#### 'Block Vote' Bill

(Continued from Page D2)

House Bill 767 seeks to amend the Pennsylvania Agricultural Commodities Marketing Act of 1968, which sanctioned cooperative bloc voting.

Our organization polled every state represented by the National Farmers Union and discovered that Pennsylvania was the only state issuing carte blanche voting rights to cooperatives in commodity referendums. The accepted practice of cooperatives in other states is to let the individual producer decide if a mandatory advertising program is suitable for their commodity.

If HB 767 is enacted, it will restore the co-op member's right to control the result of a reterendum by voting for, against or deciding not to vote.

By allowing cooperatives to bloc vote for its membership, the co-op automatically assumes that all "no-show" votes are in agreement with that cooperative board's decision. The last referendum that relied heavily on cooperative bloc voting was the 1973 milk referendum. Of the number of cooperatives casting bloc votes, only eight of the thirty five agreed with the majority of individual producers who cast ballots.

For example, one cooperative cast its bloc votes in favor of the referendum, but 90 percent of the votes cast by individual producers disagreed with the co-op's decision. Farmers Union members feel a cooperative is remiss to assume that all no show votes are

in agreement with the opinion of the board, especially, when the voting members do disagree at such a substantial rate.

When the referedum vote concerns a mandatory promotion program, shouldn't the ultimate decision be in the hands of each producer and not the co-op board? We have yet to see a cooperative agreement stating that the co-op board shall cast the votes of all members who fail to vote.

If the political parties in this country were given permission to bloc vote for its registered members who tailed to vote, the electoriate would be up in arms. Think of the havoc bloc voting would cause to our representative torm of government.

The same havoc is occurring in rural Pennsylvania. Farmers want to have sole control of their vote in reterendums, even if it means exercising their right not to vote.

To clarify a question earlier submitted by a member of this committee, an elected official in the General Assembly does not bloc vote for his constituents. His vote on legislation is a representative form of voting. It his decisions do not coincide with the wishes of his constituents, they have the power to vote him out of office.

In a cooperative structure, members elect delegates who then vote for cooperative board members. The cooperative board member, who decides which way a bloc vote is submitted, is not at the mercy of his members. His seat on the board was chosen by delegates.

So in reality, he is one step removed from the democratic process.

In response to other portions of HB 767, we teel that a three year review of the marketing order is time enough for producers to determine whether they are investing their dollars wisely. Under current law, it a program does not meet the expectations of the producer, he must continue to subsidize it for a five year period. We teel a three year review is an adequate time trame in which to determine the effectiveness of a marketing order.

HB 767 also increases the votes needed tor passage of a reterendum from a simple majority and 50 percent of production, to a twothirds majority without regard to production.

By eliminating the production clause, the individual producer stands to gain on two points. First, it would simplify the process of conducting check-offs. Tabulating production in addition to total votes is a complicated and costly tormula. Secondly, by taking production into account, the vote of a tarmer who produces an abundant supply of that commodity has a stronger vote than the small tamily tarmer with less production. So a man with a million dollars has a stronger voice than a man with a thousand dollars.

By eliminmating production considerations and increasing the votes needed for passage of a referendum, administrative costs tor tabulation will also be reduced. Under the basic principles of a democracy, the concept of "one man-one vote", with each vote carrying the same weight, is the cornerstone of a free society. The tarmers of Pennsylvania,

however, do not have this same basic treedom in commodity referendum votes.

Many of the cooperatives testifying have said that House Bill 767 will inhibit them from adequately representing their membership in commodity reterendums. What they tail to mention is that bloc voting contradicts the main principles that guide cooperatives.

The Rochdale Principles, which date back to 1844, are the basic rules that most member-owned cooperatives tollow. The Rochdale Principles clearly state that the coop is democratically controlled, with each member having an equal vote. There is no consideration for production or monetary status, and each member controls his own

Current law is a direct defiance to these set of guidelines that cooperatives have followed for over a century. House Bill 767 will change all that.

In closing, may I say that the Pennsylvania Farmers Union is

not attempting to be anticooperative. In fact, the Farmers Union has a long and illustrious history of forming farmer-owned cooperatives. National Farmers Union has organized more cooperatives in the last 79 years than all other organizations combined.

Our main concern is that each tarmer in this state has an equal vote, equal representation and full control of their own vote. Producers in Pennsylvania are responsible enough to make their own decisions, especially when it comes to mandatory advertising. It advertising is a good thing in the eyes of the producer, the vote will reflect it under the proposals of House Bill 767.

But under current law, the mandate of an advertising program is controlled by the wishes of a cooperative board, and not the individual tarmer. For these reasons, the Pennsylvania Farmers Union is in tull support of House Bill 767.

### Luzerne agent presents paper at nat'l meeting

NANTICOKE — E.V. Chadwick, Luzerne County Extension director, has been selected to present a Search for Excellence paper Monday at the annual meeting of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents at Cornell University.

Chadwick's paper on ad-

ministrative management was judged a state and northeastern United States regional winner.

He is one of 21 county Extension agents from throughout the United States named to take part in the national association's professional improvement program.



## SELF LOCKING FEED THRU FENCE



THREE SIZES:

SMALL -For Calves Up To 15

ADJUSTABLE-8 Months And Older (Pictured)

> LARGE -For Cows 15 Months And Older

- All cows can be reléased at one
- time or individually ★ When handle is in lock position, cow automatically locks as it
- enters ★ No more chasing cows

high)

- \* Heavy duty construction
- \* Stabilizer on bottom of yoke for extra strength
- ★ Custom built to your specifications
- \* You can release all cows or hold cows that need treatment

#### ALSO AVAILABLE

- Standard Free Stalls
- Gates (38" 48" 54"
- Fencing
- Automatic Head Gates
- Automatic Gate Latches

# PAUL B. ZIMMERMAN,

Hardware • Farm Supplies **Custom Manufacturing** Crane Service

Box 128 R D #4, Lititz, PA 17543 **Wood Corner Rd** 1 Mile West of Ephrata Phone 717-738-1121

