Migrant Schools

There were three migrant summer schools operated in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 growing season, but only one during 1962, for reasons which will be explained below. In 1961, two of the three schools were located in Costilla County -- one at San Luis and the other at the Sierra Grande Consolidated School near Blanca. Ninety to 100 youngsters were enrolled in each one of these schools. The other school was located in Monte Vista and had 30 pupils.

Costilla County. While there were some out-of-state migrants enrolled in the two Costilla county schools, most of them were from families who live in the county but who (according to the Costilla County Superintendent of Schools) travel to other areas to seek employment during a portion of the regular school year, and as a result their children either miss all or part of the regular school year.

During the field study, an effort was made to find out how many families with children enrolled in the special summer program actually migrated to other areas during any part of the regular school sessions. The results of this survey were inconclusive but indicated that the families of some of these children did not leave the county, at least during the regular school year.

Monte Vista. In Monte Vista, the youngsters enrolled in the summer school program were from families, or portions thereof, who had dropped out of the migrant stream at one time or another and now live in Lariat on the west outskirts of Monte Vista. Most of these families have numerous children and are without an adult male member; consequently, they receive Aid to Dependent Children. These youngsters are extremely retarded, and their families take little, if any, interest in their school attendance or progress.

1962 Summer Program. During the 1962 growing season, the only migrant school in operation in the valley was located at San Luis and had an estimated enrollment of 180. The other two schools did not operate, because the children who had been enrolled do not come within the definition of House Bill 410 (1961) which provided for state financial support of the migrant school program. A migrant agricultural worker is defined as, "an individual engaged in agricultural labor in this state who is residing in a school district which is not his regular domicile during the performance of this labor."[9] A migrant child is defined as, "a child of school age who is in the custody of migrant agricultural workers, whether or not they are his parents."[10] Therefore, had these schools continued to operate, it would have been at local rather than state expense. Prior to the passage of House Bill 410 (1961), state aid for migrant summer schools was provided by the State Board of Education from the state school contingency fund, and this fund could be allocated under formulae and rules established by the board; consequently, state aid was provided, even though some of the children's families were domiciled in the county.

9. Chapter 223, Section 2(c), Session Laws of Colorado, 1961.
10. Chapter 223, Section 2(b), Session Laws of Colorado, 1961.

Regular School Attendance

Only one school district in the San Luis Valley reported that migrant children were attending during the regular 1961-1962 school year. This district is located in Costilla County and had 45 migrant children in attendance for part of the regular school term.

As a general practice, the schools in the San Luis Valley are closed during potato harvest. There have been a number of criticisms of this practice, especially by educators who feel that the time lost by the children in the area is never really made up by the end of the school year. Further, they feel that the closing of schools during this period denies educational opportunities to migrant children as well as those who are residents. It is their opinion that children should be in school rather than working in the fields or left unsupervised.[11]

Those who support the closing of schools point out that:

1) The potato harvest provides an opportunity for a large number of families to make enough money to help them get through the winter. It is usually necessary for as many family members as are able to work in order to make a sufficient amount of money.

2) If they did not have this opportunity, many families would lack sufficient funds to send their children to school at all.

3) If children were not allowed to work because the schools are open, many families would not come to the valley to pick potatoes, and a labor shortage and crop loss would result.

An acceptable solution to this problem may develop in time through the mechanization of the potato harvest. Those growers who have mechanized their harvest operations usually limit their labor crews to adult members (over the age of 16) because of the potential safety hazards from having young children working around machinery. Mechanization also reduces labor needs substantially, so that eventually it may not be so necessary to have a large number of outside workers.

Migrant Attitude Toward Education for Their Children

The migrants interviewed in the San Luis Valley were asked the number of years of formal education which they would like their children to have. These answers were correlated with the number of years of formal education obtained by the interviewee, and the results are shown in Table 30.

11. For further discussions of this point of view, see Survey of San Luis Valley School Closures, Alfred M. Potts, State Department of Education, Denver, 1960 and Providing Education for Migrant Children, Alfred M. Potts, Colorado State Department of Education, Denver, 1961.

TABLE 30

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Luis Valley, 1961

Migrant's Years of School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend							
	5	8	9	11	12	12+	Other[a]	Total
0	1	3			12		4	20
1		1			2			3
2					1			1
3		1			6	1	2	10
4		1			7	1	1	10
5		1			7		2	10
6					8		2	10
7		2			5	4	2	13
8		2	1		15	3	2	23
9					6	1		7
10					2	2		4
11				1	1		1	3
12					2	2	1	5
Total	1	11	1	1	74	14	17	119

a. This category includes the following responses: "as much as possible," "as much as they want," and "as much as we can afford."

Sixty-three per cent of those interviewed were of the opinion that their children should have a high school education, and an additional 12 per cent felt that their children should attend college. Only one migrant felt that less than an eighth grade education would be satisfactory for his children. Thirteen per cent of those interviewed felt that formal education was desirable and necessary, but, instead of stating a specific number of years, gave replies such as, "as much as possible," "as much as they want," or "as much as we can afford."

Welfare

Other than provision of surplus commodities, none of the county welfare departments in the San Luis Valley have provided any emergency assistance for migrants and their families. The welfare directors of the valley counties stated that they do not have sufficient general assistance funds available to provide such assistance and added that they have sufficient financial problems taking care of their resident welfare cases. It is their opinion that they are already providing assistance through A.D.C. (Aid to Dependent Children) to migrant families who have been deserted by their adult male members.

The Migrant

Number of Interviews

Two hundred and fifty-three interviews were conducted with migrant workers in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 growing season. One hundred and four of these interviews took place during the early season labor peak (July-August) and 149 during the late season labor peak (September-October).

Five different ethnic groups were included in these interviews: Spanish-American, Indian, Filipino, Negro, and Anglo. In determining the number of interviews with each ethnic group, consideration was given to the approximate proportion each group was of the total number of migrant workers in the area at the time the interviews were made.

These 253 interviews covered 428 workers, including 63 children under the age of 16 years. The total number of people represented by these interviews was 767. Table 31 shows, by ethnic group, the total number of interviews and the number of workers and people represented by them.

TABLE 31

Number of Migrant Interviews and Related Information By Ethnic Group, San Luis Valley, 1961

Ethnic Group	Number of Interviews	Number of Workers: Males Over 16	Number of Workers: Females Over 16	Number of Workers: Children Under 16	Number of Workers: Total	Total Number of People
Spanish-American	168	187	71	60	318	615
Indian	50	49	21	1	71	101
Filipino	27	27	0	2	29	36
Negro	7	7	0	0	7	9
Anglo	1	3	0	0	3	6
Total	253	273	92	63	428	767

The Migrant Generally--A Profile

These composite migrant profiles cover the family and single workers of three ethnic groups: Spanish-American, Filipino, and Indian. No profiles were made for the Negroes and Anglos interviewed because they were so few as to make generalizations meaningless.

Spanish-American -- Married. The married Spanish-American migrant working in the San Luis Valley during the 1961 season, in most cases, calls either Texas or New Mexico his home state. If he worked in the valley during the early season peak, it is most likely that his home state is New Mexico. If he comes from a state other than New Mexico, it is either Texas or Arizona. If he worked during potato harvest, the chances are three to two that his home state is Texas rather than New Mexico.

The average Spanish-American migrant is between 27 and 32 years of age, and his wife is a few years younger. He and his wife have four or five children. He had been a migrant worker for eight years prior to the 1961 season and had worked in Colorado two or three years prior to 1961. He is working as a farm laborer because he has no other job skills and would otherwise be unemployed. Generally, he likes to work in Colorado and will return the following season. Wages, types of crops, and good treatment by employers are the major reasons why he likes to work in this state. If he does not like working in Colorado and does not plan to return, wages and housing are the chief reasons.

If he is in the San Luis Valley during the early season peak, he most likely obtained his employment either by asking around or by returning to a grower for whom he had worked previously. If he is working during potato harvest, the chances are he is employed by a grower for whom he worked previously or that he obtained his job through a crew leader.

He and his family probably came to the valley in July but may have come in June, if he is working during the early season peak. He will work in the valley from two to three months before leaving. Before coming to the valley, he worked in New Mexico in most cases. (Arizona, California, Texas, and Idaho are other states he may have worked in before coming to Colorado.) If he intended to work after leaving Colorado, Arizona, California, Texas, and New Mexico were the most likely states in which he would seek employment. It cost him and his family between $15 and $22 to come to Colorado. In most instances, he came by car, but, in a few cases, he came by truck. The chances are four to one that he provided the transportation for himself and his family. In the other instances, he traveled with relatives or friends.

If he and his family came to the valley for potato harvest, they probably arrived in the latter part of September. The chances are one in two that he didn't work prior to coming to Colorado. If he had been employed, he probably worked in Texas, but other possible states include New Mexico, Alabama, Ohio, Michigan, and North Dakota. Most likely he had no other work plans after the conclusion of potato harvest, but, if he did, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and Florida (in that order) were the probable states where he would seek employment. It cost him and his family between $20 and $25 to come to Colorado. In most cases, he provided his own transportation and was just as likely to have traveled by truck as by car. In a number of instances, however, he and his family traveled with relatives or friends.

Spanish-American -- Single. The average Spanish-American solo worker in the San Luis Valley during the early season peak in 1961 was in his early 30's. The average single worker during potato harvest is more likely to be between 18 and 22 years of age. His home state is either New Mexico or Texas (applies to both early and late season workers). The early season single Spanish-American worker had been a seasonal farm laborer for five years prior to the 1961 growing season and had worked in Colorado two years. The late season single Spanish-American worker had been a seasonal farm worker for two years prior to the 1961 growing season, and the chances are good that he worked in Colorado during both years. He is working as a seasonal farm laborer because of a lack of other skills and formal education.

Generally, he likes to work in Colorado and plans to return during the following season. Wages and the type of crop are the chief reasons why he will return. In the few instances where he dislikes working in Colorado and does not plan to return, wages and housing (in that order) are listed as the reasons. If he has come for early season employment, he probably worked previously in either Texas, New Mexico, or California. His previous state of employment prior to potato harvest was probably Texas, but he may have worked in Alabama, Florida, Ohio, Michigan, or Idaho. Arizona, Texas, New Mexico, and California were listed by early season single workers as probable states of employment after leaving Colorado. Single Spanish-Americans working during potato harvest indicated Texas as the most likely state in which employment would be sought. Other possibilities included Wyoming and Florida.

The single worker employed during the early season peak probably obtained his job by asking around or through a grower, perhaps the same one who employed him in the previous season; however, he may have gotten his job through a crew leader or contractor. He came to Colorado by car and either came alone or traveled with relatives or friends. In either case, it cost him approximately $15 to get here.

The single Spanish-American worker employed during potato harvest either got his job through arrangements made by an employer, by returning to a grower for whom he worked previously, or through a crew leader. He came to Colorado either by car or truck. While he may have come by himself, it is more likely that he traveled with relatives or friends. It cost him between $8 and $10 to come to Colorado.

Filipino. The average married Filipino lettuce worker in the San Luis Valley in 1961 was between 45 and 50 years old. The average single Filipino worker was likely to have been a few years older.[12] Both married and single workers on the average had followed the lettuce harvest for 12 years prior to the 1961 growing season. They had worked in Colorado, however, only two or three years. Those workers who were married, divorced, or widowed had an average of three children. California or Arizona was most likely to have been the home state of the Filipino workers. Prior to coming to Colorado, most of them had worked in California, but a few had been employed in Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. After completion of the lettuce harvest in the San Luis Valley, Arizona would most likely be the next state of employment, but California, New Mexico, and Texas (in that order) were other possibilities. The type of crop and wages were given as the main reasons why they preferred to work in Colorado and planned to return during the following season. The one worker who would not return listed wages and housing as the reasons.

Indian. Almost all the Indians interviewed were Navajos from the reservations in New Mexico and Arizona. The others were Pueblo Indians from New Mexico. The average married Indian working in the 1961 potato harvest was in his late 30's. The average single Indian worker was in his early 20's. The married Indian had been a seasonal farm laborer for two years prior to the 1961 growing season and the single Indian for one. In both instances, the number of previous years worked in Colorado was the same as the number of years as a seasonal farm laborer. The married Indian worker and those single workers who were divorced or widowed had between four and five children.

12. Most of these single workers were either divorced or widowed.

Most of the Indian workers (both married and single) had not been employed prior to coming to Colorado and they did not intend to seek further employment off the reservation after completion of potato harvest. The few that had been employed previously and who would seek further employment had worked and planned to work in either Arizona or New Mexico. Almost all of them liked to work in Colorado and planned to return the following season. The type of crop and wages were listed as the chief reasons. The few who did not plan to return objected to the wages and housing.

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

TABLE 32

Years As a Migrant Worker
By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment,
San Luis Valley, 1961

	Early Season						Late Season						Total		
	Family			Single			Family			Single					
Years	F	SA	T	F	SA	T	I	SA	T	I	SA	T	F	I	SA
0		2	2												2
1		6	6				8	7	15	9	7	16		17	20
2		3	3		1	1	6	8	14	3	6	9		9	18
3	1	5	6		5	5	1	4	5	1	5	6	1	2	19
4		3	3		1	1	3	3	6	1	3	4		4	10
5	1	1	2	2	3	5		4	4	2	1	3	3	2	9
6	1	2	3					6	6	1	5	6	1	1	13
7	1	4	5		2	2	1	1	2		1	1	1	1	8
8		3	3	1		1		1	1		1	1	1		5
9		3	3	2		2		3	3				2		6
10	2	8	10	1		1		2	2	1	1	2	3	1	11
11-15		6	6	3	2	5	3	6	9				3	3	14
16-20	2	5	7	1		1	1	6	7				3	1	11
21-25		2	2				1	4	5					1	6
26-30	2		2	1		1		2	2				3		2
31+	3	1	4	1		1	3	5	8	1	1	2	4	4	7
NK	2	3	5		1	1	4	3	7				2	4	7
Total	15	57	72	12	15	27	31	65	96	19	31	50	27	50	168

NK - Not known
F - Filipino
SA- Spanish-American
I - Indian
T - Total

TABLE 33

Years As a Migrant Worker in Colorado
By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment,
San Luis Valley, 1961

	Early Season						Late Season						Total		
	Family			Single			Family			Single					
Years	F	SA	T	F	SA	T	I	SA	T	I	SA	T	F	I	SA
0	1	4	5	3	1	4							4		5
1	3	13	16	4	1	5	15	16	31	12	9	21	7	27	39
2	2	7	9	1	2	3	9	18	27	3	6	9	3	12	33
3	3	4	7	2	3	5	1	7	8	2	4	6	5	3	18
4	2	3	5		2	2	3	4	7		3	3	2	3	12
5	2	1	3	1	2	3		5	5	1	1	2	3	1	9
6	1	1	2	1		1		3	3		4	4	2		8
7		2	2				1	2	3		1	1		1	5
8		2	2					1	1		1	1			4
9		1	1					1	1						2
10		4	4					1	1	1		1		1	5
11-15		3	3		1	1	2	3	5		1	1		2	8
16-20		1	1					3	3						4
21-25															
26-30	1		1										1		
31+								1	1		1	1			2
NK		11	11		3	3									14
Total	15	57	72	12	15	27	31	65	96	19	31	50	27	50	168

NK - Not known
F - Filipino
SA- Spanish-American
I - Indian
T - Total

TABLE 34

Reasons Given for Preferring to Work or Not Work in Colorado, By Ethnic Group and Time of Employment, San Luis Valley, 1961

	Wages		Housing		Type of Crops		Length of Season		Treatment by Grower		Community Attitude		Weather		Other	
	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
Early Season																
Spanish-American																
Family	20	6	12	2	9				9		5				9	2
Single	7		1		5				1							2
Total	27	6	13	2	14				10		5				9	4
Filipino																
Family	5		3		10				1		3				2	
Single	4	1	2	1	6				3		3				1	
Total	9	1	5	1	16				4		6				3	
Late Season																
Spanish-American																
Family	17	2		5	24				8		2				24	2
Single	5	4		3	11						2				8	1
Total	22	6		8	35				8		4				32	3
Indian																
Family	1	3		1	7						1				15	2
Single	3	1		1	4				2		1				4	2
Total	4	4		2	11				2		2				19	4
Total[a]	62	17	18	13	76				24		17				63	11

a. Both seasons and all ethnic groups, family and single.

TABLE 35

Areas To Which Migrants Expected To Travel
To Find Employment After Leaving the San Luis Valley,
By Ethnic Group, 1961

State	Spanish-American			Filipino			Indian		
	Family	Single	Total	Family	Single	Total	Family	Single	Total
Arizona	11	3	14	11	5	16	2		2
California	3	1	4	4	5	9			
Florida	1	1	2						
Kansas		1	1						
New Mexico	17	3	20	2	4	6	2	5	7
Texas	34	8	42	3	2	5			
Washington					1	1			
Return to Home State or Area	59	29	88				27	14	41

The Migrant and the Community

There are no organized programs for domestic migrants in the San Luis Valley, nor is there any group specifically interested in the migrant and his problems. (It should be noted, however, that in some respects the problems of migrant workers and their families are not much different from those of some of the valley's residents.) While there have been no programs for migrants, efforts were made in the Alamosa area in 1961 to provide entertainment for Mexican nationals. Free Saturday night movies for braceros were sponsored by the Alamosa Chamber of Commerce. They were terminated after four weeks, according to a chamber of commerce official, because of a lack of interest on the part of the braceros. The chamber of commerce had four goals in establishing this program for nationals, including: 1) promotion of the Good Neighbor policy; 2) countering of any communist activity; 3) promotion of trade with local merchants; and 4) provision of entertainment for these foreign workers.

The Council of Churches Migrant Ministry had hoped to have a worker in the valley during the 1961 growing season, but had been unable to recruit anyone for this position. According to newspaper reports, a program is in the process of being developed for the San Luis Valley, but no details are available.

During the past few years, Adams State College has been conducting annual workshops for educators who work with migrant children. A different phase of migrant education has been stressed each year; in 1961, the emphasis was on language arts. The workshop leaders and faculty have been selected on a national basis, and educators have come from many states to attend. Starting with the 1962-1963 academic year, this program is being expanded, with the major emphasis on bilingual education. The full-time director of the new Adams State program is the former head of the state department of education's migrant research project.

Law Enforcement

Chamber of commerce officials in Alamosa and Monte Vista were of the opinion that domestic migrants, especially the Filipino lettuce workers, created a considerable law enforcement problem because of drinking and disorderly conduct. The police officials in Alamosa, Monte Vista, and Center stated that there was very little trouble caused by domestic migrants, and the Filipinos caused no trouble at all. They added, however, that there were occasional problems during potato harvest with domestic workers because of excessive drinking. They also said that Mexican nationals caused no particular law enforcement problems. These were the attitudes expressed by the mayor of Center, who said that most of the problems were caused by local residents.

Crop Activities and Acreage

The Western Slope area as defined in this study includes the fruit growing areas around Grand Junction, Palisade, and Delta and the hay, grain, tomato, and sugar beet areas from Montrose to Grand Junction. All of the area included in the study is irrigated.

Crops Using Seasonal Labor

Grand Junction 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 of August and is largely concluded within 10 to 12 days. Table 36 shows the number of farms growing fruit in Mesa County in 1959 (latest figures available).

TABLE 36

1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Mesa County[a]

Fruit	No. of Farms	Quantity Harvested
Apricots	364	43,129 bushels
Apples	282	50,926 bushels
Sour Cherries	177	311,496 pounds
Sweet Cherries	219	169,955 pounds
Peaches	689	1,241,887 bushels
Pears	228	138,536 bushels
Plums and Prunes	186	9,561 bushels

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

In addition to these fruit crops, there were 3,609 acres of sugar beets harvested in Mesa County in 1961, with a yield of 81,226 tons.[1] This yield was approximately 3.3 per cent of the total state sugar beet production. Average yield per acre of sugar beets in Mesa County in 1961 was 22.5 tons, the highest county yield in the state and considerably above the state average yield of 14.7 tons per acre.

Mesa County had 50 acres of commercial tomatoes harvested in 1960.[1] No information is available on the yield of tomatoes harvested.

Delta Area. The Delta area produces the same crops as the Grand Junction area for which seasonal farm labor is needed. Table 37 shows the number of farms growing fruit in the Delta County area in 1959.

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

TABLE 37

1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Delta County [a]

Fruit	No. of Farms	Quantity Harvested
Apricots	187	25,016 bushels
Apples	393	533,004 bushels
Sour Cherries	114	249,496 pounds
Sweet Cherries	181	468,529 pounds
Peaches	318	248,128 bushels
Pears	150	52,769 bushels
Plums and Prunes	160	21,028 bushels

a. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final, Colorado Department of Agriculture.

Delta County also harvested 685 acres of sugar beets in 1961, for a production of 12,825 tons. The yield on sugar beets was 18.7 tons per acre,[2] second only to Mesa County in yield per acre and well above the state average.

Delta and Montrose counties harvested 660 acres of onions in 1960,[3] with the bulk of this acreage in Montrose County.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

During the ten-year period, 1950-1960, the number of bearing peach trees in Mesa County declined from 636,354 to 496,274. The production in bushels during the same period decreased slightly from 1,282,991 to 1,241,857 bushels. This difference might have been caused by weather and climatic conditions. Production, however, increased .49 bushels per tree, or 24.3 per cent more than in 1950.

The number of bearing apple trees in Delta County decreased during the 1950-1960 period from 215,534 to 177,527. The production in bushels of apples also decreased from 983,635 to 533,004, and production per tree decreased more than a bushel and a half.

Table 38 shows the difference between 1950-1960 in the total number of farms in Mesa County growing peaches, the farms in Delta County growing apples, the average number of trees per farm, and the per cent change in number of farms and in trees per farm.

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.

TABLE 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

	No. of Farms		Pct. of Change	Average Number of Trees Per Farm		Pct. of Change
	1950	1960		1950	1960	
Mesa	1279	689	-46.1%	497	720	+44.8%
Delta	667	363	-45.6%	323	489	+51.4%

Mechanization and Technological Change

There has been little success in mechanizing the fruit harvest on the Western Slope except for picking cherries. A spokesman for the only fruit processing plant in the area said that two mechanical cherry harvesters had cut their need for cherry pickers by fifty per cent and had reduced the per unit cost for labor from $3.00 to $.57. This company plans to mechanize fully the cherry harvest as soon as possible.

So far as could be determined, there was no mechanical peach picking during the 1961 season, although several machines for this operation have been developed and used in other states. Thinning of the peach crop is now performed to a considerable extent through the use of spray applications while the trees are in bloom and by mechanical shaking after the fruit has set. Growers who do not spray or shake the trees resort to hand thinning in order to insure a quality product.

One of the major factors which seems to be blocking the development and use of mechanical harvesters on the Western Slope is the small size of most of the farms. Few farms have enough bearing trees to make the purchase and use of a mechanical harvester economically feasible.

Mechanization in the pre-harvest activities in sugar beets is not far advanced. An interview with Holly Sugar Company officials confirmed that no monogerm seed is planted on the Western Slope, because of the stronger disease resistant qualities of the segmented seed beet plants. The use of segmented seed requires the use of hand labor almost exclusively in blocking and thinning operations. Most of the workers in pre-harvest activities in sugar beets are Mexican nationals, although there are some Navajo Indians so employed.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

The fruit grower is faced with the problem of obtaining a large supply of labor on short notice to be used for only a short period. This situation makes it difficult to attract well-qualified, able workers. Many workers who are already in other areas of Colorado hesitate to go to the fruit harvest because of the short harvest season. The normal time for the peach harvest to begin is about the third week of August, but a change in the weather can advance or delay this date by several days. If the workers are in the area and the fruit is not ready, many

may leave the area completely and cause a labor shortage. If the fruit is ready and workers are not available to harvest it, severe economic loss can be sustained by the growers. The fruit grower is constantly faced with the possibility of having either too much labor or not enough.

Another problem facing peach growers on the Western Slope is the small size of their orchards. With rising labor and material costs, a small acreage is not an efficient economic unit. The most recent figures available show the average farm has 720 trees. The average per tree yield in 1959 was 2.5 bushels, or 1,800 bushels per farm. An average price for two recent years, 1959-1961, was $2.77 per bushel. Consequently, the average sized peach orchard could realize a gross of $4,986. From this gross must be paid all costs of rent, taxes, depreciation, labor, supplies, water, etc.

Some farmers have expressed concern because the type of people who come to pick peaches is changing. For a number of years, many family units came to the peach areas to help pick peaches and at the same time can enough peaches for the family's winter use. These workers were steady and dependable and stayed until the harvest was completed. In recent years, fewer of these family groups have come to pick peaches, and their ranks are being filled by solo, itinerant workers or by large, contract labor groups. Both of the latter type of workers are more likely to leave the area before the harvest is completed, if a sudden change of weather slows down or stops picking for a few days.

The attitude of the Western Slope growers is that the migrant worker is a very necessary and important part of the fruit growing process and that some allowances must be made for the unreliable or inefficient worker in order to assure that the crop will be harvested. There is a general feeling in the area that better housing, health, and other facilities must be provided so that the area will be able to attract enough qualified workers to pick the peach crop.

Liquor consumption was cited by several growers as a main cause of unreliability of the migrant worker, but this problem does not seem to be as widespread among the workers as a group as it is in the San Juan Basin.

Pertinent Economic Conditions

Sugar Factory. During the 1960-61 growing season, considerable anxiety was caused in the sugar beet growing areas of the Western Slope over the Holly Sugar Company's decision to shut down the Delta sugar processing plant. Had this decision been carried out, it would have seriously disrupted the economic base of many farmers in the area.

During the winter of 1961-62, discussions were held throughout the region to see what could be done to keep the Delta processing plant in operation. The company officials revealed that they would consider keeping the plant operating, if funds for modernizing the plant were made available. Accordingly, many of the beet growing farmers jointly raised part of the money to put the plant into first class operating condition during the summer of 1962. The future of the beet sugar industry in western Colorado now seems assured for several years.

The beet growing farmers of Mesa, Delta, and Montrose counties agreed to loan Holly Sugar Company $200,000 and to increase the sugar beet acreage in the three counties from the 6,000 acres grown in 1961 to 8,000 acres in 1962, with an increase of 1,000 additional acres per year in 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966. The company agreed to pay the loan back in equal installments of $40,000 per year, plus five per cent interest, and to pay a bonus of 25 cents per ton if 170,000 tons of beets per year averaging 16 per cent sugar content were delivered to the Delta mill during the five years the $200,000 loan was outstanding.

Proposed Winery. A recent proposal has been submitted to the fruit growers in the Palisade and Grand Junction areas to consider the establishment of a winery and distillery to process fruit which does not meet necessary standards for shipping to fresh markets out of the area. This winery and distillery would make brandy, nectar, cordials and other beverages. So far as can be determined, plans for this facility have not yet been fully developed. Development of this winery and distillery would create a market for the 10 to 15 per cent of the fruit crop that is discarded because it is not good enough to be placed on the fresh market.

Canneries. There are two canning plants on the Western Slope. One of these plants is located in Delta and packs apples, cherries, apricots, and peaches. The company raises some of its fruit but purchases most of it from other growers. A company spokesman said that the company would process more fruit, but the plant has only a 5,000-6,000 bushels per day capacity on peaches. The entire season's peach canning output, therefore, is limited to about 85,000 bushels. This is about seven per cent of the 1959 peach production, which was considered a fairly normal yield.

The other canning plant is the Kuner-Empson plant in Grand Junction. The only product processed through this plant is tomatoes. All of the tomatoes processed at the Grand Junction plant are grown locally, with the heaviest planting of tomatoes being in the Fruita-Loma region.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers -- Peak Employment

There is not much employment of seasonal farm labor prior to the second or third week in May. From the third week of May through the first half of June between 500 and 800 seasonal farm workers are employed. Employment during this period consists primarily of tomato planting and sugar beet pre-harvest work. An early season peak is reached toward the end of June, with some 1,100 to 1,300 workers employed in 1962. The major activities at this time are peach pre-harvest (thinning) and sugar beet pre-harvest work. These two activities employed 60 per cent of the seasonal farm workers around Grand Junction in the fourth week of June, 1962. Some workers are employed in cherry and apricot harvests at this time, also. The number of employed workers usually drops to 800 or less by the third or fourth week in July and to 500 or less during the first two weeks of August.

The late season peak is reached during peach harvest, which usually begins the third or fourth week of August and continues for 10 to 12 days. Pear harvest is also carried on during this period, as is tomato harvest. Tomato harvest usually continues until late September or early October.

In 1962, the following seasonal farm labor totals were reported for late August and early September by the employment department:

Week	Total Workers	Workers in Peaches	Per Cent of Total Workers in Peaches
3rd August	715	110	15.4%
4th August	5,900	5,340	90.5%
5th August	5,340	4,700	88.0%
1st September	1,505	530	35.8%

After the completion of peach harvest, employment of seasonal farm workers drops rapidly. During the remainder of September and October, the main activities are tomato harvest and the harvesting of the remaining late fruit crops.

Recent Trends. Employment figures for the past four years show peak employment totals in peaches varied between 1,700 in 1960 and 5,500 in 1959, with peak employment in 1961 and 1962 being 4,850 and 5,340 workers, respectively. The great difference in 1960 was caused by a very poor crop of peaches, so that very little harvest labor was required. During normal crop years, the number of workers needed annually during the high peak employment period has varied less than 12 per cent. The dominant factor in determining the size of the work force has been the size of the peach crop.

Longer Range Trends. The 1957 to 1962 period shows a decrease in the total number of workers being used in peach harvest. In 1957, total employment in peaches was 5,900, and the 1962 total was 5,340. The changing pattern in the type of worker being used in the peach harvest may account for this difference, assuming that crop yields remain fairly constant. In 1957, the employment department reported that adult, contract crews were used for the first time on a large scale. The use of these crews has increased from year to year, replacing many of the family group pickers who used to constitute a large proportion of the total workers.

Mexican Nationals. Mexican nationals are not used in any of the fruit producing activities on the Western Slope. The use of nationals is confined mostly to two crops, sugar beets and tomatoes. The peak use of Mexican nationals occurred during the third week of May in 1962, when 392 were reported in the Grand Junction-Fruita area, most, if not all, of them being in sugar beets. This was an increase of 152 workers over the same period in 1961 and an increase of 183 over 1960. Late season peak use of nationals to harvest tomatoes was 223 workers during the second week of September, 1962, which was 35 more workers than were used in 1961 and 93 more than were used in 1960 for the comparable period.

Employment Department Statistics. The number of workers reported in the Grand Junction area by the employment department is probably one of the most accurate estimates made in the state. The high concentration of workers in a relatively small area lends itself to ease of counting and estimating. Also, the employment department maintains an office in Palisade, along with the Peach Board of Control, and is in daily contact with many of the growers during the harvest season.

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment

Peaches. The main efforts of the employment department and the Peach Control Board are directed to the provision of an adequate labor supply for peach harvest. According to the executive secretary of the Peach Control Board and the employment department field representatives, the initial planning takes place early in the spring. The peach board and the employment department estimate the number of workers who will be needed during peach harvest and the number of locals who will be available. Then recruitment activities are planned, aimed at bringing in a sufficient quantity of outside workers. The employment department works with the employment departments of several other states (Arizona, Arkansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, primarily). The peach board also advertises for workers in newspapers throughout the state and in surrounding states.

Many workers return annually as a matter of course and often are employed by the same growers. A number of growers make arrangements for crews directly with contractors in other states. The crews who are recruited in other states through the joint efforts of the departments of employment in Colorado and other states usually know the grower for whom they will work prior to their arrival in Colorado.

The Department of Employment has an office in the Peach Control Board building in Palisade and staffs this office with two field men who work closely with the board. During the peach harvest period, these employment department staff members keep track of workers as they arrive and check to see if they go to work for the growers as arranged. Their only other major task during this period appears to be the assignment of workers who arrive without prior agreements. These workers are allocated according to the labor shortages reported by the growers.

Using the experience of a several-year period, the Peach Board of Control has determined that a picker will harvest about 225 bushels of peaches during the season and uses this figure to estimate the number of pickers needed. For instance, in early 1961, the peach crop was estimated at about 1,200,000 bushels. The number of workers needed for harvesting a crop of this size would, therefore, be about 5,300. The actual number of workers employed at the peak of the harvest in 1961 was 4,850. However, several days of rainy weather during the harvest may have caused some of the workers to leave the area without staying to finish, which decreased the total number available.

The employment department applies to all of the local employment offices in Colorado for available labor before it asks help from other states. Local labor is used extensively in the packing sheds.

Scheduled contract crews are being used more and more with good results. These crews are not so apt to arrive several days too early as are the individual workers or the unscheduled crews and family groups.

The Peach Board of Control advertises extensively throughout Colorado and surrounding states in order to attract workers for the peach harvest. Some questions have been raised as to the effectiveness of this advertising campaign. In 1961, for example, there was no advertising placed in the metropolitan areas of Colorado, because it was felt that workers from these areas were less reliable than other workers. Staff interviews during the 1961 field study showed that few workers, if any, came to the harvest because of any advertising offered by the board. Most workers not members of an organized crew said they came because: 1) they had been there before; 2) they came with a friend or family; or 3) they "just knew about" the peaches in western Colorado.

Other Crops. Recruiting for workers for crops other than peaches is done by the employment department or by individual growers. The employment department attempts to utilize all local and intrastate workers before it asks for workers from other states. If workers from other states cannot be found, Mexican nationals are certified for use. The main sources of labor from out of state are Spanish-Americans from Texas and New Mexico and Navajos from New Mexico and Arizona.

Most of the pre-harvest work in peaches and the harvest activities of other fruit is done by local labor or other labor that has come into the area in advance of the peach harvest. The workers in hay are primarily from local sources, with some from other areas of Colorado.

Utilization and Reallocation

From 1947 to 1961, the Peach Board of Control operated the migrant housing camp at Palisade. This camp did not operate in 1962 and has been abandoned and the buildings sold.

While the camp was in operation it was an effective staging area and relocation center for workers who came to the area without work commitments. The manager of the camp could keep in daily contact with the board and with the employment department and could refer workers to those farmers who needed labor.

The employment department operates two offices during peach harvest; one at the main office in Grand Junction and another with the Board of Control in Palisade. These two offices give fairly effective control of utilization by directing workers to farmers with known labor needs. Workers who finish a harvest for one farmer can obtain information about further job opportunities at either office.

The employment department tries to direct workers to other employment in Colorado once they have finished the peach harvest. Little success is obtained from these efforts, however. The employment department reports that many of the workers could move to the Hotchkiss-Paonia area and pick apples, but few do because of colder temperatures and the poor housing available there. Some workers are successfully referred to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest, however. There appear to be two factors which reduce the effectiveness of the department's reallocation efforts. One is that the contract crews may have commitments to perform in other states and, therefore, cannot stay in Colorado, even though work is readily available. The other is that the family groups return home immediately after peach harvest in order to get the children into school.

Reallocation. It is estimated from the migrant questionnaire that possibly 21 per cent of the peach harvest workers might be available and interested in working elsewhere in Colorado, following completion of the harvest. In arriving at this proportion, all workers who had even the slightest reason for not staying were excluded. The application of this proportion to the total interstate migrant force during peach harvest results in an estimate of 600 workers. Nine per cent of the interstate migrants interviewed planned to stay in the area. until completion of apple harvest. Another ten per cent indicated that they would work in other areas in the state before returning home. Some were going to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest, others (mostly Cherokee Indians) were going to Baca County for broomcorn harvest, and still others were going to pick apples in Hotchkiss.

In computing the 21 per cent availability estimate, no crews brought in by contractors were included. It is interesting to note, however, that a few crews from Louisiana planned to remain for apple harvest in both the Palisade and Hotchkiss areas. Possibly, contractual arrangements covering apples were made at the same time as for peaches. If this is the case, it opens up new possibilities in the scheduling of workers. Perhaps more crews (especially since they travel long distances) might be willing to remain through apple harvest.

Table 39 on the following page shows the methods by which the workers reported finding a job on the Western Slope in 1961.

It should be pointed out that even though the individual workers reported that they obtained their jobs through the efforts of a crew leader or contractor; these leaders very often had contacted an employment department office either in Colorado or in their home state before coming to Colorado. Thus, the figures as presented above are not indicative of the part played by the employment department in recruiting or allocating workers.

TABLE 39

Method of Finding Job on Western Slope
Migrant Interviews, 1961

Method of Finding Job	Family	Single	Total	Per Cent of Total Interviews
Colorado Employment Department	13	6	19	6.1%
Another State's Empl. Dept.			11	3.5
Arkansas	3	3		
Arizona	2	2		
Texas	1			
Return to Previous Employer	20	7	27	8.6
Through Labor Contractor	28	98	126	40.4
Through Crew Leaders	5	16	21	6.7
Arrangements by Employer	19	15	34	10.9
Just Asking Around	27	30	57	18.3
Other	7	10	17	5.4
Total	125	187	312	99.9%

States Worked In Previously. Table 40 on the following page shows the states worked in by the migrant before coming to western Colorado in 1961 as reported in the migrant interviews.

None of the workers interviewed had worked as a seasonal farm laborer in any other part of Colorado in 1961 before coming to the Western Slope for peach harvest. Some may have worked on the Western Slope in other crops before the beginning of peach harvest. At least 22 of the interviewees had arrived in the area several weeks to a month before the peach harvest began; most workers, however, did not arrive until middle or late August.

Many of the workers who reported that they did not work anywhere else before coming to the Western Slope are not true migrants. These people have steady jobs in other places and came to pick a few peaches as a sort of working vacation.

Employment after Peach Harvest. Table 41 gives an indication of migration and employment pattern after completion of the peach harvest. This table shows the state or Colorado area to which the worker intended to go and whether he intended to seek further employment in 1961.

Of the 51 family units interviewed, 30 said that they would seek employment in their home state. Seventy-six single workers said that they would seek further employment in 1961, and 42 of these reported that they would return to their home states to find jobs. Only one single worker planned to seek further employment in Colorado.

TABLE 40

State Worked In Prior To Coming
To The Western Slope, Migrant Interviews 1961

Area or State	Family	Single	Total	Per Cent of Total Interviews
Alabama		1	1	.3%
Arkansas	8	19	27	8.6
Arkansas and Illinois	1		1	.3
Arkansas and Texas		2	2	.6
Arkansas and Wisconsin		1	1	.3
Arizona	2	19	21	6.7
Arizona and California		2	2	.6
Arizona and Nebraska	1		1	.3
Arizona and Oregon		1	1	.3
California	3	6	9	2.9
California and Texas	1		1	.3
California, Oklahoma, Texas, and Washington	1		1	.3
Idaho	1	1	2	.6
Idaho and Utah		1	1	.3
Illinois		1	1	.3
Illinois and Ohio		1	1	.3
Kansas	2	3	5	1.6
Kansas, Ohio and Pennsylvania		1	1	.3
Louisiana		7	7	2.2
Michigan		1	1	.3
Nebraska		1	1	.3
New Mexico	3		3	.9
Ohio		1	1	.3
Oklahoma	8	8	16	5.1
Oklahoma and Texas	2	1	3	.9
Oregon	1		1	.3
South Carolina	1		1	.3
Texas	7	7	14	4.4
Utah		3	3	.9
Washington	1		1	.3
Wyoming	2	2	4	1.2
No other state	80	97	177	56.7
Total	125	187	312	99.0

TABLE 41

Travel and Work After Leaving Western Slope, Migrant Interviews, 1961

Month Leaving Western Slope	State or Area Going To	Family		Single	
		will seek work	will not seek work	will seek work	will not seek work
August			3		6
	Arkansas			1	
	Idaho			1	
	Michigan			1	
	Oklahoma	1			
September			62		90
	Arkansas	9		12	
	Arizona	4		18	
	California	3		5	
	Idaho	1		3	
	Kansas	1		2	
	Louisiana			2	
	Nebraska			1	
	New Mexico	3		2	
	Ohio			1	
	Oklahoma	4		5	
	Texas	11		5	
	Utah	1			
	Washington	5		3	
	West Virginia			2	
	San Luis Valley			1	
October			2		4
	Arizona			1	
	California			2	
	Idaho	1			
	New Mexico			1	
	Texas	1			
November			3		1
	Arizona	1			
	Florida			1	
	Utah			1	
No Date Given			3		11
	Arizona			3	
	California	2			
	New Mexico	1			
	Oklahoma	1		2	
	Texas	1			
TOTAL		51	73	76	112

Wage Rates and Earnings

Wage rates for the 1961 peach harvest, as generally established by the Peach Board of Control prior to harvest, were $.11 per box, plus four cents bonus if the worker finished the harvest. Few farmers, however, refused to pay the four-cent bonus, even if a worker quit before finishing the harvest. Most workers who were working on piece rates were getting paid the full $.15 per box. Table 42 shows the wage rates being paid in 1961 during peach harvest to the 312 persons interviewed on the Western Slope.

TABLE 42

Wage Rates Received During Peach Harvest, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Rate	Number of Workers
$.05½ box (shed worker)	1
.11 box	1
.12 box	1
.15 box	53
.16 box	1
.17 box	2
.18 box (pears)	1
.20 box (pears)	2
Piece rate total	62
$ .90 hour	2
1.00 hour	209
1.10 hour	7
1.15 hour	6
1.19 hour	1
1.20 hour	1
1.25 hour	14
1.50 hour	3
Hourly rate total	243
GRAND TOTAL	305[a]

a. Seven workers did not know their rate of pay or had not started to to work when interviewed.

The amount that each interviewee had earned during the previous week is shown in Table 43.

TABLE 43

Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants on the Western Slope, 1961[a]

	Anglo		Negro		Spanish-American		Indian	
	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single
Mean	$21.25	$26.91	$17.97	$15.31	$ 31.26	$19.81	$16.75	$13.25
Median	15.00	20.00	11.00	8.50	20.00	16.50	11.00	5.50
Low Earnings	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00
High Earnings	98.00	77.00	92.00	78.00	120.00	72.00	45.00	50.00

a. Interviewees who had not been paid yet are not included.

The mean for all of the family groups was $22.86 and the median was $15.00. The mean weekly earnings for all of the single individuals interviewed was $18.98 and the median was $10.00. It should be noted that only a few workers were fully employed during the week surveyed, as the peach harvest did not get underway until the last few days.

Children of migrant families do not play an important role in peach harvest. Only 34 children from the 124 families interviewed were reported as working and adding to the family's earnings. Eight of the children working as part of a family group were Anglo; two were Negro; and 24 were Spanish-American.

Very few migrant wives work during peach harvest according to the results of the field survey. Only 33 wives from the 124 family units were found who had been working in the peach harvest. Eighteen of the women were Anglo; three were Negro; and 12 were Spanish-American.

Table 44 presents a breakdown of the average weekly earnings from April 1, 1961, until the time interviewed, as reported by the 312 interviewees.

TABLE 44

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Western Slope, 1961

	Anglo		Negro		Spanish-American		Indian	
	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single	Family	Single
Mean	$ 27.84	$23.18	$ 18.92	$ 8.52	$23.23	$19.94	$10.72	$14.97
Median	16.66	17.50	10.00	5.00	20.00	15.00	14.00	14.28
Low Average	00	00	00	00	1.50	00	3.75	00
High Average	115.00	72.50	120.00	40.50	71.43	80.00	14.40	45.00

The mean average weekly earnings since the first of April for all family groups was $23.52 and the median was $15.00. During the same period, all single workers had a mean average weekly wage of $14.63 and a median average weekly wage of $12.00.

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

Housing facilities for migrant workers have been considerably altered since the committee hearing and tour in Palisade and surrounding area on August 18 and 19, 1961, and the field survey conducted from August 18 to September 2, 1961. The Palisade camp, which was a staging area, as well as providing housing, has been abandoned.

Palisade Camp. The Palisade camp was owned by the Peach Board of Control and had been purchased from the federal government in 1948. The camp itself consisted of about 200 one-room wooden shelters, with central washing and shower facilities located in the community building but with no indoor plumbing facilities. The Palisade camp had become a source of controversy between different groups of growers on the Western Slope, and following the 1961 harvest, the decision was made to close the camp and dispose of the shelters to individual growers.

Recent articles in the Grand Junction Sentinel have shown that the closing of the Palisade camp has had an adverse effect. During the 1962 season, workers were again found camping along the river banks and under bridges. This situation had almost completely disappeared during the time the camp was operated. While sanitation facilities in the camp could have been improved, they were far superior to anything available for workers living along the river bank. The closing of the Palisade camp also may have been responsible, at least in part, for the decrease in family groups and the increase in solo workers.

The camp provided: 1) a centrally-located headquarters to assist workers to find on-the-farm housing; 2) central housing area before on-the-farm housing was ready; and 3) longer-term housing for those workers who could not find on-the-farm housing. On August 31,1961, there were 442 persons over 16 years registered as living in the Palisade camp, or 9.1 per cent of the workers reported by the employment department as being employed in peaches and 7.9 per cent of the total workers reported in the area on that day.

Other Housing. Since the closing of the Palisade camp, all housing is located on or near individual farms. There are no other camps or concentration of facilities under any joint operation, although some farms have housing facilities that are of camp size, with 75 to 100 workers being housed. On-the-farm facilities vary from good to very poor. In 1962, between February 6 and September 14, the employment department inspected 653 housing units in the Grand Junction area. One hundred eighty-six were found to be in good condition, 430 in fair condition, and 37 in poor condition. One farmer refused to let the department's inspector on the premises to see the housing.

Facilities for housing workers include regular farm houses, sheds, garages, barn lofts, and tents. Provisions for feeding workers also vary widely. Some workers must cook for themselves, while many of the large contract crews have access to furnished dining halls and paid cooks.

Housing for fruit workers other than peach pickers was usually available at the Palisade camp prior to its closing. However, much of the pre-harvest work in fruit is performed by locals. Housing for the workers not in fruit, sugar beets, and tomatoes, is on-the-farm. The Mexican nationals used for sugar beet and tomato work are usually housed at the Holly Sugar Company's units in Grand Junction.

Sanitation

The Mesa County Health Department had not made any sanitation inspections at the Palisade camp during the 1961 season. The director of the county health department said that some inspections had been made in prior years, but that the department's recommendations for health and sanitary measures had been ignored by the Peach Board of Control. The health department reported that they made no inspections of on-the-farm housing.

The county health department reported that it tries to have all waste peaches placed in sanitary ditches and promptly covered with dirt in order to minimize the fly problem. The department's efforts seem to have been somewhat less than effective. Field study observations, documented by photographs, showed large amounts of peaches dumped on the ground, instead of sanitary ditches, with no dirt covering them.

Health Program and Needs

During 1960 and 1961, free night medical clinics were conducted at the office of Dr. C.H. Bliss in Palisade. Prior to 1960, the clinics had been held at the Palisade camp, but this arrangement was not too satisfactory from a medical standpoint, because of the lack of supplies and equipment. In 1961, the Peach Board of Control, after considerable disagreement, finally sponsored these free night clinics and paid $500 for their operation. The Mesa County Migrant Council strongly supported the program and urged the peach board to sponsor it. Prior to 1961, and again in 1962, the clinics were either sponsored by the Mesa County Migrant Council, and/or operated gratis by Dr. Bliss. Six clinics were held in 1960 and 61 patients were seen in the clinics.

Following is a report on night clinic operations in 1961:[2]

Night Clinic Statistics

		Types of Conditions Treated	
Number of people seen for medical calls	92	Muscle-skeletal	7
Number of calls	115	Psychological	3
		Neurological	5
Number of people seen for injuries covered by compensation	8	Injury (non-occupational)	5
Number of Calls	16	Alcoholism	4

2. Mesa County Migrant Council 1961 Report, unpaged.

Night Clinic Statistics
(continued)

Cost of night clinics	$773.00
Including care, drugs, dressings, laboratory, and X-ray, etc., for medical patients.	
This does not include patients covered by compensation.	
This does not include cost for patients seen during the day even though they were subsequently seen in night clinics.	

Age Groups:	
0-15 years	17
15-20 years	13
20-30 years	11
30-40 years	15
40-50 years	16
50-60 years	6
60-70 years	7

Sex:	
Male	69
Female	22

Systemic	
Measles	1
Influenza	1
Nephritis	1
Diffuse Cellulitis	2
Cervical Lymphadenitis	1
Acute appendicitis-surgery	1
Insect bite(infected)	2
Eye, ear, nose, throat	10
Chest	5
Pre natal	2
Skin infections	16
Upper respiratory	2
Genito-urinary	5
Gastro-intestinal	15
Hernia	2
Malnutrition	1
Starvation	1

The night clinics constituted only one part of the 1961 Medical Care Program. Statistics on the total program were reported by the Mesa County Migrant Council as follows:[3]

Medicare Statistics

Total patients seen	202
Total office visits	319
Children 0-6 years	34
Children 7-14 years	4
Maternity cases	8
Obstetrical - delivered	1
Total hospitalized at St. Marys	5
Veterans hospital	2
Major surgery	1
Minor surgery	21
Injuries (not related to work)	13

Office laboratory:	
Urinalysis	16
Wbc	3
Hb	7
X-ray	3
Serology	4
Urethral smear	4

Premarital exam	2
Immunizations:	
Polio	13
DPT	8
DT	0
Tetanus Toxoid	1
Smallpox	6
Special Treatment (large amount) Topical medication and extensive heavy dressings	14
Death	0
Total value of medical care & drugs	$2067.71
Drug value at retail prices	$ 436.46
Reimbursement @ $25.00 each of 10 NCL	$ 250.00
Reimbursement for Overhead and expenses $10.00 each clinic	$ 100.00

3. Ibid.

In presenting this statistical report, the Mesa County Migrant Council made the following comments:[4]

> Dr. L.D. Kareus reports that he gave care and medicine to 23 seasonal workers. Drs. Paul Wubben and Fred E. Brown saw a total of three patients, and both refused any compensation.
>
> Dr. Bliss reports that the privilege of medical service was not abused by either the worker or the grower, and that those who came to his office had a valid need for care. Most people were able to return to work after one office call. Had the medical care and drugs been paid for at the usual rates, they would have amounted to $2,067.71.
>
> The $500.00 received from the Control Board were spent as follows:

Dr. C.H. Bliss	$350.00
Printing of script . . .	17.90
Stamped envelopes. . . .	34.96
Letterhead, stencils . .	5.14
Dr. L.D. Kareus	92.00
Total	$500.00

> As a result of the medical care program, the peach industry of Mesa County is receiving commendation from several national organizations. The splendid cooperation of growers, doctors, drug companies, Health and Welfare solved one of the most serious problems occurring where many seasonal workers are used.

Workers who desired to visit the clinic in Palisade were referred there by the grower, who furnished the worker with script supplied by the Peach Board of Control. This use of script allowed more accurate records to be kept of the use of the free clinics, and prevented misuse of the service by workers who were not working in peaches.

In addition to the clinics held by Dr. Bliss in Palisade, a nurse was on duty at the labor camp on a part-time basis. She took care of minor medical problems and referred the more serious ones to Dr. Bliss and other physicians. Part of the medical program offered at the labor camp included immunizations for diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, and polio.

In 1960, a public health nurse was available in Mesa County to visit migrant workers on the job and at on-the-farm housing. Despite over-all satisfaction with the migrant nurse program, the program was discontinued in 1961.

---

4. Ibid.

According to newspaper reports, the Peach Board of Control did not support the medical care program in 1962, and Dr. Bliss again operated the clinic at his own expense.

The 1961 field study showed that 29 interviewees out of the 312 had been sick or injured since coming to the Western Slope. Twenty-two of them said that they did see a doctor about their conditinn, and 17 of the 22 did not pay for this doctor's care, which indicates that the workers were taking advantage of the free medical services being offered.

Staff interviews with workers showed that while the free medical care provided for peach workers was utilized, the fact that the program existed had no effect at all on influencing them to come to Colorado, and would have no effect on whether they returned to Colorado or not.

Education and Welfare

Migrant School

Palisade. The migrant summer school at Palisade has been in operation annually from 1956 through 1962. Responses to committee questions at the August 18,1961 regional meeting in Palisade revealed that most of the children enrolled in 1961 were living in the camp. The initial enrollment for the 1961 session was 28 pupils and three teachers were employed. Enrollment reached 55 during the height of peach harvest. The field survey could not be relied on to furnish any information about attendance at the migrant school, since only two children were reported in migrant school from the 124 family units interviewed on the Western Slope. In 1962, the summer school had a maximum of 52 children enrolled.

The principal of the Palisade summer school stated that the school program included all subjects ordinarily taught in the elementary grades, and the school tried to teach kindergarten through the sixth grade with an attempt being made to fit the teaching program to the students' abilities.

Absences at the summer school were largely attributable to parents moving from the labor camp to one of the orchards without letting the school know where they were to be. The principal reported, however, that he felt attendance was extremely good, considering the circumstances.

Hot lunches were served each day, with milk and rolls or cookies served during mornings and afternoons. Since many of the children had not had breakfast, milk and rolls were served within 10-15 minutes after morning arrival. Afternoon refreshments were served immediately before leaving on the bus at 2:30.

Regular School Attendance. Attendance at a regular school was reported by the 124 families interviewed for 88.9 per cent of their children between the ages of six and 16 years. Eighty-five point three per cent of the Anglo children had attended a regular school the previous year, 86.6 per cent of the Negro children, 92.0 per cent of the Spanish-

American children and all of the Indian children. One factor which became apparent from the field survey was that many of the migrant families did not start their children to school until the children were seven or eight, and allowed them to drop out as soon as they reached 16.

Attitude Toward Education. The attitudes of migrants toward education are indicated by the figures shown in Table 45. This table shows the years of schooling completed by the 124 family interviewees and the number of years they wanted their children to go to school.

TABLE 45

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, Western Slope, 1961

Migrant's Years at School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend									
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	12+	NA	Total
0							2	1	3	6
1							1		1	2
2			1				3	1	2	7
3							2	3	4	9
4		1					4		3	8
5			1				3		2	6
6	1		1				4	1	2	9
7			1				5	3	6	15
8						1	7	1	7	16
9							1	3	5	9
10					1		7	2	5	15
11							1	2	4	7
12				1			3	1	4	9
12+								3		3
NA									3	3
Total	1	1	4	1	1	1	43	21	51	124

A high portion (41 per cent) of the families interviewed indicated that they had set no definite goals for their children's education. On the other hand, almost 17 per cent indicated that they would like to see their children have at least some college education and almost 35 per cent wanted their children to finish high school.

Day Care

During the 1961 peach harvest, the migrant ministry maintained a day care center at the Palisade Camp.

The child care center operated from August 23 to Sept. 6, with three supervisors. They were assisted by volunteers.

The center was held in the camp's community building because of its accessibility to the mothers. The enrollment was from 11 to 36 children each day with an average of 22. For the first time, the center accepted infants under two years. Although there was more work involved in this decision to take crib babies, the staff felt it was worth while because a survey showed that 28 mothers were able to work by having free child care available.

Lunch for the children was prepared by the supervisors and milk and graham crackers were provided for morning and afternoon snacks.

Both the playground and the large room in the community center were used for games.

Vocational Training Program

In 1961, adult education classes at the Palisade camp were held three nights a week, with three-hour sessions. The program, which lasted about eight weeks, was financed by a grant given the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches. This grant paid the salaries of the instructors ($25 per week per instructor) and provided funds for the acquistion of tools and supplies. The classes included: home economics, woodworking, and auto mechanics.

Welfare

The Mesa County Department of Welfare made the following report to the Mesa County Migrant Council concerning welfare assistance provided migrants in 1961.[5]

Financial and Statistical Report
Migrant Cases
1961 Season

Number of Applications and Inquiries Received	23
Family Cases	14
Adults	28
Children	49
Single Person Cases	9
By Type of Assistance Requested	
Total Cases	23
Food and Shelter	14
Medical Care	9
Transportation	0
By Type of Action by Department	
Total Cases	23
Approved for Assistance	17
Referred to other Agencies	1
Given Service by Department	2
Denied	3

5. Ibid.

Expenditures

Total Expenditures	$ 2,772.80
By Type of Assistance Granted	
Food and Shelter	$ 360.40
Medical Care	$ 57.64
Hospitalization	$2,254.76
Transportation	$ 100.00

There were 23 migrant cases making application for assistance during the 1961 season. The 23 cases making application compare with 25 cases applying in each of the years 1959 and 1960. It is noted that there is a marked increase in total expenditures over the preceding two years. Expenditures for 1961 totalled $2,772.80, as compared to an expenditure of $637.21 in 1959; and $351.26 in 1960. The reason for the big increase is because of the necessity of hospitalizing nine persons during the 1961 season. Cost for hospitalization in three of these cases alone totalled $1790.04.

The Migrant

Number Interviewed

A total of 312 interviews were conducted during the field survey on the Western Slope. Because of the tremendous impact on labor needs and because of time allowed for the study, all of the interviews were with workers who had come for the peach harvest. One hundred and twenty-four interviews were with family group members and 188 with single workers. Table 46 and 47 show the number of people and workers included in the survey respectively.

TABLE 46

Number of People Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	345	85	111	541
Per Cent	63.8	15.7	20.5	100

TABLE 47

Number of Workers Included in Interviews, Western Slope, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	341	56	25	422
Per Cent	80.8	13.3	5.9	100

The 124 families units interviewed reported a total of 481 children. The average number of children per family was 3.88, and the median number of children per family was 2.23.

Years a Migrant Worker

Table 48 shows the number of years the interviewee had worked as a seasonal farm worker.

TABLE 48

Years As A Migrant Worker by Age, Western Slope Interviews, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	AGE OF WORKER												Total
	Under 20		21-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		61+		
	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	
0	1	17	8	7	4	2	6	6	3	1	5	2	62
1	2	20	6	3	4	4	3	3		1	1		47
2		12	1	6	3	1	1	1	2	5			32
3		9	3	2	3	1	2	1	2			1	24
4		7	1	2	2		2	1	1	1	1		18
5		4		5	1	2		2				1	15
6		6				1	1	1		1	2		12
7	1	3	1		3	1	2	1					12
8				2	3		2		1	1			9
9		1				1	2		1				5
10			2	2	2	2	3	4		2	1	2	20
11-15			2	1	1	2		3		4		1	14
16-20					1	4				1	1	1	8
21-25					2	1	1		1		1		6
26-30							3		2				5
31+							4	2	8	2	3	2	21
NA		1			1								2
TOTAL	4	80	24	30	30	22	32	25	21	19	13	12	312

The average age of all the interviewees was 35.2 years and the median age was 25.28 years.

Table 49 shows the number of years the migrants interviwed had been seasonal farm workers, as well as the number of years they had worked in Colorado.

Table 49 shows that 39.1 per cent of all the interviewees were working in Colorado for the first time and that more than 52 per cent indicated that Colorado was the only state that they had ever worked in as a seasonal farm worker other than their state of residence.

TABLE 49

Years As A Migrant Worker And Years Worked In Colorado,
Western Slope Interviewees, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	Years As A Migrant In Colorado																
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31+	NA	Total
0	62																	62
1	10	37																47
2	5	8	19															32
3	5	4	2	13														24
4	4	1	3	2	8													18
5	3	2	2		4	4												15
6	2	3	1	2	1		3											12
7	3	1	2	2		1		3										12
8	2	2	1		1			1	2									9
9		2				1				2								5
10	8	2	1	3	1		1				4							20
11-15	5	3	1		1					1	2	1						14
16-20	2	1	1			3							1					8
21-25	1					1		1		2				1				6
26-30	2	2													1			5
31+	6	3	2		1	3	1			1	1				1	2		21
NA	2																	2
Total	122	71	35	22	17	13	5	5	2	6	7	1	1	1	2	2		312

Home State

The home states of the 312 interviewees are shown in Table 50.

TABLE 50

Home States Of Migrant Workers,
Western Slope Interviews, 1961

	Ethnic Group				
Home State	Anglo	Negro	Spanish-American	Indian	Total
Alabama		1			1
Arkansas	3	68			71
Arizona	6	5	4	6	21
California	8	2			10
Colorado	17	2	29		48
Florida	1				1
Georgia	1				1
Illinois	1				1
Indiana		1			1
Kansas	7				7
Louisiana	1	24			25
Michigan	1	1			2
Mississippi		1			1
Missouri	6	1			7
Nebraska	1			1	2
New Mexico	1		11		12
New York		1			1
North Dakota				1	1
Ohio	1				1
Oklahoma	29	6	2	14	51
Oregon	2				2
South Dakota	1			2	3
Texas	13	11	11		35
Utah	1				1
West Virginia	1				1
Wisconsin	1	1			2
Wyoming			1		1
No Home State	1				1
Canada	1				1
Total	105	125	58	24	312

Length of Time in Colorado

Table 51 shows very clearly that the majority of workers came to Colorado only for the peach harvest and did not intend to stay for any other work.

TABLE 51

Length Of Stay In Colorado By Time of Arrival,
Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Month Of Arrival On Western Slope	Length of Stay in Colorado							
	Less Than 1 Mo.	1-2 Mo.	2-3 Mo.	3-4 Mo.	4-5 Mo.	5-6 Mo.	More Than 6 Mo.	No Date Given
March							1	
April							1	
May				1		1		
June			1	1	2			
July		4	6	2	2			
August	239	25	1	1				14
No Date Given								10
Total	239	29	8	5	4	1	2	24

Reasons for Working in Colorado

Table 52 shows the reasons the 312 interviewees gave for preferring to work in Colorado or not preferring to work in Colorado.

TABLE 52

Reasons For Working In Colorado,
Western Slope Interviews, 1961

Reasons Given	Prefer Working In Colorado	Do Not Prefer Working In Colorado
Wages	110	35
Housing	10	15
Type of Crops	32	19
Length of Season	4	2
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	11	1
Community Attitudes	22	2
Weather	76	3
Other	32	13
Only Work Offer	8	4

Wages and weather were the most commonly given reasons for preferring to work in Colorado, while wages were also the main reason for not liking the work in Colorado.

Return to Colorado Next Year

Table 53 on the following page shows the answers to the question as to whether or not the worker would return to Colorado next year and why.

TABLE 53

Return To Colorado Next Year,
Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Reason Given	Yes	No
Wages	91	32
Housing	17	12
Types of Crop	37	31
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	28	2
Community Attitude	15	
Other	30	25

Wages were cited as a main reason both by those workers who indicated they would return the following year and by those workers who would not return.

Reasons for Working at Seasonal Farm Labor

Table 54 lists the responses by the 312 interviewees as to why they were seasonal farm workers.

TABLE 54

Reason For Doing Seasonal Farm Work,
Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

Reason Given	Number
No Other Job Skills	43
Able to Make More Money	70
Unemployed Otherwise	202
Enjoy it	20
Other	66

Winter Employment

Table 55 is a compilation of the type of jobs worked at during the preceding winter and the number of interviewees who worked at each type of job.

TABLE 55

Winter Employment of Migrants,
Western Slope Interviews, 1961

Type of Job	Number
Farm	87
Factory	12
Housework for Wages	6
Odd Jobs	43
No Work	72
Other	108

To complete the winter employment picture, Table 56 shows the weeks worked during the winter and the amount of money earned during the winter of 1960-61.

TABLE 56

Weeks Worked During Winter and Amount Earned 1960-1961, Western Slope Migrant Interviews, 1961

	Weeks Worked	Amount Earned
Mean	10.1	$ 524.83
Median	10.0	280.00
Low	0	0
High	22	$4200.00

The Migrant And The Community

Community Attitude

Mesa County Migrant Council. Mesa County is the one area in the state where community interest in the migrant worker is well developed, organized, and has contributed concrete results to improving living and working conditions for the migrant. A brief history of the Mesa County Migrant Council, taken from the 1960 Report of the Mesa County Migrant Council, is included below:

> Until 1948, there was no organized effort to better the lot of the many migrant workers who help grow and harvest the crops of Mesa County. In June of that year, the State Director of the Migrant Ministry of the Council of Churches came in person to pioneer a work in the newly purchased Labor Camp of the Palisade peach growers.
>
> In order to support her efforts, Palisade women from several churches organized themselves into a group known as United Churchwomen. They supplied toys, clothing, milk, volunteer service, and some money. Realizing that their efforts were inadequate in comparison to the need, they began asking the help of other organizations and agencies.
>
> In this way the program was substantially broadened year by year. At their request, the Red Cross gave free swimming lessons to the children; the Recreation Commission supplied used sports equipment, the County Library gave

books, the FFA began a long-range tree-planting project in the Camp and the Girl Scouts conducted a Pilot project. In 1955, the United Churchwomen were instrumental in bringing to Palisade a Health Project, financed by federal funds, which provided nursing and clinic service to Mesa County migrants.

The same year, the Palisade Women's Club added their strength to the existing program. They established and successfully operated the first Thrift Shop, Free Child Care Center, and Sewing Center. The need for a coordinating group was most evident, so that fall they invited all organizations which had contributed to the Child Care Center to send a representative to form a County Migrant Council. Thirty-five organizations and eight interested people joined with the professional agencies - Health, Welfare, and Migrant Ministry - in answer to this appeal.

So was born the Mesa County Migrant Council which coordinates activities in behalf of migrant workers; supplies information to the public, to growers, and to the migrants themselves; carries on projects, such as the Child Care Center; and develops other services as needed. As a Council, we have been able to secure a Special Summer School for migrant children, extend the original services of the Public Health Department, and continue to increase the effectiveness of existing services.

The 1961 report of the Mesa County Migrant Council lists a total voting membership of 63 individuals and organizations, including governmental agencies such as the departments of health, education, welfare, and employment and Mesa County School District No. 51; several church and service organizations; and the Council of Churches' Migrant Ministry Program.

Peach Board of Control. While several Peach Board of Control members, and many growers, are members of the Migrant Council, the two organizations have not always seemed to pursue the same goals. The council is worker oriented and vigorously pushes programs designed from a humanitarian viewpoint first with economic benefits to the grower second. The board, of course, is oriented toward the grower's economic position and, therefore, has been less inclined to support social programs for migrant workers. The board did underwrite the 1961 migrant medical care program, however, as indicated in a previous section.

Law Enforcement Problem

Law officers on the Western Slope report few problems in the transportation of workers, since all trucks traveling interstate must comply with ICC regulations concerning safety requirements, rest stops, load limits for trucks, etc.

Some local police problems do arise during the peach harvest season, but the police officers are aware of this and take steps to correct them before any trouble or injuries occur. Drinking on the streets or in the parks is closely watched and quickly stopped when found. Loitering in parks after dark is not permitted. None of the peace officers contacted on the Western Slope felt that the migrants caused enough special problems to need any corrective state legislation.

THE SAN JUAN BASIN

Crop Activities and Acreage

The San Juan Basin, which includes Montezuma and Dolores counties, is predominantly a dry land farming region with some irrigated acreage. The principal crops grown are dry pinto beans, fruits, and hay.

Crops Requiring Seasonal Farm Labor

The principal crop for which seasonal farm labor is used in the San Juan Basin is pinto beans. Other crops requiring lesser amounts of seasonal farm labor include: hay, small fruits (cherries and apricots), and apples. Table 57 shows the number of farms growing fruit in 1959 and the number of bushels harvested in Montezuma County in 1959 (latest figures available).

TABLE 57

1959 Fruit Crop Harvest in Montezuma County[a]

Fruit	No. of Farms	Quantity Harvested
Apricots	66	529 bushels
Apples	133	77,521 bushels
Sour Cherries	49	2,221 pounds
Sweet Cherries	36	1,156 pounds
Peaches	96	16,649 bushels
Pears	55	759 bushels
Plums	52	215 bushels

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

Table 58 on the following page shows the pinto bean acreage and harvest in Dolores and Montezuma counties in 1960.

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production. During the 10-year period, 1950-1960, total harvested acreage of dry beans in Dolores County increased slightly, from 35,650 acres to 36,250 acres, or 1.7 per cent. During the same period in Montezuma County, the increase in harvested acres was almost nine per cent (from 48,900 acres to 53,300 acres). The increase in dry bean acreage for the area as a whole was 5.9 per cent.

TABLE 58

Bean Acreage and Harvest in the San Juan Basin in 1960[a]

	Montezuma County	Dolores County	Total
Irrigated Land			
Acres Harvested	350	---	350
Pounds Per Acre	1,100	---	1,100
Production 100 lb. Bags	3,850	---	3,850
Non-irrigated Land			
Acres Harvested	52,950	36,250	89,200
Pounds Per Acre	280	280	280
Production 100 lb. Bags	148,085	101,500	249,585
Total			
Acres Harvested	53,300	36,250	89,550
Production 100 lb. Bags	151,935	101,500	253,435
Value	$1,063,545	$710,500	$1,774,045

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

Table 59 shows the total number of farms in Dolores and Montezuma counties for 1950 and 1960, the median size farm, and the per cent of increase of the median size farm.

TABLE 59

Number of Farms and Median Size
San Juan Basin, 1950 and 1960[a]

County	Number of Farms 1950	Number of Farms 1960	Per Cent of Change	Median Size (Acres) 1950	Median Size (Acres) 1960	Per Cent of Change
Dolores	246	184	-25.2%	339	531	+56.6%
Montezuma	978	744	-23.9	162	253	+56.2
Total	1,224	928	-24.2%	501	784	+56.5%

a. Federal Census data.

This table shows that the San Juan Basin reflects the changing agricultural pattern of the state as a whole. The number of farms decreased almost one-fourth, and the average farm size increased more than one-half.

Mechanization and Technological Change

Several different opinions have been expressed concerning the extent of bean harvest mechanization in the San Juan Basin. The manager of the employment department's Cortez area office stated that mechanization had progressed very rapidly in recent years and that a major portion of the crop is harvested mechanically. He modified this statement by the observation that growers are more likely to use hand labor if the crop is a good one. It was the opinion of the Montezuma county agent that only 20 per cent of the bean harvest in Montezuma County was not mechanized. In Dolores County, the county agent said that only 10 to 20 per cent of the harvest was not mechanized.

Interviews with several growers indicated that there appears to be no valid reason why the pinto bean harvest cannot be completely mechanized. One grower, for example, strongly expressed his opinion that the use of hand labor was not only more costly to the grower but also resulted in a poorer quality bean. (The use of hand shocking resulted in more dirt in the threshed beans.) Other farmers stated that they preferred hand labor because the workers picked up enough scattered beans to more than offset the added cost of hand shocking. The impression was conveyed by several growers that the use of hand labor in the pinto bean harvest is mostly a tradition and that complete mechanization will be effected in a few years.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

Most, if not all, of the seasonal workers available are Navajo Indians from New Mexico and Arizona. For many years, the Navajos have come to the San Juan Basin in search of work, but they do not think of themselves as migratory workers. Rather, they consider their stay in the area as an opportunity to earn a few dollars for food, clothing, and other necessities before winter.

One of the major problems facing both the grower and the worker is the difficulty of communication. Few, if any, growers can speak the Navajo language. Most Navajos can speak some English, but many of them do not speak it well and prefer their native language. During the field interviews, even those who could speak good English preferred to remain silent while their designated spokesman answered questions through an interpreter. This lack of ability to communicate may lead to misunderstanding and distrust on the part of both the grower and the worker. The grower does not expect to learn to speak a language such as Navajo, and the older Navajos either can't or won't learn to speak English.

Many growers have complained about the unreliability of the Navajo workers, pointing out that the workers often leave the area during the middle of the harvest, causing the grower added expense in the recruitment and employment of another crew. Liquor consumption was cited by several growers as a chief cause of the Navajo's unreliability. They reported that after a weekend the Navajo already employed would either fail to show up or refuse to work until the middle of the following week.

The attitudes of the growers toward the Navajo are similar to those of the community in general. These attitudes toward the Navajo workers vary greatly. Some growers would like to help the Navajo achieve some of the material and cultural benefits of the white man's society; many are inclined to have as little to do with the Navajo as possible, except to employ them for a few weeks in the bean harvest. Generally, the growers accept the existing attitude without giving it much thought.

Navajo workers have been coming to find work in the basin for a great number of years, and the feeling is that they will continue to do so. The Navajo are considered no particular problem as long as their work is acceptable. If a worker becomes a problem, he can be returned to the reservation and another employed in his place.

Only one grower appeared before the Migrant Labor Committee at the Cortez regional meeting; consequently, it is apparent that the growers feel they do not have any major problems with their seasonal farm labor.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers--Peak Employment

The seasonal farm labor peak is reached in September during pinto bean harvest. In 1961, the following totals were reported for September by the employment department's Cortez area office:

Week	Total Workers	Workers in Pinto Beans	Per Cent of Total Workers in Pinto Beans
1st	1,400	700	50.0%
2nd	2,400	1,500	62.5
3rd	800	500	62.5
4th	2,300	1,500	65.2

Pinto bean harvest, as shown above, requires most of the seasonal farm labor force in the San Juan Basin. Other seasonal farm workers in the month of September were employed in apples, hay, and other farming activities.

More than 1,000 seasonal farm workers were employed in the San Juan Basin by the middle of May, in 1960 and 1961, according to the employment department's weekly estimates. This total increased gradually on a week-by-week basis until the end of June. Throughout July and August, the total number of workers varied considerably, with a low of 700 workers and a high of 1,650 workers.

During 1962, the early season peak of 600 workers did not occur until the first week of July, and this figure remained fairly constant until the last week of August, when the total number of workers dropped to 350. The peak employment of 900 workers in 1962 was reached during the first two weeks of October, somewhat later than usual.

Long Range Trends. There had not been much change in the annual number of farm workers in the San Juan Basin for bean harvest for several years prior to 1962. During both 1956 and 1957, the employment department reported a peak employment of 1,500 workers in dry beans. In 1960, the peak employment figure was 1,600 workers and, in 1961, 1,500 workers; however, the 1962 peak employment of workers for bean harvest was only 650. Without further information about crop conditions in the area, it appears that either there has been a vast increase in mechanization in the past year or that the employment department has instituted a new system of counting workers.

Employment Department Statistics. During the 1961 field study in the San Juan Basin, every bean-producing section was covered by the field staff. These on-the-spot observations resulted in an estimate of approximately 500 seasonal workers employed during bean harvest, or one-third of the total reported by the employment department. In this connection, it should be noted (as mentioned above) that employment department estimates of workers for 1962 are almost 57 per cent less than in 1961. In June and July, 1961, employment department statistics indicated that as many as 250 to 300 workers were employed for apples and small fruit. A field check was made of the area in which many of these workers were supposed to have been employed, and very few orchards were found; in none of them were there any seasonal workers.

Use of Local Workers. The employment department's estimates of employment of locals in seasonal farm labor remained fairly constant for the three years of 1960, 1961, and 1962. In 1960, a peak of 600 locals were employed during the last three weeks of June and the first week of July. In 1961, a peak of 800 locals were employed in the second week of October, and, in 1962, the peak employment of locals occurred during the second week of August and again during the third week of September when 550 locals were working.

Recruitment

The employment department does not attempt extensive recruitment, not even during bean harvest, according to the employment department manager in Cortez. Apparently, extensive recruitment is not necessary, as most growers prefer Navajo workers and they may recruit them directly from the reservation at Shiprock or through a trading post. Many Navajos come to the San Juan Basin and find their own employment.

The employment department acts mostly as a referring agency for those Navajos who contact the department's office in Cortez or the mobile office in Dove Creek.

Forty-one Navajo workers were interviewed during the 1961 field study. Only three stated that they had obtained their present jobs through the employment department. Two reported that they had returned to their previous employer on their own; one had obtained a job through arrangements made by the employer; 33 had found jobs just by asking around; one had found a job by other means; and one did not answer the question.

Number and Source. No intrastate or interstate workers were found, other than Navajo Indians, even though the employment department reported that there were from 300 to 500 intrastate workers in the Cortez area in September, 1960; from 250 to 400 intrastate workers in September, 1961; and from 50 to 150 intrastate workers in September, 1962. No Spanish-American or Anglo migrant workers were found in the area, and no Mexican nationals are recruited.

Labor Market Organization

The labor market in the San Juan Basin is largely unorganized. It would be very difficult to change the present employment pattern or to recruit Navajos for work in another area. The Navajos come to the basin to work because they or their families have done so for years and it is not too far from the reservation. They have no desire, however, to work elsewhere in Colorado. Twenty-five of the 41 Navajos interviewed stated that they had not worked for wages before they came to the San Juan Basin in 1961, and twenty-six stated that they would not work for wages after they left the San Juan Basin.

This attitude of the Navajos toward working elsewhere probably explains the lack of effort by the employment department to try to refer the Navajo workers to other areas of Colorado once they are in the San Juan Basin. There is work available in the San Luis Valley after the pinto bean harvest is completed in the basin, and several hundred Navajos are recruited from the reservations in New Mexico and Arizona and transported to the San Luis Valley for potato harvest. As far as could be determined, hardly any of the Navajo bean harvest workers go to the San Luis Valley to pick potatoes.

Few growers call on the employment department when they need labor. Some growers prefer to make their own arrangements to obtain workers with the Navajo Tribal Council. While this practice provides workers in sufficient quantity, the employment department is bypassed, and its potential control over allocation or reallocation of the available labor supply is reduced.

Wage Rates and Earnings

The prevailing wage rate for work in pinto beans for both 1961 and 1962 was $.75 to $1.00 per hour, as reported by the employment department. Other wage rates reported were $1.00 to $1.25 per hour for work in hay in 1961, and $1.00 per hour for hay work in 1962. There is very little seasonal farm work paid by piece rate in the San Juan Basin.

The field survey in 1961 showed the following rates being paid:

Rate	Number of Interviewees[a]
$ .75 Hour	32
.80 Hour	3
1.00 Hour	3
180.00 Month	1
	39

a. Two did not know method or amount of payment.

Each Navajo interviewed was asked how much he and/or his family had earned during the past week. These answers were tabulated and are shown in Table 60.

TABLE 60

Previous Week's Earnings by Migrants in the San Juan Basin, 1961

	Family	Single
Mean	$26.08	$17.25
Median	24.00	12.00
Low Earnings	00.00	00.00
High Earnings	80.75	45.00

Each worker interviewed was also asked how much he had earned from April 1, 1961 until the time of the interview. The average weekly earnings during this period for family groups and single workers are shown in Table 61.

TABLE 61

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, San Juan Basin, 1961

	Family	Single
Mean	$13.99	$27.72
Median	9.72	19.57
Low Average	00.00	8.70
High Average	41.25	63.04

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

Housing facilities for the migrant workers in the San Juan Basin were the worst found anywhere in the state. Of the 41 persons interviewed during the field study, only 17 were living in any kind of frame structure, not necessarily a house. Garages, sheds, and old buses were used, as were old, abandoned houses. Some Navajos lived in tents or had no shelter at all and slept in the sagebrush.

Several growers and other residents of the area stated that one of the reasons that housing was not provided was the Navajos' fear of sleeping in a house in which some person may have died. The Navajo interpreter assisting in the field study confirmed that there was such a belief among the Navajo, but only the very old and very ignorant held it anymore. All of the workers who were not sleeping in a house were asked if they would prefer a house to their present shelter. Without exception, they answered in the affirmative.

There is little permanent housing available in the basin for seasonal farm labor, and few farmers can see any need to build new facilities that might be used only one month a year. The lack of housing might work adversely, because poor living conditions could make recruitment and retention of workers more difficult.

The use of cooking stoves was a rarity among the Navajo workers. Whether cooking stoves were not furnished or whether the Navajo preferred not to use them could not be determined. In any case, the usual method of cooking food was over an open campfire.

Rudimentary sanitary facilities were lacking, except where the workers' quarters were located near enough to the farm residence to have access to a privy. No attempt was made to provide privies or garbage or waste cans for those workers living some distance from a farmhouse.

Water was hauled or carried from the nearest available source, usually the farm well or cistern. In one instance, the farmer had supplied his workers with a large tank truck of water for their needs.

Between May and July, 1962, the employment department inspected all of the housing units in the San Juan Basin that could be used for housing seasonal farm workers. Twenty-nine units were inspected. Six of the units were rated in good condition by the employment department, and 23 were rated as fair. None was found to be in poor condition or in an unacceptable condition.

Health Needs

It is extremely difficult to get a clear picture of the health needs of the seasonal workers in the San Juan Basin. Their nearness to the Navajo reservation made health services available to them, but evidently not all of the Navajos can or do take advantage of these free services.

Eight persons interviewed said that they had been sick since coming to Colorado (the most common ailment was a cold); but only three of them had gone to a doctor; the other five did nothing. Four persons interviewed said that they had been injured since coming to Colorado (minor wire cuts, no serious injuries), but only one considered his injury serious enough to seek medical assistance. Two persons reported that they had (either now or previously) tuberculosis.

A survey of health needs of the migrant Navajo worker was conducted in the San Juan Basin in 1959 by Lela Mallett of the San Juan Basin Health Unit. Miss Mallett did not interview any workers but confined her survey to growers, the employment department, community leaders, and doctors and other health officials. Her comments regarding medical care for the Navajo worker are as follows:[1]

1. Narrative Report of Lela Mallett on Migrant Worker Survey Done in the San Juan Basin of Colorado, May 15-October 15,1959,pp. 3-5.

So many answers were given in answering the question relative to medical care. One answer was that the ill person was taken to the physician of his choice and all fees were paid by the Tribe. One person giving this answer had employed Navajos for 30 years. To clarify the policies regarding medical payments by the Tribe, the Director of the San Juan Basin Health Unit felt a conference with Dr. William C. Larsen, Medical Officer in Charge at the Shiprock Hospital, Shiprock, New Mexico, would be worthwhile. Dr. Larsen was very cordial and cooperative in answering all questions asked. The first question asked of him was, What is the policy regarding ill Navajos off the Reservation? His answer was that they welcome them at any of the Indian Hospitals at Shiprock, Fort Defiance, Crown Point, Winslow, or Tuba City, or at any of the Out-Patient Clinics at Towaoc, Dulce, Ignacio or Kayenta. The non-resident, that is, the Navajo who has a permanent job and home elsewhere, must provide his own transportation to the facility. If they live on the Reservation, they are eligible for all care. Only in dire emergency will the U.S. Public Health Service pay for any care given off the Reservation and this emergency care must be authorized by the Doctor on Call at the Shiprock Hospital before it is given, otherwise there will be no payment from Health Service funds. This policy is necessary because of shortage of these funds.

While in Shiprock, we also had a conference with Miss Mildred Jones, Supervisor of Public Health Nursing in the Shiprock area of the Navajo Reservation, regarding family health records kept on or given to the families in the area. The only record they give the family is the Merck, Sharp & Dohme Immunization record. The small section is given the family and the larger section is kept in the Nursing office files.

Due to the proximity of the Navajo Reservation, and Shiprock, to all areas of the Basin, no area being more than 75 miles away, most medical problems are returned to the Reservation without too much difficulty; however, a very real hardship occurs often for the unemployed who are off the Reservation in search of employment when illness or accident befalls them. As one physician said, "The off-Reservation Indian is in a No-Man's Land where neither the Tribe nor the government will claim him." The Bureau of Indian Affairs refuses reimbursement for care, the Welfare Departments are not set up to pay for care of the Migrant and it ends with "the physicians and the

hospitals being left holding the bag." A Superintendent of Schools said, "The Navajo is not being treated fairly. He is being urged to leave the Reservation in search of work, then care is refused him if anything happens before he finds employment. It looks as if a premium is being placed on the lazy tribe member who just stays on the Reservation so that he can receive care."

If the worker, or a member of his family, becomes ill, the farmer, or more likely his wife, takes the sick person to the physician of his choice. In some instances, this has been the Tribal Medicine Man. More often, the patient is taken to the employer's physician, the Doctor is paid by the employer (this fee sometimes being deducted from pay, sometimes not) and the employer's wife helps the mother or wife in interpreting the Doctor's orders. There is a growing tendency to integrate the Indian into the community's activities and schools and the physicians treat him just as any other employed person in the community, expecting him to pay for his medical care just as anyone else is expected to do.

Education and Welfare

Education

School Attendance. The field survey in 1961 showed that there were 17 children between the ages of six and 16 with the 37 family groups that were interviewed in the San Juan Basin. Thirteen of these children attended a regular school session when they were at their home base.

The 37 family groups had left 47 children of school age behind when they came to Colorado, and 37 of these children were in school. Out of the total of 64 school age children in the interview group, 50 were either in school at the time of the interview or would enter school as soon as they returned home.

Most of the Navajo workers seem to make some effort, however limited, to get their children into school. A few told the staff that they didn't want their children to go to school and didn't send them when they had the chance. One family reported that they couldn't send their children to school because they couldn't afford clothes for them.

Need for Summer School. The attitude of the Navajos who brought their children to Colorado would seem to eliminate any need for a summer school program in the San Juan Basin. The children who are old enough to work are allowed to work, and both parents and children prefer this arrangement to school attendance.

Other factors tend to complicate any attempt to establish a summer school program. First, and perhaps of primary importance, is the fact that the workers are only in the basin for three or four weeks, and while there they may change their place of employment several times. Second, there are no large concentrations of workers, and attendance at a centrally-located school would involve many miles of driving each day. Third, the peak use of Navajo workers occurs during September when regular school is in session. Since none of the migrant children tries to enroll in the regular schools, it is doubtful that space or teachers could be made available for a special program.

Attitude Toward Education. That the Navajo has no deep feeling about having his children attend school is shown in Table 62.

TABLE 62

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education for Their Children, San Juan Basin, 1961

Migrant's Years At School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend				
	6	12	12+	No Answer	Total
0		2		21	23
1					0
2		2		3	5
3		1	1	3	5
4				2	2
5	1				1
6				1	1
Total	1	5	1	30	37

Thirty of the 37 family groups did not give definite answers as to how many years they wanted their children to attend school. The usual answers given were that the children could go as long as they wanted to or that the children would go as long as the parents could afford to send them. Only seven families seemed to have established any goals for sending their children to school.

The Montezuma county school superintendent reported that no attempt is made to enroll the Navajo children during regular school sessions for several reasons: 1) Navajo children are in the area for only a short time; 2) many of the Navajo children have not attained the grade level commensurate with their ages and could cause some adjustment problems; and 3) school attendance is a responsibility of the local districts and not of county officials.

Welfare

The local welfare units in the San Juan Basin reported to the staff that no assistance was granted to seasonal farm workers in their areas.

No workers were interviewed who had requested or received welfare assistance in Colorado; but five interviewees said they had received some welfare assistance the preceding winter; three had drawn unemployment compensation; and two received old age pension allowances from their home states.

The Migrant

Number Interviewed

A total of 41 interviews were conducted by the staff during the field survey in the San Juan Basin in 1961. Thirty-seven of the interviews covered family groups, and four interviews were with single workers. Tables 63 and 64 show the number of people included in the survey and the number of workers included in the survey.

TABLE 63

Number of People Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	45	30	33	108
Per Cent	41.7	27.8	30.5	100

TABLE 64

Number of Workers Included in Migrant Interviews, San Juan Basin, 1961

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number	36	22	4	62
Per Cent	58.1	35.5	6.4	100

The 37 family units had a total of 177 children of all ages. The median number of children per family was five.

Years as a Migrant Worker

Table 65 shows the number of years the interviewee had worked as a seasonal farm worker.

TABLE 65

Years As A Migrant Worker By Age, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	Age of Worker: Under 20 F	Under 20 S	21-30 F	21-30 S	31-40 F	31-40 S	41-50 F	41-50 S	51-60 F	51-60 S	61 & over F	61 & over S	Total
0													0
1			1		5				1		2		9
2				2	1	1	1		3				8
3									1				1
4									1				1
5											1		1
6													0
7													0
8			1								1		2
9					1								1
10									1				1
11-15						1							1
16-20					4		1						5
21-25					1								1
26-30									1				1
31+							2		4		3		9
Total	0	0	2	2	12	2	4	0	12	0	7	0	41

None of the interviewees was under 20 years of age, and only four were under 30 years. Mean age for all of the interviewees was 46.5 years, and the median age was 51 years.

Table 66 shows the number of years the migrants interviewed had worked in Colorado, according to the total number of years worked as a migrant.

TABLE 66

Years As A Migrant Worker In Colorado
San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Total Years As A Migrant	1	2	3	4	5	6	8	9	10	11-15	16-20	26-30	31+	Total
1	9													9
2		8												8
3			1											1
4				1										1
5					1									1
8		1					1							2
9								1						1
10									1					1
11-15										1				1
16-20		1	1			1					2			5
21-25		1												1
26-30										1		1		2
31+	3		1		1				1			1	1	8
Total	12	11	3	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	41

Home State of the Migrant

Twenty-three of the Navajos interviewed were from New Mexico; 10 were from Utah; seven were from Arizona; and one said that he now considered Colorado as his home state.

Length of Stay in Colorado

Table 67 shows the length of time the Navajo worker intended to stay in Colorado by time of arrival.

TABLE 67

Length Of Time In Colorado By Date Of Arrival,
San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Date of Arrival	Less Than 1 mo.	1-2 mo.	2-3 mo.	3-4 mo.	4-5 mo.	5-6 mo.	More Than 6 mo.	No Date Given	Total
April					1				1
May						1			1
August	1								1
September	29	1							30
No Date Given								8	8
Total	30	1	-	-	1	1	-	8	41

Attitudes Toward Working in Colorado

Table 68 gives an account of the reasons expressed for working as a seasonal farm worker in Colorado.

TABLE 68

Reason For Working in Colorado,
San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Reason Given	Prefer Working In Colorado	Do Not Prefer Working In Colorado
Wages	3	4
Housing	1	0
Types of Crops	13	0
Length of Season	0	0
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	1	1
Community Attitudes	0	0
Weather	0	1
Only Job Offer	8	1
Other	10	1
Total[a]	36	9

a. Totals do not equal 41 because of multiple reasons given.

More workers were dissatisfied with wages received than were satisfied. The most common reason given for preferring to work in Colorado was the type of crops. Several workers said that their employment at the time of the interview was the only job offer they had received. In order to give another indication of how well the workers liked working in Colorado, they were also asked if they would return to the same place next year. The results of this question are shown in Table 69.

TABLE 69

Return to Colorado Next Year, San Juan Basin Interviews, 1961

Reasons Given	Yes	No
Wages	1	3
Housing	1	0
Types of Crops	9	0
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	3	0
Community Attitude	0	1
Other	21	0
Total[a]	35	4

a. NA responses are not included.

One reason for the high percentage of "other" answers to the questions was the difficulty in communicating with the interviewees. Most workers either did not understand the question as interpreted or responded with a noncommittal answer.

Those interviewed were also asked why they did seasonal farm labor. One-third of the interviewees said that they would otherwise be unemployed; four workers replied that they could not earn as much at any other employment; and two said they enjoyed it. The remainder gave diverse answers, such as "to buy groceries," or "to buy shoes." Apparently, seasonal farm labor was accepted as a way of life without much thought.

Winter Employment

Employment was limited and earnings low for Navajo workers in the winter of 1960-61. Table 70 lists the type of work performed, if any, by interviewees during the 1960-1961 winter.

TABLE 70

Winter Employment of San Juan Basin Migrant Workers, 1961

Type of Job	Number
Farm	15
Factory	0
Housework	1
Odd Jobs	0
No Work	20
Other	5
Total	41

Twenty out of the 41 interviewees did no work at all during the winter. Again, because of communication problems, it could not be determined whether the 15 who had worked on farms were working for wages or were working on their own farms. Table 71 shows the average number of weeks worked and amount earned by those Navajos employed during the 1960-61 winter.

TABLE 71

Weeks Worked During The Winter
And Amount Earned, San Juan Basin Migrants, 1961

	Weeks Worked	Earnings
Mean	3.92	$ 173.73
Median	0	0
Low	0	0
High	22	$1,400.00

The Migrant and the Community

Community Attitudes

The mayor of Cortez reported that, so far as the community was concerned, the migrant workers caused no particular problems. The workers are accepted as a necessity for getting the bean crop harvested. The workers generally feel that they are accepted by the community on a temporary basis during the time they are in the area. Only one interviewee said that he would not like to come back to the area again because of adverse community attitudes.

Even though the Navajo is more or less accepted, there are no programs designed to assist him and no organization actively concerned with his problems.

Law Enforcement Problems

The law enforcement officials in the San Juan Basin reported no law enforcement problems caused by the migrant workers. They said that for the most part the Navajos were well behaved, and only on weekends was there any problem with intoxication. An interview with the Cortez city jailer indicated that most of the intoxicated workers who are locked up are put into jail for their own protection since they usually are more of a menace to themselves than to society.

The state patrol officer in Cortez stated that the transportation facilities for migrant workers in the San Juan Basin were improving each year. Many workers now travel in small trucks or pickups. These vehicles are checked for safety requirements at the port of entry, as well as by the patrol officers.

Crop Activities and Acreage

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.

Crops Using Seasonal Farm Labor

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet acreage and production in Northern Colorado in 1961 is shown in Table 72. Weld County had the largest sugar beet acreage in the state. The 75,925 acres of sugar beets harvested in Weld County was about 54 per cent of the Northern Colorado total and about 45 per cent of the state total of 167,000 acres. Average per acre yield in Northern Colorado in 1961 was 14.8 tons, as compared with the state average of 14.7 tons per acre. In 1960, the average yield per acre was 18.2 tons, and the state average was 17.8 tons. The Northern Colorado counties accounted for more than 83 per cent of the total sugar beet acreage and for more than 84 per cent of total state production.

TABLE 72

Sugar Beet Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1961[a]

County	Acres Planted	Per Cent Harvested	Acres Harvested	Tons Per Acre	Production Tons
Adams	3,631	96	3,499	13.7	48,074
Boulder	3,922	98	3,850	16.4	63,061
Larimer	11,107	97	10,768	13.8	148,740
Logan	13,785	97	13,336	14.6	195,423
Morgan	26,720	96	25,708	16.0	410,304
Sedgwick	5,261	99	5,209	16.6	86,366
Washington	1,058	96	1,018	13.2	13,477
Weld	79,961	95	75,925	14.5	1,101,091
Total	145,445	95.8	139,313	14.8	2,066,536

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

Potatoes. Potato acreage and production in Northern Colorado in 1960 is shown in Table 73. Weld County had the largest number of acres planted in potatoes in 1960 in Northern Colorado and was second in the state; only Rio Grande County had a greater acreage. The 14,510 acres of potatoes harvested in 1960 in Northern Colorado was 26 per cent of the state acreage and the 3,181,200 sacks (100 pound) of potatoes grown amounted to 26.7 per cent of all the potatoes grown in the state on irrigated land.

TABLE 73

Potato Acreage and Production, Northern Colorado, 1960[a]

County	Acres Planted	Acres Harvested	CWT. Per Acre	Production CWT.
Adams	120	110	210	23,100
Larimer	210	200	195	39,000
Logan	50	40	220	8,800
Morgan	2,290	2,220	240	532,800
Phillips	50	50	210	10,500
	790	710	230	163,300
Weld	11,490	11,180	215	2,403,700
Total	15,000	14,510	219	3,181,200

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

Other Crops. Other crops in Northern Colorado requiring varying amounts of labor are onions, cantaloupes, snap beans, cucumbers and several other vegetables grown both for processing and the fresh market. Acreage for all of these crops except cucumbers, is shown in Table 74. Cucumber acreage in 1959 in Northern Colorado was 2280[1] with the majority of the acreage in Larimer County. No production figures are available for the crops listed in Table 74. Weld and Adams counties accounted for more than 78 per cent of the acreage planted in these commercial crops in 1960. Weld County is second in the state(Otero County ranks first) in onion acreage and accounted for almost 23 per cent of the total state onion acreage. Adams County ranked fourth in the state in the number of acres planted in cantaloupe and had 13 per cent of the total state acreage in this crop. Northern Colorado ranked first in the acres planted in snap beans, cabbage, carrots, cauliflower, celery, sweet corn, and tomatoes.

1. Colorado Agricultural Statistics, 1959 Final and 1960 Preliminary, Colorado Department of Agriculture in cooperation with U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 74

Cantaloupe, Onions, and Vegetables Acreage
Northern Colorado, 1960[a]

County	Cantaloupe	Onions	Snap Bean	Cabbage	Carrots	Cauliflower	Celery	Sweet Corn	Lettuce	Green Peas	Spinach	Tomatoes	Total Acres
Adams	370	880	130	450	450	220	100	700	80	20	140	70	3,610
Arapahoe		10	10	20		20		20	10		10		100
Boulder	20	150	40	170	20	10		140	10	10	30	80	680
Jefferson	10	20	40	20	10	30	20	350	20	10	10	10	550
Larimer	20	20	20	20	10	10		70	10	10		10	200
Logan	20	30						40				10	100
Morgan	30	170						10				40	250
Sedgwick	20	120						20					160
Weld	140	2,000	120	370	500	40	20	270	40		40	180	3,720
Total	630	3,400	360	1,050	990	330	140	1,620	170	50	230	400	9,370

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

Recent Trends in Acreage and Production

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet acreage for the past ten years has increased about 14 per cent for Northern Colorado as a whole, with Morgan County registering a 60 per cent increase in acres harvested between 1950 and 1960. Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Sedgwick and Weld counties also had increased acreage in sugar beets, while Adams and Washington counties both declined slightly. The average yield over the 1950-1960 period increased from 16.5 tons per acre to 18.2 tons per acre, or 10.3 per cent.

Potatoes. Potato acreage in 1950 totaled 16,720, but decreased 15 per cent to 14,510 in 1960. Total production for the period decreased from 3,938,688 100-pound sacks to 3,181,200 100-pound sacks and yield decreased from 235 sacks per acre to about 219 sacks per acre. Weld County potato acreage declined more than 1,900 acres in this ten-year period; Sedgwick County declined 740 acres; Larimer County 120 acres; and Logan County 50 acres. Adams, Morgan, and Phillips counties all reported increased potato acreage.

Other Crops. Acres planted in commercial vegetables declined substantially between 1950 and 1960. Total acreage decreased from 14,921 to 9,370, with the greatest decreases in Adams and Weld counties. Boulder County reported the only increase in commercial vegetable acreage for the ten-year period, from 372 to 680 acres. By crops, the largest decreases were in cabbage, celery, sweet corn, lettuce, green peas, and tomatoes. Snap beans and cauliflower acreage declined very little, while cantaloupe, onion, carrot, and spinach acreage increased slightly.

Cherries. Cherry production in Larimer County fell sharply between 1950 and 1960. The number of farms reporting commercial cherry trees decreased from 490 in 1950 to 84 in 1960. The number of bearing cherry trees decreased from 152,571 to 48,805 during the same period. Production in 1950 was 2,702,500 pounds, while 1960 production was only 1,274,717 pounds.

Number of Farms and Size. The decrease in number of farms in Northern Colorado between 1950 and 1960 reflects the national trend. The number of farms in the counties of Adams, Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Morgan, Sedgwick, and Weld decreased from 12,385 in 1950 to 10,394 in 1960. All seven counties reported a decrease in the number of farms, with Adams having the largest decrease, 32.5 per cent; Boulder, 31.5 per cent; Larimer, 17.2 per cent; Weld, 10.5 per cent; Sedgwick, 7.1 per cent; Logan, 6.2 per cent; and Morgan, 4.6 per cent. The over-all decrease in number of farms was 16.1 per cent. During the same period the median size of farms in the seven counties decreased from 153 to 145 acres. The counties of Boulder, Larimer, Logan, Sedgwick and Weld all had a decrease in median farm size, while Adams and Morgan counties had an increase in median farm size. Table 75 shows the comparison between 1950 and 1960 in number of farms and medium farm size for the seven counties.

TABLE 75

Number of Farms and Median Size, Northern Colorado, 1950 and 1960[a]

County	Number of Farms			Median Farm Size		
	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent Change	Acres 1950	Acres 1960	Per Cent Change
Adams	1589	1072	- 32.5%	77.3	100	+29.3%
Boulder	1320	904	- 31.5	72.0	61.7	-14.3
Larimer	1741	1341	- 17.2	112	76.9	-31.3
Logan	1482	1390	- 6.2	427	323.8	-24.1
Morgan	1361	1298	- 4.6	187.3	194	+ 3.6
Sedgwick	474	440	- 7.1	390	331.7	-14.9
Weld	4418	3952	- 10.5	154	103	-33.1
Total	12,385	10,394	- 16.1	153	145	- 5.2

a. Based on federal census data.

Mechanization and Technological Change

Sugar Beets. Sugar beet harvest in Northern Colorado is 100 per cent mechanized. Mechanization in pre-harvest activities is proceeding rapidly since the introduction of monogerm seed several years ago. The proportion of sugar beet acreage planted in monogerm seed varies from 80 to 100 per cent among the seven counties. Some hand labor is still used for blocking and thinning operations on most farms throughout the area, but most of the blocking and thinning work is done with long handled hoes rather than short handled hoes, as in the Arkansas Valley and Western Slope. A small number of farmers have eliminated the blocking and thinning operation completely and use labor only in weeding sugar beets. The use of long handled hoes is most prevalent on acreage planted in monogerm seed.

The use of mechanical thinning machines is becoming more widespread in Northern Colorado. The manager of the Greeley district for the Great Western Sugar Company estimated that as much as 80 per cent of the beet acreage in his district had some mechanical pre-harvest work done on it in 1962. In the Brighton district of Great Western, the manager estimated that 20 per cent of the acreage was mechanically blocked and thinned in 1962 and hand labor was used only for weeding. All of the district office managers for Great Western reported that pre-harvest mechanization was proceeding much more quickly than had the previous mechanization of harvest activities. The Mountain States Beet Growers' Association has been advising its members to be ready to mechanize pre-harvest work completely by the 1964 growing season, because the association is not certain that Mexican national labor will be available after 1963.

Snap Beans. In 1962, the harvest of green snap beans in Northern Colorado was mechanized to a greater extent than in any preceding year. New and more efficient bean picking machines were introduced and used successfully. At least one major producer of snap beans reported that his harvest was 100 per cent mechanized this year for the first time.

Mechanical picking of green beans is termed successful, even though the machines do not pick as many beans per acre as hand pickers can. The cost of machine picking to the farmer is about $.0125 per pound and the cost of hand picking about $.0225 per pound. Farmers reported that they preferred machine picking, even though it was not as efficient as hand picking, because it was less costly in over-all terms, much more dependable, and was available at a moments' notice.

Potatoes. Potato harvest mechanization is not as far advanced as snap bean harvest. Perhaps 25 per cent of the early potato crop in the Gilcrest-LaSalle area(Weld County)was mechanized in 1962, according to reports from both growers and shippers. The bulk of the potato crop is still picked by hand labor, especially on those farms that have soil conditions that are not easily adapted to machine handling. Even on those farms that have mechanized the picking process completely, much labor is still used in the grading, sorting, and storing operations. Most of this labor, however, is provided by local workers.

Cucumbers. Cucumber harvest in Colorado is not at all mechanized, so far as could be determined. Most of the cucumber harvest labor is supplied by Mexican nationals, with only an occasional domestic migrant family being so employed. Growers and processors reported that the type of cucumbers grown in Colorado could not be harvested mechanically. New strains of cucumbers that can be picked by machine must be developed before mechanization of harvest activities can be successful. One cucumber processor reported that his company was working on both new strains of cucumbers and new machines in other areas of the country and that some success had been achieved, but the company has no plans at present for introducing these products into Northern Colorado.

Other Crops. Except for red beets, sweet corn, and green peas (all grown for processing), hand labor is used in harvesting the various vegetables grown in the area. The harvest of beets, corn, and green peas is completely mechanized. Dry onions are picked largely by hand, except for some mechanized harvesting (as much as 80 per cent) in late onions around Eaton and Ault (Weld County). One farmer in Eaton reported that the cost of harvesting onions by machine was about one-half the cost of hand harvest.

The Grower--Problems and Attitudes

In contrast to other areas of the state, few farmers in Northern Colorado expressed concern over the $.90 per hour minimum for Mexican national workers or the effect this minimum had or might have on the wages of domestic workers. The only strong opposition to this minimum wage came from cucumber growers who stated that it tended to eliminate any incentive for workers to produce, since the workers knew that they would be paid 90 cents per hour anyhow. Rather, the growers in Northern Colorado generally were of the opinion that having a reliable, assured labor force was more important in their operations than a minimum wage. These growers indicated that they were willing to pay top wages within their economic ability to do so to workers who were dependable, efficient, and productive. The growers

generally favored using domestic workers instead of Mexican nationals, if domestic workers were available. The shortage of available, capable domestics was almost always the reason given for using Mexican nationals. The reasons given by a few growers for preferring to use them were that braceros: 1) were less costly than domestics (because all Mexican nationals are solo workers); 2) were easier to control than domestics; 3) were less demanding of perquisites than domestics; and 4) could be scheduled for a definite period of employment. On the other hand, one of the big advantages cited by growers for using domestics was that domestics could be used in more than one crop activity. Also, growers reported that there were no recruitment fees and usually no transportation fees to be paid for domestic labor, as contrasted with Mexican nationals.

Grower labor problems seem to focus on the availability of capable labor during periods of peak need and the closely related matter of labor rentention during slack periods. Few farmers reported any problems in housing, transporting, and wage rates of domestic workers, although there were some complaints about migrant disrespect for property.

Growers of crops that require especially difficult stoop labor, such as cucumbers, report that it is almost impossible to recruit domestic labor for these tasks. Even though domestic workers are in the area and are not working in other crops, few can be persuaded to pick cucumbers. Consequently, nearly all of the cucumbers in Northern Colorado are harvested by Mexican nationals. This is also the case with respect to the tomato harvest.[2]

The retention of labor during periods of slack employment was not mentioned as a problem by sugar beet growers, but it was discussed by several growers of commercial vegetables, especially those who relied on the workers who lived in the Ft. Lupton labor camp. Growers might have a crew of workers scheduled to work or already employed, but if crop conditions or weather postponed activity for a few days, the workers might not return when needed either because they had found other jobs in the area, had moved away, or had even returned to their home state.

Grower attitudes in Northern Colorado reflect recognition of the importance of the migrant worker in total farm operations. Few, if any, farmers have mechanized their operations to the extent that no labor at all is needed during the growing season. This is especially the case for those growers who raise commercial vegetables. There is no organized effort on the part of the communities and growers which compares with the program of the Mesa County Migrant Council; there is a Weld County Migrant Council, but its organization and programs as yet are not extensive.

2. Only one domestic family out of the 225 interviewed was harvesting cucumbers in 1962, even though several migrant families were interviewed who had come to Colorado for sugar beet pre-harvest, but were going on to Michigan and Ohio for cucumber and tomato harvests.

Many growers individually take an interest in the well-being of their workers and lend their support to organized efforts such as the migrant summer schools in Platteville and Wiggins, the Greeley youth employment program, and the day care center operated in 1962 in conjunction with the Platteville school. The Fort Lupton migrant labor camp operated by the Weld County Public Housing Authority is considered nationally as a model for such camps.

Seasonal Farm Labor Employment

Number of Workers--Peak Employment Periods

The need for seasonal farm labor in Northern Colorado 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.

In the area served by the Greeley employment office, the employment peak is reached the second or third week of June. Employment totals then decline 1,000 to 1,300 workers in early July and remain fairly constant at that level until the first or second week of October, or until the potato harvest is finished.

Peak employment in the Ft. Lupton-Longmont-Brighton area is reached the second or third week of June. This total declines early in July by 200 - 500 workers, increases again in late July or early August, and reaches a late season peak about the third week of August. Total seasonal farm labor employment declines sharply in the third and fourth weeks of September and then decreases gradually until all late harvest activities are completed.

The Loveland-Ft. Collins area peak is reached about the middle of June and remains fairly constant until late September. Employment totals in the Ft. Collins area actually increase in early August, but there is a general decline in the Loveland area after completion of pre-harvest activities in sugar beets in June.

The Sterling-Ft. Morgan area peak is reached about the middle of June. This total declines sharply after sugar beet work is completed. The Sterling area totals decline gradually after the second week of July, but employment in the Ft. Morgan area remains fairly constant from July through September and increases slightly in late October.

Peak employment for the area as a whole has declined during the past three years. In 1960 the peak total was 13,004 workers; in 1961 it was 11,443; and in 1962 the total was 10,876 workers. The number and types of workers employed in each of the seven counties throughout the growing season in 1960, 1961, and 1962 are shown in Table 76.

TABLE 76

Total Workers in Northern Colorado by Area, 1960, 1961, 1962

Employment Department Area Office

		Greeley			Ft. Lupton			Longmont			Loveland			Ft. Collins			Denver			Ft. Morgan			Sterling			Totals		
		1960	1961	1962	1960	1961	1962	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	60	61	62	1960	1961	1962
May	1st week	350	2450	1100	860	635	755	35	125	125	0	45	90	270	245	240	1000	250	215	0	0	75	0	90	95	2515	3840	2,695
	2nd week	1130	1000	1750	1190	570	848	180	465	374	178	145	255	280	330	313	1175	500	345	140	655	600	0	10	100	4273	3675	4,585
	3rd week	2200	1650	2300	500	550	565	355	340	585	440	40	320	350	380	415	1175	450	469	895	925	950	364	35	578	6279	4370	6,182
	4th week	2850	2450	2850	1804	1290	1203	680	725	680	500	420	430	810	460	471	1200	513	545	1365	1365	1500	984	720	1001	10,193	7943	8,680
	5th week			3300			1412			695			517			720			571			1540			1023			9,778
June	1st week	3450	3200	3350	1745	1697	1457	830	895	775	610	535	524	830	829	712	1350	552	565	1550	1697	1575	1083	1100	1185	11,448	10,505	10,143
	2nd week	3600	3400	3410	1865	1840	1560	855	888	816	708	620	523	855	845	875	1900	555	557	1575	1550	1610	1128	1100	1170	12,486	10,798	10,521
	3rd week	3650	3400	3350	1895	1752	1627	980	900	837	731	640	563	995	895	940	2000	533	805	1600	1575	1575	1153	1142	1179	13,004	10,837	10,876
	4th week	3200	3250	3100	1909	1640	1310	947	960	800	639	690	252	1043	1010	875	2000	1156	928	1565	1565	1475	974	1172	986	12,277	11,443	9,726
	5th week	2360	3000		1743	1560		660	718		220	395		790	900		2007	1235		1150	1280		787	1014		9,717	10,102	
July	1st week	2000	2700	2750	1230	1480	1234	405	535	576	88	310	158	658	765	750	1707	1275	1133	573	976	975	231	674	694	6,892	8,715	8,270
	2nd week	2300	2350	2305	1315	1320	1210	315	325	400	304	162	225	727	815	640	1726	1355	1183	1079	830	1015	379	437	542	8,145	7,594	7,560
	3rd week	2700	2500	2250	1365	1500	1184	412	270	370	675	253	320	820	770	755	1900	1600	1224	659	764	893	341	335	413	8,872	7,992	7,409
	4th week	2450	2510	2400	1713	1620	1535	377	580	295	561	576	185	1072	1080	765	1700	1460	1295	559	586	713	263	267	311	8,695	8,679	7,499
August	1st week	2500	2550	2460	2259	1721	1692	377	675	383	421	559	185	1290	1160	1234	1779	1615	1426	459	559	580	125	210	168	9,210	9,049	8,128
	2nd week	2450	2400	2350	2337	2005	1612	335	592	599	532	756	162	1278	870	1256	1775	1690	1483	409	510	530	90	185	171	9,206	9,008	8,163
	3rd week	2450	2500	2300	2323	2135	1907	192	620	263	495	510	165	1227	927	1185	1740	1625	1575	469	560	530	70	60	50	8,966	8,937	7,975
	4th week	2400	2450	2250	2280	1650	1750	197	1419	495	444	433	213	1192	930	1225	1608	1355	1151	569	593	530	110	60	60	8,800	8,890	7,674
	5th week		2500	2300		1957	1529		265	384		212	198		1157	923		1180	1259		596	585		110	60		7,977	7,238
September	1st week	2500	2450	2300	2115	1723	1322	252	260	240	326	207	203	847	1000	719	1600	1125	1138	579	655	605	160	160	120	8,379	7,580	6,647
	2nd week	2600	2350	2150	2105	1536	1199	365	465	464	345	233	225	815	867	710	1603	990	1006	581	675	618	160	110	135	8,474	7,226	6,507
	3rd week	2250	2150	2100	2033	828	981	410	292	363	368	195	195	770	855	481	1500	925	860	571	610	585	120	80	100	8,022	5,935	5,665
	4th week	2200	2050	2100	1885	742	779	485	305	390	261	107	140	715	465	390	1460	880	850	543	510	509	95	60	45	7,644	5,119	5,203
	5th week	2050			1260			355			215			576			1189			664			60			6,369		
October	1st week	2050	2150	2100	1170	660	710	340	395	310	118	135	120	485	440	380	944	755	695	630	650	575	100	100	90	5,837	5,285	4,980
	2nd week	1550	2050	1750	1085	566	561	480	550	390	70	175	95	488	400	375	658	625	620	704	800	650	110	85	85	5,145	5,251	4,526
	3rd week	1000	1650	1450	597	491	442	455	460	377	30	130	105	470	470	465	500	450	450	704	775	750	200	150	100	3,956	4,576	4,139
	4th week	950	1100	700	535	471	378	460	440	350	85	90	95	490	470	450	476	345	380	775	750	750	200	135	100	3,972	3,801	3,203

Labor Market Organization

Recruitment

Sugar Beets. Great Western Sugar Company is the largest single user of seasonal farm labor in Northern Colorado and in the state, as well. Most of the recruitment for interstate domestic labor for sugar beets is conducted by Great Western itself. The employment department recruits for Great Western only in the Panhandle area of Texas and reports that in the past few years from 700 to 800 workers have been recruited annually for Great Western. Great Western recruits labor for its growers in Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and Wyoming in addition to Colorado. All of the Great Western district managers reported that their arrangement with the employment department was satisfactory.

One general comment from the district managers was that it was becoming more and more difficult to recruit domestic labor for sugar beet work. Consequently, the company has had to depend on Mexican nationals to fill its need for seasonal farm labor. One reason for this difficulty was advanced by an employment department representative who was part of the department's recruiting staff in Texas. His opinion was that Great Western did not offer a sufficient advance(transportation, subsistence, and/or loan) in order to be competitive with other users of domestic labor also recruiting in Texas. The workers usually accepted the job offer that provided the biggest advance, no matter where the job offer might take them. This, in effect, created even more of a shortage of domestic workers in Colorado and tended to make the use of more Mexican nationals necessary.

Generally, Great Western bases its labor needs on a 20 acre per man ratio as far as Mexican nationals are concerned. For domestic workers, it is more difficult to make an acre-worker determination, and the one used is 12 to 14 acres per worker. Because of the planting of monogerm seed, an increase in mechanical blocking and thinning, and the use of long handled hoes, one Great Western manager estimated labor needs have been reduced 30 to 40 per cent in the past eight years in his district. Virtually 100 per cent of the domestic workers recruited and employed by Great Western are in family groups. (This category includes an assortment of uncles, cousins, and some more distantly related workers.) At least 95 per cent of the advances made to domestic workers is recouped by the company, according to one of Great Western's managers.

Some of the domestic workers who are employed for sugar beet work remain in the area for other employment, but a sizable proportion of them leave to work in other states or to return to Texas. The employment department has a staff member stationed at the Fort Lupton camp, and one of his functions is to contact these workers. The Fort Lupton employment department manager says these efforts have met with some success.

Great Western pays the recruitment and transportation cost for Mexican nationals. These workers are contracted by the company for sugar beet work only. The six-week contract period is usually completed by late June or early July. These workers are then available for recontracting for other crops. It is estimated that about 15 per

cent of the Mexican nationals brought in by Great Western are recontracted.

Potatoes. As far as can be determined, all organized recruitment activities for potato workers are done through the employment department, although many of the workers return each year to growers who previously employed them. There is no organized growers' association that conducts recruitment activities by itself. As in the San Luis Valley potato harvest, many of the workers in the Northern Colorado potato harvest are members of labor crews and do not contact either the employment department or the grower themselves, but rely on the crew leader or labor contractor to make all job arrangements.

Vegetables. Employment in vegetable pre-harvest and harvest activities begins in early July and continues through the first part of September. Recruitment for vegetable work is done through the employment department by Kuner-Empson, Fort Lupton Canning Company, and Western Canning Company.

Labor needs have been reduced substantially by mechanization. Green bean and beet harvests are entirely mechanized, and some of the other harvests are partially mechanized. It was the estimate of the manager of the Fort Lupton Canning Company that labor needs have been reduced by one-half during the past few years. Fort Lupton Canning Campany brings in very few braceros (approximately 15 a year) for work in the late cabbage harvest. This is necessary because many domestic workers leave the area by the end of August or early September. The full cost of recruitment and transportation is paid by the company.

Kuner-Empson officials stated that the number of domestic workers has been declining steadily and that it is increasingly difficult to get local people to work as agricultural laborers. Generally, however, it has not been necessary to use braceros, except for cucumbers and tomatoes. They reported that it is almost impossible to get domestic workers for the harvest of these two crops. They noted also that there has been considerable variation in the productivity of Mexican nationals in the past few years. In fact, they stated that the Mexican nationals who were brought in by Kuner-Empson in 1961 were the poorest workers from Mexico that they ever had. Some of the domestic workers who are employed by Kuner-Empson's growers are also employed in the various canneries, providing employment continuity.

Cucumbers. Out-of-state recruitment for workers to harvest cucumbers is done by the employment department for the four or five cucumber processors. Little success has been noted in any recruitment activity for either interstate, intrastate, or local domestic workers. Almost exclusively, the workers in cucumbers are Mexican nationals. None of the processors advances any money for transportation for domestic workers, as far as can be determined. Rates for picking cucumbers are one half of the crop.

Employment department officials state that the major reasons domestics will not pick cucumbers and tomatoes in Colorado, but will do so in other states, is the method and amount of payment. For example, growers in midwestern states have five different rates of payment according to the size cucumber picked. This method of payment does not prevail in Colorado, where workers usually must harvest the entire crop regardless of size and are paid a fixed per cent of the harvest value.

Mexican Nationals. The inability to attract enough efficient domestic workers to Northern Colorado has led growers and processors to rely on Mexican nationals as a labor force. Sugar beet pre-harvest and cucumber and tomato harvest activities account for the major portion of the nationals who are used. No nationals are used in the potato harvest or in the cherry harvest.

In certain periods during the growing season in the past three years, Mexican nationals made up nearly half of the total labor force in Northern Colorado, and accounted for the majority of the labor force in the Sterling-Ft. Morgan and the Loveland-Ft. Collins areas in 1962. This peak use of Mexican nationals occurred during the major sugar beet pre-harvest work. Table 77 shows the peak employment of Mexican nationals by area for selected weeks in 1962.

Labor Utilization and Reallocation

Some of the domestic labor brought into Northern Colorado for sugar beet pre-harvest by the Great Western Sugar Company is utilized for other crops, especially in the Greeley-Ft. Lupton-Longmont areas, where there are several crops grown requiring large amounts of hand labor.

Most of the domestic workers in the Ft. Morgan-Sterling area leave by the middle of July. Some attempt is made by the employment department to contact these workers and refer them to jobs in the Greeley-Ft. Lupton area, but the majority of the workers interviewed in this area indicated that sugar beets were the only crop they intended to work in while in Colorado. Those who were leaving Colorado, and not going straight home, indicated that they would either go to midwestern states for work or would go to the early potato and onion harvest in west Texas. This employment and travel pattern was also found with those workers interviewed around Loveland and Ft. Collins.

The workers in the Greeley-Ft. Lupton area were the only ones who indicated that they would stay for the vegetable harvests which followed pre-harvest sugar beet activities. The Northern Colorado interviews indicate that there is little in-state migration after an interstate migrant comes to Northern Colorado for sugar beet work.

There is no grower-processor organization in Northern Colorado to compare with Empire Field Crops in the Arkansas Valley, and labor reallocation in crops other than sugar beets is carried out by the employment department. It should be noted that most of the employment department's efforts are concentrated in the Ft. Lupton area and center around the Ft. Lupton camp. The department concentrates on the scheduling and reallocation of labor, often on a day-by-day basis, for three crops: snap beans, dry onions, and potatoes.

The department receives excellent cooperation from growers and processors. Growers and processors try to inform the department of their labor needs as far in advance as possible and also provide information on the number of workers they (the growers and processors) already have who are available. The employment department field men, working through crew leaders and contractors, schedule the work to be performed. Individual workers, thus, know when work is available and where it is located.

TABLE 77

Employment of Mexican Nationals in Northern Colorado
During Selected Weeks, 1962[a]

		Greeley			Ft. Lupton-Longmont-Denver			Loveland-Ft. Collins			Sterling-Ft. Morgan			Total Northern Colorado		
		Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%	Total Workers	Mex. Nat.	%
May	3rd week	2300	391	17.0	1619	453	27.9	735	341	46.4	1528	731	47.8	6182	1916	30.9
	4th week	2850	749	26.3	2428	622	25.6	901	461	51.2	2501	1727	69.0	8680	3559	41.0
June	2nd week	3410	1169	34.3	2933	1106	37.7	1398	732	52.4	2780	1850	66.5	10521	4857	46.2
	3rd week	3350	1128	33.7	3269	1069	32.7	1503	613	40.8	2461	1832	74.4	10876	4642	42.7
July	2nd week	2305	296	12.8	2793	291	10.4	915	73	7.9	1557	620	39.8	7560	1280	16.9
	4th week	2400	146	6.0	3125	296	9.5	950	98	10.3	1024	289	28.2	7499	829	11.0
Aug.	2nd week	2350	201	8.6	369	390	10.6	1418	167	11.8	701	126	17.9	8163	884	10.8
	4th week	2250	286	12.7	3396	432	12.7	1438	357	24.8	590	46	7.8	7674	1121	14.6
Sept.	2nd week	2150	00	0	2669	222	8.3	935	188	20.1	753	18	2.4	6507	428	6.6
	4th week	2100	00	0	2019	210	10.4	530	0	0	554	9	1.6	5203	219	4.2

a. Per cent of Mexican nationals to total labor force.

Utilization of labor for potato harvest in the Gilcrest-LaSalle area is handled somewhat differently from the area around the Ft. Lupton labor camp. In the Gilcrest-LaSalle area, the majority of potato workers contacted during the field study were in Colorado only for potato harvest. They were members of organized crews and relied upon labor contractors to find work. One contractor in particular seemed to have considerable control over a large portion of the potato harvest work in that area through arrangements with uncles, cousins, brothers and other relatives, each of whom seemed to be in charge of a small crew. These arrangements seemed to work very well, and all of the growers contacted were satisfied. The contractor is well known, as he has been doing the same type of work in the area for several years. This contractor agrees to pick the potatoes, haul them to the shed or dock, and unload them. The 1962 price per hundred weight was 21 to 22 cents. The contractor makes all arrangements with the growers and also with the workers, who receive $.05 per 50-pound sack for picking. The farmers prefer to deal with only one person, as it eliminates having to keep wage records on a score of individual pickers, haulers, and helpers.

It was impossible to arrive at a worker per acre ratio for the early potato harvest in Northern Colorado. Nearly all of this crop is shipped directly to market, and few potatoes are held for storage, as is the usual practice in the San Luis Valley. Consequently, growers try to schedule their harvest on a day-to-day basis to take advantage of favorable market conditions. For example, if a grower or shipper has an order for 1000 sacks of potatoes, he will have only that many sacks picked. If he does not feel that market conditions warrant any further shipments, the workers may be laid off for several days until the shipper or grower has another order or feels that the market can absorb another shipment. This practice makes it almost impossible to arrive at a workers per acre ratio for the potato harvest.

Use of Local Labor. The use of local labor is more widespread in certain parts of Northern Colorado than anywhere else in the state, with the exception of the local labor employed during the peach harvest on the Western Slope. Northern Colorado is more densely populated than any of the other major farm areas of the state and has many more locals upon which to draw.

The employment department area office in Greeley reported that an average of 540 locals were employed during each of the 26 weeks between May 1 and the end of October, 1962, with a peak of 600 workers during June and July and a low of 400 workers at both the beginning and the end of that period.

The Ft. Collins area office reported a weekly average of 430 local workers employed between May and the end of October, with a peak employment of 777 during the first week of August and a low of 185 workers the third and fourth weeks of May. The Denver area office reported an average weekly employment of 735 local workers (utilized mainly in the areas north and northeast of Denver) for this period, with a peak of 1,335 during the third week of August and a low of 160 workers the first week of May. Average weekly employment of locals around Ft. Lupton in the summer of 1962 was 310, with a peak of 491 workers in the third week of August and a low of 145 the last two weeks of October.

The Longmont area office reported an average weekly employment of 233 locals in 1962, with a peak employment of 402 during the second week of September and a low of 114 during the last week of August. It should be noted that the peak employment of locals corresponds very closely to the peak harvest and processing periods in the Longmont, Ft. Lupton, Brighton, and Greeley areas and also to the time when canning factories in those cities are operating.

In the Loveland area, the number of locals employed weekly never exceeded 150, the total reached during the third week of July (cherry harvest). Employment of locals in the Ft. Morgan area averaged 177 per week throughout the season, with a high of 350 during the last two weeks of October (sugar beet harvest) and a low of 25 the first week of May. In the Sterling area, local employment never exceeded 135 (second week of September), but after the fourth week of August, no seasonal farm labor was employed except locals.

Youth Employment Service

The Greeley employment department office operates a program called YES (Youth Employment Service). This is a program to attract junior and senior high school students to take summer time jobs. Recruitment starts well before summer vacation and takes place in the schools. Students fill out a card on which they indicate the type of work preferred. This program is not specifically a program for farm placement, and the farm placements are probably a minor part of the whole program.

There were almost 675 farm placements in 1961, and about 100 placements in 1962 as of early August. Some of the farm placements were in hoeing and thinning cucumbers and beets, but most of the placements were for hay work. The employment department refers these students as it does any other workers, and it is up to the farmer to provide supervision. The farmers seem to have accepted the program, except that some do not pay $1.25 an hour to sixteen-year olds, the wage paid adults.

Wage Rates and Earnings

Domestic workers in Northern Colorado in 1962 were paid mainly by piece rates. Only 42 out of 225 interviewees contacted during the field study were paid by the hour, day, week, or month. All of the other workers were paid by piece rates. Table 78 on the following page shows the diversity in the method of payment for domestic migrants in Northern Colorado in 1962.

TABLE 78

Method of Payment,
Migrants Interviewed in Northern Colorado, 1962

Rates and Method of Payment	Number of Workers
$ .80 hour	4
.85 hour	3
.90 hour	13
1.00 hour	9
1.02 hour	1
1.10 hour	2
1.25 hour	7
6.00 day	1
45.00 week	1
250.00 month	1
By Acre	99
By Sack(onions)	4
By Sack(potatoes)	
.01 (loader)	1
.02 (crew leader)	2
.02½ (hauling)	6
.03 (crew leader)	1
.18 (contractor)	1
.22 (contractor)	1
By ½ sack (potatoes)	
.05 (picking)	38
.06 (picking)	1
By bale (hay)	2
By pound (snap beans)	
.02¼	18
By other piece rates	7
	223[a]

a. Two workers didn't know the rate or method of payment for their work.

Hourly wage rates offered in Northern Colorado increased from 1961 to 1962, but not uniformly. Wage rates for which comparison can be made from the employment department weekly farm bulletins shows fewer jobs being offered at $.75 per hour in 1962 than in 1961 and more offered at $.90 per hour. Vegetable pre-harvest activities in the Ft. Lupton area were offered at $.75 per hour during the last week of May, 1961 and at $.80 - $.90 per hour in the Greeley area. During the corresponding week of 1962, the only rate being offered in both areas was $.90 per hour.

Piece rates for sugar beet pre-harvest work did not change from 1961 to 1962. These rates were the same throughout Colorado as follows:

Block and thin	$15.50 per acre
Hoe Trim	11.50 per acre
Hoeing	9.50 per acre
Weeding	6.00 per acre

The manager of the Great Western district at Ft. Morgan stated that the $.90 per hour guaranteed minimum wage for braceros in 1962 would have no effect on wages paid in his district, since Mexican national beet workers in the Ft. Morgan district in 1961 had averaged $1.18 per hour.[3] The district manager attributed this rate of earnings to the fact that growers in his district plant 90 per cent of their sugar beet acreage with monogerm seed, use mechanical thinning as much as possible, rely heavily on chemical weeding processes, and require little short handled hoe work.

Piece rates for potato harvest remained the same for the years 1961 and 1962. These rates were $.20 -.22 per hundred pounds for delivery at the shed or dock. The contractor paid $.05 per half sack (50-60 pounds) for picking, $.01 to $.02 per 100 pounds for loading, $.025 per 100 pounds for hauling, and perhaps another $.02 to $.03 per 100 pounds to the crew leader for supervision.

Snap bean harvest piece rate wages were the same for both years at $.0225 per pound.

Cucumber harvest rates remained unchanged; these rates have been one-half the graded crop for several years. Due to the few domestic workers who are willing to pick cucumbers, no further comparisons can be made of the rates in this crop.

Piece rates paid for harvest activities in dry onion and fresh market vegetable harvest remained basically the same for the years 1961 and 1962.

Wages Received by Workers. The amount of wages received during the previous week of the workers interviewed in Northern Colorado is shown in Table 79.

TABLE 79

Previous Week's Earnings By Migrants
in Northern Colorado, 1962

	Mean	Median	High	Low
Family				
Amount earned	$66.90	$58.00	$248.00	0
Number of workers	3	3	12	1
Amount of hours worked	81.5	80.0	480	0
Amount earned per hour	.820	.725	-	-
Single Worker				
Amount earned	$37.01	$25.00	$175.00	0
Amount of hours worked	40.5	30.0	72	0
Amount earned per hour	.913	.833	-	-

3. No separate record of piece rate and/or hourly equivalent earnings are kept for domestic workers as is done for nationals.

Table 79 shows that the working spouse and children contribute quite substantially to the family earning power. The mean hourly wages for the family group as a whole are below those for single workers, because the women and children are not able to produce as much work as adult male workers.

Table 80 shows the mean, median, and high and low average weekly earnings by family group and single worker from April 1, 1962 to the time interviewed.

TABLE 80

Average Weekly Wages From April 1st Until Time of Interview, Northern Colorado, 1962

	Family	Single
Mean	$ 39.61	$41.14
Median	34.55	45.00
Low average	3.71	3.33
High average	131.57	95.23

Housing, Sanitation, and Health

Housing and Sanitation

Housing for migrant workers in Northern Colorado generally was observed to be the best on an area-wide basis of any in the state. There was some poor housing, however, as was true of the other areas included in the field study.

Ft. Lupton Camp. The Ft. Lupton labor camp is the only one of its kind in the state, both in size and in operation. Following is a description of the camp, its history, and operation summarized from a pamphlet prepared in August of 1961 by J.L. Rice, executive director of the Weld County Housing Authority, which operates the camp.

Historical Background

Plans for farm labor camps were developed by the Resettlement Administration and the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture in the years 1937 to 1940 under the authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriations Act of 1935. As planned, fifty-three camps were completed prior to December, 1942. They were located in Florida, Texas, Colorado, Arizona, California, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. The camps were built for the purpose of housing agricultural laborers and their families, and were located in or near centers of agricultural areas largely devoted to hand-worked crops,

particularly those where labor requirements were on a seasonal basis. Until 1947 they were operated by an agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The 79th Congress, by Public Law 731, ordered the liquidation of all federally-owned labor camps by public sale to the highest bidder without regard to their future use. The 80th Congress revised this policy through Public Law 298, which directed the Secretary of Agriculture:

1) to cease direct federal operation of all labor camps;

2) to sell the camps to public agencies, to semi-public agencies, or non-profit associations of farmers who would agree to continue them in operation for the principal purpose of housing agricultural workers; and

3) to issue temporary-use permits to eligible purchasers for the operation of the camps pending sale.

Because purchasers were required to operate these camps for the principal purpose of housing agricultural workers, they /the camps/ were offered at discounts ranging from 80 to 90 per cent of their original cost (the local camp, constructed at a cost of $350,000.00, was offered to a farm organization for $42,000.00 -- a discount of 88 per cent). Despite the apparent fairness of such offers, only a few camps were sold under this provision. The next (81st) Congress abandoned this policy through the enactment of Public Law 475, by which all farm labor camps were transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the Public Housing Administration for disposition by sale to public housing agencies.

General Assembly Action. On March 28,1951, Senate Bill No. 283, titled "An Act to Create County Housing Authorities to Acquire Federal Labor Camps...." was enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Colorado. Pursuant to a provision of that bill, the Housing Authority of Weld County was created on June 6,1951. Five commissioners - E.G. Dittmer, Floyd Koshio, Elton Miller, Herman Scheid, and W.E. Scott - constitute the Authority, which is a public body, corporate and politic, possessing all powers necessary to exercise essential governmental functions and carry out the purposes for which it was established. The commissioners, appointed for terms of five years, receive no compensation for their services.

On July 1, 1951, in accordance with a provision of Public Law 475, the Authority entered into a contract for purchase and sale of the camp with the Public Housing Administration. By the terms of the sale, the Authority was required: 1) to assume responsibility for the operation of the camp; 2) to make all repairs, replacements, additions, and improvements necessary to preserve its value and provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for its occupants; and 3) to pay annually to the federal government all net income from the operation until December 31, 1971, at which time, according to the sales agreement, the project would be conveyed to the Authority.

Public Law 1020 (the Housing Act of 1956), by which the Housing Act of 1937 was amended, constituted a qualified authorization for the PHA to transfer all its rights, title, and interest in farm labor camps to eligible public housing agencies. As a consequence this amendment, all obligations imposed by the above-mentioned purchase and sale contract were canceled, and title to the camp was conveyed by the PHA to the Authority on October 17, 1956.

Description of the Fort Lupton Camp

The Fort Lupton Farm Labor Camp is located on the north side of the town of Fort Lupton and lies just east of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. Twenty-six per cent of the camp is within the corporate limits of the town.

In addition to a community center building and several offices, the camp provides the following housing accommodations:

1. Eight three-bedroom units, 24' x 36'.
2. One three-bedroom unit, 22' x 40'.
3. Sixteen two-bedroom units, 26' x 30'; 5'x 10'.
4. Twenty-two duplexes, 20' x 26'.
5. One hundred and two one-room shelters, 14' x 16'.
6. One hundred one-room shelters, 12' x 18'.
7. Eight one-room shelters, 14' x 20'.
8. Fifteen tent platforms, concrete, 16' x 16'.

The camp provides the following sanitary facilities for residents of the shelter area:

Water Closets	18
Lavatories	48
Showers	54
Laundry Tubs, double	36
Urinals	6

Occupancy

Occupancy of the camp is predominantly Spanish-American; however, as of August 21, 1961, eighteen units were occupied by Sioux Indians, from the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, South Dakota, and seven units were occupied by Kickapoo Indians from a reservation near Muzquiz, Mexico (approximately 100 miles southwest of Eagle Pass, Texas).[a]

Mexican nationals. From May 1 to June 15, annually, about 9,500 Mexican nationals pass through the camp en route to beet fields in Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, and Montana. Upon completion of their assigned work in those areas, they are returned to the camp, where they may be released by the prime contractor to local growers and vegetable processors for further work assignments, or they may be returned immediately to Mexico. Despite the contractual provision for such transfers, less than five per cent of this labor is recontracted locally.

The current population of the shelter area (1,135; of which 681 are over 14 years of age) is made up largely of family groups from Texas.[b] Of the total occupancy, the ratio of workers to non-workers is one and one-half to one.

Unit Furnishings and Rent. Each of the 210 units comprising the shelter area is equipped with a wood-burning cooking stove or a three-burner gas plate, three cots, and a kitchen table.[c] None have running water. The units equipped with gas plates rent for $5.00 weekly; the others rent for $4.50. Such units may be occupied by individuals or groups of six or less.

Rentals constitute the only source of income. However, 30 per cent of the improvements and additions were financed through donations by the following organizations: Lupton Farm Improvement Association, Kuner-Empson Company, Fort Lupton Canning Company, Western Food Products Company, Great Western Sugar Company, and Fresh Vegetable Package Company.

---

a. The date of this report.
b. As of the date of this report, August 21, 1961.
c. All units now have gas plates.

The camp is exempt from taxation. Nevertheless, in accordance with a provision of Senate Bill No. 283,[d] the Authority makes annual payments in lieu of taxes to local taxing bodies. Such payments equal 10 per cent of the camp's aggregate annual shelter rent.

Other Agencies and Programs

Through an arrangement with the Colorado State Employment Service, one of its employees is assigned to the camp office -- from June to October, annually -- where he performs a placement service mutually beneficial to camp residents and local farmers.

Educational and recreational programs for the migrant children of the camp are sponsored, planned, and conducted by the Colorado Council of Churches and the Catholic Church.

The health and sanitation departments of Weld County provide the following services for migrants occupying camp shelter:

1) education in sanitation;
2) clinics for pre-natal and post-natal care;
3) vaccines, whenever warranted by local conditions;
4) detection and control of venereal disease through blood tests and the use of penicillin; and
5) education in the selection and preparation of food.

d. Section 7. "....In lieu of taxes on its property the Authority may agree to make such annual payments to the taxing bodies in which the labor camp is situated as it finds consistent with the maintenance of the low-rent character of the labor camps or the achievement of the purposes of this Act."

There is practically no migrant on-the-farm housing between Ft. Lupton and Brighton to the south. There are several old houses in this area that probably were used for migrant housing some years ago. Almost all of the workers in the Ft. Lupton area live in the camp.

Other Camps. There are several other labor camps in the Ft. Collins-Greeley area. These camps provide housing primarily, if not solely, for the cucumber workers (usually Mexican nationals) in that area. Some domestic workers were living in at least two of these camps in 1962. These camps are owned and operated by the cucumber processors. They appear well maintained and in good condition, with the exception of certain facilities at the camp at Windsor. There, several complaints were heard about the closeness of the privies to the living quarters. The privies are located only about 20 feet from the housing units.

Other Housing. Most of the migrant housing in Northern Colorado is located on individual farms. This housing, with some exceptions, is of better quality and is better maintained than migrant housing in other parts of the state.

Table 81 shows the number of housing inspections made in Northern Colorado in 1962 and the condition of such housing as determined by the department.

TABLE 81

State Department of Employment Housing Inspections, Northern Colorado, 1962

Local Office	No. of Inspections	Condition of Housing				Inspections Prohibited
		Good	Fair	Poor	Not Acceptable	
Brighton-Ft. Lupton	546	419	113	13	1	0
Denver	42	27	10	5	0	0
Ft. Collins	182	90	87	5	0	1
Ft. Morgan	325	192	128	5	0	0
Greeley	991	586	349	50	6	7
Longmont	157	102	47	7	1	0
Loveland	53	38	14	1	0	0
Sterling	223	90	109	24	0	0
Total	2519	1544	857	110	8	8

A large number of recent migrant housing repairs were observed during the 1962 field study in Northern Colorado. It is not known the extent to which these repairs were the result of the employment department's housing inspection and resulting report of deficiencies to the grower. This appeared to be true in some cases, while in others, the growers have made it a practice to keep their housing in good repair

Health Programs and Needs

There are several organized local health units in Northern Colorado, not all of which, however, are actively concerned with migrant health and sanitation.

Northeast Colorado Health Department. This department covers the counties of Logan, Morgan, Phillips, Sedgwick, Washington, and Yuma and has headquarters in Sterling. There is no organized program for migrant health care in the district, nor is there any migrant housing and/or sanitation inspection performed, except on complaint. The department's director stated that domestic migrants coming into Colorado should have a health card showing date of last physical examination, immunization, physical defects, diseases, etc. He also suggested that domestic workers who are tubercular or have any serious contagious malady should not be allowed to enter the state. He added that there had been an occasional problem in the past with

tubercular migrants. He did not think it quite fair for domestic migrants to expect or receive free health services while in Colorado, since they received none in their home states.

Weld County Health Department. The Weld County Department provides the following services for domestic migrants in the Ft. Lupton camp:

1) education in sanitation;
2) clinic for pre-natal and post-natal care;
3) vaccines whenever warranted by local conditions;
4) detection and control of venereal disease through blood tests and the use of penicillin; and
5) education in the selection and preparation of food.

These services are confined to the Ft. Lupton camp and are not extended to other parts of the county. No inspection of housing or sanitation is made, except on complaint.

The director of the department said that few cases of TB were ever reported among the domestic migrants and that there was a very low incidence of venereal disease. The nurse in charge of the clinic at Ft. Lupton said that a common complaint from the domestic workers was dermatitis caused by the use of sprayed or dusted chemicals.

Tri-County Health Department. This unit is formed from the health departments of Adams, Arapahoe, and Jefferson counties. It has no program for migrant health care or education and performs no housing or sanitation inspection services, except on complaint.

Boulder County Health Department. The Boulder County Health Department has no program for migrant health care or education for those migrants in the eastern part of the county around Longmont. It performs no housing or sanitation inspection services, except on complaint.

Larimer County Health Department. This unit has no special program for the health needs of migrant workers but did provide some immunizations and pre and post-natal care at its headquarters in Ft. Collins. These are general services for the community as a whole, and no special effort is made to inform migrants of the facilities available, and no records are kept on how many migrants take advantage of these services.

Only 38 of the 225 migrants interviewed in Northern Colorado in 1962 reported any sickness or injury incurred by themselves or any member of their families since coming to Colorado. Twenty-four reported specific illnesses, and 21 of these either visited a doctor or the Fort Lupton clinic. The other three did nothing. Nineteen of the 21 who visited a doctor or the clinic did not pay for doctor's care.

Fourteen injury cases were reported by interviewees, and all 14 injuries were seen by a doctor. In seven of these cases, the injured migrant paid for the doctor's services. Most of these injuries were sprains; the most serious injury was a gunshot wound in the leg.

Migrant Schools

Two schools for migrant workers were operated in Northern Colorado during 1962, one at Wiggins and one at Platteville.

Wiggins School. The Wiggins school for migrant children was established in 1955 and has operated each summer since. In 1961, there was a total enrollment of 57 students, and three teachers were employed. In 1962, a maximum enrollment of about 50 students was expected, with two or three teachers as needed. The 1962 session started on May 28 and continued through July 9. The school buses which transport the children to and from school each day go as far as seven miles north and about 15 miles south of town.

All of the students enrolled in 1961 and 1962 were Spanish American and were from the Rio Grande valley of Texas. About 40 per cent of the students attending the 1961 session had been there one or more previous years, but, in 1962, only about 25 per cent of the students had been in the Wiggins school before. The principal attributed the decline in attendance to the fact that fewer domestic and more foreign workers were being employed in the Wiggins area in 1962. Migrant students at the Wiggins school in 1962 were between the ages of five and 15 years.

The principal at Wiggins stated that one of the big problems in designing a curriculum for migrant students was the lack of adequate information concerning the student's previous education. Very few of the new students at any of the summer schools had any previous school record. The children who attended the Wiggins school sessions were all given a report card of their work while there to take with them to their next place of travel or to their home state. The principal stated that one very helpful tool in teaching the migrant children would be a standardized report card that could be used in the several states and schools through which the children may pass.

Community acceptance of the migrant school has always been very good, even when it was first established, according to statements from the principal and teachers. The school officials have encountered more reluctance from the parents of migrant children than from the local school district members in getting the children into school. The principal remarked that in some cases where the migrant parents did not speak English and had no schooling themselves, they were reluctant to have their children attend school. However, the reverse was more often true. Many parents were glad to send their children to school, even for the short time offered.

Platteville School. The 1962 session was the first session for migrant children held at the Platteville school. In previous years, a summer school for migrants had been held in Fort Lupton. This school was not operated this year, and the migrant school program was transferred to Platteville, nine miles from Fort Lupton. The children who would have attended the Fort Lupton school were transported to Platteville. The students enrolled at the Platteville school came mainly from the

Ft. Lupton camp, but one bus route was extended north and northeast of Platteville as far as LaSalle. Several children were enrolled from this area who probably would not have attended the Ft. Lupton school, had it been operated there again in 1962.

The school opened on June 25 and continued through August 10. Attendance in the early weeks of the session averaged about 55 per day, but, by the time the school closed in August, the daily attendance had risen to over 100 students per day. A total of 210 different migrant children were enrolled at the Platteville school in 1962.

One of the reasons advanced for the closing of the Ft. Lupton migrant summer school in 1962 was the fact that many of the children who lived in the camp attended not only the special summer term but also enrolled in the regular fall school term. This, in effect, doubled the load upon the local district's facilities. In 1962, it was decided that no special term would be held, but that all of the children living in the Ft. Lupton camp when the regular full term started in September would be accepted into the regular school. These children in the regular term usually stay from four to six weeks before their families return to their home state.

In addition to the special migrant summer school, a day care program for preschool children (two years to six years) was operated at the Platteville school. This program was organized and operated by the Weld County Migrant Council and was staffed by volunteer workers. The purpose of this program was to free parents for work, as well as some of the older children, so that they could work or attend the summer school.

Need for Migrant Summer Schools

One basis on which estimates of the need for additional migrant summer schools can be made is the number of migrant workers in those areas without such schools.

In the Brush-Ft. Morgan area (visited June 4 to June 15), 40 migrant families were interviewed. These 40 families reported 42 children between six and 16 years present with them. Eight of these children were enrolled in the Wiggins school, which left 34 school age children not in school from the 40 families interviewed.

In the Sterling area, eight interviewed families had 24 school age children with them.

In the Ovid-Sedgwick-Julesburg area, 20 families reported 35 school age children with them in Colorado. The Sterling to Julesburg area interviews were conducted during the last two weeks of June.

Fourteen families with 25 school age children were interviewed in the Loveland-Ft. Collins area during the first two weeks of July.

During the last two weeks of July and the first 10 days of August, interviews were conducted in the Longmont-Ft. Lupton-Brighton area. No enumeration of the number of children was compiled, because the migrants living in that area had access to the Platteville summer school.

In the remaining weeks of August, interviews were made in areas around Greeley. The results of these interviews show 41 families with 94 school age children in the Greeley area; four families with five children in the Eaton area; two families with four children in the Milliken area; and 10 families with 13 school age children in the Windsor area.

So far as could be determined from talking with county school superintendents, there are no plans for establishing any more schools for migrant children in Northern Colorado, with the possible exception of the Brush-Ft. Morgan area. The county superintendent for Morgan County stated that there had been some discussion of starting another school in Morgan County (in addition to the one at Wiggins) but that no definite proposals had been considered.

Migrant Attitude Toward Education

Each family migrant interviewed was asked questions concerning his own schooling achievement and how much schooling he would like his children to have. Slightly over half of them had set a goal of high school graduation or more for their children. Eighteen per cent felt that an eighth grade education or less was sufficient for their children. The attitudes of 200 families interviewed in Northern Colorado toward their children's education are shown in Table 82 on the following page.

The mean number of years of schooling for all interviewees was 3.2 years, and the median was 3.0 years. The mean number of years of schooling for the family interviewees was 2.96, and the median was 3.0 years. The mean years of schooling for single workers was 5.1 years, and the median was 5.0 years. Sixty-four family interviewees and three single workers reported that they had attended school for less than one year or had never attended school at all.

Welfare

Welfare help to migrant workers in Northern Colorado during 1961 and 1962 amounted to $341.17 in cash and grocery assistance, plus additional assistance in the form of surplus commodities. All of this assistance was provided by the Weld County Department of Welfare. Cash payments of $302.69 were dispensed to four different migrant families in 1961, but no cash payments were made in 1962. Grocery orders of $38.48 were allowed in 1961, but all of the 1962 assistance reported was in the form of surplus commodities.

TABLE 82

Attitude of Migrants Toward Education For Their Children, Northern Colorado, 1962

Migrant's Years of School	Number of Years His Children Should Attend																	
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	College	Till He is 16	As Much As Possible	Until He Wishes to Quit	N.A.	Total
0							5		9		1		15		1	5	2	13	51
1							2	1	1		1		14	2		1		2	24
2							3		4				9			1		5	22
3							3		4	2			17			3	1	2	32
4									1		3		9			1		1	15
5									3			1	6	2		1	2	2	17
6													12						12
7													7			1		2	10
8													6				1	2	9
9													1					3	4
10																			
11													2					1	3
12													1						1
Total							13	1	22	2	5	1	99	4	1	13	6	33	200

The Migrant

All of the 225 interviewees contacted in Northern Colorado in 1962 were Spanish-American. Two of the interviews were with Kickapoo Indians from Muzquiz, Mexico, but these were counted as Spanish-American since the Kickapoo Indians have dual Mexican-United States citizenship.

Two hundred of the interviews were completed with family members and 25 with single workers. The number of workers covered in the study sample are shown in Table 83.

TABLE 83

Number of Workers and Number of People Included, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

	Males over 16	Females over 16	Children under 16	Total
Number of Workers	280	225	146	651
Per Cent	43.0	34.6	22.4	100.0
Number of People	346	280	688	1314
Per Cent	26.3	21.3	52.4	100.0

Years as a Migrant Worker

Table 84 shows the years that each of the 225 interviewees had been working as a seasonal farm worker and the number of years each had worked as a seasonal farm worker in Colorado. Twenty three per cent reported that 1962 was the first year they had worked in Colorado, and more than 24 per cent of the persons interviewed reported that Colorado was one, if not the only, state they had worked in throughout their careers as seasonal farm workers.

The mean age of the interviewees was 39.4 years, and the median was 40 years. The mean age for married interviewees was 40.7 years and the median 41 years. The mean age for the 25 single migrants was 28.8 years, and the median age was 23 years.

Table 85 shows the number of years as a migrant worker by age of the interviewee.

TABLE 84

Number of Years as a Migrant Worker and Number of Years as a Migrant Worker in Colorado, Northern Colorado, 1962

Total Years As A Migrant Worker	Years In Colorado 0		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8		9		10		More Than 10		Total	
	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S
0	9	2																							9	2
1	7		3																						10	
2	2		3		3																				8	
3	3		2		3		3	1																	11	1
4	4		3	1			1		2	2															10	3
5	1								3		2															
6	3	1	1		1		1		1		2		5												14	1
7	2		1		1		1						3		4	2									12	2
8	2		1		1	1					2				1		4	1							11	2
9	1	1			1		1		1		1								5	1					10	2
10	2	2	2	1			2				1		1		1						2	1			11	4
11							3		1						1		1		1				3	1	10	1
12	2			1	1		1		1								1					1	2		8	2
13							1														2		2		5	
14					1		1																1	1	3	1
15	4		1		1		1		1			1	1		4		2				1				16	1
More than 15	4		8		7		3		2		3		3		4		3	1			1		8	2	46	3
Total	46	6	25	3	20	1	19	1	12	2	11	1	13	0	15	2	11	2	6	1	6	2	16	4	200	25

TABLE 85

Years as a Migrant Worker by Age of Interviewee, Northern Colorado, 1962

Total Years As A Migrant	Age of Interviewee						
	Under 20	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	Over 61	Total
0	2	1	6	1	1		11
1	2	4	1	3			10
2	1		4	1	2		8
3		4	5	2	1		12
4	3	2	2	4	2		13
5		1	3	2			6
6	1	3	2	5	4		15
7		7	3	2	1		13
8		5	2	3	3		13
9	2	4	2	2		2	12
10	1	5	4	3	1	1	15
11-15	1	11	11	12	11	3	49
16-20		4	5	10	4	2	25
21-25				2		1	3
26-30			1	5	3	1	10
Over 31				4	4	2	10
Total	13	51	51	61	37	12	225

Home State

Texas was the home state of the great majority of the workers contacted in 1962 in Northern Colorado. One hundred and ninety families and all 25 single workers reported Texas as their home state. (The Kickapoo Indians are counted as Texas migrants.) The other 10 families reported their home states as follows: five were from New Mexico, four from Colorado (San Luis Valley), and one from California.

Length of Time in Colorado

Table 86 shows the length of stay in Colorado by time of arrival in Northern Colorado.

Only two persons indicated that they would stay less than one month in Colorado, while 29 intended to stay six months or longer. The mean length of stay for the 189 interviewees who had fairly definite plans for leaving was 3.6 months, and the median was 3.5 months.

TABLE 86

Length of Stay in Colorado by Time of Arrival,
Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Month of Arrival	Length of Stay in Months: Less Than 1 Mo.	1-2 Mo.	2-3 Mo.	3-4 Mo.	4-5 Mo.	5-6 Mo.	More Than 6 Mo.	No Date Given	Total
January							3	1	4
February							1		1
March							3	3	6
April			1	4	4	9	14	2	34
May		5	21	11	14	19	8	16	94
June		1		5	4	1			11
July	1	10	21	11				9	52
August	1	12	3	2					18
No Date Given								5	5
Total	2	28	46	33	22	29	29	36	225

Reasons for Working in Colorado

Table 87 shows the reasons expressed for preferring to work or not preferring to work in Colorado.

TABLE 87

Reason for Working in Colorado,
Northern Colorado Interviews, 1962

Reason Given	Prefer Working In Colorado	Do Not Prefer Working in Colorado
Wages	54	15
Housing	9	4
Type of Crops	69	5
Length of Season	3	
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	29	
Community Attitudes	3	
Weather	25	6
Other	38	5

Types of crops and wages were given as the main reason for preferring to work in Colorado, and wages were the principal reason for not preferring to work in Colorado.

Reasons for Returning to Colorado

Table 88 shows the reasons given by interviewees for planning to return to Colorado next year.

TABLE 88

Return to Colorado Next Year,
Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Reason Given	Will Return Next Year	Will Not Return Next Year
Wages	40	9
Housing	8	4
Types of Crops	64	10
Treatment by Employer or Supervisor	64	7
Community Attitude	1	
Other	21	14

The seasonal farm workers in Northern Colorado evidently care little about community attitudes toward them, for only one indicated that this was a factor in his decision to plan to return next year, and only three cited the community's attitude as a reason for preferring to work in Colorado.

Reasons For Doing Seasonal Farm Work

The fact that they would be unemployed unless they did seasonal farm work was the main reason cited by the migrant workers in Northern Colorado when asked why they were seasonal farm laborers. Only 14 out of the 225 people interviewed said they had no other job skills, and 46 of them said they could make more money in seasonal farm work than by any other means. Table 89 lists the reasons given for doing seasonal farm work by the 225 interviewees in Northern Colorado in 1962.

TABLE 89

Reasons For Doing Seasonal Farm Work,
Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Reason	Family	Single	Total
No Other Job Skills	14		14
Able to Make More Money Than By Other Work	40	6	46
Would be Unemployed Otherwise	131	13	144
Enjoy it	9	4	13
Other	15	4	19

Winter Employment

Table 90 presents a compilation of the 1961-1962 winter employment of 225 Northern Colorado interviewees. Not all of the interviewees answered this question.

TABLE 90

Winter Work of Seasonal Farm Laborers,
Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

Type of Job	Family	Single	Total
Farm	92	7	99
Factory	11	2	13
Housework for Wages	5		5
Odd Jobs	18	2	20
No Work	1		1
Other	50	10	60

Table 91 shows the 1961-1962 number of weeks worked during the winter and the amount of money earned by the migrants interviewed in Northern Colorado.

TABLE 91

Weeks Worked During 1961-1962 Winter and Amount
Earned, Northern Colorado Migrant Interviews, 1962

	Weeks Worked		Amount Earned	
	Family	Single	Family	Single
Mean	8.8	10.2	$ 391.89	$ 659.10
Median	8.0	10.0	275.00	525.00
Low	0	0	0	0
High	22	22	2,050.00	1,500.00

The Migrant and the Community

The seasonal farm workers in Northern Colorado generally are well received by the community in the area, even though there are no community organizations devoted to migrant programs which compare with the Mesa County Migrant Council.

The Weld County Migrant Council is the only organized citizens' group in Northern Colorado concerned with migrant welfare and conditions. This group appears to be not as well organized as the Mesa County Council and has initiated and participated in very few projects.

Comments from growers and community leaders at the June 1, 1962 meeting in Brush indicated that the migrant workers were welcome to use the facilities of the local parks and playing fields, although there were no programs especially for the workers, and no attempts are made to acquaint the workers with the facilities available.

Growers and community officials in the Ft. Lupton area were the most outspoken about the need for the migrant workers in their area. They recognized that the worker is an indispensable part of the

area's agricultural economy and indicated that steps have been taken to make the worker feel welcome while he is in Colorado. A spokesman for the town council of Ft. Lupton said that the Ft. Lupton camp had overloaded the town's sewer system in 1961 and that some of the sewer lines had been replaced since then to insure that the situation did not occur again. Also, several streets in the vicinity of the camp had recently been paved to reduce the dust problem, which benefited the camp residents as well as the town's permanent citizenry.

The inability of many Spanish-American migrants to speak English was cited as a reason for the lack of better relations between the workers and the community at the Migrant Labor Committee's Greeley regional meeting. This failure to converse in English apparently has heightened the Anglo and Spanish-American cultural differences in the eyes of some people, leading to more strained relationships.

Programs for Migrants

Educational and recreational programs for the children in the Ft. Lupton area are sponsored, planned, and conducted by the Colorado Council of Churches and by the Catholic Church.

The Migrant Ministry of the Council of Churches conducts various programs at the Ft. Lupton camp and assists in any way it can to ease some of the burden of the migrant workers. The Migrant Ministry held rummage sales, provided class instruction in mechanics and in sewing, provided free movies, had organized recreational programs, and provided religious instruction. The Ministry also made used clothing and bedding available in some cases. The director of the Migrant Ministry for Colorado said that community acceptance of these programs had been very heartening and hoped that they could be extended into areas of Colorado not now served.

The Catholic Church provided similar programs to those of the Migrant Ministry, with perhaps more emphasis being placed upon religious instruction. In addition to the general programs at the Ft. Lupton camp, the Catholic Church also conducted a three-week class of religious instruction for migrant children in the Greeley area. Two buses were used to transport the children from surrounding farms to Greeley for these classes.

Law Enforcement Problems

Law enforcement officials in all parts of Northern Colorado reported few problems, if any, with the migrant workers who came to their areas. The state patrol said that transportation of workers is no longer the problem it was several years ago, since most workers come to the state in their own automobiles, and only a small per cent of them come in on crew leaders' or contractors' trucks. All trucks that do enter the state, however, must comply with ICC regulations concerning safety, loading, and rest stops. Drinking, in contrast to comments received in other parts of the state, was not cited as a major cause of concern by law enforcement officials.

Importance of Farm Labor Market Organization

The organization of the farm labor market has been given special attention in this study, because the economic well-being of both growers and workers depends to a great extent on the effective recruitment, allocation, and utilization of seasonal farm labor.

The grower needs an assured labor supply, especially at certain critical periods during the growing season; otherwise, he may suffer crop loss both in quantity and quality. The growers' labor needs in Colorado may be greater proportionally in this respect than in some other states where the same crops are grown. Mechanization and technological improvement have altered the farm labor picture considerably in recent years by reducing the need for seasonal farm labor, but not to the extent that labor needs have been reduced in some other states. The worker needs continuous employment in order to 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.

Relationship of Employment Pattern and Earnings

All of the migrants interviewed during the field study were asked how much they and their families earned both during the week preceding the interview and for the entire period from April until the time they were interviewed. Earnings during the preceding week were usually good (except for the Western Slope where peach harvest had started toward the end of the week, with little prior work available, and the San Juan Basin where bad weather slowed up bean harvest), because the interviews in each area were made during a period of peak labor needs and employment was usually available. The effect of periods of non-work on the income of interstate migrant workers, especially family groups, can be seen by comparing average (median) earnings during the previous week with the average (median) weekly earnings from April 1 until the time of the interview.

This comparison is shown by area in which interviewed for both family groups and single workers in Table 92.

In each area, the average weekly earnings for family groups from April 1 until the time of interview were much less than the average amount earned during the preceding week. The difference was as much as 71 per cent in one area and, in all others except one, was more than 40 per cent. The one exception was the Western Slope, where, as previously indicated, most workers did not work full time during the preceding week.

Differences Between Family and Single Workers. The picture was different for single workers. Except for the San Luis Valley, the average weekly earnings since April 1 exceeded the average amount earned during the previous week. (In the San Luis Valley, many of the single workers interviewed, particularly during the late season, had not been actively seeking employment prior to the period during which they were interviewed.)

TABLE 92

Comparison of Earnings During Previous Week
With Average Weekly Earnings From April 1 Until Time of Interview,
Migrant Labor Interviews By Area, 1961 and 1962

Area	Family Groups			Single Workers		
	Earnings Previous Week[a]	Weekly Earnings Since April 1[a]	Pct. of Difference	Earnings Previous Week[a]	Weekly Earnings Since April 1[a]	Pct. of Difference
Arkansas Valley	$82.00	$27.25	-66.8%	$25.00	$25.00	--
San Luis Valley (Early Season)[b]	50.00	29.44	-41.1	40.00	18.75	-53.1%
San Luis Valley (Late Season)[c]	95.00	27.58	-71.0	48.00	8.00	-83.3
Western Slope	20.00	15.71	-21.5	10.00	12.00	+20.0
San Juan Basin	24.00	9.72	-59.5	12.00	19.57	+63.1
Northern Colorado	58.00	34.55	-40.4	25.00	45.00	+80.0

a. Median earnings
b. July-August
c. September-October

The difference in earning patterns between family groups and single workers may be explained by one or both of the following:

1) During periods of slack employment, it is likely that only the adult male member of a family group will find work. The crop and type of work will also affect the employment of women and children in family groups. Consequently, the adult male may have been the only one in the family to have worked at all regularly prior to the period in which the interview took place, when usually two or three or even more family members were employed.

2) Generally, single workers did not feel the economic necessity as greatly as did family members to work on a full-time basis during peak periods when employment was available. (This is substantiated by the fact that the interviews showed that single workers were employed fewer hours on the average during the preceding week than individual family members.) If such is the case, earnings during the preceding week would be lower in proportion to weekly earnings since April 1 than they would have been, had the single worker been employed for as many hours as family members.

Reasons for Differences in Family Group Weekly Earnings. There are several reasons why the average weekly earnings of family members from April 1 until the time of interview were as low as shown in Table 92. Climatic conditions, as might be expected, were a major factor in periods of non-employment. Travel also caused a number of non-work days. Some of these groups had arrived in a particular area prior to the time work was available, either through misinformation or misunderstanding or because they assumed work would be available without checking with the employment department or any other possible source of information. Often, this early arrival was the fault of a labor contractor or crew leader. Some of these workers had left an area in another state while employment was still available only to find no work at the time of their arrival in Colorado. In many instances, when such movements occurred, the workers or their crew leaders were following a travel and employment pattern of many years standing without being informed of delays caused by climatic conditions or changes in labor needs. In some cases, domestic family groups preferred not to take the work available, because either they didn't like the crop activity and/or the amount and method of payment, or because they were waiting for other employment which had been promised.

Worker Guarantees

Domestic workers and the growers who employ them have none of the protection and guarantees provided by federal law for the employment of Mexican nationals, other foreign workers, and Puerto Ricans. Foreign workers and Puerto Ricans employed as farm laborers receive guarantees as to transportation, insurance, wage rates, and the minimum amount of employment which will be provided during the contract period. In other words, these workers are guaranteed payment for a specified number of hours of work at a specified rate, even if that amount of work is not available because of climatic conditions or other reasons. The grower is guaranteed that the workers will perform as specified in the contract, and, if they refuse to work or are otherwise unsatisfactory, replacements will be provided. It should be noted that these agreements apply to single workers rather than family groups.

Federal legislation was introduced in 1961 to establish contractual relationships and guarantees for domestic workers. This measure provided that growers and domestic workers could participate in the program on a voluntary basis. This measure, however, was not reported out by the U. S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Annual Worker Plan

The Annual Worker Plan represents another approach to the two-fold problem of providing: 1) an assured supply of domestic labor to growers; and 2) continuous steady employment to domestic workers. This plan was introduced nationwide by the Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor, and its affiliated state employment departments in 1954. The purposes of the plan are "to help provide a dependable labor supply to farm employers and to increase the employment opportunities of migrant farm workers by arranging successive job referrals."[1]

As part of the plan, interviews are conducted with migrant groups in their home areas and in their places of employment for the primary purpose of providing continuous employment for the group. Information collected on the origin, size, composition, previous employment pattern, future job commitments, and other characteristics of each work crew is entered on a migratory labor employment record. Copies of this record are distributed to the crew leader's state of residence, as well as to other states in the crew's itinerary. In this way, states where the migrants are employed can develop information on this component of the seasonal work force, and home states can accumulate data on the number, characteristics, and movement of their own residents who are migratory workers.[2]

While the Annual Worker Plan represents a significant step toward rationalizing at least a portion of the farm labor market, it has not been as successful as its framers had hoped, and some states, including Colorado, have not participated in the program to the extent which might be expected, considering the number of domestic workers who come to this state each year. Table 93 shows by state the number of migrants contacted and employed under the Annual Worker Plan in 1960.

Table 93 shows that Colorado contacted very few crew leaders in comparison with a number of states whose labor needs are somewhat similar, such as Idaho, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Wisconsin. Fewer migrants were employed in Colorado under the Annual Worker Plan in relation to the total number of contacts made than in any of the states mentioned above or in several others as well.

1. The Annual Worker Plan in 1960, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Program Review and Analysis, April 1, 1961.
2. Ibid.

TABLE 93

Annual Worker Plan:
Migrants Contacted and Employed, by State, 1960[a]

State	Number of Migrant Contacts[b]				Migrants Employed		
	Total	Crew Leaders	Family Heads	Other	Families	Single Males	Single Females
Total	15,512	9,597	4,997	918	--	--	--
Alabama	289	171	2	116	319	325	183
Arizona	138	54	80	4	409	430	25
Arkansas	515	294	200	21	751	3,040	497
California	112	33	72	7	313	577	10
Colorado	370	107	246	17	558	677	18
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware	233	214	16	3	974	2,001	551
Florida	591	575	1	15	4,340	12,447	2,632
Georgia	110	69	12	29	184	1,375	221
Idaho	815	519	291	5	1,782	1,242	135
Illinois	405	124	274	7	1,086	526	133
Indiana	418	264	135	19	1,427	1,201	331
Iowa	189	79	107	3	279	173	6
Kansas	78	38	40	0	137	130	70
Kentucky	32	29	2	1	106	317	43
Louisiana	262	221	28	13	310	1,392	361
Maine	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	376	353	23	0	761	2,276	521
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Michigan	331	143	187	1	9,867	3,968	665
Minnesota	299	43	255	1	567	176	10
Mississippi	517	288	6	223	8	30	20
Missouri	372	229	142	1	1,004	1,964	282
Montana	282	68	197	17	401	207	35
Nebraska	102	61	40	1	147	33	13
Nevada	15	6	9	0	44	58	9
New Hampshire	3	3	0	0	8	152	5
New Jersey	141	101	13	27	494	1,320	327
New Mexico	96	47	38	11	85	235	13
New York	705	627	18	60	2,573	8,849	1,426
North Carolina	716	703	3	10	1,371	6,261	1,639
North Dakota	269	67	201	1	448	140	98
Ohio	1,179	660	504	15	3,332	1,707	270
Oklahoma	128	99	26	3	1,240	485	75
Oregon	194	94	92	8	475	333	24
Pennsylvania	269	250	3	16	569	2,387	333
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	229	164	0	65	645	1,793	350

TABLE 93
(Continued)

State	Number of Migrant Contacts[b]				Migrants Employed		
	Total	Crew Leaders	Family Heads	Other	Families	Single Males	Single Females
South Dakota	13	4	9	0	53	19	0
Tennessee	81	60	8	13	130	395	178
Texas	1,905	1,032	831	42	4,642	3,884	378
Utah	95	68	26	1	248	260	17
Vermont	2	2	0	0	3	43	1
Virginia	1,090	870	165	55	2,350	5,700	1,350
Washington	262	153	94	15	458	1,091	77
West Virginia	25	25	0	0	60	333	9
Wisconsin	1,017	468	477	72	2,025	2,566	249
Wyoming	242	118	124	0	442	104	4

a. The Annual Worker Plan in 1960, U. S. Dept. of Labor.
b. Migrant contacts represent a count of all interviews recorded on Form ES-369, Migratory Labor Employment Record.

Source: Information in these tables is limited to data accumulated from Form ES-369, Migratory Labor Employment Record, by State Employment Security agencies in connection with the Annual Worker Plan.

The state employment department reports that there was considerable change in Colorado's participation in the Annual Worker Plan in 1961: "Many groups were contacted and recorded under the Annual Worker Plan who had not been previously scheduled. The number of workers served in the groups was 29 per cent greater than in 1960..."[3]

According to the director of the state employment department, a new system was established in 1961 in an effort to expedite recruitment under the Annual Worker Plan. With the cooperation of the Texas Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security, arrangements were made for crew leaders and recruiters to meet in several central locations in Texas. While this approach had merit, it was not as successful as had been anticipated, because less than half of the crew leaders who had been expected showed up at the scheduled meetings.[4]

During the migrant field interviews in 1961 and 1962, only two workers were found who were participating in the Annual Worker Plan. It was likely, however, that other workers interviewed were participating in the plan without knowing it, since employment arrangements had been made by their crew leaders.

3. Farm Labor Report 1961, Colorado Department of Employment, Farm Placement Service, p. 38.
4. Legislative Council Committee on Migratory Labor, Minutes of Meeting of March 16, 1962.

Characteristics of the Seasonal Farm Labor Market

Although there are considerable variations in the organization of the seasonal farm labor market among the states and within areas of states as well,[5] there are several common characteristics applicable to all states and areas, and these characteristics in many ways differentiate the farm labor market from the industrial labor market.

The seasonal farm labor market is generally characterized by the following:

1) General Lack of Formal Relationships Between Growers and Workers. There are very few laws and no contractual agreements (with the exception of foreign workers) affecting the grower-worker relationship. Consequently, no grower has a hold on any worker, and no worker has a claim on any job. In other words, no grower can be certain that his domestic workers will show up for work the following day, and no worker can be certain that he will have work tomorrow just because he was employed today.

2) Casual Nature of Seasonal Farm Employment and the Low Level of Skills Required. The casual nature of seasonal farm employment and the low level of skills required for most farm labor tasks means that the worker's mobility is usually limited to seeking similar employment with another grower. There is very little possibility of a worker achieving a higher level job, either with his present employer or with another grower. The casual nature of seasonal farm employment also results generally in a lack of personal relationships between growers and workers. This lack of personal relationship is intensified by two factors: a) The grower often deals with a middle man between him and the worker. This middle man may be a crew leader, contractor, or a processing company field man. b) Labor recruitment is usually performed by someone besides the grower.

3) Multiple Sources of Labor Recruitment. The recruitment of seasonal farm labor involves state employment departments, growers' associations, processors, labor contractors, and occasionally individual growers. In those instances where there are formalized relationships among some of those involved in the recruitment process, these relationships apply usually to only a portion of the workers recruited in a given area.

4) Lack of Central Control Over Labor Recruitment, Utilization, and Reallocation. The lack of any central control over labor recruitment, utilization, and reallocation is illustrated by the following: a) the many different groups and individuals involved in the recruitment process, often at cross purposes; b) the lack of follow through or concern in the reassignment of workers once the job is completed for which original recruitment was made and the consequent lack of information on the part of the workers as to where further employment is available; c) the necessity usually of contacting workers individually or in relatively small crews rather than in large, cohesive, organized groups; and 4) the role tradition and past experience play in the movement of seasonal farm labor, especially in the absence of specific labor market information.

5. The differences among areas in Colorado can be seen in the previous chapters of this report.

5) Lack of Relationship Between Wage Levels and the Supply of Workers Available, Limitations Upon Individual Growers in Making Wage Rate Determinations, and Workers' Inability to Influence Wage Rates. There is very little, if any, relationship between the wage rates established at the beginning of a growing season and estimates as to the number of seasonal domestic workers who will be attracted into the area. As observed during the field study, wage rates are determined in part by tradition, profit or loss during the past growing season, and current year's expectations. These rates are also influenced to a considerable extent by the rate established for Mexican nationals, except in those areas where seasonal farm labor is traditionally performed by domestic workers.[6]

The rates established by the United States Department of Agriculture also have a bearing on the rates set for other seasonal crop activities, as does the contractual agreements between processors and growers. In those areas, where there is an active growers' association, wage rates determined by this organization usually establish a pattern which is not deviated from in the area, even by growers who are not members. The lack of relationship between labor supply and wage rates exists even though some studies have shown that in the long run workers will be attracted to higher wage areas.[7] The availability of Mexican nationals, should a shortage of domestic workers be certified, may be one reason why concern over labor supply has not been translated to wage rate determinations.

All of the factors enumerated above severely limit decision making on wage rates by the individual grower. The workers, other than seeking employment elsewhere (in which event they would either be replaced by other domestic workers or braceros), have no course of action if they are dissatisfied over the wage rates offered. This is nowhere more apparent than in the home states of most domestic migrants where there is a large supply of labor, and the low wages offered cause many of them to join the migrant stream. Both the unskilled nature of the employment in which they are engaged and the lack of any effective organization make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for domestic workers to influence wage rates.

6) Low Population Density in Relation to Manpower Needs. The need for labor, especially in peak periods during the growing season, usually far exceeds the number of local seasonal workers available. This lack of a local labor supply has made the importation of large numbers of workers by whatever means possible absolutely necessary.

It should be noted that in states and areas where there has been a high degree of mechanization, the farm labor market has been altered considerably. Fewer workers are needed, and these workers are required to have higher skills than farm laborers working in stoop crop labor. Workers employed as adjuncts to mechanized agricultural operations receive higher wages, and these wages are usually paid on an hourly rather than a piece basis. The need for a greater degree of

6. For a more complete discussion of the relationship between wage rates for Mexican nationals and domestic workers, see the chapter on the Arkansas Valley in this report.
7. The Seasonal Agricultural Labor Market In Colorado, John Gore, Doctor's Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1962., p. 37.