campaign this year against the high cost of illness or injury—Michigan Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

If you're not enrolled and are an eligible Farm Bureau member, write to MASA, 750 Michigan Boulevard, Detroit, and Blue Shield through your county Farm Bureau. The membership campaign has been great changes in the fruit industry in recent years. Much of the personal relationship between grower and consumer has been lost.

**Task Force**

Orchards this year.

**Victory Parties**

Regional Victory Parties, celebrating the attainment of membership goal and affording an opportunity to publicly acknowledge the members who have worked hard and other association responsibilities. The membership "task force" will now follow up with all of the membership activities and actions.

MACMA pricing plans for Blue Shield activities. However, an informed membership working together to sign up other growers in the MACMA programs is also very important.

Late in the summer, it was confirmed that 46 farmers would receive new orders from Farm Bureau members. Many favorable comments have been received on this pilot member project.

The Board of Directors of the major states with the Farm Bureau citrus sale has been another great success story.

Hutchinson added, "There have been many changes in the fruit industry in recent years. Much of the personal relationship between grower and consumer has been lost. Average Blue Cross and Blue Shield rates have increased over 10 per cent. The successful tart cherry effort this year is the beginning of a membership "task force" for 1972. There are several more growth opportunities for Michigan. The "task force" kickoff meetings will be held during March to begin the intensive MACMA marketing campaign this year.

The Farm Bureau office in Sandusky will be the site for the Thumb Region's Victory Party at 8 p.m. on March 13. Chatham Township, Hall, Bay City, on March 23. The Central Region will hold its Victory Party at the school in Gaylord in the evening.
**National Legislative Notes**

by Al Almy

On December 8, 1971, the U.S. House of Representatives approved a farm bill (H.R. 7597 and S. 1775) by a narrow 182 to 170 vote. The bill, H.R. 1133 provided for a government strategic reserve of 300 million bushels of wheat and 25 million tons of feed grains. It also provided for release of the reserves by the government at a price of 130% of the average price farmers received in the U.S. during the preceding five marketing years. Opponents focused on the high level of 1971-72 wheat and feed grain crops. During testimony on H.R. 1133, an Agriculture Subcommittee attached a Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R. 175) to require the Secretary of Agriculture to reinstate anti-insect strategies for wheat and feed grains beginning with the 1972 crops.

Farm bureau policy opposes government strategic reserves for several reasons: Strategic reserves are not necessary to protect the public interest; acquisition and storage of the reserves would be costly to taxpayers; farmers would be subject to depressed market prices as a result of huge reserves hanging over the open market; unrealistic support would encourage over-production, thus further hardening the market system; the current farm program would be rendered ineffective.

On January 26 the full Senate Agriculture Committee rejected the Strategic Reserve Bill by a vote of 10 to 4. However, it is expected that further attempts will be made to revise it at the next session of the Senate. The bill has been introduced by 16 members of the House and 15 Senators. Generally known as the Sisk Bill (H.R. 7597 and S. 1775), this legislation would establish a mutual obligation of a handler and advocate a back to nature movement. Such a policy, Borlaug said, is "myopic and disastrous."

Of comparatively recent discovery is a group of chemicals known as PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) or plastizers which are found in plastics, rubber tires, paving materials, printers' inks, water proofings, and carbon papers. From a chemical analyst's point of view this group of chemicals and DDT, a specific chemical, are difficult to separate. Dr. Robert M. Fitch, associate professor of polymer chemistry at the University of Connecticut, states: "Until recently, analytical methods (for residue) were not specific for DDT but rather for polychlorinated aromatic compounds as a class. This means, then, that residues in fatty tissues of birds and animals which have been attributed to DDT in the past may possibly have been from plastizers. When plastizers were consumed by hens the results—unhatchability of eggs—were the same as those attributed to DDT in wild birds. Try to visualize the plastizer, left on highways by the incessant wear of tires, that are carried into swamps, ponds, and streams. The current emphasis on recycling overlooks the fact that if we can recycle desirable materials there may be undesirable components which are carried along and may be intensified. It is one thing to recycle paper itself but when one considers the plastizer-containing inks one can immediately recognize the complexity of the problem. Some food products packaged in recycled paper have been contaminated by plastizers which, somehow, are transferred from the container to the food product. All this is not to say that DDT is necessarily blameless or that we know the long term effects of any of these materials. Control and restriction are needed. But outright bans may prove to be unwise. Dr. Frederick J. Stare, professor of nutrition and chairman of the department of nutrition, School of Public Health, Harvard University, has said: "There are no safe things, but rather safe ways of using what we have."

(Reprinted from BOSTON CULTURE, January, 1972, by special permission of the Massachusetts Horticultural Society)
Presidents' Conference

Fifty-two county Farm Bureau presidents attended the 1972 Presidents' Conference on February 10-11 in Lansing. Keynote speaker was William J. Kohlbus, president of American Farm Bureau Federation.

In his remarks, Kohlbus stressed that being a leader in Farm Bureau, at any level, county president or national president, carries with it a great deal of responsibility.

"The prestige of the Farm Bureau organization is at an all time high," said Kohlbus. This has been demonstrated by the fact that he had been invited by President Nixon to meet with him five times in the past 14 months.

According to Kohlbus, one out of every four acres of American agriculture production is exported. This means that to a great extent, agriculture is dependent on foreign trade. The recent dock strike, the longest in the history of our nation, has had dramatic effect detrimental to agriculture.

The low prices for corn and other grains in the fall of 1971 can be traced directly to the dock strike. The entire American economy is suffering from this tie-up in the shipping industry.

County Presidents were urged by Mr. Kohlbus to write letters to congressmen asking for permanent legislation curtailing nationwide dock strikes. He also urged them to see that all Farm Bureau members took similar action.

President Elton Smith also addressed the county leaders. He complimented the Presidents for the success to date in the membership campaign. He urged them to review programs at the county level, for this is where the strength of Farm Bureau lies.

President Smith indicated that a county must have goals. It must have projects which will be of benefit to farmers in the community. The responsibility for planning these projects rests with the county Farm Bureau president. The county president must see that members are involved in committee work and activity of importance within the Farm Bureau organization.

HOLIDAY CAMP

Farm Bureau Women of Districts One and Two have announced their plans for a Holiday Camp to be on April 5 and 6 at Wesley Woods, Dowling, Michigan. All Farm Bureau women are invited to attend this two-day meeting both for information and education, and also for sociability.

The cost of $5.00 per person includes one overnight lodging, four meals, Instruction, entertainment, and registration. Those who can attend only one day's meeting may purchase individual meals. Those staying overnight are requested to bring their own bedding, towels, soap, etc. Dress will be informal.

Reservations should be made in advance by completing the reservation blank on this page and returning it to Women's Department, Michigan Farm Bureau, P. O. Box 969, Lansing, Michigan 48904 not later than March 20.

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

The meeting will commence at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, April 5 after attendees have registered and been served coffee and rolls. The Wednesday afternoon program will include "Women's Activities in Farm Bureau" by Helen Atwood, coordinator of women activities, Michigan Farm Bureau and "Knowledge thru Immersion" by Kenneth Wiles from Michigan Farm Bureau.

Wednesday afternoon's program will feature Gary Parlin of Sturgis discussing "Overview of Economics and Government" and Mrs. Mildred Wendzel, a member of the Women for the Survival of Agriculture in Michigan. Instruction in various crafts will be given on Wednesday afternoon.

Following dinner, a Vesper Service will be conducted by Mrs. Mary Jane Swartz. A "tasting" party with refreshments and exchange of recipes will conclude the evening program.

Thursday morning Trooper Smith from the Battle Creek State Police Post will discuss "Drugs." Also part of this Thursday morning program will be a review of Legislative Activities by Eugene Greenawalt, regional representative, Michigan Farm Bureau.

The Thursday afternoon speaker will be Helen Pelton of St. Joseph speaking on "Leader Dogs and the Blind."

Reservation for Holiday Camp

at Wesley Wood, Dowling, Michigan
April 5-6, 1972

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________

The following ladies will accompany me: ____________________________

Approximate time of arrival: ____________________________
Approximate time of departure: ____________________________

Reservations due in MFB Office, Lansing, not later than March 20.
Regional Legislative Seminars... MOST SUCCESSFUL!

Representative Robert D. Young (R-Saginaw), (r), of the 84th District, talks to constituents during the luncheon at a recent Legislative Seminar for Farm Bureau members.

Representative Alex Pitch (D-Dearborn), (standing), at a Regional Legislative Seminar. Pitch is chairman of a special seven-member committee of Representatives appointed to study livestock feedlots and to make recommendations for regulating feedlots to protect environmental quality. Seated is Edward Darnell, assistant to Senator Coleman A. Young (D-Detroit), who attended the seminar on behalf of the Senator.

Representative Roy L. Spencer (R-Athica), (r), listens as Farm Bureau members from the 76th District express their views during the Thumb Region’s Legislative Seminar.

In Michigan Farm Bureau members are the fourth largest Blue Cross-Blue Shield group
JOIN THE CROWD

The deadline for enrolling is March 15. Effective date May 20.
MFB YOUNG FARMERS attended the national Leaders Conference in Indiana (seated L to R) Diane Spero, Polly Dieth, Bill Spike, chairman, MFB Young Farmers Committee; Maryann Carlson and Rosemary Dosson. (standing L to R) John Spero, Darryl Dosson, Bill Randall, David Cook, MFB Young Farmers Program director; Steve Carlson and Gill Van Wagoner.

AFBF PRESIDENT KUHPUSS makes a point during his speech at the 1972 Presidents' Conference.

EVERY COUNTY PRESIDENT with membership goal was pinned with a "Smile Button." Being pinned by Susie Raff, MFB Field Operations Division, is Ray Rasner of Menominee County.

County presidents from fifty-two counties were on hand for the statewide Presidents' meeting.

ROBERT BRADEN, administrative director, Michigan Farm Bureau, addresses county Farm Bureau secretaries at the recent Blue Cross-Blue Shield Seminar. Others shown who spoke to the secretaries are (L to R) B. J. McCarthy, president, Michigan Blue Cross; William S. McAlary, consultants, (immediate past president, Michigan Blue Cross) and John McCabe, president, Michigan Blue Shield.

SHOWN TOURING the Blue Cross-Blue Shield office building in Detroit are (L to R) Dorothy Routson, Shiawassee County; Ellen Pappel, Bay County; Della Johnson, Osceola County; and Lennie Luther, Benzie and Wexford Counties. These county Farm Bureau secretaries were among the group of 52 secretaries who recently attended a Blue Cross-Blue Shield Seminar.

SAGINAW COUNTY membership co-chairmen, (L to R) Harvey Goen and Richard Leach, Jr., whoop it up at the county membership victory party.
Talk to the Power People they have the seven additives you asked for.

Like all fuel companies, the Power People at Farmers Petroleum fell in love with their additives. The gasoline has HPA for extra kick. The diesel fuel has HPAD for extra pulling power. You told Farmers Petroleum you wanted more than just High Performance fuels, so they added 7 more additives: service, quality, price, information, emergency deliveries, complete product line and budget pay plans. Talk to the Power People. They listen. They hustle.
AWARD FOR SMITH

Elton R. Smith, president of the Michigan Farm Bureau, was presented with the Michigan Association of Soil Conservation Districts Distinguished Service Award at their annual banquet held in Grand Rapids on January 28, 1972.

In presenting the award, Harold Webster, chairman of the award committee stated, "Your interest and support of soil and water conservation programs is well known. You are recognized in your community as a true steward of the soil since you maintain an outstanding conservation plan on the land in your care. "During your term as president, the Michigan Farm Bureau has provided effective support to Michigan Soil Conservation Districts. Your support on behalf of the district Aide Program are especially appreciated. An excellent, corporate working relationship between our organizations has developed, allowing us to deal more effectively with common issues."

"It is a distinct honor to present this award for your continuing efforts on behalf of soil and water conservation."

The conservation group named Robert Moore of Elsie, Michigan, the "1972 Michigan Watershed Man-of-the-Year," for his outstanding accomplishments and dedicated service to conservation.

Agriculture won an important decision in the Circuit Court of Clinton County on February 14, 1972. The decision followed a three-day trial last October 13-14-15 involving alleged odors from a typical swine enterprise operated by a Grand Ledge producer.

Seven neighbors were asking the Court to award them $10,000 damages under the common nuisance law and for an injunction against the producer under both the common nuisance law and Michigan's new Environmental Protection Act.

The outcome of this case is considered vital to the livestock industry of Michigan. This was the first time agriculture was faced with legal action by citizens using the Environmental Protection Act. The outcome of this case will help influence future cases against agriculture under the new law.

In reaching its opinion as to the nuisance charge, the Court recognized that the area involved was zoned agricultural and is a farming area. Farmers must adopt new methods of operation to keep operating costs in line with income from the sale of their products. The swine enterprise carried on by the producer was considered to be typical of modern commercial swine production. The swine building is properly drained and there is no odor to infect infestation of surrounding property.

The Court was of the opinion that the producer conducted his swine operation in an acceptable manner and was not negligent in its management. It was considered impractical to expect that the raising of swine in substantial numbers could be done in an odorless manner. The Michigan Department of Public Health was unable to substantiate complaints.

The preponderance of evidence did not indicate that alleged odors caused a decline in the value of property owned by plaintiffs or that any health hazard was created. It was noted that the producer uses a successful chemical control for livestock wastes properly used, substantially reduces the odors emitted from his swine operation.

The Court did not deny the right of livestock producers to effective relief and damages against live- stock odors. It was recognized as a way to deal with natural odors in an agricultural area. If the animal wastes are properly treated and disposed in accordance with good farming practices, such odors could well be considered the result of normal farm operations and not a nuisance.

The court concluded that as long as the producer continues his operation carefully and with good management practices and uses such odor control products or devices as are made available, the balance of equities is in favor of the producer and he is not maintaining a nuisance.

In ruling on the Environmental Protection Act, the court strongly agreed that it does not exclude agricultural pursuits. However, the Act is interpreted to provide that some balance has to be maintained between absolutely no pollution and the carrying on of activities necessary to human existence. The raising of livestock to provide food for human consumption is a lawful and necessary occupation that will result in the production of animal waste and odor.

Michigan's Air Pollution Control Act clearly includes livestock odors within the legal definition of air pollution. However, in this case the Court ruled that the odors would not be of such magnitude as to constitute air pollution.

Legal counsel for the producers argued that the Environmental Protection Act is unconstitutional as applied to the raising of livestock because it delegates legislative authority and responsibility to the court.

The court recognized that the legislature can delegate powers in accordance with guidelines established by the legislature itself. But in this case, the court would be required to determine that standards relating to the raising and maintaining of livestock are deficient because none exist. As a result, the court is being asked to create standards, direct their adoption and provide enforcement of standards. The court regarded this as making law and thus an unconstitutional delegation of legislatively power as far as the raising of livestock is concerned.

In summary, the court decided this particular case strongly in favor of agriculture. However, Circuit Court decisions are not binding on other Circuit Courts and similar cases against agriculture should not expect such favorable decisions. One positive note is that producers do not relax their efforts to conduct their operations in a way that will minimize odors and prevent other types of agricultural pollution. Court litigation can be an expensive, time consuming and uncertain approach to resolve environmental issues. The best way to avoid such legal entanglements by good, conscientious farming practice.
**WOMEN**

**Spring Meetings**

Michigan Farm Bureau Women have scheduled their District Spring Meetings:

**District 6** — March 29, coffee hour at 9:30 — meeting to start at 10 a.m. at the Masonic Temperance Hall, Lansing. Theme: "Change." An interview with Mrs. M. J. Buschlen, operations manager, Michigan Agricultural Service. "Farm Labor and Safety Management" will be the subject of this program. Speakers will include Mrs. Ed Morey speaking on "Property Tax Reform — Now or Never," and a representative from the American Dairy Association.

**District 10 East** — April 18, place to be announced at a later date. Meeting and a session of the chapter will be devoted to "Farm Labor and Safety Management." Speakers will include Mr. Ed Morey speaking on "Property Tax Reform — Now or Never," and a representative from the American Dairy Association.

**District 10 West** — April 19, place to be announced at a later date. Meeting and a session of the chapter will be devoted to "Property Tax Reform — Now or Never," and a representative from the American Dairy Association.

---

**AFBF STAFF PROMOTIONS**

**BILLY EASTMAN**

Norwood D. "Bill" Eastman, director of training programs for the American Farm Bureau Federation, has been named director of the field services division for the AFBF. William J. Koehn, former director of the program, resigned in 1970 to become executive director for the Texas Farm Bureau.

Eastman will direct the AFBF staff in July, 1969, as field service director for the midwest region, later serving as secretary-manager of the Michigan Farm Bureau. His service at the Michigan Farm Bureau started in August, 1950, where he was selected as executive director of the Junior Farmer Program, organization director, manager of service division and secretary-manager in 1958. He was named director of training programs at the graduate level of Eastern Michigan University.

Eastman was born and reared on a farm in the thumb area of Michigan. His parents operated a 160-acre general farm near Cass City. He now resides in Glen Ellyn, Illinois, a western suburb of Chicago.

---

**JERRY CORDREY**

Jerry Cordrey, a member of the staff of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has been named training director of the AFBF.

Cordrey succeeds Norwood Eastman who was recently appointed director of the field service division.

In his new position, Cordrey will coordinate the planning and conducting of various management, staff and other volunteer training programs of the Federation's program development division.

Cordrey has been serving as assistant director of the program development division in the area of citizenship education, and leadership training. In 1965 he was assigned the major responsibility for the local affairs program in the division.

Prior to joining the Federation staff, Cordrey worked on the staff of the Michigan Farm Bureau in membership acquisition. He first started with the Farm Bureau in September, 1951. Born on a farm in Hillsdale County, Michigan, Cordrey was graduated from Hillsdale College in 1951. After high school and college years, he helped his father operate a 160-acre general farm. He began his years in the Navy (1942-45) as follow-up from high school education.

Cordrey is chairman of the planning committee of the Round Lake (Illinois) National Organization for Better Schools, an affiliation of organizations that have an interest in education. He was selected by the Wheaton, Illinois, Junior Chamber of Commerce for the "Outstanding Civic Leader of America" in 1966 and in 1967 was selected for recognition in the book, "Outstanding Civic Leaders of America."

---

**NEW INTEREST ON DEBENTURES**

FOR $100.00 OR MORE YOU CAN PURCHASE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Maturity</th>
<th>6% - 10 Year Maturity</th>
<th>6%-10 Year Maturity</th>
<th>7%-15 Year Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>6% - 5 Year Maturity</td>
<td>6%-10 Year Maturity</td>
<td>7%-15 Year Maturity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>6% - 10 Year Maturity</td>
<td>7%-15 Year Maturity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is neither an offer to sell nor a solicitation to buy these securities. The offering is made only by the prospectus.
County Farm Bureau Secretaries from across the state attended a two-day Blue Cross-Blue Shield seminar in Detroit during the first part of February.

The purpose of the meeting was to bring the secretaries up to date on procedures to be followed during the annual reopening period—March 1-15, 1972—and to acquaint them first hand with changes in handling subscribers' inquiries.

Attending the conference were Carolyn Bowman, Allegan County; Dorothy Crouse, Ascension County; Helen Brown, Branch County; Julie Bowen, Cass County; Jean Armertrout, Clare County; Norma Sanders, Eaton County; Muriel Vauirink, Emmet County; and Ella Vallender, Gladwin County.

Included in the 57 county Farm Bureau Secretaries and their assistants gaining first hand knowledge to better serve Farm Bureau members were Jan Nieder, Isabella County; Beatrice Leake, Jackson County; Owedthay, Kalkaska County; Barbara Fleming, Osceola County; Sue Terpetta, Ottawa County; and Martha Hacker, St. Joseph County.

Departing the two-day attitude adjustment and participation meeting with renewed interest in addition to those previously mentioned, were Alice Abbott, Laporte County; Bonnie Burkett, Missaukee County; Della Johnson, Osceola County; Hattie Lockhart, Chippewa County; Jean Scott, Ingham County; Rita Williams, Kalamazoo County; Alice Collins and Elaine Marquis, Lenawee County; Betty Bliss and Pam Muni, Monroe County; Doris Girard, Saginaw County; Loretta Kirkpatrick, Tuscola County; Mary Dick, Van Buren County; Helen Shantz and Irene Mehler, Washtenaw County; and Barbara Cotye, Washtenahtahd.

Michigan Farm Bureau employees attending the seminar included Marle Dress, Virginia Allen; Barbara Sickles and the ten Regional Representatives.

You beat grassy weeds in corn with Sutan even in a dry year. You don’t need rain to make it work, because you put Sutan in the soil where it controls grassy weeds as soon as they sprout. Sun and wind don’t reduce its power. Sutan stops the tough grasses... nutgrass, fall panicum, Johnsonsgrass seedlings, wild cane, foxtails and many others. Get Sutan now.

FARMERS’ WEEK—MARCH 20-24

A new addition to Farmers’ Week is MSU Farm Business Management Day, on Thursday, March 23.

Beginning at 10 a.m. in the Kellogg Center Auditorium, agriculture and economic development education seminars will be presented to resource development will tackle such issues as financing future farm operations, trends in farm management and the future of the farm input supply business. The afternoon program will deal with how much debt a farmer can carry, the impacts of reduced property taxes, and making more money in 1972.

The annual Farm Management Banquet, honoring outstanding Michiganians to problem solving the farm business, will be held at 5:50 p.m.

Entertainment, presentation of Outstanding Young Farmer awards by the Michigan Jaycees, and recognition of farm managers of the year and 25 year cooperators will precede Dr. Hannah’s talk.

Tickets for the banquet, which is open to the public, are $4.75 each, and may be obtained from John C. Doneth, 27 Agricultural Hall, MSU, East Lansing, 48823.

Farm Bureau Services announced the sale of their Sandusky branch to the Snover Co-op Elevator Company effective February 1, 1972.

The combining of the two operations will greatly strengthen the operations of the Snover Co-op by eliminating the overlapping trading area and increasing the efficiency of equipment and labor. Combined sales for 1971 totaled almost $1 million.

Snover Co-op Elevator is a stockholder-member and dealer of Farm Bureau Services. With this expanded trading area, they will continue to provide patrons of Sanilac County with Farm Bureau Services’ supplies and services.

A special program designed to point out and offer possible solutions to problems facing rural Michigan will be held on Wednesday, March 22 in the MSU Engineering Building auditorium. The program titled “Rural Michigan Day” will feature items about “Rural Development; Rural Manpower Problems and Present Efforts Toward Their Solution; Meeting Rural Health Needs; and Rural Housing.”

Governor William G. Milliken announced the appointment of three new members to the Michigan Bean Commission. Receiving appointment for terms expiring December 31, 1974 are Maurice Cove, St. Johns, who succeeds Basil McKenzie of Breckingridge; Orville A. Gram of Sebewaing, succeeding Edmond Good of Coetown, both farmers; and Edward R. Powell, Lansing, vice president and assistant secretary of Farm Bureau Services and manager of the Michigan Elevator Exchange Division.

Powell replaces S. Stanley Sherman of Saginaw and will remain in that post.

Tickets are available at the Gratiot County Farm Bureau office or at the door.

Blue Cross-Blue Shield Seminar

NOTES

The fifteenth annual Gratiot County Bean Smorgasbord is scheduled for Thursday, March 21, 1972 at the Hamilton Commons on the Alma College Campus.

Dinner will be served from 5:00 to 7:00 p.m. followed by a program in the Dow Auditorium at 8:00 p.m.

A special part of the evening’s program will be the crowning of the Gratiot County Bean Queen.

The special dinner features ham with a variety of bean dishes as the main course topped off by the bean dessert table with an array of cakes, sweet rolls, pies, cookies and candies all made with bean puree.

Tickets are available at the Gratiot County Farm Bureau office or at the door.

Select Herbicide

Depend on Sutan

for dry year

weed control

Your best grassy weeds in corn with Sutan even in a dry year. You don’t need rain to make it work, because you put Sutan in the soil where it controls grassy weeds as soon as they sprout. Sun and wind don’t reduce its power. Sutan stops the tough grasses... nutgrass, fall panicum, Johnsonsgrass seedlings, wild cane, foxtails and many others. Get Sutan now.
Some people reason that Old Mother Nature is responsible, to a certain degree, for the variance in property values. The difference, they reason, in soil locations and other natural features have resulted in placing the value different on that property he most values.

Early laws listed the kinds of property that was to be taxed. Anything not in the list was exempted. As the country grew the list of taxable properties grew larger and larger, until this procedure was replaced by a "simple" policy that all property, not exempted, was taxed according to its market value. This general property tax — the concept that all property both real and personal, tangible and intangible, was taxable at a uniform rate in each taxing district, unless specifically exempted — has been in effect for the past one hundred years.

The general property tax was the main support of state and local governments until the early part of this century. Special tax districts for public and more government services progressed the entire tax structure evolved into the highly complicated system we know today.

The outcome of this evolution is that the property tax has been reduced from its original design as a levy on the concept of wealth to one imposed mainly on the several parcels of real property in a given taxing district.

Dependence on the property tax, coupled with the high degree of geographic fragmentation of government services, has created a situation in which the potential for shifts to other property taxes is unconstitutional. This assumption is based on the fact that the court will rule that the support of his school districts is unconstitutional, then decide whether property tax reform is in'their best interest.

The implementation of use-value assessment will reduce the pressure on open-space land, but as long as local government services are dependent on local property taxes for revenue, urban sprawl will continue to exist. The pressure for an increased tax base, and thus competition for the more productive land, is likely to make it difficult for land owners to get the value of their land, they feel voters must be properly fed and they are not intelligent enough to decide for themselves the type of property tax reform they want. In order to provide a sound basis for long range and meaningful property tax reform it now appears that in lies of legal issues that need to be addressed.

The people of this state must exercise their inherent powers and amend the Michigan Constitution: 

a. Find new sources of revenue for local units of government in order to relieve property tax pressure. 

b. Improve assessment and equalization procedures. 

c. Permit assessment and taxation of new property for school purposes the first year it is built.

d. Find new sources of revenue for school systems, with strict limitations on property taxes for educational purposes.

e. Use the income tax as the major source of funds for school education.

f. Assess agricultural land as farmland as long as it is so used instead of on its possible potential value.

g. Prevent inequities arising from special assessment districts.

The implementation of use-value assessment will result in every citizen paying his fair share toward the costs of education, and other local and state government services.
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Specific provisions of the legislation to implement use-value assessment must also protect against the use of low property taxes as a catalyst to land speculation."

For some years Farm Bureau has consistently supported total tax reform. While much has been accomplished and the elements of balanced tax structure are now available, the feeling prevails that meaningful and lasting reform can now come only through a basic constitutional change.

The property tax burden continues upward and the situation is becoming more serious every year as farmers are finding it more and more difficult to meet the tax bill. Continued voter rejection of proposals for additional taxes emphasizes the need for property tax reform and new approaches to school finances.

A great deal of lip service, but little action has been given by state legislators regarding tax reform. Many have found that property tax reform is a complex and a continuing process. Tax reform is a complex and a continuing process. Farm Bureau members, through their delegates at the last annual meeting, pledged themselves to support constitutional change to achieve property tax reform. They also expressed the belief that to achieve greater equity of taxation it is necessary to:

1. Find new sources of revenue for local units of government in order to relieve property tax pressure.

2. Improve assessment and equalization procedures.

3. Permit assessment and taxation of new property for school purposes the first year it is built.

4. Find new sources of revenue for school systems, with strict limitations on property taxes for educational purposes.

5. Use the income tax as the major source of funds for school financing.

6. Assess agricultural land as farmland as long as it is so used instead of on its possible potential value.

7. Prevent inequities arising from special assessment districts.

The implementation of use-value assessment will reduce the pressure on open-space land, but as long as local government services are dependent on local property taxes for revenue, urban sprawl will continue to exist. The pressure for an increased tax base, and thus competition for the more productive land, is likely to make it difficult for land owners to get the value of their land. They feel voters must be properly fed and that they are not intelligent enough to decide for themselves the type of property tax reform they want.

In order to provide a sound basis for long range and meaningful property tax reform it now appears that in lies of legal issues that need to be addressed.

The people of this state must exercise their inherent powers and amend the Michigan Constitution:

a. Find new sources of revenue for local units of government in order to relieve property tax pressure.

b. Improve assessment and equalization procedures.

c. Permit assessment and taxation of new property for school purposes the first year it is built.

d. Find new sources of revenue for school systems, with strict limitations on property taxes for educational purposes.

e. Use the income tax as the major source of funds for school financing.

f. Assess agricultural land as farmland as long as it is so used instead of on its possible potential value.

g. Prevent inequities arising from special assessment districts.

The implementation of use-value assessment will result in every citizen paying his fair share toward the costs of education, and other local and state government services.

MICHIGAN TAX COMMISSION

The Michigan Tax Commission, which is appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate, can act with major changes in the state tax structure. Briefly the commission establishes the state equalized value of each assessing district; hears appeal of farm assessments for use-value assessment purposes; prepares assessment rolls of public utilities and approves claims for exemptions on air and water pollution, tools, dies, jigs, and fixtures.

The commission makes recommendations about responsibilities of the commission are the proper state equalization of the value of each county within the state. The Michigan Tax Commission acts as an appeals process, which begins in each tax district with the local assessor and the Board of Review.

This responsibility is further complicated with the commission's responsibility of determining the division of tax revenues at times becomes a difficult situation as the appeals are often the result of rules and regulations put into effect. The Michigan Tax Commission has the responsibility of creating an appeals procedure assuring individual taxpayers and local government officials an efficient and impartial procedure, therefore focusing the Tax Commissioner's energies on other essential duties, such as the equalization function, has been suggested.

LOCAL ASSESSOR

The key official in the determination of the taxable value is the tax assessor. Like many officials, even though he performs his duties fairly accurately and according to rules and regulations imposed upon him his services are not appreciated.

Difficulties in valuation has been common, particularly where a levy has been placed on two or more tax districts in the same area.

The thought has been expressed that the Tax Commission should do a better job of providing local assessors with information to help them to perform as efficiently as possible. The commission has prepared a constant updating of the Assessor's Manual. Legislation, passed in 1989, requiring training programs for local assessors was desirable in that local assessors lack the experience and expertise in the equalization and assessment techniques. However, the policy, in some cases, of requiring of the assessor to attend the training programs at his own expense and without reimbursement of any kind. County Equalization Directors can and are assisting local assessors where specialized knowledge is lacking. The help to maintain local control and help assure equitable procedures. However, the final decision should continue to remain with the local assessor.

CONCLUSION

This article has dealt with the broad subject of tax reform and some of the persons or things which have a direct and indirect bearing on taxes. Any attempt to present a complete picture of the tax situation is impossible. In the long run, it is up to the voters of this state, as it should be, to weigh the information and facts obtained from all sources at their disposal, and then decide what property tax reform is in their best interest.
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FIFTEEN

Discussion Exercise

At the suggestion of several Community Groups and individual members, the Discussion Topic Exercise and Report Sheet is being printed in the paper on a trial basis. If used by a Community Group, the first copy of the sheet furnished the Discussion Leader, please forward answers with minutes to Michigan Farm Bureau. If used by individuals please forward answers to Information Division, Michigan Farm Bureau, P. O. Box 960, Lansing, Michigan 48904 or on or before April 1, 1972.

COMMUNITY FARM BUREAU
Discussion Exercise and Report Sheet
March 1972

Community Farm Bureau, County
Please indicate the number of people talking in this discussion.

TOPIC: Tax Reform

Note: Should your Community Group be composed of members from more than one tax area (different townships, school districts, counties) please indicate more than one answer to the first four questions.

1. What is the total amount of mills presently levied in your school district for school purposes?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Both

2. How much of the property tax which the school district levies is paid by the farmers?
   - None
   - 10 percent
   - 50 percent
   - 100 percent

3. In your opinion, what property should be relieved, in whole or in part, of property tax?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Both

4. If you believe a tax is unfair, you will report it to the
   - Tax Collector
   - School Board
   - Legislative body

5. Would you think it is better to have a property tax or a sales tax?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Both

6. In your opinion, what property should be relieved, in whole or in part, of property tax?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Both

7. In your opinion, what property should be relieved, in whole or in part, of property tax?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Both

8. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Both

9. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Both

10. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

11. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

12. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

13. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

14. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

15. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

16. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

17. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

18. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

19. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

20. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

21. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

22. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

23. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

24. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

25. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

26. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

27. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

28. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

29. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

30. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

31. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

32. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

33. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

34. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

35. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both

36. What property do you feel should be relieved of property tax?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Both
It's here now! You don't have to wait for "No-Fault" legislation. Before No-Delay,
you had to sue the negligent driver to recover hospital/medical expenses and lost
income. Now, that's our problem. If you have an accident, here's what we do for
you, your passengers and injured pedestrians:

1. Provide up to $3,000 for hospital, medical and doctor bills . .
   regardless of fault.
2. Provide disability benefits up to $6,000 for wage earners and $4,380
   for non-wage earners . . regardless of fault.
3. Provide primary coverage . . you receive payment from us regard-
   less of any other personal medical or disability insurance protection
   you may have.
4. Reimburse without delay. Without red tape. And, Farm Bureau
   Insurance Group's "No-Delay" plan doesn't restrict your right to
   sue the negligent driver for economic loss, pain and suffering or
   any other claim.

No-Delay Medical Payments and Disability Income provisions are being automati-
cally initiated with renewal billings for Farm Bureau Insurance Group Auto
policyholders.

WE'RE BUILDING A NEW IDEA TOGETHER

FARM BUREAU
INSURANCE GROUP

Farm Bureau Mutual • Farm Bureau Life • Community Service Insurance • Community Service Acceptance