

S2
Colo.6
no.72
c.2

ROBERT R. SCHMIDT
51 DOWNING
DENVER, COLO.
80218

Report to the Colorado General Assembly:

MIGRATORY LABOR IN COLORADO



COLORADO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

RESEARCH PUBLICATION NO. 72

DECEMBER 1962

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
OF THE
COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Senators

James E. Donnelly, Chairman
Charles E. Bennett
L. T. Skiffington
Floyd Oliver
Ranger Rogers
Robert L. Knous, Lt. Governor

Representatives

Guy Poe, Vice Chairman
Ruth B. Clark
John L. Kane
C. P. Lamb
Albert J. Tomsic
M. R. Douglass
Elmer A. Johnson

Lyle C. Kyle, Director

* * * * *

The Legislative Council, which is composed of five Senators, six Representatives, and the presiding officers of the two houses, serves as a continuing research agency for the legislature through the maintenance of a trained staff. Between sessions, research activities are concentrated on the study of relatively broad problems formally proposed by legislators, and the publication and distribution of factual reports to aid in their solution.

During the sessions, the emphasis is on supplying legislators, on individual request, with personal memoranda, providing them with information needed to handle their own legislative problems. Reports and memoranda both give pertinent data in the form of facts, figures, arguments, and alternatives.

Stacks
52
Colo. 6
no. 72
c. 2

MIGRATORY LABOR IN COLORADO

Colorado. Legislative Council
" "
Report To The
Colorado General Assembly

Research Publication No. 72
" December, 1962

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



OFFICERS
JAMES E. DONNELLY
CHAIRMAN
GUY POE
VICE CHAIRMAN

MEMBERS
LT. GOV. ROBERT L. KNOUS
SEN. CHARLES E. BENNETT
SEN. JAMES E. DONNELLY
SEN. FLOYD OLIVER
SEN. RANGER ROGERS
SEN. L. T. SKIFFINGTON

STAFF
LYLE C. KYLE
DIRECTOR
HARRY O. LAWSON
SENIOR ANALYST
PHILLIP E. JONES
SENIOR ANALYST
DAVID F. MORRISSEY
RESEARCH ASSISTANT
MYRAN H. SCHLECHTE
RESEARCH ASSISTANT

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
ACOMA 2-9911 - EXTENSION 2285

SPEAKER ALBERT J. TONBIC
REP. RUTH B. CLARK
REP. M. R. DOUGLASS
REP. ELMER A. JOHNSON
REP. JOHN L. KANE
REP. C. P. LAMB
REP. GUY POE

December 12, 1962

To Members of the Forty-fourth Colorado General Assembly:

The Legislative Council is submitting herewith its final report on the migratory labor study, as directed by the terms of House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) and House Joint Resolution No. 4 (1962).

The committee appointed by the Legislative Council to make this study submitted its report on November 30, 1962, at which time the report was accepted by the Legislative Council for transmittal to the General Assembly.

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Donnelly
Chairman

Law
gift
Robert R. Schmidt 3-19-69

COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



OFFICERS
JAMES E. DONNELLY
CHAIRMAN
GUY POE
VICE CHAIRMAN

STAFF
LYLE C. KYLE
DIRECTOR
HARRY D. LAWSON
SENIOR ANALYST
PHILLIP E. JONES
SENIOR ANALYST
DAVID F. MORRISSEY
RESEARCH ASSISTANT
MYRAM H. SCHLECHTE
RESEARCH ASSISTANT

MEMBERS
LT. GOV. ROBERT L. KNOUS
SEN. CHARLES E. BENNETT
SEN. JAMES E. DONNELLY
SEN. FLOYD OLIVER
SEN. RANGER ROGERS
SEN. L. T. SKIFFINGTON

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 341, STATE CAPITOL
DENVER 2, COLORADO
ACOMA 2-9911 - EXTENSION 2285

December 12, 1962

SPEAKER ALBERT J. TOMSIC
REP. RUTH B. CLARK
REP. M. R. DOUGLASS
REP. ELMER A. JOHNSON
REP. JOHN L. KANE
REP. C. P. LAMB
REP. GUY POE

Senator James E. Donnelly, Chairman
Colorado Legislative Council
341 State Capitol
Denver 2, Colorado

Dear Senator Donnelly:

Transmitted herewith is the final report and recommendations of the Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor. This committee was appointed pursuant to House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961), and the study was continued under the provisions of House Joint Resolution No. 4 (1962). The report covers the committee's extensive field study in the five major seasonal farm labor employment areas in the state. Special attention has been given to the organization of the seasonal farm labor market; housing, health, and sanitation; education; trends in agricultural acreage, production, and technological change; community attitudes and programs; state and federal legislation; and last (but not least) the composition, attitudes, and problems of the seasonal farm labor force.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Representative M. R. Douglass
Chairman, Committee on
Migratory Labor

FOREWORD

This study was made under the provisions of House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) and House Joint Resolution No. 4 (1962). These resolutions continued the migratory labor study which was originally authorized by Senate Joint Resolution No. 21 (1960) and directed the Legislative Council to report its findings and recommendations to the Forty-fourth General Assembly prior to or upon its convening in 1963. In effect, the Council was directed by these resolutions to cover all pertinent aspects of the economic and social conditions and employment of migrant workers and their families.

The Legislative Council committee appointed to make this study included: Representative M. R. Douglass, Grand Junction, Chairman; Senator Robert E. Allen, Denver, Vice Chairman; Senator Charles E. Bennett, Denver; Senator Raymond W. Braiden, La Jara; Senator Allegra Saunders, Denver; Representative James A. Braden, Colorado Springs; Representative Edwin S. Lamm, Grand Junction; Representative Noble M. Love, La Salle; Representative William E. Myrick, Englewood; Representative H. Ted Rubin, Denver; Representative Raymond H. Simpson, Cope; and Representative Betty Kirk West, Pueblo.

The Council staff work on this study was the primary responsibility of Harry O. Lawson, senior research analyst, assisted by Myran Schlechte, research assistant, who was in charge of the field study and migrant interviews. D. Edward Garcia, senior, University of Colorado Law School, assisted in the field study during the 1961 and 1962 growing seasons and also served as Spanish interpreter. Francis Nakai, Navajo Reservation, Shiprock, New Mexico, was employed as a Navajo interpreter in 1961 in the San Juan Basin and during potato harvest in the San Luis Valley.

The Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor held 17 meetings between April 1961 and November 1962. Nine of these meetings were regional public hearings, which were held in Rocky Ford, Lamar, Alamosa, Monte Vista, Palisade, Cortez, Brush, Fort Lupton, and Greeley. At these hearings growers; processors; federal, state, and local officials; legislators; community leaders; and interested citizens met with the committee to discuss problems and conditions related to the employment of migrant farm workers.

In connection with the regional hearings, the committee examined migrant housing, observed the special migrant summer school programs, visited packing and processing plants, and observed workers in the fields. The staff field study made in conjunction with the regional meetings included interviews with migrants, growers, processors, government officials, and community leaders and extended examination of housing and both government and private programs related to migrant farm workers and their families.

While the resolution authorizing the study directed attention only to migratory farm workers and their families, the committee examined all aspects of the employment of all seasonal farm workers, as well as agricultural trends and conditions with respect to markets, acreage, production, mechanization, and technological change. This was considered necessary in order to place the employment and problems of migrant workers in proper perspective.

The committee wishes to express its deep appreciation to the many federal, state, and local government officials who provided information and consultation during the course of the study. In particular the committee would like to thank the following:

Federal Officials: Miss Gwen Geach and Miss Mildred Dougherty, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Department of Labor; Roy West and Alyn Trego, Bureau of Employment Security, U.S. Department of Labor.

State and Local Officials: Bernard E. Teets, Director, State Department of Employment and the members of his staff including the director of employment service, the field supervisors, the director of the farm placement service and local office managers; Guy R. Justis, Director, State Department of Welfare; Mrs. Ruth Pierce, Director of Field Services, State Department of Welfare, and county welfare directors; Dr. Ruth Howard, Director, Child Health Services Division, State Department of Public Health, and members of her staff; local health department officials generally and George J. Houck, Director of the Otero County Health Department in particular; Lionel Moss, Colorado Industrial Commission; Chief Gilbert Carrel, Colorado State Patrol and patrol officers in the areas visited by the committee; Dr. Alfred Potts and Mrs. Lucile Latting, State Department of Education, and the principals and teachers of the special migrant summer schools; and J. L. Rice, Executive Director, Weld County Housing Authority. There are many more, too numerous to name, to which the committee also wishes to express its thanks.

In addition, the committee would like to thank the growers, processors, and growers' association officials for their assistance. Further the committee would like to recognize Dr. Jack H. Gore, Colorado School of Mines, for the data prepared in connection with his doctoral dissertation which he made available to the committee and the staff.

The committee's report is lengthy because it covers the first over-all field study made in Colorado of the conditions and problems relating to the employment of seasonal farm workers generally, and migrants in particular. It is the committee's hope that the data contained herein will provide the source material needed in future consideration by the General Assembly of legislation related to migrant farm workers.

December 12, 1962

Lyle C. Kyle
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL	iii
FOREWORD	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
COMMITTEE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	xxvi
FOCUSING ON THE PROBLEM	1
Importance of Migrant Workers	1
Legislative Concern	1
1960 Legislative Study	2
Present Legislative Study	4
Committee Meetings	5
Committee Tours	5
Topics Discussed at Regional Meetings	6
Field Study	7
Migrant Interviews	7
Other Aspects of Field Work	7
Area Differences	11
ARKANSAS VALLEY	12
Crop Activities and Acreage	12
Crops Using Seasonal Farm Labor	12
Sugar Beets	12
Other Crops	13
Recent Trends in Acreage and Production	14
Sugar Beets	14
Broomcorn	14
Other Crops	14
Number of Farms and Average Size	14
Mechanization and Technological Change	15
Sugar Beets	15
Onions	16
Other Crops	16
The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes	16
Seasonal Farm Labor Employment	17
Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods	17
Employment Department Statistics	18
Labor Market Organization	22
Recruitment	22
Empire Field Crops	22
American Crystal Sugar Co.	22
Dave Nava	22
Mexican Nationals	23
Labor Utilization and Reallocation	23
Employment of Labor Contractor Crews	24
Further Comments on Labor Reallocation	25
Broomcorn Harvest	26

	<u>Page</u>
Wage Rates and Earnings	26
Effect of Braceros on Wage Rates for Domestic	28
Wage Rate Determination	29
Wages Received by Migrant Workers	29
Housing, Sanitation, and Health	30
Housing and Sanitation	30
Concentrated Housing	31
Housing Subleases	32
On-the-farm Housing	32
Employment Department Inspections	33
Migrant Care of Housing	33
Otero County Health Department	34
Health Program and Needs	34
Migrant Nurse Program	34
Health Needs	34
Education and Welfare	35
Migrant Schools	35
Lamar Area	36
Regular School Attendance	36
Migrant Attitude Toward Education	36
Welfare	37
Day Care	37
The Migrant	37
The Migrant Generally	38
Single Migrants	39
Statistical Information	40
The Migrant and the Community	43
Community Attitudes	43
Organized Programs	44
Law Enforcement Problems	44
SAN LUIS VALLEY	45
Crop Activities and Acreage	45
Crop Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor	45
Potatoes	45
Other Vegetables	45
Crop Values	46
Recent Trends in Acreage and Production	46
Potatoes	46
Other Vegetables	47
Change in Number and Size of Farms	47
Mechanization and Technological Changes	48
Other Vegetables	48
The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes	49
General Economic Conditions	50
Seasonal Farm Labor Employment	51
Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods	51
Employment of Locals	51
Mexican Nationals	53
Interstate Workers	53
Employment Department Statistics	53

	<u>Page</u>
Labor Market Organization	53
Recruitment -- Crops Other than Potatoes	53
San Luis Valley Growers' Association	53
Brown and Martin	54
Employment Department	54
Individual Growers	54
Filipino Lettuce Crews	55
Individual Workers and Families	55
Recruitment -- Potatoes	55
Utilization and Reallocation of Labor	56
Workers Who Leave the Area Early	56
Potato Harvest	57
Wage Rates and Earnings	57
Lettuce Harvest	57
Potato Harvest	60
1962 Wage Rates	61
Earnings	61
Housing, Sanitation, and Health	63
Housing and Sanitation	63
Employment Department Inspections	63
Health Programs and Needs	64
Occupational Health	64
Education and Welfare	65
Migrant Schools	65
Costilla County	65
Monte Vista	65
1962 Summer Program	65
Regular School Attendance	66
Migrant Attitude Toward Education for Their Children	66
Welfare	67
The Migrant	68
Number of Interviews	68
The Migrant Generally -- A Profile	68
Spanish American -- Married	68
Spanish American -- Single	69
Filipino	70
Indian	70
Statistical Information	71
The Migrant and the Community	75
Law Enforcement	75
THE WESTERN SLOPE	76
Crop Activities and Acreage	76
Crops Using Seasonal Labor	76
Grand Junction Area	76
Delta Area	76
Recent Trends in Acreage and Production	77
Mechanization and Technological Change	78
The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes	78

	<u>Page</u>
Pertinent Economic Conditions	79
Sugar Factory	79
Proposed Winery	80
Canneries	80
Seasonal Farm Labor Employment	80
Number of Workers -- Peak Employment	80
Recent Trends	81
Longer Range Trends	81
Mexican Nationals	81
Employment Department Statistics	82
Labor Market Organization	82
Recruitment	82
Peaches	82
Other Crops	83
Utilization and Reallocation	83
Reallocation	84
State Worked in Previously	85
Employment After Peach Harvest	85
Wage Rates and Earnings	88
Housing, Sanitation, and Health	89
Housing and Sanitation	89
Palisade Camp	90
Other Housing	90
Sanitation	91
Health Program and Needs	91
Education and Welfare	94
Migrant School	94
Palisade	94
Regular School Attendance	94
Attitude Toward Education	95
Day Care	95
Vocational Training Program	96
Welfare	96
The Migrant	97
Number Interviewed	97
Years as a Migrant Worker	98
Home State	100
Length of Time in Colorado	100
Reasons for Working in Colorado	101
Return to Colorado Next Year	101
Reasons for Working at Seasonal Farm Labor	102
Winter Employment	102
The Migrant and the Community	103
Community Attitude	103
Mesa County Migrant Council	103
Peach Board of Control	104
Law Enforcement Problem	104

	<u>Page</u>
THE SAN JUAN BASIN	106
Crop Activities and Acreage	106
Crops Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor	106
Recent Trends in Acreage and Production	106
Mechanization and Technological Change	108
The Grower -- Problem and Attitudes	108
Seasonal Farm Labor Employment	109
Number of Workers -- Peak Employment	109
Long Range Trends	110
Employment Department Statistics	110
Use of Local Workers	110
Recruitment	110
Number and Source	111
Labor Market Organization	111
Wage Rates and Earnings	111
Housing, Sanitation, and Health	112
Housing and Sanitation	112
Health Needs	113
Education and Welfare	115
Education	115
School Attendance	115
Need for Summer School	115
Attitude Toward Education	116
Welfare	116
The Migrant	117
Number Interviewed	117
Years as a Migrant Worker	117
Home State of the Migrant	119
Length of Stay in Colorado	119
Attitudes Toward Working in Colorado	119
Winter Employment	120
The Migrant and the Community	121
Community Attitudes	121
Law Enforcement Problems	121
NORTHERN COLORADO	122
Crop Activities and Acreage	122
Crops Using Seasonal Labor	122
Sugar Beets	122
Potatoes	123
Other Crops	123
Recent Trends in Acreage and Production	125
Sugar Beets	125
Potatoes	125
Other Crops	125
Cherries	125
Number of Farms and Size	125

	<u>Page</u>
Mechanization and Technological Change	126
Sugar Beets	126
Snap Beans	126
Potatoes	127
Cucumbers	127
Other Crops	127
The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes	127
Seasonal Farm Labor Employment	129
Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods	129
Labor Market Organization	131
Recruitment	131
Sugar Beets	131
Potatoes	132
Vegetables	132
Cucumbers	132
Mexican Nationals	133
Labor Utilization and Reallocation	133
Use of Local Labor	135
Youth Employment Service	136
Wage Rates and Earnings	136
Wages Received by Workers	138
Housing, Sanitation, and Health	139
Housing and Sanitation	139
Ft. Lupton Camp	139
Other Camps	143
Other Housing	144
Health Programs and Needs	144
Northeast Colorado Health Department	144
Weld County Health Department	145
Tri-County Health Department	145
Boulder County Health Department	145
Larimer County Health Department	145
Education and Welfare	146
Migrant Schools	146
Wiggins School	146
Platteville School	146
Need for Migrant Summer Schools	147
Migrant Attitude Toward Education	148
Welfare	148
The Migrant	150
Years as a Migrant Worker	150
Home State	152
Length of Time in Colorado	152
Reasons for Working in Colorado	153
Reasons for Returning to Colorado	153
Reasons for Doing Seasonal Farm Work	154
Winter Employment	154
The Migrant and the Community	155
Programs for Migrants	156
Law Enforcement Problems	156

THE SEASONAL FARM LABOR MARKET	157
Importance of Farm Labor Market Organization	157
Relationship of Employment Pattern and Earnings	157
Differences Between Family and Single Workers	157
Reasons for Differences in Family Group Weekly Earnings	159
Worker Guarantees	159
Annual Worker Plan	160
Characteristics of the Seasonal Farm Labor Market	163
Legislation, Regulations, and Governmental Action	163
Affecting the Farm Labor Market in Colorado	165
State Department of Employment	166
Employment Department Relationship with U.S. Bureau of	
Employment Security	166
Farm Placement Division	167
Governor's Farm Labor Advisory Council	167
Functions of the Farm Placement Division	167
March 16, 1962 Meeting With Employment Department	168
Comprehensive Farm Labor Requirement Plan	168
Explanation	168
Employment Department	168
Other States	169
Explanation	171
Employment Department	171
Other States	171
Utilization of Local Labor	172
Explanation	172
Employment Department	172
Other States	173
Explanation	175
Employment Department	176
Other States	176
Utilization of Intrastate Workers	178
Explanation	178
Employment Department	178
Other States	178
Allocation and/or Reallocation of Workers in a Given Area	179
Explanation	179
Employment Department	181
Other States -- Reallocation	182
Other States -- Referral to Other Areas	183
Census of Seasonal Farm Workers	184
Explanation	184
Employment Department	184
Other States	184
Formal Contract for Domestic Workers	185
Explanation	186
Bureau of Employment Security	186
Employment Department	186
Activities of the Farm Placement Service	187
Cost of Farm Labor Activities	187

	<u>Page</u>
The Bracero Program	187
1961 Legislation	189
Wage Determination	190
Department of Labor Hearings	190
Effect of Bracero Wage Rates on Domestic Rates	192
Employment of Mexican Nationals in Colorado	192
Reactions to the Bracero Program	193
Pro	193
Con	194
Future of the Bracero Program	194
 OTHER PROBLEMS AND PROGRAMS	 195
 Health	 195
Brief History of Migrant Health Programs and Services	195
Health Problems	195
Obstacles to Health Care Utilization	196
Occupational Health Problems	196
Health Department Request	197
 Housing and Sanitation	 197
Studies and Legislation Since 1950	197
Present Housing and Sanitation Status	198
Committee Housing Examination	199
Proposed Legislation for the Regulation of Migrant Labor Camps	200
Employment Department Housing Inspections	203
 Regulatory Labor Legislation	 203
Minimum Wage Legislation	203
Workmen's Compensation	204
Unemployment Insurance Coverage	205
Child Labor	205
 Regulation of Labor Contractors and Crew Leaders	 206
Previous Recommendations and Legislative Proposals	206
House Bill 62	207
Experinece With House Bill 62 (1960)	207
1961-1962	208
H.B. 396 (1961)	208
Problems and Alternatives	209
 Transportation	 210
I.C.C. Regulations	210
Effect of I.C.C. Regulations	210
Ports of Entry	211
1961 Legislation	211
Method of Traveling to Colorado	211
 Migrant Studies and Coordinating Committees	 212
1950-1951 Migratory Labor Study	212
Recommendations Contained in the 1950-1951 Study	212
Proposed Regulation 1951-1955	213
Governor's Interagency Committee on Migratory Labor	214
Farm Labor Advisory Committee	215
Committees in Other States	215

	<u>Page</u>
Education	215
Findings of the 1950-1951 Study	215
Migrant Summer Schools	215
U.S. Office of Education Grant	216
Financing of Migrant Summer Schools	217
Regular Term Schools	217
Cooperative School Attendance Programs	218
Continuing Needs	218
Welfare	219
Questionnaires	219
Extent of Financial Assistance	220
Reasons Why Assistance Requested	220
Reasons Why Assistance is Rejected	220
Other Services Provided Migrants by County Welfare	220
Department	220
Organized Approach in Assisting Migrants	220
Evaluation of Assistance Program	221
Need for Expanded Services	221
THE GROWER: TRENDS, TECHNOLOGY, AND PRODUCTION	222
Number of Farms and Farm Size	222
Acreage of Major Crops	222
Sugar Beets	222
Potatoes	223
Peaches	223
Onions	223
Pinto Beans	224
Broomcorn	224
Lettuce	224
Other Vegetables and Cantaloupes	225
Other Fruits	226
Production	227
Sugar Beets	227
Potatoes	228
Onions	229
Technological Changes and Mechanization	229
Sugar Beets	229
Potatoes	231
Fruits	231
Vegetables	232
Grower Attitudes Toward Mechanization and Other Matters	232
Attitudes Toward Seasonal Farm Labor	233
Cultural Differences	233
LEGISLATION IN OTHER STATES RELATING TO MIGRANTS	235
Minimum Wage Legislation	235
Wage Payment and Wage Collection	235
Workmen's Compensation	236
Unemployment Insurance	237
Crew Leaders and Contractors	237
Child Labor in Agriculture	238
Farm Labor Camps	239
Camps Covered	239

	<u>Page</u>
License Requirements	239
Compliance and Penalty	240
Administrative Agency	241
Education	242
Migratory Labor Committees	242
Composition of Committees	242
Functions of Committees	243
Arizona	243
Delaware	243
Florida	243
Idaho	243
Illinois	243
Michigan	243
Minnesota	243
New Jersey	244
New York	245
North Carolina	245
North Dakota	245
Ohio	245
Oregon	245
Pennsylvania	245
South Carolina	246
Texas	246
Washington	246
Wisconsin	246
FEDERAL LEGISLATION: PROPOSED AND ENACTED	247
Legislative Proposals	247
Explanation of Proposed Legislation	247
Minimum Wage (S. 1122)	247
Labor Contractor Regulation (S. 1126)	248
Child Labor (S. 1123)	248
Labor Force Stabilization (S. 1129)	249
Agricultural Labor Relations (S. 1128)	250
Education of Migrant Children (S. 1124)	251
Education of Migrant Adults (S. 1125)	251
Housing (S. 1127)	251
Health Services (S. 1130)	253
Child Welfare Services (S. 1131)	253
National Citizens' Council (S. 1132)	253
Action on Proposed Legislation	254
Bills Passed	254
Adopted by One House	254
No Action	254
Other Legislation Affecting Migrants	254
Application to Migrants	254
Manpower and Area Redevelopment Acts	254
Rural Housing Programs	255
Day Care for Migrant Children	255

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 1 Number and Location of Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962	8
2 Number of People Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962	9
3 Number of Farm Workers Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962	10
4 Sugar Beets Acreage and Production, Arkansas Valley, 1961	12
5 Broomcorn Acreage and Production, Arkansas Valley, 1960	13
6 Cantaloupes and Vegetable Acreage, Arkansas Valley, 1960	13
7 Number of Farms and Median Size, Arkansas Valley, 1950 and 1960	15
8 Employment of Seasonal Farm Workers in the Arkansas Valley by Area for Selected Weeks and Principal Crop Activities, 1960-1962	19
9 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in the Arkansas Valley, 1961	30
10 Average Weekly Wages from April 1st Until Time of Interview, Arkansas Valley, 1961	30
11 State Department of Employment Housing Inspection, Arkansas Valley, 1962	33
12 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Arkansas Valley, 1961	37
13 Number of Migrant Interviews and the Number of Workers and People Included, Arkansas Valley, June-July, 1961	38
14 Years as a Migrant Worker, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961	40
15 Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961	41
16 Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or Not Work in Colorado, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961	41
17 Return to Colorado Next Year, Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961	42

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 18 Areas to Which Migrants Expect to Travel to Find Employment After Leaving the Arkansas Valley, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961	42
19 Winter Jobs of Arkansas Valley Migrants in 1960, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961	43
20 Weeks Worked and Total Winter Earnings of Arkansas Valley Migrants, 1960; Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961	43
21 Potatoes Planted and Harvested, San Luis Valley, 1960	45
22 Commercial Vegetables, Acres Harvested for Market, San Luis Valley, 1960	46
23 Comparison of Values for Potatoes, All Other Vegetables, and Other Crops, San Luis Valley, 1959	46
24 Number of Farms and Median Size, San Luis Valley, 1950 and 1960	47
25 Seasonal Farm Labor in the San Luis Valley by Type of Workers for Selected Weeks, 1961-1962	52
26 Wage Rates Received During Potato Harvest, San Luis Valley, 1961	60
27 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in the San Luis Valley, 1961	62
28 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, San Luis Valley, 1961	63
29 State Department of Employment Housing Inspections, San Luis Valley, 1962	64
30 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Luis Valley, 1961	67
31 Number of Migrant Interviews and Related Information by Ethnic Group, San Luis Valley, 1961	68
32 Years As a migrant Worker by Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961	71
33 Years As a Migrant Worker in Colorado By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961	72
34 Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or not Work in Colorado, By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961	73
35 Areas to Which Migrants Expected to Travel to Find Employment After Leaving the San Luis Valley, By Ethnic Group, 1961	74

		<u>Page</u>
TABLE	36 1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Mesa County	76
	37 1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Delta County	77
	38 Number of Mesa County Farms Growing Peaches and Number of Trees, Number of Delta County Farms Growing Apples and Number of Trees, 1950-1960	78
	39 Method of Finding Job on Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961	85
	40 State Worked In Prior to Coming to The Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961	86
	41 Travel and Work After Leaving Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961	87
	42 Wage Rates Received During Peach Harvest, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961	88
	43 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants on the Western Slope, 1961	88
	44 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Western Slope, 1961	89
	45 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Western Slope, 1961	95
	46 Number of People Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961	97
	47 Number of Workers Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961	97
	48 Years As A Migrant Worker by Age, Western Slope Interviews, 1961	98
	49 Years As A Migrant Worker and Years Worked In Colorado, Western Slope Interviews, 1961	99
	50 Home States Of Migrant Workers, Western Slope Interviews, 1961	100
	51 Length of Stay In Colorado By Time of Arrival, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961	101
	52 Reasons For Working In Colorado, Western Slope Interviews, 1961	101
	53 Return to Colorado Next Year, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961	102
	54 Reasons For Doing Seasonal Farm Work, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961	102

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 55 Winter Employment of Migrants, Western Slope Interviews, 1961	102
56 Weeks Worked During Winter and Amount Earned 1960-1961, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961	103
57 1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Montezuma County	106
58 Bean Acreage and Harvest in the San Juan Basin in 1960	107
59 Number of Farms and Median Size, San Juan Basin, 1950 and 1960	107
60 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in the San Juan Basin, 1961	112
61 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st until Time of Interview, San Juan Basin, 1961	112
62 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Juan Basin, 1961	116
63 Number of People Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961	117
64 Number of Workers Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961	117
65 Years As A Migrant Worker By Age, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961	118
66 Years As A Migrant Worker in Colorado, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961	118
67 Length of Time In Colorado By Date of Arrival, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961	119
68 Reason for Working in Colorado, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961	119
69 Return to Colorado Next Year, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961	120
70 Winter Employment of San Juan Basin Migrant Workers, 1961	120
71 Weeks Worked During the Winter and Amount Earned, San Juan Basin Migrants, 1961	121
72 Sugar Beet Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1961	122
73 Potato Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1960	123

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 74 Cantaloupe, Onions, and Vegetable Acreage, Northern Colorado, 1960	124
75 Number of Farms and Median Size, Northern Colorado, 1950 and 1960	126
76 Total Workers in Northern Colorado by Area, 1960, 1961, 1962	130
77 Employment of Mexican Nationals in Northern Colorado During Selected Weeks, 1962	134
78 Method of Payment, Migrants Interviewed in Northern Colorado, 1962	137
79 Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in Northern Colorado, 1962	138
80 Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Northern Colorado, 1962	139
81 State Department of Employment Housing Inspections, Northern Colorado, 1962	144
82 Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Northern Colorado, 1962	149
83 Number of Workers and Number of People Included, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962	150
84 Number of Years as a Migrant Worker and Number of Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado, Northern Colorado, 1962	151
85 Years As A Migrant Worker by Age of Interviewee. Northern Colorado, 1962	152
86 Length of Stay in Colorado By Time of Arrival Northern Colorado Migrant Interview, 1962	153
87 Reason for Working in Colorado, Northern Colorado Interviews, 1962	153
88 Return to Colorado Next Year, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962	154
89 Reason For Doing Seasonal Farm Work, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962	154
90 Winter Work of Seasonal Farm Laborers, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962	155
91 Weeks Worked During 1961-1962 Winter and Amount Earned, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962	155

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE 92 Comparison of Earnings During Previous Week With Average Weekly Earnings From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Migrant Labor Interviews by Area, 1961 and 1962	158
93 Annual Worker Plan: Migrants Contacted and Employed by State, 1960	161
94 Growers' Association and Processors Severed By the Colorado Department of Employment, 1961	188
95 Bracero Wage Rates Established in 1962 and Average Farm Wage in 1961 for Selected States	191
95A Relationship of Bracero Wage Rates, 1961 and 1962 In Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas	191
96 Number of Farms, Median Size of Farms, and Per Cent Change 1950 to 1960, Selected Areas of Colorado	222
97 Sugar Beet Acreage in Colorado, 1950-1961	223
98 Potato Acreage in Colorado, 1950 and 1960	223
99 Onion Acreage in Colorado, Selected Areas, 1950 and 1960	224
100 Lettuce Acreage in Colorado, Selected Counties, 1950 and 1960	224
101 Other Vegetables and Cantaloupes Acreage in Colorado (Fresh Market), 1950 and 1960	226
102 Production of Apples, Cherries, and Pears, and Number of Bearing Trees by County, 1950 and 1960	227
103 Sugar Beet Yield Per Acre For Selected Years in Colorado	228
104 Colorado Potato Acreage, Yield Per Acre, and Total Production, 1946-61	228
105 Colorado Onion Acreage, Yield Per Acre, and Total Production, 1946-61	229

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Importance of Migrant Workers

Each year a large number of seasonal farm workers are needed in Colorado, not only at harvest time, but throughout the growing season as well. Only a small proportion of seasonal farm labor needs is met by local workers, especially during peak harvest periods. Consequently, seasonal farm workers from other states play an important role in Colorado's agricultural production. It is virtually impossible to determine accurately the total number of different workers from other states who come to Colorado during the course of a growing season; it is estimated, however, that at least 15,000 different interstate workers are employed during a normal crop year in this state.

Colorado ranks 12th among all states in the number of interstate migrant farm workers who are employed during the growing season. Among the Rocky Mountain and west coast states, Colorado ranks fourth in the number of interstate workers employed.

The size of the total seasonal farm labor force (local workers, intrastate workers, interstate workers, and Mexican nationals) has remained fairly constant in recent years, but the number of interstate workers has been declining. There has been a sharp decline in the past 15 years in both the total number of seasonal farm workers employed and in the number of interstate migrants. Mechanization, technological change, and a reduction in acreage in some of the crops requiring seasonal farm labor have been responsible for the decrease in the size of the seasonal labor force required. Even with this reduction, crops requiring seasonal farm workers are very important in Colorado's agricultural economy.

Present Legislative Study

House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) directed the Legislative Council to continue the study of migratory farm labor which had been started by a Legislative Council Committee in 1960. In authorizing the continuation of this study, House Joint Resolution No. 10 specified that the following subjects be included:

- 1) coordination of efforts by public agencies and statewide and local organizations in trying to solve the problems of migrant farm workers and their families;
- 2) cooperation between federal and state agencies to facilitate the recruitment, transportation, and placement of migrant farm workers;
- 3) economic problems of migrant farm workers;
- 4) community cooperation in providing social services for migrants;
- 5) migrant school programs; and

6) such other problems as may come within the purview of this study.

At its initial meeting on May 10, 1961, the members of the present Migrant Labor Committee agreed that an extensive field study was needed to develop as complete a picture as possible of the migrant farm worker and his problems in Colorado. The committee also decided to hold a series of regional meetings in conjunction with the field study and, in connection with these meetings, to tour migrant housing facilities and to observe migrant schools and other agency and community programs for migrants, whenever possible. In making the field study the committee authorized the staff to employ a Spanish and a Navajo interpreter and to seek the cooperation of public agency personnel concerned with migrants.

Because of the wide scope of the study, the amount of field work involved, and the overlap among areas in the peak employment of migratory farm workers, the committee determined that it would take the full two years provided in House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) to complete the study. During the first year, it was decided that the committee would cover the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Palisade area, and San Juan Basin. During the second year, attention would be focused on Northern Colorado, where the largest number of migrants are employed for an extended period.

Committee Meetings

During 1961 and 1962 the committee held nine regional public hearings. Public hearings were held as follows:

Arkansas Valley -- Rocky Ford and Lamar, June 5 and 6, 1961
San Luis Valley -- Alamosa and Monte Vista, July 19 and 20,
1961
Western Slope -- Palisade, August 18, 1961
San Juan Basin -- Cortez, August 21, 1961
Northern Colorado -- Brush, June 1, 1962
Ft. Lupton, July 19, 1962
Greeley, August 10, 1962

Invited to meet with the committee at these hearings were: growers, processors, labor contractors, legislators from the area, federal officials (Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Bureau of Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), state officials (departments of education, employment, health, and welfare, the Colorado highway patrol, and the Industrial Commission), local officials (education, health, welfare, sheriffs, police chiefs, mayors, county commissioners, and councilmen), community leaders, and interested citizens.

Prior to each series of regional meetings, the Council staff made a preliminary study of the area to compile background data for the committee and to develop a list of those who might be interested in meeting with the committee. Each person on the list received a personal invitation to attend from the chairman on behalf of the committee, and information concerning the meeting and invitations to all citizens to attend were sent to all newspapers and radio and television

stations in the area. Approximately 550 people attended the public hearings: Rocky Ford, 60; Lamar, 30; Alamosa, 35; Monte Vista, 50; Palisade, 75; Cortez, 30; Brush, 75; Ft. Lupton, 150; and Greeley, 50.

Committee Tours

In connection with the Arkansas Valley meetings, the committee made two tours of migrant housing, one in the Rocky Ford-Manzanola-Swink area and the other in the Lamar-Granada area. The committee also spent one morning at the Rocky Ford school for migrant children. The committee examined housing facilities around Alamosa and Monte Vista, observed workers in the field during lettuce harvest, visited a lettuce packaging plant, and spent some time at the Monte Vista school for migrant children. At Palisade, the housing tour included both the Palisade camp and on-the-farm housing, and a visit was made to two peach and pear packing plants. The committee also spent some time at the Palisade migrant school. At the time of the Cortez meeting, there were few migrants in the area, so the committee visited two pinto bean packaging plants and the migrant housing there and traveled to the Navajo reservation to observe how Navajo migratory workers live at home. The committee visited the Wiggins school and examined housing in the area prior to the Brush meeting. The Fort Lupton meeting was preceded by a tour of the Fort Lupton migratory labor camp. Following the meeting, the committee visited the Platteville school. Several potato packing sheds and a cucumber processing plant were visited in connection with the Greeley meeting.

Topics Discussed at Regional Meetings

The same major topics were covered at each regional meeting, although there was some difference in the questions asked by the committee because of situations and problems which varied from area to area. In general, the following major topics were covered at each meeting:

- 1) number of seasonal farm workers employed, during what periods, and for what crops;
- 2) composition of the seasonal farm labor force and the sources of supply for such labor;
- 3) reasons for decrease in the number of interstate and intrastate migrants and the utilization of local labor for seasonal farm work;
- 4) employment of Mexican nationals;
- 5) relationship of processors, growers, growers' organizations, labor contractors, and the state employment service in the recruitment and utilization of seasonal farm labor;
- 6) agricultural marketing problems, extent of mechanization and technological improvements, need for further mechanization and technological improvement, availability of and need for packing and processing plants;

- 7) availability and adequacy of housing for seasonal farm workers;
- 8) migrant health and sanitation programs and needs;
- 9) migrant school programs and education needs;
- 10) law enforcement problems related to the migrant farm worker; and
- 11) community programs for and attitudes toward the migrant farm worker and his family.

Field Study

Interviews were completed with 706 migratory workers in 1961 and with 225 migratory workers in 1962. The 1961 interviews covered the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Slope, and San Juan Basin. The interviews in 1962 covered the following areas in Northern Colorado: 1) Morgan and Logan counties; 2) Ft. Lupton, Brighton, and Longmont; 3) Loveland and Fort Collins; and 4) the remainder of Weld County.

Six hundred and twenty-five of these interviews were made with family heads or other family members, so that information was obtained concerning other members in the family group. Consequently, the 931 completed interviews covered 3,219 people, of whom 1,811 were employed as farm laborers.

Migrant Interviews. The migrants who were interviewed were asked questions concerning the following: 1) age and place of residence; 2) number of years as a farm laborer and number of years as a farm laborer in Colorado; 3) crop activity in which employed and other crops in the area in which worker expects to be employed; 4) area or state where employed prior to present employment and expected location of next employment if different from present; 5) attitudes toward working in Colorado and toward employers and communities; 6) how present employment was obtained; 7) present rate of pay and amount made by worker and family during past week and since April 1 of this year; 8) number of days employed during past month and reasons for days of non-work; 9) place in which last winter was spent, employment during the winter, and amount earned; 10) comparison of home base or winter housing and present migrant housing; 11) family status, number and age of children, if employed or in school; 12) health status of worker and his family; and 13) financial status of worker and his family, expenditure for food, transportation, and other goods and services.

Other Aspects of Field Work. In addition to the completed migrant questionnaires, the field work included interviews with a representative number of growers, processors, labor contractors, growers' association officers, state and local officials, community leaders, and law enforcement officers. The subjects discussed during these interviews generally followed the topics covered at the committee's regional hearings, with the questions asked designed to develop more specific and detailed information.

More than 100 growers were interviewed. These growers were asked about their labor and marketing problems, labor utilization, mechanization, crop acreage, and recommendations concerning seasonal farm labor. Considerable time was spent with the growers, examining fields and observing crews at work.

Extensive interviews were made with processors and officials of growers' associations. Included in these interviews were: Western Canning Company, American Crystal Sugar Company, National Sugar Company, Holly Sugar Company, Divon Packing Company, Empire Field Crops (where the staff had the opportunity to attend a board meeting), San Luis Valley Growers Association, the Peach Board of Control, Great Western Sugar Company, Kuner-Empson, and the Fort Lupton Canning Company.

There were several reasons why the number of growers and processors interviewed was much smaller than the number of migrants:

1) The committee's public hearings were held for the purpose of meeting with growers, processors, public officials, and community leaders, so a much larger number of growers and processors were contacted by the committee than those interviewed by the staff.

2) The growers interviewed by the staff were selected because of crop activity, location, and amount of labor employed; generally, they were among the largest employers of seasonal farm labor in a given area.

3) The interviews with growers and processors took considerably longer than those with migrants. The average time per interview with growers and processors was two hours, and some took much longer.

Considerable time was spent in observing and examining local programs and services for migrants, such as the migrant nurse program, the work of the migrant ministry, school programs, and the employment department farm labor field service. Housing and sanitation facilities were examined, as were some of the vehicles used to transport migrant workers, and visits were made to agricultural experiment stations.

The field staff interviewed migrants either in the evening or on days when they were not working, so as not to interfere with agricultural activities. The other interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the interviewees.

Area Differences

The areas covered by the committee during the study differ to a considerable degree in many respects such as: 1) size and composition of the seasonal farm labor force; 2) crop activity and peak periods of labor utilization; 3) organization of the farm labor force and wage scales; 4) use of Mexican nationals; 5) public and private programs and services for migrants; and 6) community attitudes toward migrant workers. There are considerable variations within some areas as well.

The following examples illustrate these area differences:

Arkansas Valley. The major crops for which migrant labor is used are onions and sugar beets, with the exception of Baca County where broomcorn is the chief crop activity in which migrants are employed. Other crops for which seasonal farm labor is needed are melons, tomatoes, and cucumbers. All of the migrant workers (except for broomcorn) are Spanish Americans, mostly from Texas with a few from New Mexico. A large number of Cherokee Indians from Oklahoma are employed during broomcorn harvest. The early season peak for seasonal farm labor utilization is usually during the first part of June. The late season peak is usually in early September. This area is one of the three covered by the committee which uses a large number of Mexican nationals. The wage scale for seasonal farm laborers has been one of the lowest in the state (\$.65 to \$.75 per hour) but was increased with the imposition of a \$.90 per hour minimum wage for Mexican nationals. This is also the area in which labor contractors play the largest role in recruiting interstate migrant workers.

There is little community concern over the migrant, and aside from the children's recreation program sponsored by the migrant ministry and a second hand store operated by the Rocky Ford Ministerial Alliance, there is no organized citizens' activity on behalf of the migrant. On the other hand, the migrant school program in Rocky Ford, in the committee's opinion, is excellent and has been operating for a number of years. The director of the Otero County Health Department has taken an active interest in housing and sanitation conditions and is doing the best job in this respect of any local health department official contacted by the committee. The migrant nurse program operated under health department auspices is also one of the best of its kind.

San Luis Valley. Potatoes, lettuce, and spinach (in that order) are the major crops for which seasonal farm labor is used in the San Luis Valley. Other crops involving the use of seasonal farm labor include peas, cauliflower, cabbage, and carrots. Potatoes are by far the most important crop, although lettuce and spinach are the major crops in Costilla County. There are two peak utilization periods of farm labor, corresponding to the harvest seasons for the major crops. The early season peak is reached by the middle of July and continues at this level through most of August (lettuce and spinach harvests). The late season peak is reached at the end of September and holds for three weeks during potato harvest. The potato harvest is concentrated primarily in the northern part of the valley, where two-thirds of the valley's potato acreage is located, while 85 per cent of the commercial vegetable acreage in the valley is located in the southern three counties (Alamosa, Conejos, and Costilla).

The domestic migrant workers in commercial vegetables, with the exception of lettuce, are primarily Spanish Americans, with most of these workers coming from New Mexico. Approximately 300 custom lettuce packers of Filipino origin are also employed during lettuce harvest. Very few of the Spanish Americans who work in vegetables remain for potato harvest. The potato harvest workers include a large number of Navajo Indians and Spanish Americans. The Spanish Americans generally come from New Mexico, although a number of Texas crews were found working in the southern three counties, and a large group of Spanish Americans who are residents of Costilla and Conejos counties migrate to Rio Grande and Saguache counties for potato harvest.

In addition to the difference in crop emphasis between the northern and southern parts of the valley, there is a wage differential in some instances; some workers in the northern counties receive from \$.05 to \$.20 an hour more. There is also a piece rate differential between the two parts of the valley during potato harvest; again, the rate is higher in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. Wage rates in the valley, especially in the southern counties, were among the lowest in the state in 1961. In these counties the hourly wage rates varied from \$.60 to \$.80 per hour and in the northern counties from \$.75 to \$1.00 per hour. Domestic wage rates increased in 1962 at the same time that the \$.90 per hour minimum for Mexican nationals was imposed.

A large number of Mexican nationals are employed in the valley, and this number has been increasing annually during the past few years. There has been little community interest in migratory workers and no organized citizen activities. There is no organized health department in the valley, and the state health department sanitarian stationed in Alamosa has not given much attention to migrant housing and sanitation. There was a migrant nurse employed in the valley from 1956 through 1959, but there has been no program since that time. Three special summer school programs were operated in 1961, but these were attended for the most part by children who were residents. In 1962, only one summer school program was held; the other two were terminated because of the statutory requirement that state aid be given only for attendance by migrant children.

Grand Junction-Palisade Area. The crops for which seasonal farm labor is needed in the Grand Junction area include: peaches, cherries, pears, apples, tomatoes, and sugar beets. The largest number of seasonal workers by far are needed during peach harvest, which usually begins the third or fourth week in August and is largely concluded within 10 to 12 days. Most of the fruit in Mesa County is grown in the area surrounding Palisade. Sugar beets and tomatoes are concentrated in the Fruita area, west of Grand Junction. There is not much employment of seasonal farm labor prior to the third week in May. An early season peak is reached toward the end of June. Then there is a gradual reduction in the number of workers needed until peach harvest. Pear and tomato harvests usually continue until the latter part of September.

While a number of Mexican nationals are employed in sugar beets and tomatoes, there are none used for peach harvest. The peach harvest work force is composed of Anglos, Negroes, Spanish Americans, and some Indians. The wage scale is among the highest in the state, averaging about \$1.00 per hour.

This area has the greatest amount of community interest in the migrant and his problems of any region visited by the committee. The Mesa County Migrant Council has been in operation for a number of years and is composed of interested citizens, many of whom are growers or public officials. An inexpensive clothing and houseware store is run for migrants; there is a day-care program and a medical care program. Although there is considerable community interest, there is still some indifference and hostility toward the migrant. The Palisade area, however, is confronted with a situation which has no parallel in any of the other areas covered by the committee, with the possible

exception of the northern San Luis Valley during potato harvest. There is considerable congestion and disruption of normal community activity caused by the influx of a large number of workers and their families during a short period of time for the harvest of a very perishable crop.

The migrant school program has been in operation for a number of years but attracts fewer children than the Rocky Ford program. The migrant ministry has a team of three working in the area and quartered at the Palisade camp. This team works with the migrant council and in 1961 operated the day-care center and two vocational training programs for teenage and adult migrants.

The Palisade camp was closed in 1962 and the buildings sold to individual growers. As a result there were a number of workers sleeping along the river bank, adding to sanitation and health problems. The absence of the camp appeared to be the reason for the reduction in the number of family groups coming to the area for peach harvest in 1962.

San Juan Basin. Pinto bean harvest and pre-harvest are the chief agricultural activities for which seasonal farm labor is employed. Other crops which require a relatively small amount of seasonal farm labor are hay and apples. Almost all of the migrant laborers employed are Navajo Indians, although there are a few intrastate workers. There are no Mexican nationals employed in the area. Hourly wage rates vary from \$.75 to \$1.00, with most workers receiving \$.75 or \$.80 per hour. The seasonal farm labor peak is reached in the latter half of September during pinto bean harvest.

There is little community interest in the Navajo and his problems, and there are no special programs, either community or public agency sponsored, for these workers and their families in Montezuma County. In Dolores County, which is part of the San Juan Basin Health Department, a survey has been made as to the health and sanitation needs of the Navajo. The Navajo workers come from the reservation located near Shiprock, New Mexico. According to the answers received to the migrant questionnaire, none of the Navajos who work during pinto bean harvest planned to travel to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest. Conversely, none of the Navajos interviewed in the San Luis Valley during potato harvest had previously worked in pre-harvest activities in the San Juan Basin.

Northern Colorado. This area includes Adams, Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, and Weld counties, and more seasonal farm laborers (including migrants) are employed than in any other area of the state.

Sugar beets require the most labor of any single crop in Northern Colorado, with potatoes, onions, cucumbers, tomatoes, green beans, and other fresh vegetables requiring lesser amounts of seasonal labor. The hay, corn, wheat, and small grain crops grown extensively in this area require labor also, but most of the workers utilized in these crops are permanent employees, except for some seasonal workers used for irrigation and tractor operation. The need for seasonal farm labor begins in May and reaches a peak in June during pre-harvest activities in sugar beets. Labor needs in the whole Northern Colorado area then decline throughout the rest of the season, with variations from area to area. Between 10,000 and 12,000 seasonal farm workers are employed during the June peak period.

There is a higher degree of agricultural mechanization and technological innovation in Northern Colorado than in any other area of the state using large numbers of seasonal farm workers. This is most noticeable in sugar beet pre-harvest activities and in the harvest of some vegetable crops. The extensive use of monogerm seed and the more limited use of mechanical blocking and thinning has reduced sugar beet pre-harvest labor needs considerably in the past decade. The harvest of some vegetable crops for processing, notably snap beans, red beets, sweet corn, and green peas have been completely mechanized. Mechanization of potato and onion harvests has been increasing.

The wage rates in Northern Colorado are among the highest in the state, and the continuous need for seasonal farm labor throughout the growing season provides fairly continuous employment. Some of the domestic migrants are also employed in the canning and processing plants from time to time during the season. A large number of Mexican nationals are used in the area, especially during sugar beet pre-harvest, when more than 4,800 are employed (or 46 per cent of the total seasonal farm labor force at that time). The use of local seasonal labor is more widespread in certain parts of Northern Colorado than anywhere else in the state, with the exception of peach harvest on the Western Slope. Northern Colorado is more densely populated than any of the other major farm areas and has many more locals upon which to draw.

Migrant housing in Northern Colorado is among the best in the state, although there are some poor and inadequate housing units. The largest housing concentration is the Fort Lupton camp, which is operated by the Weld County Public Housing Authority. This camp has received national attention as a model facility of its type. Most other housing is located on individual farms.

There were two migrant summer schools operated in Northern Colorado in 1962, one at Platteville and the other at Wiggins. The Wiggins migrant school was the first to be established in the state, and the Platteville school (which replaced the Fort Lupton school) had the largest enrollment in the state.

Although all of the counties in the area are served by organized local health departments, the only health program for migrants was operated at the Fort Lupton camp. Community interest in migrants and their families appeared to be greater than in some other areas, although there are no organized programs to compare with those of the Mesa County Migrant Council.

Seasonal Farm Labor Market Organization

While not slighting the other problems related to migrant labor, the committee has given special attention to the organization of the farm labor market. In the committee's opinion, the effective recruitment, allocation, and utilization of farm labor is the central problem, and all other problems are related to it. Both the grower and the worker have a major interest in how the farm labor market is organized; the grower needs an assured labor supply throughout the growing season, but especially at certain specific times; the worker needs continuous employment in order to at least have some possibility of maintaining himself and his family during the growing season and to attempt to lay aside some savings for the winter months. The need for

an assured labor supply is one reason why many growers favor the employment of Mexican nationals. More effective allocation and utilization of labor would result in a reduction of the number of workers needed.

Mechanization and technological improvement have altered the farm labor picture considerably in Colorado in recent years by reducing the need for seasonal farm labor, but not to the extent that this has occurred in some other states. There has also been progress in the recruitment and routing of labor, which has reduced the possibility of labor shortages in one area at the same time that there is a surplus of labor in another.

The committee's study of the farm labor market was aimed at determining whether further improvements can be made in the recruitment, allocation, and utilization of labor.

In developing information on this subject, the committee examined the functions of the State Department of Employment, growers' organizations, labor contractors, and processors with respect to the recruitment and allocation of labor. In addition, the committee gathered information on farm labor placement service operations in other states. (An extensive discussion of the farm labor market will be found on pp. 157-194 of the research report.)

Housing and Sanitation

During the past two years, the committee and field staff have examined all types of housing for migrant workers (both in camps and on the farm). Some of this housing was either good, or at least adequate, but some of it could not be considered adequate, even by minimum standards. Of special concern was the lack in many places of even minimum proper sanitary conditions. Lack of proper sewage and garbage disposal and inadequately protected water supplies can have a detrimental effect on nearby communities, as well as on the people living in the migrant housing.

In examining migrant housing, cognizance was taken that migratory workers live in this housing for a relatively short period of time. Failure to recognize this fact could lead to recommendations for housing standards which would be more restrictive than necessary, creating a considerable burden for growers. Further, housing conditions for migrants must be considered in light of resident housing in the same area. In some places, a portion of the resident housing is equally as bad as that provided for migrants. Many migrants also have poor housing in their state of residence, but the migrant interviews indicate that if many of these workers had sufficient income to afford better housing at their home base, they would not join the migrant stream year after year. The field study results indicate that adequate housing is an asset in attracting and keeping workers and is often a consideration in the worker's decision as to whether to return to the same farm or area in following years.

Concern has been expressed to the committee because there are no standards for housing for interstate and intrastate migratory workers, while there are standards promulgated by the United States Secretary of Labor for Mexican national housing. It has been suggested that at least these standards should be met for domestic workers. The state

health department has recommended legislation to regulate and license farm labor housing providing for five or more workers. Improvement in housing and sanitation conditions will not result from the promulgation and enforcement of standards alone. In addition, an extensive education program is needed to instruct migrants in the proper use of facilities and the consequences of bad sanitation practices.

Other Programs and Problems

The committee has studied many other programs and problems related to migrant workers and their families including: education, welfare, health, day-care for small children, transportation, licensing and registration of crew leaders, and other matters.

Education. The field study and the committee's observations of several migrant schools indicate that the special migrant education program is quite successful, especially considering present limitations. The State Department of Education is to be commended for the leadership it has provided for this program and its continued research on the subject. Additional migrant schools may be needed, but in some areas there is a notable lack of interest in establishing such a program, even though it is financed entirely by the state. Further study is needed to determine the best way in which migrant children present during the regular school term might be integrated into the regular school program, although the provision of state reimbursement for the attendance of migrant children during regular sessions has improved the situation. Attention should be given to the feasibility of establishing an adult education or vocational program to assist young adult and older migrants in gaining skills which might make it possible for them to gain employment outside of the migrant stream. It is possible, however, that adult education programs might best be conducted in home base areas. The committee is of the opinion that education offers the greatest opportunity to improve the lot of the migrant and his family.

Transportation. Transportation seems to be less of a problem than in former years, as more families are traveling by car, and few trucks were observed to be in unsafe condition. Perhaps the biggest problem is the overloading of vehicles used to take workers to and from the fields.

Welfare. Some counties with limited welfare budgets find it difficult to provide occasional emergency assistance for migrant workers and their families, and the amount of this aid provided was less in 1961 and 1962 than in the preceding two years.

Other Matters. A detailed discussion of other subjects with which the committee has been concerned will be found on pp. 195-221 of the research report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee is concerned over the inadequacy of migrant housing in certain parts of the state and recommends that the state department of health expand its inspection of sanitary facilities and water supplies at migrant housing facilities. (Generally, these inspections have been made only upon complaint.) Further, the committee recommends that the health department initiate an education program to assist the sponsors of migrant labor camps in improving their facilities.
- 2) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee commends the state employment department for its migrant housing inspection program initiated in 1962 and recommends that this program be continued on an annual basis. The committee recommends further that the department refuse to refer seasonal farm workers to growers whose housing either does not meet the department's standards or who do not correct the housing deficiencies reported to them by the department.
- 3) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee recognizes the efforts made by the state employment department to find continuous employment for seasonal farm workers. The committee recommends that the department: a) expand its participation in and the implementation of the Annual Worker Plan; b) take all possible steps to recruit local workers and interstate migrants to the fullest extent possible; and c) expand its efforts in the effective utilization and reallocation of interstate seasonal farm workers.
- 4) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee commends the state education department and local school districts for the successful operation of the migrant summer school program and recommends that this program be expanded into other areas where the concentration of seasonal farm labor indicates such programs would be desirable.
- 5) The Legislative Council Migratory Labor Committee recommends that House Bill 62 (1960), which requires labor contractors and crew leaders who are employers to keep payroll records and provide workers with withholding statements, be amended to require the registration of labor contractors and crew leaders coming under the provisions of the act.

FOCUSING ON THE PROBLEM

Importance of Migrant Workers

Each year a large number of seasonal farm workers are needed in Colorado, not only at harvest time, but throughout the growing season as well. Only a small proportion of seasonal farm labor needs is met by local workers, especially during peak harvest periods. Consequently, seasonal farm workers from other states play an important role in Colorado's agricultural production. It is virtually impossible to determine accurately the total number of different workers from other states who come to Colorado during the course of a growing season; it is estimated, however, that at least 15,000 different interstate workers are employed during a normal crop year in this state.¹

Colorado ranks 12th among all states in the number of interstate migrant farm workers who are employed during the growing season.² Among the Rocky Mountain and west coast states, Colorado ranks fourth in the number of interstate workers employed.³

The size of the total seasonal farm labor force (local workers, intrastate workers, interstate workers, and Mexican nationals) has remained fairly constant in recent years, but the number of interstate workers has been declining. There has been a sharp decline in the past 15 years in both the total number of seasonal farm workers employed and in the number of interstate migrants. Mechanization, technological change, and a reduction in acreage in some of the crops requiring seasonal farm labor have been responsible for the decrease in the size of the seasonal labor force required. Even with this reduction, crops requiring seasonal farm workers are very important in Colorado's agricultural economy.

Legislative Concern

There has been a continuing legislative interest in the problems of the migrant worker and his family, especially since the completion of the 1950-51 Colorado migrant study made by a committee appointed by Governor Lee Knous.⁴ This interest has been shown by legislation aimed at helping migrants proposed at several sessions of the General Assembly and the passage by the General Assembly of two measures, one in 1960 to require labor contractors and crew leaders to keep payroll records and provide wage statements to workers in their

1. The Seasonal Agricultural Labor Market in Colorado, John Gore, Doctor's Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1962, p. 135.
2. Based on Farm Labor Market Developments, Employment and Wage Supplement, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, published monthly.
3. Ibid.
4. For a discussion of the 1950-1951 study, see Migratory Labor in Colorado, A Progress Report, Colorado Legislative Council, Research Publication No. 43, December 1960, pp. 2 through 5.

employ, and the other in 1961, which provided state financial support for special migrant summer school programs and reimbursement to school districts for migrants enrolled during regular school terms.

1960 Legislative Study

The general lack of information concerning the seasonal farm worker, his problems, and his relationship to the agricultural economy has made it difficult for the General Assembly to evaluate the various legislative proposals relating to migrant workers. To obtain detailed information, the Forty-second General Assembly in 1960 directed the Legislative Council to conduct a study of the problems of migrant laborers and their families.⁵ In making this study, the Council was directed to give consideration to the following:⁶

1) coordination of the efforts of state and other public agencies and state-wide and local charitable, ethnic, and religious organizations in attempting solutions to the problems of migrant farm workers;

2) cooperation between federal and state agencies to facilitate the recruitment, transportation, and placement of migratory farm workers;

3) economic problems affecting migratory farm workers;

4) community cooperation in providing social services to such workers; and

5) schooling available to the children of migrant families.

The 1960 Council Committee on Migrant Labor began its study by reviewing the developments in programs for migratory workers and their families, as well as in employment, wages, and working conditions; housing and sanitation; welfare; and education since the 1950-1951 Governor's Committee study. State agency officials concerned with programs and services involving migrant workers and their families met with the committee to explain these programs and indicate further needs. These agencies included: Department of Education, Department of Employment, Department of Health, Department of Welfare, Industrial Commission, and State Patrol.

The subjects on which the committee concentrated during its first year of study consisted of the following:

1) Employment and Wage Rates--recruitment by the Department of Employment, number of migrants and crops for which employed, and wage rates paid.

5. Senate Joint Resolution No. 21, Forty-second General Assembly (1960).

6. Ibid.

2) Bracero Program--number and proportion of Mexican nationals used and crops for which employed, effect of braceros on the state's agricultural economy, and comparison of wages and standards for braceros and domestic migrants.

3) Education--present summer school program and future needs, interstate cooperation, results of Department of Education research project, financing school needs, regular school attendance, and adult education.

4) Housing, Health and Sanitation--Department of Health projects, housing and sanitation conditions and standards, and statutory and regulatory authority.

5) Transportation--present conditions, Interstate Commerce Commission regulations, and enforcement

6) Welfare--welfare needs and programs and financing welfare services.

7) Minimum Wage Legislation--need and feasibility, interstate relationships, and piece-rate conversion.

8) Unemployment Compensation--administrative problems, interstate relationships, and feasibility.

9) Workmen's Compensation and Occupational Disease Coverage--feasibility, administrative problems, and expense.

10) Licensing and Regulation of Contractors and Crew Leaders--experience and problems under House Bill 62 (1960), and further needs.

The background information on these subjects compiled by the 1960 committee assisted in the definition of problem areas and provided the basis for further study and consideration.

In its report to the General Assembly, the 1960 Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee made the following statement:⁷

A realistic appraisal of migratory labor problems and a proper evaluation of proposals for improvement cannot be made without first-hand knowledge concerning the migrant and the conditions under which he and his family live and work. For this reason, the committee proposes that a comprehensive field study be made as the next step in its study program. This field study . . . should be coordinated

7. Migratory Labor In Colorado, op. cit., p. 35.

with a series of committee regional meetings in the five areas of the state where the greatest number of migratory workers are employed: Northern Colorado, Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Slope, and San Juan Basin.

The 1960 committee recommended in its report that the field study to be conducted by the Council staff should include: 1) examination of housing facilities for migrants; 2) observation of public agency programs for migrants, with special emphasis on employment department field operations; 3) interviews with a representative sample of migratory farm workers to cover such things as cultural background, residence, education, work skills, type and place of agricultural work, and economics of migratory existence; and 4) interviews with a representative sample of growers, community leaders, labor contractors, crew leaders, and processors.⁸

Present Legislative Study

House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) directed the Legislative Council to continue the study of migratory farm labor which had been started by a Legislative Council Committee in 1960. In authorizing the continuation of this study, House Joint Resolution No. 10 specified that the following subjects be included:

- 1) coordination of efforts by public agencies and statewide and local organizations in trying to solve the problems of migrant farm workers and their families;
- 2) cooperation between federal and state agencies to facilitate the recruitment, transportation, and placement of migrant farm workers;
- 3) economic problems of migrant farm workers;
- 4) community cooperation in providing social services for migrants;
- 5) migrant school programs; and
- 6) such other problems as may come within the purview of this study.

At its initial meeting on May 10, 1961, the members of the present Migrant Labor Committee agreed that an extensive field study was needed to develop as complete a picture as possible of the migrant farm worker and his problems in Colorado. The committee also decided to hold a series of regional meetings in conjunction with the field study and, in connection with these meetings, to tour migrant housing facilities and to observe migrant schools and other agency and community programs for migrants, whenever possible. The committee directed the

8. Ibid.

staff to follow generally the recommendations of the 1960 committee as to the content of the field study, and the committee devoted considerable time to review and revision of a proposed questionnaire for migrant workers. In making the field study the committee authorized the staff to employ a Spanish and a Navajo interpreter and to seek the cooperation of public agency personnel concerned with migrants.

Because of the wide scope of the study, the amount of field work involved, and the overlap among areas in the peak employment of migratory farm workers, the committee determined that it would take the full two years provided in House Joint Resolution No. 10 (1961) to complete the study. During the first year, it was decided that the committee would cover the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Palisade area, and San Juan Basin. During the second year, attention would be focused on Northern Colorado, where the largest number of migrants are employed for an extended period.

Committee Meetings

During 1961 and 1962 the committee held nine regional public hearings. Public hearings were held as follows:

Arkansas Valley -- Rocky Ford and Lamar, June 5 and 6, 1961
San Luis Valley -- Alamosa and Monte Vista, July 19 and 20, 1961
Western Slope -- Palisade, August 18, 1961
San Juan Basin -- Cortez, August 21, 1961
Northern Colorado -- Brush, June 1, 1962
Ft. Lupton, July 19, 1962
Greeley, August 10, 1962

Invited to meet with the committee at these hearings were: growers, processors, labor contractors, legislators from the area, federal officials (Bureau of Employment Security, Department of Labor and Bureau of Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), state officials (departments of education, employment, health, and welfare, the Colorado highway patrol, and the Industrial Commission), local officials (education, health, welfare, sheriffs, police chiefs, mayors, county commissioners, and councilmen), community leaders, and interested citizens.

Prior to each series of regional meetings, the Council staff made a preliminary study of the area to compile background data for the committee and to develop a list of those who might be interested in meeting with the committee. Each person on the list received a personal invitation to attend from the chairman on behalf of the committee, and information concerning the meeting and inviting all citizens to attend was sent to all newspapers and radio and television stations in the area. Approximately 550 people attended the public hearings: Rocky Ford, 60; Lamar, 30; Alamosa, 35; Monte Vista, 50; Palisade, 75; Cortez, 30; Brush, 75; Ft. Lupton, 150; and Greeley, 50.

Committee Tours

In connection with the Arkansas Valley meetings, the committee made two tours of migrant housing, one in the Rocky Ford-Manzanola-Swink area and the other in the Lamar-Granada area. The committee

also spent one morning at the Rocky Ford school for migrant children. The committee examined housing facilities around Alamosa and Monte Vista, observed workers in the field during lettuce harvest, visited a lettuce packaging plant, and spent some time at the Monte Vista school for migrant children. At Palisade, the housing tour included both the Palisade camp and on-the-farm housing and a visit was made to two peach and pear packing plants. The committee also spent some time at the Palisade migrant school. At the time of the Cortez meeting, there were few migrants in the area, so the committee visited two pinto bean packaging plants and the migrant housing there and traveled to the Navajo reservation to observe how Navajo migratory workers live at home. The committee visited the Wiggins school and examined housing in the area prior to the Brush meeting. The Fort Lupton meeting was preceded by a tour of the Fort Lupton migratory labor camp. Following the meeting, the committee visited the Platteville school. Several potato packing sheds and a cucumber processing plant were visited in connection with the Greeley meeting.

Topics Discussed at Regional Meetings

The same major topics were covered at each regional meetings, although there was some difference in the questions asked by the committee because of situations and problems which varied from area to area. In general, the following major topics were covered at each meeting:

- 1) number of seasonal farm workers employed, during what periods and for what crops;
- 2) composition of the seasonal farm labor force and the sources of supply for such labor;
- 3) reasons for decrease in the number of interstate and intrastate migrants and the utilization of local labor for seasonal farm work;
- 4) employment of Mexican nationals;
- 5) relationship of processors, growers, growers' organizations, labor contractors, and the state employment service in the recruitment and utilization of seasonal farm labor;
- 6) agricultural marketing problems, extent of mechanization and technological improvements, need for further mechanization and technological improvement, availability of and need for packing and processing plants;
- 7) availability and adequacy of housing for seasonal farm workers;
- 8) migrant health and sanitation programs and needs;
- 9) migrant school programs and education needs;

10) law enforcement problems related to the migrant farm worker; and

11) community programs for and attitudes toward the migrant farm worker and his family.

Field Study

Interviews were completed with 706 migratory workers in 1961 and with 225 migratory workers in 1962. The 1961 interviews covered the Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Slope, and San Juan Basin. The interviews in 1962 covered the following areas in Northern Colorado: 1) Morgan and Logan counties; 2) Ft. Lupton, Brighton, and Longmont; 3) Loveland and Fort Collins; and 4) the remainder of Weld County.

Six hundred and twenty-five of these interviews were made with family heads or other family members, so that information was obtained concerning other members in the family group. Consequently, the 931 completed interviews covered 3,219 people, of whom 1,811 were employed as farm laborers. An analysis of the number of migrants interviewed, location of interviews, and related information is shown in Tables 1 through 3.

Migrant Interviews. The migrants who were interviewed were asked questions concerning the following: 1) age and place of residence; 2) number of years as a farm laborer and number of years as a farm laborer in Colorado; 3) crop activity in which employed and other crops in the area in which worker expects to be employed; 4) area or state where employed prior to present employment and expected location of next employment if different from present; 5) attitudes toward working in Colorado and toward employers and communities; 6) how present employment was obtained; 7) present rate of pay and amount made by worker and family during past week and since April 1 of this year; 8) number of days employed during past month and reasons for days of non-work; 9) place in which last winter was spent, employment during the winter and amount earned; 10) comparison of home base or winter housing and present migrant housing; 11) family status, number and age of children, if employed or in school; 12) health status of worker and his family; and 13) financial status of worker and his family, expenditure for food, transportation, and other goods and services.

Other Aspects of Field Work. In addition to the completed migrant questionnaires, the field work included interviews with a representative number of growers, processors, labor contractors, growers' association officers, state and local officials, community leaders, and law enforcement officers. The subjects discussed during these interviews generally followed the topics covered at the committee's regional hearings, with the questions asked designed to develop more specific and detailed information.

More than 100 growers were interviewed. These growers were asked about their labor and marketing problems, labor utilization, mechanization, crop acreage, and recommendations concerning seasonal farm labor. Considerable time was spent with the growers, examining fields and observing crews at work.

TABLE 1
 Number and Location
 of Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962

	<u>Arkansas Valley</u>	<u>San Luis Valley^a</u>	<u>San Luis Valley^b</u>	<u>Palisade Area</u>	<u>San Juan Basin</u>	<u>Northern Colorado</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Total Interviews</u>	100	104	149	312	41	225	931
Anglo	0	1	0	105	0	0	106
Spanish-American	100	72	96	58	0	225	551
Negro	0	4	3	125	0	0	132
Indian	0	0	50	24	41	0	115
Other ^c	0	27	0	0	0	0	27
Family Groups	78	76	85	151	34	200	624
Single Workers	22	28	64	161	7	25	307

a. Early season, July-August.

b. Late season, September-October.

c. American citizens of Filipino extraction, who are custom lettuce workers.

TABLE 2
 Number of People
 Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962

<u>Total People Covered</u>	<u>Arkansas Valley</u>	<u>San Luis Valley^a</u>	<u>San Luis Valley^b</u>	<u>Palisade Area</u>	<u>San Juan Basin</u>	<u>Northern Colorado</u>	<u>Total</u>
	496	320	447	541	101	1,314	3,219
Anglo	0	6	0	198	0	0	204
Spanish-American	496	272	343	143	0	1,314	2,568
Negro	0	6	3	167	0	0	176
Indian	0	0	101	33	101	0	235
Other ^c	0	36	0	0	0	0	36

- a. Early season, July-August.
 b. Late season, September-October.
 c. American citizens of Filipino extraction.

1
6
1

TABLE 3

Number of Farm Workers
Covered by Migrant Interviews, 1961 and 1962

	<u>Arkansas Valley</u>	<u>San Luis Valley^a</u>	<u>San Luis Valley^b</u>	<u>Palisade Area</u>	<u>San Juan Basin</u>	<u>Northern Colorado</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Total Workers</u>	240	151	277	422	70	651	1,811
Anglo	0	3	0	144	0	0	147
Spanish-American	240	115	203	94	0	651	1,303
Negro	0	4	3	157	0	0	164
Indian	0	0	71	27	70	0	168
Other ^c	0	29	0	0	0	0	29
<u>Males Over 16</u>	138	113	160	341	37	280	1,069
Anglo	0	3	0	107	0	0	110
Spanish-American	138	79	108	64	0	280	669
Negro	0	4	3	145	0	0	152
Indian	0	0	49	25	37	0	111
Other ^c	0	27	0	0	0	0	27
<u>Females Over 16</u>	71	19	73	56	30	225	474
Anglo	0	0	0	28	0	0	28
Spanish-American	71	19	52	21	0	225	388
Negro	0	0	0	5	0	0	5
Indian	0	0	21	2	30	0	53
Other ^c	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<u>Children Under 16</u>	31	19	44	25	3	146	268
Anglo	0	0	0	9	0	0	9
Spanish-American	31	17	43	9	0	146	246
Negro	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
Indian	0	0	1	0	3	0	4
Other ^c	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

a. Early season, July-August.

b. Late season, September-October.

c. American citizens of Filipino extraction.

Extensive interviews were made with processors and officials of growers' associations. Included in these interviews were: Western Canning Company, American Crystal Sugar Company, National Sugar Company, Holly Sugar Company, Divon Packing Company, Empire Field Crops (where the staff had the opportunity to attend a board meeting), San Luis Valley Growers Association, the Peach Board of Control, Great Western Sugar Company, Kuner-Empson, and the Fort Lupton Canning Company.

There were several reasons why the number of growers and processors interviewed was much smaller than the number of migrants:

1) The committee's public hearings were held for the purpose of meeting with growers, processors, public officials, and community leaders, so a much larger number of growers and processors were contacted by the committee than those interviewed by the staff.

2) The growers interviewed by the staff were selected because of crop activity, location, and amount of labor employed; generally, they were among the largest employers of seasonal farm labor in a given area.

3) The interviews with growers and processors took considerably longer than those with migrants. The average time per interview with growers and processors was two hours, and some took much longer.

Considerable time was spent in observing and examining local programs and services for migrants, such as the migrant nurse program, the work of the migrant ministry, school programs, and the employment department farm labor field service. Housing and sanitation facilities were examined, as were some of the vehicles used to transport migrant workers, and visits were made to agricultural experiment stations.

The field staff interviewed migrants either in the evening or on days when they were not working, so as not to interfere with agricultural activities. The other interviews were scheduled at the convenience of the interviewees.

Area Differences

The five areas (Arkansas Valley, San Luis Valley, Western Colorado, San Juan Basin and Northern Colorado) covered by the committee during the study differ to a considerable degree in many respects such as: 1) size and composition of the seasonal farm labor force; 2) crop activity and peak periods of labor utilization; 3) organization of the farm labor force and wage scales; 4) use of Mexican nationals; 5) public and private programs and services for migrants; and 6) community attitudes toward migrant workers. There are considerable variations within some areas as well.

These differences are discussed at length in the following five chapters, each of which presents a picture of the migrant labor situation and related matters in one of the five areas requiring a large number of seasonal farm workers.

ARKANSAS VALLEY

Crop Activities and Acreage

Crops Using Seasonal Farm Labor

The Arkansas Valley area covered in the migrant labor study includes: Baca, Bent, Crowley, Otero and Prowers counties. The major crops for which seasonal farm labor is employed are sugar beets and onions; in Baca County broomcorn is the chief crop requiring seasonal farm workers. Other crops for which seasonal labor is used are melons, tomatoes, and cucumbers.

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet acreage and production in the Arkansas Valley in 1961 are shown in Table 4. Otero County had the largest sugar beet acreage, more than 7,000 acres or almost 45 per cent of the total in the five counties; Prowers County accounted for slightly more than one-fourth of the five-county total. The average yield for the five counties was 12.3 tons per acre, compared with the state average of 14.7 tons per acre. This average per acre yield was considerably lower than the 15.7 ton per acre average in 1960; the 1960 state average per acre yield was 17.8 tons. These five Arkansas Valley counties accounted for almost 10 per cent of the total state sugar beet acreage and eight per cent of total state production.

TABLE 4

Sugar Beets Acreage and Production
Arkansas Valley, 1961 ^a

<u>County</u>	<u>Acres Planted</u>	<u>Per cent Harvested</u>	<u>Acres Harvested</u>	<u>Tons Per Acre</u>	<u>Production Tons</u>
Baca	1,406	99%	1,389	15.9	22,043
Bent	1,951	100	1,949	12.0	23,437
Crowley	1,949	90	1,755	9.2	16,164
Otero	7,006	98	6,842	12.7	87,103
Prowers	4,325	93	4,008	11.9	47,661
Total	16,637	96%	15,943	12.3	196,408

- a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary. Colorado Department of Agriculture in Cooperation with U.S. Dept. of Agriculture.

Broomcorn. Only two Arkansas Valley counties have any broomcorn acreage, and one of these (Prowers County) has only 350 acres. Baca County accounts for almost 98 per cent of the state's broomcorn acreage and production. This information is shown in Table 5 on the following page.

TABLE 5

Broomcorn Acreage and Production
Arkansas Valley, 1960^a

<u>County</u>	<u>Acres Planted</u>	<u>Per Cent Harvested</u>	<u>Acres Harvested</u>	<u>Pounds Per Acre</u>	<u>Production Tons</u>
Baca	46,670	92%	42,770	240	5,156
Prowers	350	91	320	210	34
Total	47,020	91.6%	43,090	240	5,190

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960.

Other Crops. Onions, tomatoes, cantaloupe, potatoes, and cucumbers (in that order) all require significant numbers of seasonal farm workers. Otero County has the greatest acreage among the five counties for all of these crops, with two-thirds of the cantaloupe and onion acreage, slightly more than three-fourths of the tomato acreage, and all except eight acres in cucumbers. Over-all, almost 57 per cent of the state's cantaloupe acreage is planted in four Arkansas Valley counties (Bent, Crowley, Otero, Prowers). These counties plus Baca have 45 per cent of the state's onion acreage. The tomato acreage in these counties (Baca excepted) constitutes 50 per cent of the state total. Cucumber acreage in Otero and Bent counties is 11 per cent of the state total, while potato acreage is less than one per cent of the state total. The most recent acreage totals for these crops are shown by county in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Cantaloupe and Vegetable Acreage
Arkansas Valley, 1960^a

<u>County</u>	<u>Cantaloupes</u>	<u>Onions</u>	<u>Tomatoes^b</u>	<u>Potatoes</u>	<u>Cucumbers</u>
Baca	--	200	--	30	--
Bent	390	710	51	90	8
Crowley	100	120	373	--	--
Otero	1,000	2,500	1,524	350	316
Prowers	100	300	31	100	--
Total	1,590	3,830	1,979	470	324

- a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960.
 b. Totals for 1959 taken from 1959 Federal Census.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

Sugar Beets. There has been a 12 per cent increase in sugar beet acreage in the Arkansas Valley in the past 10 years. This rate of increase was only slightly less than that for the state as a whole. Production, however, increased substantially during the same period (57 per cent), so that the valley's proportion of total state production increased from 6.5 to eight per cent. This over-all production increase is reflected in the change in the yield per acre. In 1951, the average yield in the five Arkansas Valley counties was 10.4 tons per acre, only two-thirds of the state average, as compared with 12.3 tons per acre in 1961.

Only three of the five counties increased their sugar beet acreage during the 10-year period. Otero's acreage increased from 5,172 to 7,006; Baca from none to slightly more than 1,400; and Bent from 864 to 1,951. Prowers County's sugar beet acreage decreased from 5,206 to 4,325, and Crowley County's decreased from 2,739 to 1,949. The average yield per acre increased in all five counties.

Broomcorn. Even though Baca County accounts for 98 per cent of the state's broomcorn acreage, the number of acres devoted to this crop has decreased substantially in the past 10 years. The 1960 acreage was only two-thirds of that in 1950, although production increased from 190 to 240 pounds per acre. The decrease in broomcorn acreage in Prowers County was even greater, from 3,080 acres in 1950 to 350 acres in 1960.

Other Crops. There was little change in potato and cucumber acreage in the Arkansas Valley between 1950 and 1960. Onion acreage decreased from 5,000 to 3,830, with almost all of the decrease in Otero and Prowers counties. There was a similar decrease in the state as a whole, so the five Arkansas Valley counties accounted for approximately the same proportion of total state acreage in 1960 as they did in 1950. Two crops showed increased acreage during the 10-year period, cantaloupes and tomatoes. Cantaloupe acreage increased by a third (from 1,190 to 1,590 acres). Otero and Bent counties accounted for the increase, while Crowley and Prowers counties had a slight decrease. Tomato acreage increased 19 per cent in the Arkansas Valley from 1950 to 1960, while in all counties, except Otero, there was a decrease. Tomato acreage in Otero County increased from 900 to 1,524 acres, or 69 per cent.

Number of Farms and Average Size. The changing nature of agricultural organization and activity in the Arkansas Valley during the past 10 to 15 years may be illustrated by the decrease in the number of farms and the increase in average (median) farm size, even though the data available apply to all farms and ranches and not those with crops requiring a significant amount of seasonal farm labor. Between 1950 and 1960, the number of farms in the five Arkansas Valley counties decreased by 28 per cent. Prowers County had the greatest decrease (32 per cent) and Baca County the least (21.6 per cent). During the same period, the median farm size in the five counties increased almost 45 per cent. The greatest increase was in Crowley County, from 153 to 243 acres (almost 59 per cent), and the smallest increase in Prowers County, from 307 to 418 acres (36 per cent). Table 7 shows the 1950 and 1960 comparisons in number of farms and farm size for the five counties.

TABLE 7

Number of Farms and Median Size,
Arkansas Valley, 1950 and 1960^a

<u>County</u>	<u>Number of Farms</u>			<u>Median Farm Size</u> (In Acres)		
	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>Pct. of Change</u>	<u>1950</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>Pct. of Change</u>
Baca	999	783	-21.6%	792	1,102	39.1%
Bent	638	439	-31.2	224	328	46.4
Crowley	490	348	-29.0	153	243	58.8
Otero	1,030	755	-26.7	91	132	45.1
Prowers	1,126	763	-32.2	307	418	36.2
Total	4,283	3,088	-28.0%	338	489	44.7%

a. Federal Census Data

Mechanization and Technological Change

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet harvest in the Arkansas Valley is completely mechanized which is also true in other major sugar producing areas in the state. Mechanization and technological change have been slow to come, however, in pre-harvest activities. Only 50 per cent of the sugar beet acreage is planted in monogerm seed or its equivalent. There is very little mechanical blocking and thinning of sugar beets, and almost all hand labor is performed with short-handled hoes, even on that acreage planted in monogerm seed.

Several of the growers who were interviewed by the field staff or who spoke at the Migrant Labor Committee's regional hearings in Rocky Ford and Lamar contended that they did not use monogerm seed or mechanical blocking and thinning because they anticipated less yield per acre from such practices.

Officials of both the American Crystal Sugar Company and the National Sugar Company stated that they have been quite unsuccessful in encouraging their growers to mechanize their pre-harvest activities in sugar beets. Both companies have machinery and indicated that they were willing to rent it or make it available free of charge, but that the growers were not interested. The two sugar companies have had more success in promoting the use of monogerm seed, although there were few indications that acceptance was widespread during the 1961 field study.

One sugar company official was of the opinion that the diversified agricultural base of most of his company's beet growers was the major reason why they (the growers) were reluctant to mechanize. With a number of crops requiring seasonal hand labor, it is easier to keep workers constantly employed, and the sugar companies assist by recruiting labor, which is also used on other crops besides beets. This official added that the mechanization of sugar beets would reduce the supply of labor to the point where growers would have to consider mechanization and technological improvement in onions and other crops; he didn't think they were ready to do so at this time.

This point of view was confirmed by several growers who said that there was no need to mechanize pre-harvest activities in sugar beets as long as there is an adequate supply of domestic and Mexican labor. If the supply diminished, or if the bracero program was terminated, some of them indicated they would mechanize, while others said they would turn to other crops. Almost all of the growers surveyed (who had both sugar beet and onion acreage) used the same workers for pre-harvest activities in both crops, if at all possible.

On the other hand, a few growers indicated the need for mechanization and were experimenting with mechanical blocking and thinning. One grower said that such mechanization was the only alternative if Mexican nationals were no longer available and added that elimination of the bracero program would improve the grower's position in the long run (a viewpoint shared by only a very small number of the growers interviewed).

Onions. At the time of the field survey, very few growers were harvesting onions mechanically, and for those that were, mechanical harvesting was still in the experimental stage. A number of growers stated that soil conditions and the type of onions grown were not conducive to mechanical harvest operations. Others had reservations but were willing to try harvesting onions mechanically because of the high cost of hand labor for this operation. Only a few growers were trying pelletized onion seed in order to reduce the amount of hand thinning necessary. None of them reported satisfaction as yet with the results.

Other Crops. Hand labor is used extensively for other stoop crops such as melons, cucumbers, potatoes, and tomatoes. It is possible to pick tomatoes mechanically, but as yet a variety suitable for growing in the Arkansas Valley has not been developed which can be adapted to mechanical harvest. Further research on this problem is underway at Colorado State University.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

Generally, Arkansas Valley growers feel that they are caught in a cost-price squeeze over which they have no control. A number of them cited the increased costs of machinery, supplies, and labor as contrasted with the prices received for their products. Several stated that past joint efforts to establish production and quality controls (in such crops as onions, for example) have not been successful, and there is a difference of opinion as to whether such efforts could be successful in the future. The growers recognize the trend in their area toward fewer and larger farms, and a number expressed the fear that they would be forced to go out of business, either because of the cost-price relationship or through an insufficient supply of seasonal farm labor. These concerns of the growers help to explain their attitudes toward seasonal farm labor. There is a reluctance to increase the wage scale, although a number of growers indicated they would do so if it were economically feasible. One grower expressed concern over the \$.75 an hour wage rate with the comment that if he pays his workers \$.75 an hour, his own labor is only worth that much.

By and large, local workers were considered undependable, and domestic migrants also have been considered unsatisfactory by some growers, because of their refusal to work in certain crop activities, such as tomato and cucumber harvests and their freedom to pick and choose employment or not work at all, even though a crop might be lost if not harvested when ready. For this reason, there is general support of the bracero program. This program provides an assured source of steady, hard-working labor, and if the Mexican nationals won't work or don't perform satisfactorily they can be sent home and replaced. The continuation of the bracero program is considered especially desirable by some growers who are reluctant to mechanize under present economic conditions.

On the other hand, there are some growers who dislike using Mexican nationals and prefer domestic labor. A number of these growers have been able to attract and keep the same local and domestic workers over a number of years and have found them hard-working and reliable.

Two growers said that they would like to use domestic workers if they could employ them on a contract basis similar to that for Mexican nationals. Otherwise, experience has shown that they could be caught short during critical harvest and pre-harvest periods.

Many of the growers have not shown any great interest in migrant workers other than in their work performance, although a number have cooperated in the establishment and operation of the Rocky Ford migrant school and have tried to improve housing conditions. Empire Field Crops, the major growers' organization in the valley, has been working with its members in this respect.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers - Peak Employment Periods

There is not much employment of seasonal farm labor in the Arkansas Valley until about the second week in May. The number employed increases steadily until the early season peak in the latter part of June. From the end of June until the end of August, there is a gradual decrease. There is a rather rapid increase in employment during the first two weeks in September, with the late season peak in the latter part of the month. Although there are fewer than in May, June, and September, there are still some interstate migrants and Mexican nationals employed in the Arkansas Valley during October.

The major early peak period of agricultural activity includes: sugar beets, blocking and thinning, and hoeing and weeding; onion seeding and pre-harvest; irrigation; and some pre-harvest work in tomatoes, melons, and vegetables. The small grain harvest accounts for about half of the farm employment in the Lamar area during June. Major late season agricultural activities are the broomcorn harvest in the Lamar area and the onion and tomato harvests, primarily around Rocky Ford and La Junta.

Employment department estimates of the number of seasonal farm workers are made each week during the growing season by the area offices. There are three area offices in the Arkansas Valley: Rocky Ford (Crowley County and the western two-thirds of Otero County); La Junta (the eastern one-third of Otero County and the western three-fourths of Bent County); and Lamar (the remainder of Bent County and Baca and Prowers counties).

Generally, less than 25 per cent of the seasonal farm labor in the Arkansas Valley has been performed by local workers during the past three years, although there is considerable variance among the areas. In the La Junta area, local labor accounted for only 15 per cent of seasonal farm employment through the 1960-1962 growing seasons; in the Rocky Ford area, almost 23 per cent, and in the Lamar area, almost 25 per cent.

Mexican nationals have made up 35 per cent of the seasonal farm labor employed during the past three years. Relatively few Mexican nationals were employed in the Lamar area (about 10 per cent of the total seasonal labor force). In the Rocky Ford area, almost 40 per cent of the seasonal farm workers were Mexican nationals, and in La Junta, 55 per cent.

Slightly more than 30 per cent of the seasonal farm workers employed in the Arkansas Valley during the past three years have been interstate migrants. Interstate workers constituted 21 per cent of the work force in the La Junta area, almost 30 per cent in the Rocky Ford area, and 52 per cent in the Lamar area. Less than 10 per cent of seasonal farm labor needs are supplied by intrastate workers.

Table 8 shows the employment of seasonal farm workers in the Arkansas Valley by area for selected weeks, 1960 through 1962.

Employment Department Statistics. Table 8, as indicated, is based on the weekly reports of seasonal farm labor by the employment department area offices. Department officials admit that these statistics are good estimates at best. It is possible that at least some of those workers employed by private labor contractors may not have been counted from time to time, because many of these contractor crews are moved constantly around the valley, from Pueblo across the Kansas line. (For example, the largest contractor in the area estimated that there were 1,000 interstate migrants in the valley during a week when employment department reports showed a total of 510.)¹

There is no way, however, to determine the per cent of error in the employment department estimates, if error exists, and these statistics are the most reliable available.

1. In an interview with an Industrial Commission staff member. Field staff observations of the number of workers employed in a specific area also differed on occasion from the number reported by the employment department area officer.

TABLE 8

Employment of Seasonal Farm Workers
In the Arkansas Valley By Area
for Selected Weeks and Principal Crop Activities, 1960-1962^a

Month and Week	La Junta			Rocky Ford			1960	Lamar		1960	Total	
	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962		1961	1962		1961	1962
<u>May (2nd week)</u>												
Total workers	406	400	563	455	476	382	142	251	269	1,003	1,127	1,216
Mexican nationals	271	196	160	149	196	62	20	28	9	440	420	231
Locals	105	57	30	119	120	105	100	161	147	324	338	282
Intrastate	---	39	---	---	10	20	---	50	6	---	99	26
Interstate	30	108	375	187	150	195	22	12	107	239	270	677
<u>Crops</u>												
Sugar Beets	13	---	351	152	238	213	---	46	84	165	284	648
Onions	393	400	214	263	216	146	27	52	25	683	668	385
<u>May (4th week)</u>												
Total workers	571	631	559	856	718	702	484	567	555	1,911	1,916	1,816
Mexican nationals	340	324	244	276	193	166	33	40	44	649	557	454
Locals	80	79	100	202	140	120	142	154	142	424	373	362
Intrastate	75	40	---	---	30	75	18	59	20	93	129	95
Interstate	76	188	215	378	355	341	291	314	349	745	857	905
<u>Crops</u>												
Sugar Beets	287	280	334	560	314	550	104	343	352	951	937	1,236
Onions	199	329	239	130	273	80	205	47	28	534	649	347
<u>June (3rd week)</u>												
Total workers	546	639	423	844	785	518	495	445	715	1,885	1,869	1,656
Mexican nationals	353	352	207	267	274	188	43	47	72	663	673	467
Locals	78	98	115	151	135	100	110	161	150	339	394	365
Intrastate	30	49	20	15	35	30	15	35	95	60	119	145
Interstate	85	140	81	411	341	200	327	202	398	823	683	679
<u>Crops</u>												
Sugar Beets	306	268	208	483	343	310	240	200	330	1,029	811	848
Onions	179	304	114	246	282	94	50	77	65	475	663	273

TABLE 8
(Continued)

Month and Week	La Junta			Rocky Ford			Lamar			1960	Total	
	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962		1960	1961
<u>July (3rd week)</u>												
Total workers	519	441	416	471	530	374	335	421	398	1,325	1,392	1,188
Mexican nationals	263	265	211	179	210	133	32	36	50	474	511	394
Locals	107	61	75	162	160	160	110	124	130	379	345	365
Intrastate	91	26	45	---	20	41	10	27	33	101	73	119
Interstate	58	89	85	130	140	40	183	234	185	371	463	310
<u>Crops</u>												
Sugar Beets	94	---	95	76	91	95	80	140	197	250	231	292
Onions	259	70	145	187	200	110	80	40	63	526	297	318
Other veg.	112	248	179	120	196	141	---	---	---	232	444	320
<u>August (4th week)</u>												
Total workers	494	666	674	496	598	715	286	287	288	1,276	1,551	1,677
Mexican nationals	294	374	284	238	298	347	32	32	50	564	704	681
Locals	103	115	108	163	170	190	109	118	114	375	403	412
Intrastate	34	92	95	---	40	45	13	28	20	47	160	160
Interstate	63	85	187	95	90	133	132	109	104	290	284	424
<u>Crops</u>												
Onions	273	443	367	200	321	340	25	---	23	498	764	730
Melons	105	45	56	111	120	41	26	32	27	242	197	124
Other veg.	85	217	85	159	161	304	---	---	---	244	378	389
<u>Sept. (3rd week)</u>												
Total workers	619	649	555	640	500	595	1,049	1,164	1,070	2,308	2,313	2,220
Mexican nationals	380	402	320	360	355	395	32	235	50	772	992	765
Locals	79	53	85	165	100	125	125	152	138	369	305	348
Intrastate	70	64	50	---	10	10	253	218	250	323	292	310
Interstate	90	130	100	115	35	65	639	559	632	844	724	797
<u>Crops</u>												
Broomcorn	---	---	---	---	---	---	803	940	760	803	940	760
Onions	307	253	238	195	157	215	86	55	119	688	465	572
Other veg.	253	277	219	308	303	277	---	---	---	561	580	496

TABLE 8
(Continued)

Month and Week	La Junta			Rocky Ford			Lamar			Total		
	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962
<u>October (1st week)</u>												
Total workers	586	519	353	590	349	492	386	807	1,141	1,562	1,725	1,986
Mexican nationals	380	341	256	330	233	334	24	234	50	734	808	640
Locals	64	66	52	130	100	120	120	131	138	314	297	290
Intrastate	47	53	25	---	---	18	48	134	245	95	187	308
Interstate	95	109	20	130	16	20	194	308	708	419	433	748
<u>Crops</u>												
Broomcorn	---	---	---	---	---	---	125	510	860	125	510	860
Onions	283	255	189	282	58	195	76	104	107	669	417	491
Tomatoes	215	150	149	205	116	137	---	---	---	420	266	286

a. Taken from State Employment Department Area Office Weekly Reports.

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment

Most of the recruitment of interstate migratory labor in the Arkansas Valley is done by the American Crystal Sugar Company, Dave Nava (a private contractor), and the State Department of Employment. American Crystal recruits approximately 9,000 workers in Texas to supply its growers in a several-state area. The employment department recruits workers in New Mexico, primarily for Empire Field Crops, a growers' organization. In addition to Mr. Nava, there are also a few small labor contractors in the Arkansas Valley. These contractors employ local labor usually and make their own arrangements with growers, although occasionally they may receive referrals from the employment department.

Empire Field Crops. Empire Field Crops' membership is concentrated in an area bounded by Manzanola on the west and Las Animas on the east, although there are several members in the Lamar area. The organization is nine years old and was established primarily to rationalize and organize the seasonal farm labor market, so that growers would be assured, as far as possible, a constant labor supply without having to depend on private contractors. Even though Empire Field Crops is a growers' organization, three processors are members and play an important role in its activities: Western Canning Company, American Crystal Sugar Company, and National Sugar Company.

American Crystal Sugar Co. This company, as indicated above, brings several hundred workers into the Arkansas Valley. Not all of these workers are placed with Empire Field Crop members, because a number of American Crystal's growers, especially in the Fowler area (west of Manzanola), are not members of Empire.

Dave Nava. At one time, Mr. Nava was the prime supplier of labor for the valley. A number of the growers interviewed indicated dissatisfaction with this arrangement because they had no assurance that they would have labor when they needed it, because an independent contractor is free to choose those farms and crop activities which he considers to be the most advantageous. This situation, along with concern over the quality of labor provided, helped lead to the organization of Empire Field Crops.

Even with the establishment and organizational growth of Empire Field Crops, Mr. Nava is still very prominent in the farm labor picture. He still recruits a large number of workers and is able to keep a good proportion of them throughout the growing season.² Empire Field Crops, as yet, is unable to provide a sufficient number of workers to meet all peak period needs and emergencies in the area. Therefore, many Empire members make use of Mr. Nava's crews from time to time.

2. The migrant interviews conducted in the Arkansas Valley indicated that Mr. Nava's workers usually came earlier and stayed longer than domestics brought in under other auspices, although there appears to be a high annual turnover rate.

Because Empire cannot provide all the labor needed, it is unable to prohibit its members from obtaining labor from other sources. The need for Dave Nava's crews is demonstrated by the fact that a number of growers sublease housing to him free of charge on the condition that he will provide workers when needed.

There are several problems in the recruitment of migratory labor for the Arkansas Valley, aside from the fact that recruitment activities are not coordinated. First, the Arkansas Valley has been a low wage area, as compared with most other areas in Colorado and other states. Consequently, it becomes progressively more difficult to attract workers to the area, and often those that do come will not return for a second year. Second, the available labor supply is considerably less than it was a few years ago. The employment department reports that it is becoming difficult to recruit workers in New Mexico, because they have turned to other types of employment. Colorado recruits in Texas, but must compete with those from a number of midwestern and western states for available labor. Third, the quality of the labor recruited has diminished in the past few years, according to several of the growers with whom this matter was discussed.

Mexican Nationals. The recruitment problems enumerated above, especially the reported difficulty in obtaining labor in Texas and New Mexico, has made the Mexican national an important part of the farm labor picture in the Arkansas Valley. Other reasons cited for the need for Mexican nationals include: 1) domestic workers refuse to pick cucumbers and tomatoes; 2) domestic workers leave the area in early September so as to return to their home state in time for the opening of school; and 3) the general unreliability and unavailability of local labor. Empire Field Crops serves as the sponsoring agency for most of the Mexican nationals brought into the valley. The recruitment fees and transportation costs for most of the braceros brought in are paid by the processing companies. By having Empire Field Crops designated as the official employer of these Mexican nationals, these workers may be employed for any crop activity carried on by Empire's members. If the processors were the official employers, these braceros could work only in those crops in which the processor is concerned.

Ciruli-Grasmick farms (Lamar-Granada area) and the Divon Packing Company (Fowler) sponsor braceros independently and not through Empire Field Crops. Divon has not joined Empire Field Crops because currently it brings in braceros specifically for tomatoes and peas and sees no advantage in belonging to Empire. The failure of the Divon Packing Company to join Empire Field Crops appears to be a major reason why some growers in the Fowler area have not become members. These growers generally have two crops which require seasonal farm labor: sugar beets and tomatoes. Labor for the former is supplied by the American Crystal Sugar Company and for the latter by the Divon Packing Company, so they feel there is no need to join Empire Field Crops.

Labor Utilization and Reallocation

The focal point for Empire Field Crops' labor activity is the Swink camp. This camp is used primarily as a staging area, and the employment department maintains an office there. Usually domestic workers remain at the camp for a short period of time, but there are exceptions. Braceros may remain throughout the six-week contract period.

The initial allocation of domestic workers by Empire Field Crops is usually made by the end of May. The beginning of the contract period for Mexican nationals is usually the second week in May. Following the early season peak (in late June), Empire recontracts braceros and reallocates among its members both braceros and domestic workers. A priority list has been established for this reallocation. At the top of the list are those growers who already have labor. These growers may retain all they need. If growers have sponsored workers,³ but have lost some, they have second priority. At the bottom of the list are those growers who need additional labor. The only source of labor to be reallocated appears to be the surplus from those growers who do not need all the workers who were in their employ during the peak period.

This reallocation procedure by Empire is an attempt to rationalize the labor market. But it falls short for several reasons: 1) Empire does not control a sufficient number of workers to supply all of its members' needs. 2) It has no control over locals or workers supplied by contractors. 3) American Crystal does not always reallocate workers in accordance with Empire's wishes.

As indicated previously, a number of American Crystal's growers are not members of Empire. Depending on pressures and labor needs, American Crystal may reallocate workers (both braceros and domestics) to non-member growers. Empire objects to this process because it interferes with its efforts to structure the labor market. It appeared from the interview with company officials that American Crystal is not too happy with several aspects of the labor market situation, none of which is necessarily related to Empire Field Crops. American Crystal is dissatisfied because growers often use the workers brought in by American Crystal (both domestic and braceros) for crops other than sugar beets and neglect beet hoeing and thinning. When it is no longer possible to put off this activity, these growers contact American Crystal for additional labor, and then the company has difficulty in finding a sufficient number of workers. American Crystal has no objection to workers' being used for crops other than sugar beets after the beets have been taken care of. Because American Crystal has had considerable difficulty in getting growers in the area to mechanize pre-harvest activities, the acre-worker ratio in the Arkansas Valley is lower than that of any other area in which the company operates.

Employment of Labor Contractor Crews. The Arkansas Valley is usually subjected to rapidly changing weather conditions during the pre-harvest period. Several days of rain will result in the idleness of a large number of workers. The return of clear weather will set off a clamor for labor by growers because of an immediate need for thinning and weeding. The same pattern may also develop during harvest season; weather conditions may delay harvest, and again workers will be idle and may leave the area. When the harvest is ready, a large supply of labor is needed immediately.

3. Those provided by processors.

Empire Field Crops cannot meet these peak demands, and neither can the employment department. Many of the growers stated that they no longer contacted the employment department in such circumstances, because either it could not supply the labor needed or the laborers referred (mostly locals) were unreliable and poor workers. The employment department in turn has pointed out that it has an obligation to place unemployed locals and that growers may be unjustifiably critical of the workers referred.

The variance in climatic conditions and the lack of a surplus worker pool upon which to draw have placed the independent labor contractors in an important position, even though they no longer control the major portion of available seasonal labor. Contractors, especially Dave Nava, control a sufficient supply of labor, however, to meet many of the peak needs. Although some of Mr. Nava's workers have the possibility of season-long employment from some growers, a number of them may be considered as marginal labor. In other words, they are likely to have periods of unemployment, caused either by adverse weather conditions or because sufficient labor is supplied from other sources.

One of Mr. Nava's complaints is that at times when his crews are unemployed, Mexican nationals are working. He contends that his workers should be given these jobs and the Mexican nationals placed on a standby basis or returned home. He stated, when interviewed, that the employment department has refused to place his workers under such circumstances. The employment department's position is that it is willing to place Mr. Nava's workers if they assure the department that they are no longer under his control. Department spokesmen state that as long as these workers owe their allegiance to Mr. Nava rather than to the grower to whom they are referred, there is no assurance that they will not leave the job as soon as Mr. Nava finds other employment for them. If Mexican nationals are returned to the border under these circumstances, a grower could find himself without labor at a time when he needs it most.

Further Comments on Labor Reallocation. Observation of the Empire Field Crops' reallocation program indicates that the association may be placing more emphasis on the recontracting and reallocation of braceros than on the retention and reallocation of domestic workers. This observation is supported by the results of the migrant interviews in the Rocky Ford--LaJunta area. Analysis of these interviews shows that 48.5 per cent of the interstate migrants leave the area by July 30, with a considerable number leaving between June 30 and July 10. Subtracting those workers leaving during this period who are employed by Mr. Nava and those who probably would not be willing to remain in the area or to go to another section of Colorado, for other reasons (employment in another state, desire to return home), it is estimated that 35 per cent of the interstate workers who leave after early season pre-harvest activities might be retained in the area or routed to another part of the state. Application of this proportion to employment department estimates of interstate migrants indicates that 160 workers fall in this category.

In the Lamar area, the migrant questionnaires indicate that approximately one-half of the early interstate migrants leave by July 30. After making allowances for those whose interviews indicated that it would not be possible to encourage them to work either in the Rocky Ford --LaJunta area or elsewhere in Colorado, it was estimated that 28 per cent of these early season workers might be available for work in other areas.

This estimate, applied to the number of interstate migrants reported by the employment department's Lamar office, shows a total of 110 workers in this category.

The results of this analysis were discussed with employment department officials at the March 16, 1962 meeting of the Migrant Labor Committee. At that time, the director of the employment department said that the department was aware that many domestic workers do leave the state and that the department tries to encourage these workers to stay in Colorado. At the time the workers are recruited, they are informed of job opportunities throughout the state and are encouraged to make commitments for some of these jobs if they can be worked into their schedules. He pointed out that many workers won't follow a plan, once it has been set up, but seem to prefer to follow the whims of chance and fancy and trust to luck that they will find a job. He also remarked that it is only natural that the farmers and processors should try to avoid advancing transportation costs, even though it might encourage workers to go to another area of the state where they were needed. The supply of labor may diminish in the next few years, however, to the extent that growers and processors may have to advance much more in transportation costs for domestic workers than they do at present.⁴

Broomcorn Harvest. The broomcorn harvest usually begins during the middle of September and reaches a peak at the end of the month but may continue through the first two weeks in October. Usually this harvest is handled almost entirely by domestic workers. Local and intrastate workers are joined by a large number of interstate migrants, most of which are Cherokee Indians from Oklahoma. In the past few years, this pattern has been altered only once, in 1961, when more than 200 Mexican nationals were employed during the height of the broomcorn harvest. Employment department officials explained that the 1961 harvest was about twice the size of the 1960 harvest, and the workers who usually came to Colorado from Oklahoma were in demand in their home state and in New Mexico for the large broomcorn crops in these states; for this reason, Mexican nationals were needed.⁵

Wage Rates and Earnings

The average hourly wage rate for domestic seasonal farm labor increased almost 44 per cent in the Arkansas Valley between 1960 and 1962. Piece rates during harvest season have also increased, but it is impossible to calculate the per cent of over-all increase because of the number of variables involved (different crops and methods of payment). The usual hourly rate offered seasonal workers in 1960 was \$.65 per hour. The general hourly rate in 1961 was \$.75 per hour,

4. Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of March 16, 1962.

5. Ibid.

although the migrant questionnaires showed that some workers were still being employed at \$.65 per hour. During the 1962 growing season, the usual hourly rate reported in the employment department farm labor bulletin was \$.90 per hour, although some pre-harvest activities were reported at \$.75 to \$.85 an hour. Prior to the middle of May, the employment department farm labor bulletins reported pre-harvest wage rates at \$.70 and \$.75 per hour. It should be noted that these rates do not apply to pre-harvest work in sugar beets. The rates for this work are set by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture and are as follows:

Hand Blocking and Thinning-----	\$15.50 per acre	} 1961 & 1962
Hand Hoeing and Trimming-----	11.50 per acre	
Hand Hoeing-----	9.50 per acre	
Hand Weeding-----	6.00 per acre	

The changes in hourly wage rates for domestic workers (not including sugar beet pre-harvest activities) correspond in timing and amount to changes in the minimum hourly rate which must be paid Mexican nationals. During the 1960 growing season, Mexican nationals employed in the Arkansas Valley received \$.65 per hour. On May 4, 1961, the Secretary of Labor ruled that Mexican nationals employed in the Arkansas and San Luis valleys must be paid a minimum of \$.75 per hour. This decision by the Secretary of Labor was based upon the following considerations:⁶

1. Mexican national workers form a large proportion of the total workers employed...in these areas. In the Arkansas Valley in 1960, 47 per cent of the workers employed...during the peak period were Mexican national workers... The prevailing wage rate for domestic workers in these areas [San Luis Valley included] was \$.65 per hour in 1960. In contrast, few Mexican national workers were employed in this activity [vegetable pre-harvest] in other areas of Colorado. No Mexican national workers were employed in this activity in the Western Slope and San Juan Basin areas. In Northern Colorado less than five per cent of total employment in this activity at peak consisted of Mexican national workers. The prevailing rate for these activities for domestic workers in these areas was \$.75 per hour.

Thus it is found that the lower wage rate paid domestic workers in the Arkansas Valley...areas was directly associated with the availability of Mexican national workers.

6. Notice to: Colorado Department of Employment, All Employers who Might Wish to Use Mexican Nationals in Miscellaneous Vegetable Pre-harvest Activities in the Arkansas Valley and the San Luis Valley in Colorado, and other Interested Parties, from Robert C. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment Statistics, May 4, 1961.

2. The 1961 United States Department of Agriculture determination for sugar beet hand operations increased the minimum "fair and reasonable" wage rate from \$.75 to \$.85 per hour.
3. Average hourly earnings of Mexican national workers employed at piece rates in other activities in the Arkansas Valley and San Luis Valley range from \$.84 to \$1.13. Domestic workers are paid the same piece rates as Mexican national workers in these other activities and it is reasonable to assume that their piece rate earnings are approximately the same as the Mexican national workers.
4. According to the United States Department of Agriculture, the average annual cash wage rate per hour in Colorado was \$.912 in 1960.

Employment department representatives and Empire Field Crops officials stated that the \$.10 increase in hourly rates for domestic workers was encouraged by the employment department and agreed to voluntarily by the growers, even though it increased labor costs. Nevertheless, the increase in rates for both Mexican nationals and domestic workers occurred at approximately the same time. No information has been obtained as to whether the 1962 increase for domestic workers was approved by the growers independently of the Secretary of Labor's ruling raising the rate for Mexican nationals to \$.90 an hour. Both rate increases took place at approximately the same time, however.

Effect of Braceros on Wage Rates for Domestic. Public Law 78, which provides for the contracting and employment of Mexican nationals, specifies that Mexican nationals may not be employed at a rate less than the prevailing wage in the area, and state employment departments are required to make wage surveys to determine the prevailing rates for crop activities for which a shortage of domestic labor has been certified, so that Mexican nationals may be imported. This provision was placed in Public Law 78 for two reasons: 1) to protect domestic workers from having their wage levels depressed through the employment of braceros at a lower rate; and 2) to assure the Mexican government that its citizens would be paid a wage commensurate with that received by American workers.

Experience has indicated that this provision of Public Law 78 has not worked exactly as expected. In the Arkansas Valley, as indicated above, the rate set for Mexican nationals by the Secretary of Labor during the past three years has tended also to be the rate paid domestic workers. It can be argued (as the Secretary of Labor has) that if the rate set for Mexican nationals in one area is lower than in other areas, and the rate for domestic workers is pegged at the same level, domestic workers will go elsewhere, thus creating a domestic labor shortage and assuring a need for braceros. Because of this apparent interrelationship between wage rates for domestic and Mexican national workers, the Secretary of Labor, in effect, is setting a minimum wage for an area when he establishes the wage rate for Mexican nationals. This is one reason why many growers in the Arkansas Valley have objected strongly to the 1962 ruling pegging the wage rate for Mexican nationals at \$.90 an hour.

Another problem has resulted from the requirement that Mexican nationals be paid not less than \$.90 an hour. This ruling also applies to the harvest of crops for which workers are traditionally paid on a piece rate basis, such as cucumbers, tomatoes, and onions. Mexican nationals are guaranteed \$.90 an hour for the harvest of these crops, whether or not their piece rate earnings equal this amount. Some growers have reported that their Mexican workers have not been performing at maximum efficiency because of the lack of incentive resulting from the \$.90 an hour guarantee. Domestic workers are still paid on a piece rate basis with no hourly guarantee, but often won't work in certain crop harvests such as tomatoes and cucumbers. In a number of instances, this has placed the grower in a "pickle."

Wage Rate Determination. The establishment of the wage rate for sugar beet hand labor by the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the influence of bracero wage rates on the rates paid domestics narrow considerably wage determination by individual growers. It is difficult to assess accurately the extent to which a growers' organization such as Empire Field Crops influences the wage pattern for seasonal farm labor. Empire Field Crops officials have stated that they do not determine the wage rates to be paid by the association's members. The organization may suggest wage rates but does not require that these rates be paid by members. It is unlikely, however, that many association members would deviate appreciably from the wage rates suggested by their own organization. The association published its wage rate schedule in 1961 with the following comments: "At a meeting of the Board of Directors of Empire Field Crops, Inc., at La Junta, Colorado on May 1, 1961, the following wage scale was determined and set for the 1961 season."⁷ Field interviews and observations indicated that generally the rates determined by Empire Field Crops were being followed by most growers whether or not they were members of the association.

Wages Received by Migrant Workers. The migrants who were interviewed were asked several questions concerning time worked and earnings, both for the week previous to the interview, and for all weeks spent in the Arkansas Valley between April 1 and the time interviewed during the 1961 growing season. This information was tabulated for family groups and single workers. Table 9 shows the mean, median, and high and low earnings during the previous week as reported to interviewers. Also shown are the number of workers per family unit, the number of hours worked by family units and single workers, and the amount earned per hour.

7. Wage Scale for 1961, Empire Field Crops, Board of Directors, May 1, 1961.

TABLE 9

Previous Week's Earnings
By Migrants in the Arkansas Valley, 1961

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Low</u>
<u>Family</u>				
Amount earned	\$90.53	\$82.00	\$325.00	\$13.00
Number of workers	3	3	6	1
Number of hours worked	110	100	300	15
Amt. earned per hour	\$.823	\$.82	---	---
<u>Single Workers</u>				
Amount earned	\$30.13	\$25.00	\$81.00	\$10.00
Number of hours worked	37.7	40	72	16
Amt. earned per hour	\$.799	\$.625	---	---

Table 10 shows the mean, median, and high and low average weekly earnings by family groups and single workers from April 1, 1961 to the time interviewed.

TABLE 10

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st
Until Time of Interview, Arkansas Valley, 1961

	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>
Mean	\$ 32.27	\$ 35.77
Median	27.25	25.00
Low Average	5.20	12.00
High Average	133.00	108.00

The difference between the earnings of family groups, as shown in Tables 9 and 10, illustrates the chaotic economic existence of migrant workers. Many of them had arrived in the Arkansas Valley before much employment was available, and there were a number of days of bad weather when it was impossible to work. A number of them had been able to obtain groceries on credit, and, generally, housing was provided free of charge. Otherwise, few of them would have been able to exist until work was available on a full-time basis. A number of migrants had moved around quite a bit since April 1, and the time consumed in travel cut deeply into possible working hours.

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

In the eastern part of the Arkansas Valley, housing for domestic migrants and Mexican nationals is concentrated in the area between Lamar and Granada. There is also some housing in and around

Holly. Housing in the Rocky Ford -- La Junta area is scattered from Swink in the east to Fowler on the west. There is also some housing located in Crowley and Bent counties and to the south of La Junta.

Concentrated Housing. There are few large housing concentrations, with on-the-farm housing the rule rather than the exception. One of the largest concentrations of housing is at the Swink camp. This camp has 27 units of 2 rooms each and is operated by Empire Field Crops. Both Mexican nationals and domestic workers are housed at the camp, and it is used as a staging area. Newly-arrived workers live at the camp until assigned to growers, who then provide housing for them. The units are constructed of brick and clay tile; each unit has an outside water tap; and there are central bathing and laundry facilities. The Swink camp was among the best housing found in the Arkansas Valley.

There are four concentrated housing areas owned by the American Crystal Sugar Company. Two of these areas are near Rocky Ford and two between Lamar and Granada. There are a number of individual houses located in each area. American Crystal assigns the housing located near Rocky Ford to growers who have leased land from the company. The number of housing units provided is proportional to the amount of acreage a tenant has. A number of these units have been subleased free by some growers to Dave Nava on the condition he will supply labor when needed.

These houses are leased to growers free of charge by American Crystal. Formerly the company assumed full responsibility for the maintenance and repair of these units. Starting in 1961, however, the company turned this responsibility over to the growers, although it still offered to provide paint and calcimine, if the growers would provide the labor. Company officials, when interviewed, stated that the provision of housing had proved to be a heavy burden financially and that they were trying to transfer some of this burden to the growers who benefited from having the housing available. They recognized that some growers had a tendency to neglect the upkeep on these units and that there were instances where migrants had misused the facilities.

American Crystal's housing in the Lamar--Granada area is operated by the company rather than leased to individual growers. Prior to 1961, no charge was made to growers for housing their workers or for maintenance and repair. The company initiated a per acre housing charge to growers in the Lamar area in April, 1961. This charge was in keeping with the company's intent to shift some of the financial burden.

There are several other small concentrations of housing, including three railroad section houses containing about four units each. These section houses were among the worst housing examined in the valley. Perhaps the poorest housing of all was found at the Manzanola camp. This camp is located north of the railroad tracks just outside of the Manzanola town limits and consists of adobe buildings erected in 1911. At the time the camp was visited, there were two outside toilets and one water tap for a potential population of 300. This camp was filled during onion harvest in 1961 but only had a few residents in 1962. It has been used from time to time, despite the fact that it has been condemned for the past three years by the Otero County Health Department.

Housing Subleases. As indicated earlier, it is not at all uncommon in the Arkansas Valley to find migrant housing subleased one or more times. This practice makes it difficult to find out who is responsible for the housing and for the people living in it. The Manzanola camp is a good example of the difficulties occasionally encountered by the health department because of such arrangements. When the camp was occupied during the 1961 onion harvest, the director of the Otero County Health Department went to see the camp's owner. The owner said he had no knowledge that there were people living in the camp and that he was receiving no rent from any of the units. It was his opinion that a labor contractor had moved the workers and their families in. The labor contractor said that he wasn't aware there were any crews living in the Manzanola camp. He thought that some of the crew leaders were responsible. The crew leaders said that they were told to use the Manzanola camp by the labor contractor. After another examination of conditions at the camp, the director of the health department tried to have the area sprayed and cleaned up to get rid of insects and filth and to avoid any possible outbreak of disease. The owner of the property refused to pay for the spraying and cleanup, because he was receiving no rent from the people living in the camp. The labor contractor refused to pay, as did the crew leaders, as they all disclaimed responsibility for housing migrants in the camp. The Manzanola Town Board also refused to be responsible for spraying and cleaning up the camp, because it is located outside of the town's incorporated limits.

On-the-farm Housing. Housing provided on individual farms varied from very good to uninhabitable, with much of it at least adequate. Some of the migrants interviewed stated that they would probably not return to the valley during the following season because of poor housing, and, if they did return, they would not work for the same grower. On the other hand, some migrants indicated satisfaction with the housing provided and said that either this had been an inducement for them to return this year or would be a factor in their returning in 1962. A number of the growers interviewed who had good housing stated that the same workers had been employed by them for several years, and they felt that the housing provided by them was a major reason why these workers came back year after year.

According to the head of the Western Canning Company, there is a trend in the valley toward on-the-farm housing rather than centralized housing for migrants. He attributed this trend to: 1) a desire on the part of growers to have their labor located near the fields in which they were to work; and 2) an attempt by growers to avoid the transportation, health and other problems which can develop when large numbers of people are concentrated in one place.

Officials of the American Crystal Sugar Company were of the opinion that farmers were trying to eliminate on-the-farm housing because of the expense and the problems involved in maintenance and repair. This viewpoint is also held by the director of the Otero County Health Department. It is his opinion that now that federal loans are available for the construction of farm labor camps there will be greater interest in centralized housing. One such camp is being considered for the Manzanola area.

For several years, an effort was made to establish a central farm labor camp at the U. S. Air Force installation located north of La Junta. This installation is now used for the Colorado Boys Ranch. According to the director of the La Junta area employment department office, there was insufficient interest by growers and processors to make the project successful.

Employment Department Inspections. In 1962, the employment department made an effort to inspect all farm labor housing in the state. These inspections were made pursuant to a U. S. Department of Labor regulation which gave the employment department the authority to refuse to provide interstate workers for growers where housing did not meet the minimum requirements and who did not correct deficiencies. The findings of these 1962 inspections in the Arkansas Valley are shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11

State Department of Employment
Housing Inspections, Arkansas Valley, 1962

	<u>Area Office</u>			<u>Total</u>
	<u>La Junta</u>	<u>Rocky Ford</u>	<u>Lamar</u>	
Number of units inspected	109	138	126	373
Good	59	13	56	128
Fair	50	36	47	133
Poor	---	11	23	34
Not Acceptable	---	78	---	78

The department found 21 per cent (or 78 housing units) unacceptable; all of these were located in the Rocky Ford area. When a unit is found unacceptable growers are given a list of deficiencies and requested to make the necessary improvements. No report is yet available on the correction of deficiencies in these 78 units. Almost nine per cent of the housing inspected in the Arkansas Valley was found to be poor; 133 units or 36 per cent were classified as fair; and 34 per cent were classified as good.

The standards used by the employment department include such items as floor space per worker, presence of screens and windows, distance of unit from water supply and toilet facilities. The department is not qualified to make, and does not make, sanitary inspections. This is a health department function. The employment department inspections do not apply to housing for migrants provided by non-growers, e.g., the Manzanola camp.

Prior to the establishment of the employment department inspection program, Empire Field Crops examined the housing of its members and encouraged improvement in the facilities provided.

Migrant Care of Housing. The field study revealed that, in some instances, migrant tenants had not taken care of their housing units, had damaged the property, and had scattered debris. By and large, this was not the case. The housing units of at least 90 per

cent of the migrants interviewed were kept in as good a condition as might be expected, considering the type of facility in which they were living. It is understandable that prior unpleasant experiences would make some growers reluctant to spend very much to improve migrant housing. A number of growers, who feel that housing would and should be improved, recommended the development of a program to instruct migrants in the proper use of facilities and the consequences of bad sanitation practices.

Otero County Health Department. The director of the Otero County Health Department, who is also a sanitarian, inspects migrant housing in the county as often as his schedule permits and has succeeded in getting some housing units improved and others destroyed. It was his opinion that he lacked adequate enforcement power, but this view was expressed prior to the adoption of the housing and sanitation regulations by the State Board of Public Health. He feels that there has been very little improvement in housing for migrants in the past two years despite his efforts and those of the employment department and Empire Field Crops.⁸

Health Programs and Needs

Migrant Nurse Program. During the growing season each year, the Otero County Health Department employs a nurse who works only with migrants. This program is financed with federal funds and has its counterparts in other areas of the state. Primary emphasis is placed on the health of migrant children, and an immunization program is provided. The nurse visits migrant families, presents movies in the different housing areas, and tries to carry out an educational program in conjunction with her other duties. The program has been accepted by both migrants and growers and has been quite successful within the limits imposed by funds, time, and personnel available.

Although both Bent and Prowers counties have public health nurses, Otero County has the only organized health department in the valley; thus, there are no special programs for migrants except in Otero County.

Health Needs. In December, 1961, the Otero County Medical Society held a joint meeting with growers, community leaders, and state and local health department officials. At this meeting, discussion centered on the development of a study of migrant health needs. It was felt that such a study was needed before a meaningful migrant health program could be established. This study has been conducted during the 1962 growing season, and it is hoped that it will lead to the establishment of an outpatient clinic for migrant workers and their families. It is expected that initially the clinic will stress treatment of chronic ailments, because of the general lack of medical attention provided migrants.

8. Legislative Council Hospital and Medical Care Committee, Meeting of September 13, 1962, Otero County Court House, La Junta.

The director of the Otero County Health Department, in commenting on migrant health and medical needs, stated that most of their illnesses were chronic rather than communicable. He cited malnutrition as a common problem. There are some communicable diseases prevalent, such as tuberculosis and intestinal infections. There is more day-to-day illness among migrants than among other farm workers. Often they tolerate a condition which needs medical attention, because they don't know where to go or what to do about it.⁹

The need for an occupational health program has been recognized by the Otero County Health Department. It is hoped that information on occupational health problems can be gathered, when and if the outpatient clinic is established.

Education and Welfare

Migrant Schools

The only migrant summer school program in the Arkansas Valley is held in Rocky Ford. The school has been in operation for seven years. During the first year, there were 50 children enrolled, and this number has increased to 105 during the 1962 season. School usually starts at the end of May and continues through the first week of July. In 1961, the school had five teachers and a full-time nurse, in addition to the principal.

The school covers a wide area -- from the Pueblo County line on the west to the Swink camp on the east. Three school bus routes are maintained to transport migrant youngsters to and from the school. The children are placed in the five classes according to their educational achievement rather than age. A number of them have been in the Rocky Ford migrant school for several years. Often these children have not been to school elsewhere during the year. The school principal is of the opinion that some migrant families return to the Rocky Ford area each year because of the school. When the school was first established, many parents were reluctant to send their children, and it often took several visits by the principal before they would be willing for their children to go to school. Although an occasional parent still balks at enrolling his children in the summer school, generally the program is accepted.

The Rocky Ford school program was considered to be one of the best in the state by the Migrant Labor Committee. The school has been successful in several ways:

- 1) Many children overcome the handicaps caused by an inadequate knowledge of English, and many improve considerably their grade achievement level.

- 2) The summer school experience encourages many of them to attend school during the regular school year whenever possible.

9. Ibid.

3) The children receive an introduction to Anglo society and culture without destroying their Spanish background.

4) The children learn about cleanliness and nutrition. (They eat lunch at the school, take showers twice a week, and brush their teeth daily.)

Lamar Area. There appears to be a sufficient number of migrant families in the Lamar -- Granada area during the time that the Rocky Ford migrant school is open to justify the establishment of a school in or near Lamar. This possibility of establishing a migrant school in the area was discussed at the June 6 meeting of the Migrant Labor Committee in Lamar. There was little interest expressed, even though the school would be financed by state funds.

Regular School Attendance

Migrant children were encouraged to attend regular school sessions in the Rocky Ford area, even before state reimbursements were available. During the 1961-1962 school year, 55 migrant children were reported as having attended during the regular term (either in the late spring or early fall). No other school district in the Arkansas Valley reported attendance by migrant children during the 1961-1962 regular school year. Most migrant families leave the area before the start of the school year in September; so very little attendance during the fall should be expected. In the spring, however, there is a considerable number of families in the area before school is out. It is doubtful, however, whether many of the migrant children would gain much benefit from attending three to six days at the end of the school term.

Migrant Attitude Toward Education

The migrant families interviewed were asked how many years of school did they wish their children to have. The responses indicate that the migrants recognize the value of education for their children, even though they, themselves, may have had little, if any, formal education. Almost 60 per cent of those who were asked this question said that they would like their children to complete the 12th grade. Included in this group were three-fourths of those who had no formal education. Only 10 per cent had no opinion as to how many years of formal education their children should have. With one exception, all of the rest thought their children should have at least eight years of school, and eight per cent thought their children should have education beyond the high school level. The attitude of migrants in the Arkansas Valley toward the amount of formal education their children should have is shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children,
Arkansas Valley, 1961

Migrant's Years of School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend				
	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>12+</u>	<u>No Opinion</u>
0		3	15		2
1		1			
2		3		1	
3	1	4	6		2
4		2	4	1	1
5		4	2	1	2
6			6	3	1
7			4		
8			3		
9			2		
10			3		
Total	<u>1</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>8</u>

Welfare

With the exception of a cash payment of \$2.00 (reason unspecified) in Prowers County, no emergency welfare assistance for migrants in the Arkansas Valley has been reported for the 1961 and 1962 growing seasons. The director of the Otero County Welfare Department told the Migrant Labor Committee that very few migrants are stranded in the area and that Otero County has not provided for emergency aid, because the county's general assistance funds are limited.¹⁰ He recommended that federal or state funds be provided for this purpose, because a county should not have to assume this burden for non-residents.¹¹

Day Care. There are no organized day care programs for preschool migrant children in the Arkansas Valley. If both parents are working, either these younger children are taken to the fields with their parents or left in the care of a slightly older child. The dispersion of housing for migrants throughout the valley would necessitate an extensive transportation program (similar to that of the Rocky Ford school), if day care centers were to be successful.

The Migrant

All of the migrant workers in the Arkansas Valley are Spanish-American. Most of them come from the Rio Grande Valley in Texas, a few from other parts of Texas, and the remainder from the Taos area in Northern New Mexico.

10. Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee, Rocky Ford Meeting, June 5, 1961.

11. Ibid.

One hundred migrant interviews were conducted in the Arkansas Valley during June and the first two weeks in July, 1961. These 100 interviews covered 240 workers and 496 people in all. Seventy-eight interviews were conducted with family members and 22 with single workers. Information on the number of interviews is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13
Number of Migrant Interviews
and the Number of Workers and People Included,
Arkansas Valley, June-July, 1961

	Male Over <u>16</u>	Female Over <u>16</u>	Children Under <u>16</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of Interviews	91	9	---	100
Number of Workers	138	71	31	240
Number of People	138	106	253	496

The Migrant Generally

It is difficult to draw a composite picture of the Arkansas Valley migrant worker; some general observations may be made, however. If he is the head of a family, he is probably between 35 and 40 years of age and his wife is ten years younger. He has been a migratory worker for nine years before the 1961 growing season but has spent only two previous summers working in Colorado. He is a seasonal farm worker because he has no other job skills and would otherwise be unemployed. His lack of other job skills is explained largely by the fact that he has only a sixth grade education. He probably has four or five children, and both his wife and his children have come with him to Colorado.

His home state is probably Texas, but he may have come from New Mexico. He obtained his present employment by one of three methods: 1) through the employer directly (either for the first time or by returning to his place of employment during the previous season); 2) through his crew leader or a labor contractor; or 3) through the department of employment in Colorado or in his home state. Both he and his wife are working, and perhaps one or two of his children are employed in the fields from time to time as well.

He and his family probably came to the Arkansas Valley in May, but he might have come in the latter part of April. If he came in May, he will stay two to three months. If he arrived in April, he may work for a longer period before leaving the valley. More than likely he will leave the valley in July or no later than early August. The chances are two in three that he will return to his home state. If he is going elsewhere to seek work, it is more likely to be in another state than in another area of Colorado. It may be a state close to Colorado, such as Oklahoma or Nebraska, but he may go further east to Wisconsin, Michigan or Ohio. Even California or Florida may be his

next stop, but this is not likely. If he stays in Colorado, he will work either in the San Luis Valley or Northern Colorado, but there is a slim possibility he may go to the Grand Junction area for fruit harvest. If he prefers working in Colorado and plans to return, he lists weather, type of crop, treatment by growers, wages, housing, and the length of growing season, in that order, as his reasons. If he does not like working in Colorado and plans not to return, it is because of wages and housing primarily.

During the winter months, if he was employed at all, it probably was as a farm laborer. He probably worked between seven and 10 weeks during the winter and earned between \$300 and \$400.

He and his family traveled to Colorado either by truck or passenger car. He probably brought himself and his family, but they may have traveled with a crew leader, relatives, or friends. The chances are excellent that he came to Colorado primarily for pre-harvest work in sugar beets. If he did, either he or his crew leader received a travel advance. In some instances, he may have received a travel advance from a labor contractor.

The chances are one in two that he owns his home in his state of residence. His house has electricity and running water, but he is less likely to have hot water, and the chances are slim that he has a shower. The chances are five to one that he has an outside privy rather than indoor plumbing and three to one that he has an icebox rather than an electric refrigerator. He probably also owns his own car or truck, and it is likely to be at least five years old and may be 10 years old or more. He is probably making time payments on his vehicle, especially if it is less than five years old.

Single Migrants. The single migrant worker in the Arkansas Valley is between 20 and 25 years of age and has been a migrant worker for four years prior to the 1961 growing season, which would be his third spent in Colorado. His reasons for being a seasonal farm laborer are the same as those of the family head. On the average, he has had one more year of school than the married migrant worker. With few exceptions, his home state is Texas. Otherwise, he comes from New Mexico.

He obtained employment in the Arkansas Valley in the same way as the married migrant worker. He arrived in the valley in late April or early May and plans to work three or four months but might stay as long as six months if work is available. He will probably return to his home state, but if he seeks employment elsewhere it may be either in the San Luis Valley or Northern Colorado, unless he leaves the state. If he leaves Colorado, he is most likely to go to Michigan, Oregon, or Oklahoma.

If he prefers to work in Colorado and plans to return the following year it is because of wages, weather, and type of crop. Wages and housing are listed in that order as the reasons why he does not like to work in Colorado and does not plan to return.

He probably did not work during the winter months, but if he did, more than likely he was a farm laborer, worked about four weeks, and earned between \$140 and \$150.

He traveled to Colorado either by truck or car, but if he came by truck it was usually with friends or relatives. He probably received a travel advance if he came to Colorado for sugar beet pre-harvest work.

Statistical Information. The following tables contain some of the information from the questionnaires upon which the above summaries were based:

TABLE 14
 Years as a Migrant Worker,
 Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961

<u>Years</u> No Previous Work	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	1	1	2
2	2		2
3	6	4	10
4	5	5	10
5	4	1	5
6	3	4	7
7	2		2
8	4	2	6
9	6	2	8
10	6		6
11 to 15	6		6
16 to 20	11	2	13
21 to 25	5	1	6
26 to 30	8		8
Over 31	6		6
Not Known	2		2
Totals	<u>78</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>100</u>

TABLE 15

Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado,
Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961

<u>Years</u> Not in Colorado Before	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Total</u>
	26	4	30
1	7	4	11
2	7	5	12
3	10	4	14
4	6	3	9
5	2	1	3
6	5		5
7	4	1	5
8	3		3
9	1		1
10	2		2
11 to 15	3		3
16 to 20	2		2
21 to 25			
26 to 30			
Over 31			
Totals	<u>78</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>100</u>

TABLE 16

Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or Not Work
In Colorado, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Family</u>		<u>Single</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Wages	27	13	8	3	35	16
Housing	17	6	3	2	20	8
Type of Crops	23	1	5		28	1
Length of Season	16	1	4		20	1
Treatment	13	1	3		16	1
Community Attitude	15		3		18	
Weather	43	5	7	1	50	6
Other	4		3	1	7	1
Total ^a	<u>158</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>194</u>	<u>34</u>

a. Multiple reasons given by some interviewees.

TABLE 17

Return to Colorado Next Year,
Arkansas Valley Interviews, 1961

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Family</u>		<u>Single</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Wages	36	7	8	3	44	10
Housing	19	4	2	2	21	6
Type of Crops	31		4		35	
Treatment	28		4		32	
Community Attitude	47		4		51	
Other	4	3	4	1	8	4
Total ^a	165	14	26	6	191	20

a. Multiple reasons given by some interviewees.

TABLE 18

Areas to which Migrants Expected to Travel
to Find Employment After Leaving the Arkansas Valley,
Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

<u>State or Area</u>	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Total</u>
California	1		1
Florida	2		2
Indiana	1		1
Kansas	1		1
Michigan	1	1	2
Nebraska	1		1
New Mexico	6		6
Ohio	1		1
Oklahoma	5	2	7
Oregon	1	1	2
Texas	30	6	36
Wisconsin	4		4
Northern Colorado	8	2	10
San Luis Valley	5	2	7
Western Slope	1		1
Return to Home State ^a	26	14	40
Total ^b	94	28	122

a. Will not seek further employment.

b. Total exceeds number of interviews, because some migrants indicated they would work in more than one area.

TABLE 19

Winter Jobs of Arkansas Valley Migrants
in 1960, Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

<u>Type of Job</u>	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Total</u>
Farm	34	5	39
Factory	8	1	9
Housework	--	--	--
Odd Jobs	10	1	11
No Work	13	9	22
Other	16	6	22
Total ^a	81	22	103

a. Answers do not total 100 because of multiple jobs worked at during the winter.

TABLE 20

Weeks Worked and Total Winter Earnings
of Arkansas Valley Migrants, 1960;
Arkansas Valley Migrant Interviews, 1961

	<u>Weeks Worked</u>		<u>Total Earnings</u>	
	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>
Mean	9.4	4.2	\$ 384.42	\$151.83
Median	7	4	240.00	140.00
Low	0	0	0	0
High	22	20	2,160.00	325.00

The Migrant and the Community

Community Attitudes

There is very little organized community interest in the migrant in the Arkansas Valley. The migrants' annual appearance during growing season is accepted as a usual occurrence, and not much concern is expressed. Nevertheless, the public programs in operation, such as the migrant school in Rocky Ford and the Otero County Health Department's migrant nurse program, are generally accepted, if not actively supported. Empire Field Crops has tried to improve migrant housing and make improvements at the Swink camp.

As can be seen from these comments, most of the interest in migrant problems is in the Rocky Ford -- La Junta area. With the exception of the mayor of Holly, very few of the public officials and community leaders in the eastern part of the valley feel that the migrant needs any special assistance programs. The mayor of Holly expressed his concern and that of the city council's over the condition

of some of the housing units within the city limits. These units are inhabited by both residents and migrants, and Holly has embarked upon an urban renewal program to replace this substandard housing.

Organized Programs. The only non-public organized program for migrants is the one maintained by the Migrant Ministry in the Rocky Ford area. Each summer, a team of two or three workers come into the area to operate a traveling recreational program for migrant children. This team travels to the various housing concentrations, shows movies, conducts games, and loans toys and books to children. The Rocky Ford Council of Churches has operated a secondhand store for migrants, at which clothing and cooking utensils may be purchased at nominal prices. The Catholic Church in Rocky Ford is also very much concerned about migrant workers, and the local priests do all they can to provide assistance.

Law Enforcement Problems. Interviews with law enforcement officials throughout the Arkansas Valley (police chiefs and sheriffs) indicate that the migrant very seldom gets into trouble with the law, especially those workers who come to the valley with their families. Contrary to popular opinion, these workers are not heavy drinkers.

SAN LUIS VALLEY

Crop Activities and Acreage

Crops Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor

Potatoes, lettuce, and spinach (in that order) are the major crops for which seasonal farm labor is needed in the San Luis Valley. Other crops requiring lesser amounts of seasonal farm labor include: peas, cauliflower, cabbage, carrots, and radishes.

Potatoes. The San Luis Valley (Rio Grande County in particular) is the major potato producing area in the state.¹ In 1960, the last year for which statistics are available, the San Luis Valley had 69 per cent of the state's potato acreage and almost 70 per cent of production. Rio Grande County ranks among the top eight potato producing counties in the United States. Table 21 shows potato acreage and production by county in the San Luis Valley in 1960.

TABLE 21

Potatoes Planted and Harvested,
San Luis Valley 1960^a

<u>County</u>	<u>Acres Planted</u>	<u>Acres Harvested</u>	<u>Cost per Acre</u>	<u>Production Costs</u>	<u>Value Dollars</u>
Alamosa	5,680	5,450	210	1,144,500	\$2,323,335
Conejos	4,610	4,520	215	971,800	1,914,446
Costilla	2,550	2,500	215	537,500	1,064,250
Rio Grande	20,910	20,500	211	4,333,200	8,753,846
Saguache	6,050	5,930	225	1,334,250	3,681,842
Total	39,800	38,900	214	8,321,250	\$16,737,719

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1962.

Other Vegetables. More than 90 per cent of Colorado's lettuce acreage is in the San Luis Valley, primarily in Costilla County. Costilla County also has approximately two-thirds of the state's spinach acreage. The valley has almost 90 per cent of the state's acreage planted in green peas for market. Other vegetable crops for which the San Luis Valley's acreage constitutes at least 30 per cent of the state's total include: cabbage, carrots, and cauliflower.

Commercial vegetable acreage, except potatoes, in the San Luis Valley in 1960 is shown in Table 22.

1. Weld County's acreage exceeds that of each San Luis Valley county except Rio Grande. As a whole, the valley has almost three times as much potato acreage as Weld County.

TABLE 22

Commercial Vegetables, Acres Harvested
for Market, San Luis Valley, 1960^a

County	Cabbage	Carrots	Cauliflower	Lettuce	Green		Total
					Peas	Spinach	
Alamosa	350	10	140	800	70	50	1,420
Conejos	40		40	800	600	50	1,530
Costilla	250	350	90	2,400	80	1,540	4,710
Rio Grande	10		10	700	70	30	820
Saguache	10			900	30		940
Total	660	450	280	5,600	850	1,670	9,420

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1960 Final, 1961 Preliminary,
Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1962.

Crop Values. Potatoes are the most important crop grown in the valley as far as value is concerned. This is true in each valley county, except Costilla, where lettuce and spinach are more important. Table 23 shows the comparison of values for potatoes, all other vegetables, and other crops in the San Luis Valley in 1959, the last year for which these data are available.

TABLE 23

Comparison of Values
for Potatoes, All Other Vegetables, and Other Crops
San Luis Valley, 1959^a

County	Potatoes	Other Vegetables	Other Crops ^b
	Value \$	Value \$	Value \$
Alamosa	\$ 1,541,050	\$ 456,925	\$ 275,434
Conejos	1,455,210	471,673	707,617
Costilla	835,550	2,470,321	228,475
Rio Grande	7,425,389	149,616	730,833
Saguache	1,826,000	207,818	526,676
Total	\$13,084,199	\$3,456,354	\$2,469,035

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final, 1960 Preliminary,
Colorado Department of Agriculture, April 1961.

b. Corn, spring wheat, oats and barley.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

Potatoes. During the decade 1950-1960, potato acreage in the San Luis Valley increased slightly more than 20 per cent. Potato acreage in Alamosa County increased 56 per cent during the 10-year

period, and 28 per cent in Costilla County; no valley county had a decrease. Potato acreage increased at a much greater rate in the valley than in the rest of the state. In 1950, the valley had 59 per cent of the state's potato acreage as compared with 69 per cent in 1960. During the same period, production increased almost 40 per cent in the San Luis Valley as compared with slightly less than 10 per cent for the state as a whole.

Other Vegetables. Total acreage in vegetables for commercial market in the San Luis Valley decreased almost 22 per cent from 1950 to 1960, even though lettuce and spinach acreage increased substantially. The change was most noticeable in Costilla County, where lettuce acreage increased from 500 to 2,400 and spinach acreage from 50 to 1,540. During the same period cabbage acreage in Costilla County decreased from 800 to 250 and cauliflower from 850 to 90.

Cauliflower acreage decreased substantially for the valley as a whole, from 1,950 to 280 acres, or almost 86 per cent. Another crop which had greatly reduced acreage during the 10-year period was green peas. Acreage decreased from 3,150 to 850; most of this decrease was in Conejos County. The availability of and public preference for frozen peas has virtually eliminated the fresh pea market, and this is the major reason why pea acreage has been so greatly reduced. This may also be the reason for the reduction in cauliflower acreage, but no specific comments were made about the decrease in cauliflower acreage during the field interviews.

Change in Number and Size of Farms. The number of farms in the San Luis Valley decreased 30 per cent between 1950 and 1960. The greatest decrease was in Costilla County where there were 468 farms in 1950 and only 240 in 1960 (a decrease of almost 49 per cent). Conejos and Alamosa counties also had a substantial reduction in the number of farms. During the same period, there was also an increase of almost 38 per cent in farm size in the valley as a whole. The greatest increases were in Saguache, Costilla, and Conejos counties. The changes in the number and size of farms in the San Luis Valley from 1950 to 1960 is shown by county in Table 24.

TABLE 24

Number of Farms and Median Size,
San Luis Valley, 1950 and 1960^a

County	Number of Farms			Median Farm Size (In Acres)		
	1950	1960	Pct. of Change	1950	1960	Pct. of Change
Alamosa	440	338	-23.2%	224	380	+ 69.6%
Conejos	872	542	-37.9	129	243	88.3
Costilla	468	240	-48.8	49	105	114.2
Rio Grande	593	496	-16.4	238	334	40.3
Saguache	345	293	-15.1	398	854	114.6
Total	2,718	1,909	-29.8%	239	329	+ 37.6%

a. Federal Census Data.

Mechanization and Technological Change

Only 15 to 20 per cent of the potato harvest in the San Luis Valley is mechanized, and most of the mechanization is concentrated in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. Growers have been reluctant to mechanize because of rocks and the lumpy condition of the soil. Usually, if a grower intends to mechanize his harvest activities, he will derock his field as much as possible before planting. During harvest, he will have a crew separating the rocks from the potatoes as they move along the conveyor belt. While this procedure does not completely eliminate hand labor, it reduces the need for such labor approximately 50 per cent. A potato picking machine has been developed which removes the potatoes from the rocks by application of forced air. This machine was being used on an experimental basis during the 1961 growing season.

Some potato growers who are using mechanical pickers are still sacking their potatoes in 100 pound bags in the field, an operation which requires considerable hand labor both in the field and at the warehouse.

An alternative would be to load the potatoes in large boxes or directly on a truck with a specially-designed loader bed. The potatoes could either be stored in bulk or packaged at the warehouse, with considerably less hand labor and time involved. The manager of one of the potato storage plants in the San Luis Valley and a staff member at the San Luis Valley Agricultural Extension Experiment Station both advocated bulk handling and storage of potatoes. Both had been in Idaho recently and said this method had been widely adopted there. Some growers stated the two major deterrents to adoption of bulk handling and storage of potatoes are: 1) the cost of the equipment necessary; and 2) the changes required in present storage plants to make conversion to bulk storage possible.

While only a small portion of the potato harvest is now mechanized, a few of the growers with substantial potato acreage have predicted that the harvest will be entirely mechanized in a few years.

Other Vegetables. There has been no mechanization and very little technological change in the other vegetable crops grown in the San Luis Valley. In California and Arizona, there has been some use of pelletized lettuce seed and some experimentation with mechanical blocking and thinning. The growers with whom this subject was discussed were unanimous in their opinion that pelletized lettuce seed could not be used successfully in the San Luis Valley because of soil conditions and the difficulty in determining the proper planting depth. One processor commented that if pelletized seed could be adapted for use in the valley, it would reduce labor costs.

San Luis Valley growers are at a disadvantage in comparison with California, Arizona, and Rio Grande Valley (Texas) growers of the same crops with respect to research and experimentation on mechanical and technological improvements. In these other areas, crop acreage is very large and the growing season quite long, so that equipment and chemical companies conduct extensive research programs at no expense to the growers. The results of these research programs may have some general application, but their applicability is mostly for the areas in which the research was conducted. Differences in soil conditions, weather, length of growing season, altitude, and variety of crops are all reasons why it is impossible to adopt in the San Luis Valley an

innovation developed in California. The San Luis Valley growers have no such large scale research sources available to them, which is one reason why mechanization and technological change is slower in the valley than in some areas in other states growing the same crops.

The Grower -- Problems and Attitudes

The San Luis Valley has been suffering from an economic decline, which is illustrated in part by the decrease in the number of farms during the past 10 years. There are no subsidies or price guarantees on the crops grown in the San Luis Valley for which seasonal labor is needed. In other areas, the Arkansas Valley for example, the growers who raise sugar beets or vegetables for processing have been able to contract acreage and price agreements with the sugar and canning companies. Almost all of the potatoes and all of the other vegetable crops (lettuce, spinach, cabbage, cauliflower, carrots, etc.) grown in the San Luis Valley are grown for the fresh food market, which can be quite unstable.

Further, San Luis Valley vegetable growers are competing with other areas which have longer growing seasons, better climate, and extensive acreage (Rio Grande Valley, Texas; Imperial Valley and Stockton area, California; and Arizona). Potato growers are competing with Idaho, North Dakota, and California; and in these states, mechanization has been extensive and the number and capacity of potato processing plants are on the increase.

Within this context, it is understandable that many growers feel they have little control over costs and prices. Some of them are trying to add to their acreage as quickly as possible, recognizing that their survival depends on large acreage and efficient operation with the hope that greater volume will offset lower per unit profits. One of the areas in which growers, at least as a group, can exercise some control is the wage level. This area of discretion, however, is circumscribed by the minimum rate set for Mexican nationals. This rate, as discussed in the preceding chapter, tends also to be the wage for domestic workers.

Many San Luis Valley growers defend the utilization of Mexican nationals (even though there is considerable local unemployment) on the grounds that local workers have been quite undependable in recent years. In interviews and in testimony at the Migrant Labor Committee's hearings in Alamosa and Monte Vista, several growers stated that: 1) Local workers often do not show up for work for two or three days at a time. 2) Their work performance often is not satisfactory, even when they do show up. 3) Many local workers are not sufficiently skilled to do an adequate job during lettuce harvest. 4) During peak harvest periods (especially potato harvest), there is an insufficient labor supply even if all available local workers are employed.

Many of these same growers were quick to add, however, that their criticism did not apply to all local workers. These growers said that they had a number of local workers who were satisfactory and reliable and who were employed on a steady basis. Critics of the growers' attitudes toward local workers told the committee and field

interviewers that many locals did not wish to work or did not perform as well as they might because of low wage scales. The growers' response was that they could not afford to pay higher wages, especially when work performance was not adequate.

Because of the perishable nature of the crops grown, San Luis Valley growers need an assured supply of dependable labor when harvest is ready. The growers' attitudes toward seasonal farm labor, therefore, are conditioned by the availability and dependability of labor, as well as market and general economic conditions. While many individual growers are concerned about housing and other social conditions for their workers and their families, there is no organized program aimed at the general improvement of these conditions. It is recognized that a large number of domestic migrants are needed on an annual basis to augment the local labor supply, and their presence in and around valley communities and farms is more or less taken for granted. Some growers might wish to do more for their workers but feel that they are financially unable to do so. Other growers become so involved, of necessity, in the problems of crop production and prices that they have little time to give much thought to their migrant workers, other than as part of the production process.

Some growers stated that it was unrealistic to place such great emphasis on improving conditions for migrants when many local residents live in substandard housing and accept social conditions which are the same as those confronted by the migrant.

General Economic Conditions

During the past 10 to 12 years, the population of the San Luis Valley has declined almost 20 per cent. Three of the valley counties (Alamosa, Conejos, and Costilla) have been declared distressed areas for the purposes of redevelopment assistance. The economic and social conditions for some of the valley's residents, as pointed out above, are about the same as those generally thought of as applying to migratory workers. There are several rural slum areas in the valley, the most notable being the Lariat area located west of Monte Vista.

There has been an organized effort, especially in the northern part of the valley (Rio Grande and Saguache counties) to bring in new industry. Two potato starch plants have been opened in the Monte Vista area as a result of these efforts. These plants operate about nine months a year and employ 15 to 20 persons each. An attempt is also being made to interest potato processing firms in opening plants in the area. The possibility of establishing potato processing plants has become greater since natural gas has become available in the valley.

Some of the persons interviewed who were concerned with the valley's economic development expressed the opinion that it would be feasible to establish a frozen food processing plant for potatoes and green vegetables. At the present time, the valley has no outlet for its vegetable crops except the fresh market, which is not noted for its stability.

A number of growers indicated their pessimism over the possibilities of establishing a frozen food plant. They stated that Birdseye considered the proposition a number of years ago and rejected it. This, they felt, ended the matter. Transportation, the establishment of markets, and the length of the growing season are all factors which would have a bearing on the feasibility of such a plant. An Alamosa Chamber of Commerce official said that in 1960 there had been a possibility of having a frozen food processing plant for potatoes established in La Jara. According to this official, there was very little local interest in the project and some opposition, so the matter was dropped.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers -- Peak Employment Periods

In the Alamosa area (Alamosa, Conejos, Costilla counties) there is not much employment of seasonal farm labor until the third week in May. This number increases steadily until the third or fourth week in July and holds at this level through most of August (lettuce and spinach harvests). Then there is a gradual decline until the end of September when there is an increase for potato harvest. The late season peak is not quite as large as the early one (2,400 as compared with 2,500 workers).

Between 800 and 900 seasonal farm workers are employed in the Monte Vista area (Rio Grande and Saguache counties) during May. This number usually increases to 1,000 in June; 1,200 in July; 1,300 in August; and 1,400 by the middle of September. During the potato harvest (late September through the middle of October), the number of seasonal farm workers varies from 3,800 to almost 5,700.

The reason for the difference in seasonal employment patterns between north and south parts of the San Luis Valley can be explained by the fact that less than 15 per cent of the commercial vegetable acreage in the valley is in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. On the other hand, two-thirds of the valley's potato acreage is in these two counties.

Table 25 shows the number of seasonal farm workers reported by the Alamosa and Monte Vista area employment department offices for selected weeks in 1961 and 1962. Also shown is the number of Mexican nationals, local workers, intrastate workers, and interstate migrants reported as employed during the weeks selected.

Employment of Locals. During 1961 and 1962, locals accounted for between 40 and 55 per cent of the seasonal farm labor force in the months of May and June for the valley as a whole. From July through August, approximately 40 per cent of the seasonal work force was local. The proportion of locals in the seasonal labor force decreased to approximately 36 per cent during potato harvest, because of labor needs which required a large number of outside workers.

TABLE 25

Seasonal Farm Labor in the San Luis Valley
by Type of Workers for Selected Weeks, 1961-1962

Week	Alamosa				Monte Vista				Total			
	1961		1962		1961		1962		1961		1962	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
<u>June (4th week)</u>												
Mexican Nationals	394	36.4%	645	52.0%	241	23.4%	140	21.1%	635	30.1%	785	41.2%
Locals	580	53.6	455	36.7	614	59.6	350	52.6	1,194	56.5	805	42.3
Intrastate	---	---	30	2.4	75	7.3	75	11.3	75	3.5	105	5.5
Interstate	109	10.0	110	8.9	100	9.7	100	15.0	209	9.9	210	11.0
Total	1,083	100.0%	1,240	100.0%	1,030	100.0%	665	100.0%	2,113	100.0%	1,905	100.0%
<u>July (4th week)</u>												
Mexican Nationals	940	36.7%	1,270	31.3%	146	12.1%	161	15.1%	1,086	28.8%	1,431	40.4%
Locals	1,132	44.2	842	34.0	840	69.7	647	60.6	1,972	52.3	1,489	42.0
Intrastate	240	9.4	75	3.0	110	9.1	100	9.4	350	9.3	175	4.9
Interstate	250	9.7	290	11.7	110	9.1	160	14.9	360	9.6	450	12.7
Total	2,562	100.0%	2,477	100.0%	1,206	100.0%	1,068	100.0%	3,768	100.0%	3,545	100.0%
<u>August (3rd week)</u>												
Mexican Nationals	1,017	49.9%	1,228	64.7%	289	22.4%	124	10.7%	1,306	39.3%	1,595	34.6%
Locals	619	30.4	370	19.5	770	59.7	680	58.4	1,389	41.8	2,159	46.8
Intrastate	150	7.4	50	2.6	120	9.3	170	14.6	270	8.1	390	8.4
Interstate	250	12.3	250	13.2	110	8.6	190	16.3	360	10.8	470	10.2
Total	2,036	100.0%	1,898	100.0%	1,289	100.0%	1,164	100.0%	3,325	100.0%	4,614	100.0%
<u>Sept. (4th week)</u>												
Mexican Nationals	615	25.6%	540	22.5%	152	3.2%	232	5.0%	767	10.6%	772	11.0%
Locals	600	25.0	850	35.4	1,800	37.3	1,600	34.6	2,400	33.2	245	34.9
Intrastate	678	28.2	150	6.2	500	10.4	600	13.0	1,178	16.3	750	10.7
Interstate	510	21.2	860	35.9	2,370	49.1	2,190	47.4	2,880	39.9	3,050	43.4
Total	2,403	100.0%	2,400	100.0%	4,822	100.0%	4,622	100.0%	7,225	100.0%	7,022	100.0%
<u>October (2nd week)</u>												
Mexican Nationals	278	15.0%	139	11.1%	81	1.7%	64	1.5%	359	5.5%	203	3.7%
Locals	500	27.0	568	45.2	1,800	38.9	1,400	32.9	2,300	35.5	1,968	35.7
Intrastate	525	28.4	10	7.9	500	10.8	500	11.8	1,025	15.8	600	10.9
Interstate	548	29.6	450	35.8	2,250	48.6	2,288	53.8	2,798	43.2	2,738	49.7
Total	1,851	100.0%	1,257	100.0%	4,631	100.0%	4,252	100.0%	6,482	100.0%	5,509	100.0%

Except for potato harvest and the months of May and June, the proportion of locals employed in the Monte Vista area was approximately twice that of the Alamosa area. During the past two years there has been a decrease in the number of locals employed during the growing season, as compared with 1960 and preceding years.

Mexican Nationals. There was an increase of approximately 60 per cent in the number of Mexican nationals employed in the San Luis Valley during the months May through August from 1960 to 1961. The increase from 1961 to 1962 in the number of Mexican nationals employed during the same period was approximately 20 per cent. Almost all of this increase was concentrated in the Alamosa area (Alamosa, Conejos, and Costilla counties). During these months, Mexican nationals constituted 22 per cent of the total seasonal farm labor force in 1960, 33 per cent in 1961, and 38 per cent in 1962.

Interstate Workers. The number of interstate workers employed in the San Luis Valley decreased almost two-thirds between 1960 and 1961 and approximately 60 per cent between 1960 and 1962 during the months of May through August. This decrease was concentrated primarily in the Alamosa area. Interstate workers accounted for 27 per cent of the seasonal farm labor force during these months in 1960 and between 10 and 12 per cent in 1961 and 1962.

Employment Department Statistics. The employment department area offices in the San Luis Valley rely, primarily, on the San Luis Valley Growers' Association for estimates of the number of seasonal farm workers employed and do not make field counts, as do offices in some other areas. For this reason, the department estimates may be low. For example, during the 1961 growing season, the employment department estimates show a weekly average of 252 interstate workers in the Alamosa area and 107 in the Monte Vista area. During the same period, 116 interstate migrants were interviewed, and field observations indicate that there were at least 300 Filipino custom lettuce workers in the valley.

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment -- Crops Other Than Potatoes

Involved in the recruitment process are the department of employment, the San Luis Valley Growers' Association, a lettuce contractor, and several of the larger growers. There is only one independent labor contractor in the valley, and he was not operating any crews during the 1961 growing season.

San Luis Valley Growers' Assn. The San Luis Valley Growers' Association had 82 members during the 1961 growing season. The association serves as the contracting agency for Mexican nationals, although only 12 of its members use them. Each grower using Mexican nationals pays the association an initial charge of \$20 per bracero. This charge includes the cost of transporting a national to the valley from El Paso (\$7.00). The grower using nationals contracted by the association also pays \$.05 per hour per national, from which the association purchases the necessary insurance and provides transportation back to El Paso at the end of the contract period.

The association does not recruit domestic workers directly but depends on the employment department for this function. The department refers all domestic workers (local, intrastate, and interstate) to the association, which, in turn, refers them to individual growers. During July and August 1961, a number of domestic workers coming into the area bypassed the employment department and came to the association directly to obtain jobs.

The director of the association is also director of a growers' association in Arizona, and, except for the lettuce growing season in the valley, spends his time in that state. On occasion, the Colorado association will recontract braceros after their contract period has terminated in Arizona. The recontracting process may also work in reverse, i.e., from Colorado to Arizona. The association also may recontract braceros who have been employed in other areas of Colorado -- mostly around Ft. Lupton.

Brown and Martin. Brown and Martin are lettuce contractors who operate in several states, primarily Arizona and Colorado. In 1961, Brown and Martin had 1,100 acres of lettuce under contract in the San Luis Valley.² They are members of both the San Luis Valley and Arizona growers' associations and obtain Mexican national labor through these organizations. They often recontract the nationals employed in one of the two states to work in the other. They usually do not recruit domestic workers directly but work through the employment department and/or the growers' association.

Employment Department. The employment department's out-of-state recruitment for the San Luis Valley for crops other than potatoes is confined generally to northern New Mexico, although it was working through the Arizona employment department to recruit labor in that state; the effort was largely unsuccessful. The department also refers locals and workers from other valley counties, if they contact the department. As far as could be ascertained from the field study, the department does not actively recruit local workers, at least not to the extent of making direct contacts.

Individual Growers. A few of the largest lettuce and spinach growers recruit their own domestic workers to some extent, at least within the valley. One of these growers experienced considerable difficulty in attempting to recruit in Texas a few years ago, including running afoul of some of the local laws pertaining to recruiting fees and licenses, and has not tried to recruit in Texas since that time. These few growers have buses and transport their own labor as needed, including Mexican nationals.

2. This lettuce is contracted on a 50/50 basis with growers. The grower furnishes the land, water, cultivation, and one-half of the fertilizer and insecticide needed. Brown and Martin provide the remainder of the fertilizer and insecticide, seed, all hand labor, and pack, cool, and ship the lettuce.

Filipino Lettuce Crews. There are a number of custom lettuce crews composed of skilled lettuce cutters of Filipino descent, most of whom are California natives. These crews follow the lettuce harvest throughout the western states and are in great demand because of their skill and speed in chopping and packing lettuce. At one time, more than 600 workers would travel in these crews, but it is estimated that there were only slightly more than 300 in Colorado in 1961. The number is decreasing, because second and third generation workers have left the crews either to obtain an education or to settle permanently in one of the western states. A number of Spanish-Americans from Texas have been taken with these crews as replacements and appear to have worked efficiently and to have fitted in with the crews' operations, even though some growers have commented that Spanish-American migrants are not particularly adept at lettuce cutting and harvesting.

Individual Workers and Families. A considerable number of domestic migrants from northern New Mexico, as well as workers from Costilla and Conejos counties, travel each year to the more northern counties in the valley to find seasonal employment and usually return to their previous employer without contacting either the employment department or the growers' association.

Recruitment -- Potatoes

The major source of outside workers for potato harvest include: New Mexico, Texas, the Navajo reservations in New Mexico and Arizona, and the southern part of the San Luis Valley (Costilla and Conejos counties). The major portion of the potato harvest is completed during a three-week period (last part of September and first part of October), and, at that time, as many as 7,500 workers may be needed, of whom 35-40 per cent are local workers. Very few Mexican nationals are employed during potato harvest, although the number has been increasing in recent years. The employment department works with the departments in surrounding states and with the Navajo Tribal Council to obtain a sufficient number of domestic migrants. Once the over-all arrangements are made, some growers go to the Navajo reservation and directly recruit and transport workers.

Many of the New Mexico workers and those from Costilla and Conejos counties return each year on their own to the same growers in Rio Grande and Saguache counties. Generally, the Texas workers seek employment in the potato fields in the southern part of the valley. According to the employment department, these workers prefer to be paid by the half-sack (50-lb.), which is the common practice in the southern three counties, rather than the full sack of 100 lb. (common practice in Rio Grande and Saguache counties). In 1961, some of these Texas workers came to the San Luis Valley from Northern Colorado, where they had been employed. Indians from three of the 19 New Mexico Pueblo tribes were also employed in the northern part of the valley during the 1961 harvest.

Utilization and Reallocation of Labor

It appears that the San Luis Valley Growers' Association has the major responsibility for the utilization and reallocation of labor, except during potato harvest. The employment department, as mentioned above, refers workers to the association for placement, and a number of workers bypass the employment department and contact the association directly. While the association probably controls a significant part of the labor supply, a few large growers and Brown and Martin operate more or less independently.

There are also workers, who operate more or less independently, seek their own employment and move from employer to employer as they see fit. Often this movement follows long established patterns. For example, there are a few crews from Center in Saguache County who pick peas each year near La Jara in Conejos County, even though: 1) there is employment available near Center, and Mexican nationals are brought in because of a labor shortage; and 2) there are unemployed workers in the La Jara area. The employment department did not know about this movement of workers, and the manager of the Monte Vista office indicated there was nothing he could do about coordinating this activity, because the workers were employed within the area covered by the Alamosa area, even though they traveled from the Monte Vista area.

Workers Who Leave the Area Early. Very few of the Spanish-Americans who work in other vegetables remain for potato harvest. The migrant questionnaires show that 18 per cent of the early interstate workers in the Alamosa area (southern three counties), exclusive of Filipinos, leave by July 30, and an additional 10 per cent leave by August 30. In the Monte Vista area (Rio Grande and Saguache counties), 21 per cent of the early interstate workers (exclusive of Filipinos) leave by July 30, and an additional three per cent leave by August 30.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to apply these proportions to the employment department's estimates of interstate workers with any high degree of accuracy, because the department's estimates were found by field observation to be low, and no satisfactory substitute estimate could be made from the field study. The questions can be raised, however, as to whether any effort is made to retain these workers and also whether any of them will remain (if fully employed) through potato harvest. Further, the pre-harvest season peak in the Arkansas Valley occurs sufficiently early so that, theoretically, workers leaving the area (who will not accept further employment in the Arkansas Valley) might be induced to work in the San Luis Valley or Northern Colorado. No workers from the Arkansas Valley were found in the San Luis Valley during the field survey.

An analysis was made of the 1961 employment department estimates of seasonal farm labor in the San Luis Valley during the month of August, 1961. This analysis showed that there was a decrease of more than 600 locals during the month in the Alamosa area, while over-all employment and the number of braceros increased in the Monte Vista area. Consequently, the question was raised with the employment department as to whether it would be feasible to establish a day-haul

program during this period from Alamosa to the Monte Vista area to utilize the locals who were no longer working in the Alamosa area. After checking these statistics, the employment department reported that most of these workers were employed for radish, carrot, and pea harvests. They were primarily women and children and would not be suitable for employment in lettuce in the Monte Vista area, lettuce harvest being the reason for the worker increase in that area. Further, many of these women and children were employed in the packing sheds at Blanca and Fort Garland after finishing their field work.³

There are no organized day hauls in the San Luis Valley, and, as pointed out above, no great effort has been made to recruit domestic workers or to relate the employment of those local workers who free-wheel to the over-all labor needs of the area.

Potato Harvest. While the employment department contacts Texas crews in Northern Colorado (with some success) to obtain potato harvest workers for the San Luis Valley, there is some question as to whether very many contacts are made in the Palisade area following peach harvest. Possibly, as many as 600 workers might be available in that area for employment elsewhere in Colorado at the conclusion of peach harvest. Only four of the Navajo workers interviewed in the San Juan Basin who were working there during bean harvest indicated that they were going to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest. Conversely, none of the Navajos interviewed during potato harvest in the San Luis Valley had been employed in the San Juan Basin.

Wage Rates and Earnings

The wage rates for seasonal agricultural labor in the San Luis Valley during the 1960 and 1961 growing seasons differed somewhat between the northern and southern counties; however, this difference was not as great as it had been in prior years, nor did it extend to all crops. Prior to the 1962 order of the Secretary of Labor which established the minimum wage for braceros at \$.90 per hour, the southern portions of the San Luis Valley and the Arkansas Valley were the lowest agricultural wage areas in the state. In 1960, the wage rate for pre-harvest activities in the southern three counties in the San Luis Valley was \$.65. This rate also prevailed at the beginning of the 1961 growing season but shifted to \$.75 an hour at approximately the same time that the 1961 ruling of the Secretary of Labor established the minimum rate for braceros at \$.75 an hour. In the northern two counties, hourly wage rates were found by the field survey to be largely between \$.75 and \$.85 per hour, with a major portion of the workers being paid \$.80 per hour. There were also a number of workers paid \$45 to \$50 per week for six days. Even though these were the rates found in the field survey, the director of the Monte Vista employment department stated that 99 per cent of the work orders specified a wage rate of \$1.00 per hour.

Lettuce Harvest. Wages during lettuce harvest are paid on a piece rate basis. During the 1961 and 1962 seasons, the piece rate was \$.215 per carton for cutting and packing a carton of lettuce. As this is a three-man activity, each man receives \$.0717 per carton. Under

3. Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee, Minutes of March 16, 1962.

this rate, the skilled Filipino lettuce crews were able to make as much as \$1.70 per hour each, but less skilled workers make considerably less.

During the 1960 growing season, Mexican nationals were employed for lettuce harvest at an hourly rate of \$.75 per hour. In 1961, however, the Secretary of Labor ruled that Mexican nationals employed during lettuce harvest must receive \$.215 per carton (three-man crew) or the prevailing piece rate, whichever is higher. Further, the Secretary of Labor stated that if the earnings of Mexican nationals so employed are less than \$1.10 per hour, he could no longer certify that the continued employment of Mexican nationals "at this piece rate will not affect the wages of domestic workers similarly employed."⁴

The Secretary of Labor based this decision on the following factors:⁵

Mexican National workers were employed during 1960 in the lettuce harvest at a wage rate of \$.75 per hour. Domestic workers were employed at piece rates yielding earnings ranging from \$1.13 to \$1.70 per hour.

Experience in other lettuce growing areas of the country has indicated that if Mexican national workers are made available to employers at hourly rates considerably less than the average hourly earnings earned by domestic workers employed at piece rates, there may be a substantial lessening of job opportunities for domestic workers.

This condition has materialized in the San Luis Valley area in that employment of domestic workers in the lettuce harvest has declined since 1957 when Mexican nationals were first used in sizeable numbers in this crop activity. This can be seen from the following figures concerning peak employment in the activity obtained from the reports of the Colorado Department of Employment (ES-223 reports):

<u>Year</u>	<u>Acreage Harvested</u>	<u>No. Domestic Employed</u>	<u>No. Mexican Nationals Used</u>	<u>Total</u>
1957	7,250	1,045	360	1,405
1958	6,200	815	169	984
1959	6,400	792	308	1,100
1960	6,650	648	512	1,160

4. Letter dated April 19, 1961 from Robert C. Goodwin, Director, Bureau of Employment, Secretary U. S. Department of Labor.

5. Ibid.

It is noted that while the decrease in acreage over the four-year period is only 8 per cent, during this same period there has been a decrease in the employment of domestic workers of 38 per cent and an increase in the employment of Mexican nationals of 42 per cent.

In addition to this change, earnings studies for 1960 show that the average weekly hours worked by Mexican nationals was 40 per week while the average worked by domestic workers was 31 hours per week, thus reflecting under-utilization of available domestic workers and constituting an adverse effect upon their wages.

Conflicting information has been provided the Secretary of Labor which indicates that in the past Mexican national workers employed in the lettuce harvest may have been required to produce a so-called "select" or "national" pack of uniform size heads while domestic workers were producing a "standard" pack of all size heads and that the production of the "select" pack was a slower, more time-consuming activity that would result in lower earnings if the workers were paid the same piece rate as was paid the "standard" pack. This is a situation which, if it did exist in the past, will not be permitted in 1961.

The regional office field staff is instructed to thoroughly investigate the manner in which lettuce is harvested to ascertain the type of pack produced by domestic workers and that produced by Mexican workers. This investigation should include interviews with employers, domestic workers, and foreign workers, as well as on-the-spot examination of the work done. If the results of this investigation indicate that there is a difference in the method of harvest, appropriate action will be taken by the Secretary to ensure that this practice in itself does not adversely affect the wages of domestic workers.

This problem encountered in the lettuce harvest in the San Luis Valley of Colorado is recognized not to be unique only to Colorado. We plan to proceed similarly in those other lettuce growing areas of the nation in which foreign workers are employed.

This action by the Secretary of Labor was protested by the growers on the grounds that: 1) Mexican nationals were not sufficiently skilled as lettuce pickers to be able to equal \$1.10 per hour on a piece rate basis. 2) Mexican nationals preferred to be employed at an hourly rate instead of a piece rate, and \$.75 per hour was more in line with their abilities as lettuce pickers and, therefore, fair to both

employer and worker. 3) The earnings cited by the Secretary of Labor were those of the most highly skilled lettuce pickers and, therefore, did not represent an average wage.

As a consequence of this objection, a compromise was rendered which applied to the 1961 growing season. This compromise provided that Mexican nationals employed during lettuce harvest could be paid either \$.75 per hour or \$.215 per carton (three-man crew), whichever they preferred, but that their earnings must equal at least \$.75 per hour. In addition, a study would be made of the productivity of these workers to determine a just and equitable rate.

Effective November 4, 1962 (and applicable to the 1963 season), the Secretary of Labor ruled that Mexican nationals employed in Colorado for lettuce harvest must be paid:

1) not less than a crew piece rate of \$.24 per carton or the prevailing piece rate, whichever is higher, with guaranteed hourly earnings no less than the hourly adverse-effect rate for the state (\$.90 per hour); or

2) an hourly rate not less than the adverse-effect wage rate for the state or the prevailing hourly rate for lettuce harvest work, whichever is the higher.

The workers would have the option of selecting piece rates or an hourly rate, unless the employer can show that his lettuce crop is defective to such an extent that harvesting requires special handling. In such situations, the employer may determine whether the piece rate or the hourly rate will be paid, without regard to the workers' preference.

Potato Harvest. The wage rates found by the field study to be in effect for the 1961 potato harvest in the San Luis Valley are shown in Table 26. Also shown is the number of workers receiving each rate.

TABLE 26

Wage Rates Received During Potato Harvest,
San Luis Valley, 1961

Hand Picking

Rate per 100 lb. Sack	No. of Workers	Rate per 50 lb. Sack	No. of Workers
\$.12	2	\$.06	39
\$.14	27	\$.07	1
\$.15	10	mean	\$.06
\$.16	10	median	\$.06
\$.17	6		
mean	\$.148		
median	\$.14		

TABLE 26
(Continued)

<u>Per Hour or Per Day</u>			
<u>Rate per Hour</u>	<u>No. of Workers</u>	<u>Rate per Day</u>	<u>No. of Workers</u>
\$.80	1	\$ 8.00	3
\$1.00	6	\$10.00	6
\$1.10	9	mean	\$ 9.33
\$1.25	6	median	\$10.00
\$1.50	1		
mean	\$1.12		
median	\$1.10		

Machine Picking

<u>Rate per Sack</u>	<u>No. of Workers</u>
\$.08	6
\$.10	4
mean	\$.088
median	\$.08

1962 Wage Rates.⁶ In the Alamosa area, the hourly wage rates for vegetable pre-harvest activities were \$.75 to \$.90 during April and May, and, in June and July, \$.90 an hour was the only rate quoted. The early season hourly rates for irrigation were \$.80 to \$.90, increasing to \$.95 in June and July. This same rate applied to tractor operators.

With the exception of vegetable pre-harvest at \$.90 per hour, the offered rate in the Monte Vista area for seasonal farm labor was \$1.00 per hour during the months of April through July.

In both areas, vegetable harvest rates, except for lettuce, were \$.90 an hour, with some piece rate options. The \$.90 an hour rate applied to lettuce harvest in the Monte Vista area, but, in the Alamosa area, the rate was \$1.00 an hour or \$.24 per carton (three-man crew).

During potato harvest, the offered rates in the Monte Vista area were \$.14 to \$.16 per 100 pound sack or \$1.00 to \$1.25 per hour. The rates in the Alamosa area were \$.06 per 50 pound sack, \$.14 per 100 pound sack, or \$1.00 per hour.

Earnings. The migrant workers interviewed in the San Luis Valley were asked how much they made during the previous week. The mean and median previous week's earnings for family groups and single workers is shown in Table 27. This information is presented for both early season and late season workers. Many of the early season workers were employed in the spinach and lettuce harvests. All of the late

6. Information taken from Colorado Farm Labor Bulletin, Weekly Report by the Colorado State Employment Service.

season workers were employed in the potato harvest. Also shown are the mean and median hours worked and the hourly rate of earnings, which was derived by dividing the total amount earned by the hours worked. The relatively high hourly rates for early season single workers is a reflection of the skill of the Filipino custom lettuce crews, who work on a piece rate basis. The data for the late season (potato harvest) includes workers who were paid either on a piece rate or hourly basis.

TABLE 27

Previous Week's Earnings
By Migrants in the San Luis Valley, 1961

	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
<u>Early Season</u>		
<u>Family</u>		
Amount Earned	\$ 67.33	\$50.00
Number of Workers	2	1
Number of Hours Worked	61	60
Amt. Earned per Hour	\$ 1.12	\$.83
<u>Single</u>		
Amount Earned	\$ 42.91	\$40.00
Number of Hours Worked	34	30
Amt. Earned per Hour	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.33
<u>Late Season</u>		
<u>Family</u>		
Amount Earned	\$120.36	\$95.00
Number of Workers	2.5	2
Number of Hours Worked	112	84
Amt. Earned per Hour	\$ 1.07	\$ 1.12
<u>Single</u>		
Amount Earned	\$ 53.11	\$48.00
Number of Hours Worked	42	45
Amt. Earned per Hour	\$ 1.26	\$ 1.07

The workers who were interviewed were also asked how much they had earned from April 1 until the time of the interview, and this information is shown in Table 28. It should be noted that there is a considerable difference between the amount earned during the previous week and the average amount earned weekly from April 1 until the time of the interview. The former is considerably higher for all early and late season workers and illustrates the lack of steady employment during the growing season.

TABLE 28

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st
Until Time of Interview, San Luis Valley, 1961

	<u>Family</u>	<u>Single</u>
<u>Early Season</u>		
Mean	\$35.11	\$24.58
Median	29.44	18.75
<u>Late Season</u>		
Mean	\$36.77	\$17.08
Median	27.58	8.00

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

There are no large housing concentrations for migrants with families in the San Luis Valley. Some of the Filipino lettuce crews, composed of solo workers, live in two old hotels in Alamosa; otherwise, most housing is on the farm. The housing examined during the field study ranged from very poor to very good. On the average, it was adequate and compared favorably to the housing found in the Arkansas Valley.

In evaluating the housing provided for migrant workers in the San Luis Valley, two factors need to be considered: 1) the condition of the housing lived in by many of the valley's low income residents; and 2) the brevity of the potato harvest season. As indicated previously in this chapter, some of the residential housing in the valley is on a par with some of the less than adequate migrant housing. Housing which might not be adequate on a season-long basis is satisfactory for the two or three weeks during potato harvest, especially since some of the potato harvest crews live near enough to their place of employment to return home on weekends.

There is no organized health department in the valley, although almost all of the counties have a public health nurse. The only sanitarian available is on the staff of the state health department with headquarters in Alamosa. His responsibilities extend to all six counties in the valley (Mineral included), so that he does not have the time to make sanitation inspections of migrant housing, unless a complaint is made.

Employment Department Inspections. The employment department inspected 467 housing units in the San Luis Valley in 1962. Growers refused to allow the department to make inspections at seven locations. Only 34 of the 467 units were found to be poor or unacceptable. Table 29 shows the number of inspections made by the department in the Alamosa and Monte Vista areas and the condition of the housing as determined by department personnel.

TABLE 29

State Department of Employment
Housing Inspections, San Luis Valley, 1962

	Area Office		Total
	Alamosa	Monte Vista	
Number of Inspections	160	307	467
Good	84	220	304
Fair	61	68	129
Poor	13	16	29
Not Acceptable	2	3	5
Inspection Prohibited	2	5	7

Health Programs and Needs

Health service for migrants was provided from 1956 through 1959 on an on-again-off-again basis. In 1956, a migrant nurse was available during potato harvest, and the same nurse was employed throughout the 1957 growing season. A migrant nurse was employed during part of the 1958 and all of the 1959 growing seasons. The migrant health program was carried on under the supervision of the local medical society, because the valley does not have an organized health unit. No arrangements were made for a migrant nurse program during the 1960 growing season apparently because of a misunderstanding between valley growers and the state health department. The department did not try to recruit a nurse for the program, because it received no indication from valley growers that services were desired. The growers did not contact the department because they assumed that there would be a nurse available as a matter of course.⁷

There was no migrant health program in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 and 1962 growing seasons, largely because of recruitment problems. The director of the Child Health Services Division, State Department of Public Health (who administers the migrant health program) has commented that while there is a need for a health program during the growing season, the biggest need is for organized health service on a 12-month basis.⁸

Occupational Health. No study has been made of occupational health problems in the San Luis Valley, but the sanitarian reported several cases of poisoning from insecticides during the 1960 and 1961 growing seasons.

7. Legislative Council Migrant Labor Committee, Minutes of Meeting of August 15, 1960.

8. Ibid.