

THE
GAZETTE-TIMES

Vol. 92, No. 48

Heppner, OR, Thursday, Jan. 15, 1976

15c



Willow Creek overflows at the Country Club.

Farm licence plate hearings set

Important PUC public hearings will be held in January. The hearings, concerning the adoption by the Public Utility Commission (PUC) of new rules and regulations pertaining to the Farm Exemption provision, will be held in Ontario, Jan. 6, 10 a.m., County Library; at Pendleton, Jan. 7, 10 a.m., Council Chambers (2nd floor City Hall); Jan. 13, 10 a.m., Medford, Council Chambers, City Hall; and Jan. 20, 10 a.m., Salem, Hearing Room E—Basement, Labor & Industries Building.

The Farm Exemption provision allows motor vehicles owned by farmers to be exempted from weight-mile tax(s) and economic regulation.

During the 1975 legislative session, SB No. 1 was passed, substantially changing the conditions under which vehicles owned and operated by farmers can qualify for exemption from the regulatory and tax provisions.

The hearings are to determine the rules and regulations which will cover the operation of motor vehicles owned by farmers. The proposed rules and regulations are available by either writing the ABC or PUC, Room 300, Labor & Industries Building, Salem, 97310, or they will be available at the public hearing locations. All comments must be received by Jan. 30, 1976.

Listed below are highlights of particular interest to those involved in agriculture:

The exemption application form includes seven sections, ending with a statement "that the motor vehicle will be used exclusively for one or more of the operations which are: (in an abbreviated form)

(a) transporting a farmer's own commodities, agricultural products or livestock; (b) transporting forest products to the farmer's own farm; (c) transporting from the farm of another farmer the items listed in (a) above; however (and this is an important and substantial change) this paragraph (c) shall not apply unless at least 75 per cent of the use of such vehicle is for the operation specified in paragraph (a); (d) transporting supplies, equipment or materials on an exchange or labor basis or for a nominal consideration to another farmer, if such supplies, equipment or materials are to be used or consumed on the other farmer's farm or are directly related to the operation of such farm. The 75 per cent

requirement applies here also, except the use of the vehicle must be for two operations, and (e) transporting sand, gravel, rock, dirt, debris, cinders or asphaltic concrete mix to a project of a district or corporation of which the farmer whose vehicle is being used is a land-owner, if such materials are directly related to the construction or operation of such district or corporation project."

In order to meet the 75 per cent requirement, 75 per cent of both the tonnage carried and the miles traveled by the vehicle must be transportation in the farmer's own farm operations.

The proposed law also states that for each motor vehicle for which an exemption is claimed, the farmer shall maintain records of the motor vehicle's movements, whether loaded or empty. These records shall include for each trip on public highways: the date; point of origin; destination; miles traveled; commodity carried; weight of load; ownership of load; if farm products were carried, where grown; and any other documents relating to the load, including, but not limited to, purchase receipts. This information shall be maintained in such a manner as to facilitate audit by representatives of the Commissioner.

These record keeping requirements are of concern, since to qualify for an exemption from "taxation" or "regulation", it appears that extensive regulation is being proposed—the same form of regulation which is required if the farmer were not exempt and was a commercial-hauling-for-hire motor carrier.

The Agri-Business Council feels a consideration might be to only require the signed statement referred to in the "application for exemption." If further monitoring were required, since the permits are renewed annually, the farmer suspected of being in significant violation of the exemption clause could be required to provide information substantiating the actual use of the vehicle. This procedure would be far less costly for the farmer and the State and would more closely parallel other requirements of individuals engaged in activities principally of a private nature but in which a "for hire" possibility exists.

Agri-Business Council urges your attendance at the hearing in your area to testify.

Sen. Hatfield

The Child and Family Service Act

Since the Child and Family Services Bill has generated a great deal of concern, I want to provide this information on its objectives and details.

I welcome the interest of my constituents in this legislation and hope that from the dialogue will emerge a clearer understanding of the proper response of the federal government to the needs of the children and families in our society. Unfortunately, some of the opposition to S. 626 and H.R. 2966, the Child & Family Services Act of 1975, has been based on misleading and erroneous reports. The copy of the bill, the summary and the other material in this background are intended to help citizens in arriving at their own judgments about the legislation. If after studying this material you find that you oppose the bill, I would appreciate knowing your reasons.

While I am co-sponsor of this bill, I have made suggestions for its improvement in the past and will continue to seek corrections for any flaws it may yet contain. I share the underlying concern some people have about the potential expansion in the authority of the federal government and I have worked in a number of ways for the decentralization of political power. For this reason, I appreciate the structure of this bill, which would place the implementation of programs in the hands of local "prime sponsors." This is a system which has been tested in other areas and found to be successful. I also appreciate the firm commitment in the bill to voluntary participation in child and family programs.

THE NEEDS OF FAMILIES

The debate on this legislation must begin with the question, "are there significant needs which are not being met by present programs?" Note these evidences of need:

1. Working Parents—In 1974, according to the Department of Labor, 34 per cent of all married women with children under age six who lived with their husbands held jobs, compared with 18.6 per cent in 1960. About half of such women with children under age 18 were working.

2. Single Parent Families—Among widows, divorcees and women separated from their husbands, about 54 per cent of those with pre-school children and about two-thirds of those with children under age 18 are working.

3. Insufficient Licensed Day Care Centers—There are about six million pre-school children with working mothers, but only about one million openings in licensed day care programs.

4. Health Needs—The infant mortality rate in the U.S. is higher than that of 13 other nations. Each year an estimated 200,000 children are struck by handicaps which could have been prevented if their mothers had received early health care. Forty per cent of the young children in the country are not fully immunized against childhood diseases. Sixty five per cent of handicapped pre-school children are not receiving special services.

Existing Federal Programs

The largest share of federal support for day care is provided for welfare recipients and other low-income families. The new social services program (Title XX) currently channels some \$680 million to provide day care for 980,000 children. Congress has recently been debating the staffing standard for these programs.

Other federal programs for children include:

1. The "Head Start" program for economically disadvantaged pre-school children—\$434 million.

2. The "Follow Through" program for children in the early grade school years—\$42 million.

3. The day care portion of the "Work Incentive" program to assist welfare recipients in training for and becoming established in employment—\$97 million.

Additionally, working parents of higher income are allowed to deduct some child care expenses from income subject to federal tax. Legislation passed by the House in 1974 (H.R. 10612) would convert the deduction to a credit and make it substantially more generous.

Background of the Child and Family Services Bill

Congress has been considering legislation for several years which would help states and localities upgrade the quality of service for children and families and expand the range of service to meet existing needs. Congress gave approval to such changes by passing the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971 (S. 2007), a bill which was subsequently vetoed. The senate passed similar legislation in 1972.

Sen. Walter Mondale (D-Ind.) then substantially revised this legislation and introduced it in August 1974. Hearings

were begun at that time and have continued, with the identical bills being re-introduced in the 94th Congress (S. 626 and H.R. 2966). Twelve days of joint hearings were held in 1975 and others may be scheduled in the future. While the legislation has been under study for a long period of time, it is not at all certain that the committees will report the bills out for action.

Purposes of the Child and Family Services Bill

Those who have been deeply involved in drafting this legislation have begun with an awareness that children are one of our great resources as a society and that families are the means of preserving and developing these resources. Here are some of the objectives of the bills:

1. More Options for Parents—Instead of just providing financial assistance to day care centers, the bill would authorize assistance to in-home care, in-school programs and summer programs.
2. More Comprehensive Services—Prenatal care, medical assistance for new mothers to prevent birth defects, and counseling services would reach beyond the simple need for child care.
3. More Local Control—State or local prime sponsors would plan the specific programs to be assisted, operating within minimal federal standards.
4. More Parental Control—Policies for prime sponsors and local projects would be set up by councils, half of whose members would be parents.
5. Broader Eligibility—Current income tests sometimes prevent the "working poor" from receiving needed assistance. Eligibility under the bill would be based on the "lower living standard budget" drawn up by the Department of Labor, with a sliding scale of fees for those above this level.
6. Careful Planning—The bill would authorize funds only for planning during the first year, to assure that appropriate delivery systems were developed.
7. Emphasis on Training—Adequate training would be provided, not only for staff personnel but for family members and members of the community.
8. Retention of Voluntary Element—As is the case with

present programs, participation by families would be totally voluntary.

CRITICISMS OF THE BILL:

While it is the privilege and duty of citizens to voice opposition to proposed legislation with which they disagree, some of the attacks on the Child and Family Services bill have been based on misleading or inaccurate reports. Materials have been circulated anonymously, alleging the bill has objectives which, in fact, it does not. Because of the extent of this opposition, it is necessary to respond in some detail to the charges.

1. "Child Advocacy Clause"—It is alleged that the bill contains the authority for a government "advocate" to step into home situations which were inadequate and take over the functions of the parents. There is no such section in the bill and the sponsors of the bill do not advocate such governmental intervention. This "Child Advocacy Clause" may have appeared in the Congressional Record at some time, but not as a suggested provision of this bill.

2. "Charter of Childrens Rights"—Another citation from the Congressional Record is a statement of childrens rights which also is not in the bill and was not put forward by the supporters of the bill. The statement was inserted in the debate in 1971 on similar legislation by opponents of the bill. The statement originated with a civil liberties group in Great Britain.

3. Role of Parents—It has been alleged that the bill would take the responsibility of the parents to raise children and give it to the government. If this were the case, I most certainly would oppose the bill. In fact, the bill requires that programs must build upon and strengthen the family and not infringe upon the moral and legal responsibilities and rights of parents and guardians.

4. Cost—some would reject this bill primarily on the basis of cost, which would be \$1 billion annually, after a phase-in. While we must constantly guard against costly and unnecessary new programs, we should ask ourselves whether the needs of families are not greater than the many programs for which we spend much more, such as military aid, tax reductions and defense.

Proposed budget up \$368,291

At a special meeting of the Morrow County School Budget Committee, held at the District Office, Lexington, Monday evening, Dr. Wallace Wolff was elected chairman, Bob Rietmann, vice chairman and Pauline Winter, secretary.

A proposed budget of \$2,640,590 was presented to the committee for their approval. The new budget is an increase of \$368,291 over last year's budget, an increase of 16.2 per cent.

The proposed budget contains a request for six new teachers, three for A.C. Houghton Elementary School and three at Riverside High School and one teachers aide.

Following nearly threehours of discussion, the budget committee voted to recommend

the adoption of the transportation and the District Office budget.

Transportation is projected to cost \$230,837, an increase of \$38,186 over last year.

The District Office is slated for an expenditure of \$263,730. This is \$46,797 higher than the previous year.

Adoption of the proposed budget would mean a tax levy increase of \$263,711 or an increase of \$1.38 on each \$1,000 of true cash value of assessment.

The next budget meeting will be held Jan. 26 at Riverside High School, Boardman, 7:30 p.m. Another budget meeting will be held Feb. 2, at the District Office and one is scheduled for Feb. 9, if needed.

Legal Aid clinic

The Sixth Judicial Legal Aid Society will handle legal matters for low income residents of Morrow and Umatilla Counties.

A clinic will be held in Heppner from 1:30-5 p.m. on the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, at the Bank of Eastern Oregon's

Board Room.

Anyone wishing further information is asked to contact the main office, 146 S. Main St., Pendleton or by telephoning 276-6685. The office is open from 9-12 and 1-5 p.m. weekdays. It is suggested that interested persons phone for an appointment.

Farm meeting

A special meeting of all wheat and cattle producers pertaining to Senate Bill No. 1 has been scheduled for Jan. 20, 8 p.m. at the Heppner High School Cafeteria. "This meeting should facilitate a better understanding of Senate Bill No. 1 as it pertains to the farm exemption of motor vehicles," says Mike Howell, Morrow County Extension Agent.

State Sen. Ken Jernstedt

and State Representatives Jack Sumner and Dick Magruder will be present to help answer questions and make interpretations on this law. It is also hoped that a member from the P.U.C. board will be able to attend.

Copies of this law and a classification of exempt and non-exempt status of motor vehicles is available at the Extension Office.

Chamber hears of Trinidad, Tobago

"The purpose of the IFYE program is to acquaint people of one country with those of a foreign country," said Dave Bonkowski, speaking before the Chamber of Commerce, Monday.

He continued saying he had spent six months living in Trinidad and Tobago. While there he lived as the natives do, eating their food and respecting their culture.

While in Trinidad he lived with the Peters family, who have nine children. While Mr. Peter and the older children worked, Bonkowski also worked on the small farm doing whatever chores were necessary.

"Schooling is different in Trinidad," said Bonkowski, as most of the students wear uniforms to school. When a student reaches the age of 11 or 13 he is given an examination to qualify for secondary education. If he fails the test he goes to work.

There is quite a variety of people in Trinidad, including Africans, East Indians and some Chinese; however, with the variety of ethnic groups they appear to live in harmony.

Bonkowski showed slides of his trip, showing the school children playing cricket. "They have also learned how to play American baseball but they seem to prefer cricket," he said. He also showed slides of an all school band. The students use steel barrels as instruments cutting holes in the barrels then tapping them to produce the music.

The homes within the area lack in sanitary facilities and showers are taken from an outside standpipe. The homes do not have any heaters in them and some of the upper portions of the walls are made of a hollow ceramic tile to allow ventilation between the various rooms. Heaters are

(Continued on Page 2)



DAVID BRONKOWSKI