

Letters

Daringly honest

It has not been my practice in the past, to endorse or comment upon candidates running for campus-wide positions, but the present run-off election for ASUO president deserves a comment. Jan Oliver is an amazing person, and she would certainly bring qualities to that office that are much needed.

That she is obviously a woman, as well as a black person, are the very least of her qualifications in this age of Affirmative Action. What is more important is that Jan Oliver is a daringly honest person, and so extremely talented. She is a single parent; she works hard to improve day-care facilities in Eugene; she works hard to improve health services for the not-so-advantaged in Eugene; she is a diligent advocate for rights of students in an institutional environment that is sometimes hostile toward such advocates. To be frank, I don't know exactly why Jan Oliver wants to be ASUO president—it seems to be a tough and sometimes thankless job. But I know that should she be elected, she will make of it an exciting and positive experience for all of us. I urge everyone to support her in her quest.

Dennis P. DeGross
Director,
Native American Program

Beware

A recent letter to the editor of the *Emerald* suggested that Doug Melevin was a more "progressive" candidate than Nancy Hayward for the position of county commissioner. I would like to reply to that letter.

Nancy Hayward, some years ago when the Saturday Market was a controversial issue, stood as the strongest voice in support of the establishment of the market, which is today considered to be a positive, well-established business concern. Nancy Hayward not only supported the efforts of BRING, but also was its first chairperson. Nancy Hayward supported the right of peaceable assembly when the first Renaissance Faire was held even though there were some people in the Veneta-Elmira area who were very critical of the Faire. Nancy Hayward has recently received the endorsement of the Oregon League of Environmental Voters because of her consistent efforts to maintain the livable quality of our county. She has also received the endorsement of the Oregon Women's Political Caucus for her promotion of more equitable treatment of women in today's society.

Beware of candidates' promises without substance. Nancy Hayward's record proves that she has been and will continue to be the progressive candidate.

Denyse McGriff
pol. sci., grad.

Immersed again

Once again we are immersed in an ASUO election. We are immersed and I think it is time to do some serious evaluation of the presidential candidates and their campaigns.

Ms. Oliver impresses me as an intelligent and concerned young woman. That she is intelligent and

concerned, though, is all I can determine about her. I have found nothing in her own campaign literature or in the *Emerald* outlining exactly which issues she supports or opposes. She consistently deals in vague generalities concerning "program advocacy" (which programs?), and in an "intensive lobbying effort" in the legislature (lobbying for what?). Her continual avoidance of taking specific positions leads me to believe that she doesn't really understand what the ASUO is, and what it can do.

Concerning campaigns.

There has been a lot of reckless mud-slinging in this campaign, mostly directed at Mr. Davis and emanating, for the most part, from Michael Schaefer. Perhaps the air can still be cleared before the election. Mr. Schaefer strikes me as a dedicated but over-zealous campaign supporter. The charges he brought against Davis were admittedly petty, but he neglects the fact that Oliver is guilty of the same offenses. I have seen Oliver's campaign literature hanging in forbidden places and, just like Davis, no permission was obtained for its placement there.

Jim Davis is the only candidate who dares to speak of specific programs and courses of action. Through this I can determine that he is aware of both the scope and the range of the ASUO and will be able to mold the ASUO into the effective student advocate we need.

In conclusion, I would urge students to let the issues determine their vote rather than vague and poorly substantiated accusations. When viewed logically, there is really only one choice.

Tom Milligan
computer sci., soph

Decision made

I have been trying to understand each of the candidates for ASUO president in an effort to decide which would be best for the job. After considering the qualifications of each I have decided to vote for Jim Davis. This letter is to explain why I think he would do a better job than his opponent.

An ASUO president needs to be able to put in a great deal of time on the job in order to adequately serve the students. Jan Oliver, with her three little children, would find it extremely difficult to put in the time and effort necessary to do a complete job. On the other hand, Jim Davis has proven himself to be a hard worker who will give full attention to the job of being president. In his position this year as ASUO vice-president, he has learned just how much work being president will actually be.

The other basis which I see as important in selecting a president is the overall orientation toward the purpose of our student association. While Jan Oliver's involvement with the ASUO has been limited to budgeting incidental fee money, Jim Davis has had experience with the ASUO programs, lobbying at the legislature and academic affairs. Jim Davis understands the importance of our student association's advocacy of the interests of students as consumers of education. What we need most from the ASUO is effective work toward minimizing tuition and ensuring a quality education for its members.

For the above reasons I am voting for Jim Davis.

Linda Thorpe
bus., jr.

Duck Soup

Oregon Daily Emerald



She took the sprouts!

opinion

Gallo ad unfair, distorts

The *Emerald* may not wish to acknowledge it, but it does have a responsibility to its readers as well as to its advertisers. It should never knowingly give its readers misleading and distorted information, no matter how much someone is willing to pay to have it printed. Yet the *Emerald* did precisely this by running the Gallo anti-UFW ad, May 7.

The ad suggested that Gallo is a good union company which has cooperated with its farm workers' efforts to organize. This is untrue. Gallo did sign a UFW contract in 1967, but it took two years of the national grape boycott to convince them. They signed with the UFW, because a card check-off election conducted by the California Department of Industrial Relations Conciliation Service showed that 68 out of 90 Gallo farm workers supported the UFW. Gallo renewed that contract in 1970, but in 1973 they simply switched to the Teamsters. When 127 of the 155 farm workers went out on strike that April, they were fired. Seventy-one farm worker families were evicted from Gallo housing they had occupied for years. Gallo tried to drive the rest out by turning off the labor camp pumps, which backed sewage up into the water supply. They brought in new crews to break the strike and took the Teamsters around to organize them. Only then did Gallo hold a representation election. They ran it themselves and claimed the Teamsters won all but one vote.

The ad also suggested that Gallo farm workers are well-paid and taken care of under their Teamster contract. This is untrue as well. Gallo farm workers are paid about \$3.15 per hour. This is only a few cents an hour more than what farm workers under UFW contract have made for the past three years. And it is less than what the UFW's recently-negotiated master vegetable workers contract calls for. Gallo field workers are not earning \$12,000 a year! Their base pay—if they work 40 hours a week the year round—is just over \$6,000. Those workers who Gallo claims are making \$278 per week are either working well over 80 hours a week, or else they are including the earnings of their entire family on one paycheck. They are certainly not getting rich on a job that is theirs only a few months out of the year.

All of the fringe benefits mentioned in the Gallo ad are available to farm workers under UFW contract, as well as treatment at the UFW clinic and use of the community service centers, credit union and retirement village. With the UFW all farm workers—seasonal as well as year-round—are eligible for these benefits. Under Teamster contracts like the one at Gallo, it is almost impossible for any but the year-round workers to secure benefits. Unfortunately, the Gallo farm workers lost much more than just fringe benefits when the Teamsters came in. They lost control of hiring, lost control of their union through the ranch committee, lost all seniority rights, lost adequate protection from pesticides, lost guarantees against children working in the fields, and of course, most of the original workers lost their jobs. This past year three Gallo workers lost their lives, because of the speed-up in work and inadequate safety precautions.

Finally, the ad suggested that Gallo is simply waiting for the California Agricultural Labor Relations Board (ALRB) to determine who represents its workers, so it can begin negotiations on a new

contract. This is also untrue. The ALRB did conduct a representation election at Gallo last September. It was one of the first elections held under the labor relations law passed last summer. The results of the election were: Teamsters—223; UFW—131; and 195 challenged votes, as the ad stated. About 60 of the challenged votes were contested by the UFW, because they were cast by Gallo security guards. The law states that only farm workers are allowed to vote. The other 131 challenged votes were cast by the Gallo workers who went on strike in 1973 and were fired. According to the law, these workers have the right to vote. Thus, when the ALRB finally certifies the election, the UFW will win and Gallo will once again have to negotiate with them.

But Gallo has made it clear that they have no desire to sign another UFW contract. The ALRB has ruled that before the election last fall Gallo tried to prevent a UFW victory by firing UFW supporters and by taking pictures and spying on its workers. After the election Gallo stalled the ALRB's certification process for five months by insisting that the board solicit testimony from all of the strikers whose votes Gallo had challenged. Those hearings had hardly begun when in January Gallo joined other large growers in pressuring the state legislature to prevent refunding of the ALRB. When the ALRB ran out of money on February 6 it simply shut down. It is thus not "in the process of determining which union won the election" at Gallo. Even if the ALRB receives funds after the beginning of the new fiscal year in July, a decision at Gallo is many months away.

What Gallo did in its May 7 ad was string together a few facts and half-truths to try to convince people that they should not boycott Gallo wines. The ad was timed to coincide with a mass picket at the local Gallo distributor sponsored by the Eugene Friends of the Farm Workers to celebrate National Farm Worker Week. The ad in its entirety presented a false and distorted picture of the situation at Gallo. But that was of no concern to the *Emerald*. They argued that as long as the individual statements in the ad were not false that they had a responsibility to run the ad. They verified those statements by calling up the Gallo winery in Modesto and checking with the man who had placed the ad. And then they turned around and decided that the mass picket, which had provoked the ad, was not newsworthy.

The Eugene Friends of the Farm Workers has asked the *Emerald* to print a retraction of the Gallo ad; to check any future ads concerning the farm workers thoroughly for accuracy before accepting them; and to accord the UFW and local supporters equal treatment in its news columns. A week has passed and the *Emerald* has yet to respond.

It is time for the *Emerald* to stop playing games with farm workers' lives. Farm workers are struggling for the basic right of self-determination. They do not write the news, run the ads or own the newspapers in this country. But their struggle is just. They have the support of the students on this campus. They should have the support of the students' newspaper as well. At the very least, they should not have to suffer from the biases of the editors of that paper.

Kurt Wilcox, Eugene
Friends of the Farm Workers