TO: All Members of Colorado Flower Growers Association
FROM: Wayne Pearson, Chairman Legislative Committee for the Colorado Flower Growers
SUBJECT: Proposed Bill to extend coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to Agriculture
DATE: April 1, 1968

Dear C. F. G. A. Member:

Attached is a copy of a report sent out by the Society of American Florist describing a proposed bill to extend the coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to Agriculture. This bill, if passed, will seriously affect you as a greenhouse operator. You have a vital interest in this legislation.

We are requesting that you contact your congressman and senators asking them to oppose any such legislation which affects the flower growing industry. If you know any congressmen or senator personally, please spend the cost of a long distance phone call and talk to your representative or senator personally. We are earnestly asking your efforts to defeat this legislation.

Please cooperate by spending a few minutes to write your representatives.
Bills to Extend Coverage of the National Labor Relations Act to Agriculture

Legislation is now under consideration in both Senate and House labor committees on extension of the National Labor Relations Act to include farm workers.

At the present time agricultural workers are not covered by the NLRA. Farmers are not required to recognize and bargain with a farm labor union. A dispute between a farmer and a union representing farm workers is not subject to the Act, and the NLRB has no jurisdiction to concern itself with the dispute.

SAF management is cooperating with the National Council of Agricultural Employers here in Washington and with a number of farm groups and trade associations interested in this problem.

House Bill 4769 is expected to be reported out of the full Education and Labor Committee in the near future. (It was scheduled for hearing this week (8) but the meeting was postponed.) The Senate Bill, S.8, has been reported out of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee and is pending before the full Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The Executive Director of NCOAE, Mr. John Heiney, provided me with the following analysis of these bills. He said the bills are identical and provide:

"That any worker presently hired must join the union and any worker subsequently hired must join within seven days from the date of his employment.

"That the farmer shall give preference to hiring union members. This provision is not mandatory. However, it can be expected that farmers would be subject to pressure to enter into a contract of this character.

"Coverage of farm workers involves:

If workers were covered by the National Labor Relations Act, the following would be considered unfair labor practices:

1. To interfere with, restrain, or coerce workers in the exercise of their right to join a union."
2. To discriminate against a worker 'in regard to hire or tenure' because the worker is or is not a union member.

3. To refuse to bargain with a union with respect to terms and conditions of employment and the execution of a written contract. This does not compel any employer to agree to union demands, but it does require him to bargain 'in good faith' a term subject to innumerable NLRB and court interpretations.

"The Act provides that the NLRB may determine the unit for the purposes of elections and may conduct such elections. In recent years the NLRB has tended to accept a 'card count' as adequate evidence of workers' intent. If the union is able to sign up more than half of the workers of an employer, the employer is required to bargain with the union. If the employer refuses to do so, NLRB will hold him in violation of the requirement that he must bargain in good faith, unless he can show NLRB that he has good reason to believe the union does not represent a majority of his workers.

"Due to the temporary nature of most farm employment it seems likely that farm labor unions would use the sign-up procedure as described above."

Unionization of agricultural labor will come soon unless we use our right to express ourselves positively concerning these two bills.

Communicate with your two Senators and your Congressman and oppose the O'Hare Bill (H.R. 4769) and the companion Senate bill (S.8) that will extend the National Labor Relations Act to include farm workers.

The National Chamber has reported to us that unions are pressuring Congress for $2 minimum wages. There is real pressure for hearings. Although there appears to be little chance of anything materializing this year, it's an indication that the great push is on.
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LOCAL GOVERNMENT DIVISION REPORT

Property Tax 'Revolution' Recommended

By DICK JOHNSTON
Denver Post Staff Writer

A revolutionary change in property tax assessment is among the many recommendations for consideration by the state legislature in the annual report of Colorado's Division of Local Government.

The report, issued by division director J. D. Arehart, for example, also calls for much greater state aid to local governments, for replacement of political patronage in county governments with a civil service system, and sharply increased statutory powers for regional councils of government.

Arehart said a state constitutional amendment is needed to allow differentials in assessments and tax mill levies within classes of property "under certain conditions provided by law."

"Critics of property tax administration have long emphasized the undesirable consequences of a tax which penalizes new and stable properties and rewards the owner of deteriorated or idle properties," the report says.

Variable Assessments

Variable assessments and tax rate differentials "would permit assessment of deteriorated property at a higher ratio of market value than new or well maintained properties within the same class (for example, commercial apartment houses)."

"Rate differentials would permit imposition of a higher mill levy and thus a higher tax on vacant property within a given building zone to encourage improvement of the property or its lawful use," says the report.

"In both cases, property owners would be penalized for non-development or non-use of property or permitting it to become rundown."

"Resulant higher taxes would provide an economic incentive to the owner to properly manage his property to rid himself of the penalty. The community would benefit from stabilized property values and greater tax base."

The report says consideration should be given to merit systems for county employees, especially in larger counties, since retirement systems have now been authorized and implemented in some counties.

Continued Federal Aid

Also, Arehart noted, continued federal aid to counties may be made contingent upon establishment of merit systems.

The report calls for statutory authority for regional councils of government (called COGs, composed of local government elected officials) and notes that the state's three major urban areas have them, organized under the old state law for regional planning commissions.

"If councils are to mean anything on a regionwide basis, they must be given permissive authority to adopt policies which they are able to enforce," the report says.

"For example, when a council is formed, local government entities should be precluded from withdrawing; once a policy decision is made by a council, member units should be required to perform accordingly.

"Only in this manner can a COG be a meaningful governmental entity; anything short of this is merely a social organization."

Broad New Program

A broad new program of direct financial assistance by the state to municipalities and counties should be implemented, particularly so local governments can have funds to match a wide variety of federal grants, the report says. State aid is now confined to schools and local highways.

Arehart specifically suggested an initial state fund of $2.5 million, to be administered by his division, to help Denver and Trinidad with their federally aided Model Cities programs.

Other recommendations in the report include:

- A variety of constitutional and statutory changes to give local governments much more power to change their structures, provide services, and obtain additional revenues.

- A complete system of centralized local government accounting, auditing and data processing procedures plus state-sponsorded data banks needed for equitable allocation of state and federal aid.

- Repeal of the local option sales tax law unless it is amended to include a use tax. An alternative is a statewide sales tax which would be distributed to local governments.

- Provisions for consolidation of the hundreds of special purpose taxing districts in the state, particularly in urban areas, and for control of all special districts by county commissioners.

- Mandatory use of county managers in larger counties and perhaps some other and public works, for example.

- Granting of state licenses to building contractors that would be valid in any specialized county officers for budgeting county or municipality in the state.

- Especially in the Denver metropolitan area, contractors must obtain licenses in several jurisdictions to conduct their business."

- Allowing counties to adopt model codes (building, fire, housing and health codes, for example) by reference. Such codes are published by national associations and their use by counties would cut costs and simplify procedures.

- Establishment of a state "board of review for municipal incorporations and annexations" to try to cut down the frequent feuds in urban areas. "Chaos now prevails," the report says.

- Creation of a state "board of assessment appeals" to handle complaints about property assessments, short of court suits.

- Strong authority for the State Tax Commission to require uniform property assessment among the state's 63 counties.

'Mother of Year,' 81, Mugged, Robbed in D.C.

WASHINGTON — (UPI) — An 81-year-old "Mother of the Year" was mugged in the nation's capital, police reported Saturday.

Authorities said Mrs. Nellie Butler Deane, who was 1963's District of Columbia American Mother of the Year, was thrown down a set of stairs, Friday and robbed of her handbag containing $70.

She suffered a broken right leg and a broken hip and was hospitalized in satisfactory condition.

A 17-year-old suspect was being questioned in the case.

Berlin Police Halt Students

BERLIN — (AP) — Police beat back a charge by about 100 dissident students who tried to enter the office of West Berlin Education Director Werner Stein Saturday. The students were protesting proposed disciplinary action against 14 of their comrades involved in earlier university demonstrations.
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Eve. Director Check on this... or Legislative Committee

How would this affect greenhouse?
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

NOTICE

July 10, 1968

TO: WAYNE PEARSON
    BOB BRIGGS
    BUD KINTZELE

A meeting of the Legislative Committee

of Colorado Flower Growers Association, Inc.

is scheduled for Monday, July 15, at 2:30 P.M.

in the Association Office, 901 Sherman St.,

Suite 1410, Denver, Colorado.
An organizational meeting of the appointed Legislative Committee was held in the Association Office, 901 Sherman, Suite 1410, Denver, Colorado, at 3:00 P.M. on Monday, July 15, 1968.

Present were:

Wayne Pearson
Bud Kintzele
Bob Briggs
and
Dorothy Conroy, Secretary

There was a general discussion regarding the Committee's plans for the future. It was the consensus that a close liaison between other specialized segments of the Agriculture industry and members of the State Legislature should be developed. This will be pursued by each member of the Committee.

It was agreed that a request should be made to have all Committee members placed on the SAF mailing list.

It was felt that consideration should be given to increasing the Committee to five members.

Mr. Bud Kintzele reviewed the role played by the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture in making rules and regulating interstate commerce. The national convention of the NASDA will be held in Sun Valley, Idaho the latter part of September and the first couple of days in October. Approximately 200 to 250 people are expected to attend.

After discussion, the Committee agreed a recommendation should be made to the Board of Directors that consideration be given to hosting a breakfast during the Convention at a cost of approximately $500.
ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN
On a motion made by Mr. Bud Kintzele, seconded by Mr. Bob Briggs and carried, Mr. Wayne Pearson was elected Chairman of the Legislative Committee.

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the Legislative Committee will be called at the discretion of the Chairman.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Conroy,
Secretary
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
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COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

November 25, 1968

A meeting of the Legislative Committee was held at Lakewood Country Club Tuesday, November 25, 1968 at 11:45 A. M.

Present were:

Wayne Pearson
Bud Kintzele
Bob Briggs
and
Dorothy Conroy, Secretary

Steps which can be taken to help alleviate various existing industry problems were discussed.

It was agreed that a recommendation should be made to the Board of Directors that consideration be given to the passage of a Board resolution opposing Mr. Ben Cline's bill.

It was agreed that copies of the Colorado Labor Peace Act should be obtained, and that said Act should be thoroughly reviewed.

It was agreed that CFGA should hold joint meetings with various agricultural groups.

It was agreed that CFGA should consider membership in the Colorado Association of Commerce & Industry, as well as other groups.

It was agreed that a questionnaire should be submitted to the membership to obtain the names of State Legislators and others with considerable influence who are known personally by individual growers.
It was agreed that a "fact" booklet should be compiled.

It was further agreed that the Legislative Committee should invite Mr. John Orcutt to participate at the Committee's next meeting sometime during the week of December 2, 1968.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Conroy,
Secretary
BULLETIN NO. 2

This Legislative Report will include the title of the proposed legislation as it is introduced, the number of the House or Senate Bill, the names of the sponsors, and the Committee to which it is initially referred. From time to time, on subjects of specific importance to the business community, extensive analysis and in-depth comments will also be sent to the members of CACI.

HOUSE BILLS

H. B. No. 1067, by Representative Sack—For an act permitting domestic insurance companies to invest funds in loans to students that are insured under the provisions of certain federal laws.

Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1068, by Representative Porter—For an act concerning hunting, and making it unlawful to hunt under certain circumstances.

Committee on Game, Fish, and Parks.

H. B. No. 1069, by Representative Bryant—For an act concerning the Public Airport Authority Act, and providing that counties may join with municipalities in creating authorities under such act.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1070, by Representative Cole—For an act concerning evidence in civil actions, and creating a presumption that habitual heavy smoking is a cause of cancer of the lung.

Committee on Health, Welfare, and Institutions.

H. B. No. 1071, by Representative Klein—For an act concerning the jurisdiction of superior courts.

Committee on Judiciary.


Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1073, by Representatives Grimshaw and Bastien—For an act concerning the operation of motor vehicles; providing for the suspension and revocation of licenses to drive motor vehicles; defining degrees of the offense of driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor and providing for penalties therefor; and providing penalties for driving while under the influence of any drug.

Committee on Transportation and Highways and then to Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1074, by Representative Safran—For an act making mandatory the availability to certain law enforcement agencies of sound motion picture equipment for use as evidence in the conviction of persons charged with the crime of driving under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

Committee on Transportation and Highways and then to Committee on Judiciary.


Committee on Agriculture and Livestock.

H. B. No. 1076, by Representative McNeil—For an act concerning schools, and amending the definition of "Taxpaying Elector".

Committee on Education.

H. B. No. 1077, by Representatives Lamm and Bryant—For an act amending 13-5-30 (2) (c) and (d), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, concerning presumptions in connection with driving while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

Committee on Transportation and Highways.

H. B. No. 1078, by Representatives Sack and Lamm—For an act amending section 13-5-30 (3) (d), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963 (1967 Supp.), requiring the revocation of a driver's license for a person's failure to submit to a test for determining the alcoholic content of that person's blood.

Committee on Transportation and Highways.

H. B. No. 1079, by Representatives Moore and Dittemore—For an act providing for the recall of elective officers of local improvement and service districts formed under chapter 89, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1080, by Representatives Lamm and Hamilton—For an act concerning civil rights.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1081, by Representative Lamm—For an act concerning the liquor code, and providing an exemption from the state excise tax for up to one quart of intoxicating liquors in the possession of persons subject to customs clearance upon arrival at international airports.

Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1082, by Representatives Mullen, Cooper, Hamilton, Lamm, and Newman—For an act requiring the teaching of sex education in the public schools.

Committee on Education.

H. B. No. 1083, by Representatives Friedman, Grimshaw, Hamilton, Neal, Safran, DeMoulon, Moore, Sack, Dittemore, Knox, Vanderhoof, Munson, Schubert, and Bain; also Senators Minister, Shoemaker, and Strickland—For an act concerning the Public School Foundation Act, and providing for increased assistance to school districts operating schools at least two hundred thirty days in twelve months.

Committee on Education.

H. B. No. 1084, by Representatives Strahle, Koster, and Friedman; also Senator Anderson—For an act concerning mechanics' liens for claims under article 3 of chapter 86, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended; providing certain...
moneys are made trust funds for the payment of such claims; providing for the distribution of such trust funds; and providing a penalty for the wrongful distribution of such trust funds.

Committee on Business Affairs.

SENATE BILLS

S. B. No. 32, by Senator Chance—Amending 22-2-2, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, to provide that the names of children who are sixteen years of age and older, and who are taken into temporary custody or issued a summons under the provisions of the children's code, may be publicized.

Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 33, by Senators Denny and Garnsey—Concerning licenses to operate motor vehicles.

Committee on Transportation.

S. B. No. 34, by Senator Denny—Providing that minors having attained age eighteen may contract without legal disability.

Committee on Judiciary.


Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 36, by Senators Stockton, Anderson, Cisneros, Kemp, Schieffelin and Strickland—Providing that a head of a principal department or other officer or employee of the state may be employed and receive compensation or fees from more than one department, institution, or agency of the state government.

Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 37, by Senators Stockton, Cisneros, Kemp, and Strickland—Concerning community mental health services and providing for the purchase thereof by the department of institutions.

Committee on Institutions.

S. B. No. 38, by Senators Stockton, Anderson, Cisneros, Kemp, Schieffelin, Strickland—Concerning the criminally insane.

Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 39, by Senator Garnsey—Concerning county and municipal sales taxes, and providing for the exemption of certain sales from such taxes.

Committee on Finance.

S. B. No. 40, by Senators Schieffelin, Anderson, Massari, and Jackson, and Representatives Schubert, Gustafson et al.—Concerning the protection of fishing streams.

Committee on Transportation.

S. B. No. 41, by Senators Massari, Brown, Gill, MacFarlane, and Taylor, and Representatives Baer, Dameron, et al.—Concerning higher education, and abolishing the Colorado commission on higher education and the office of the executive director thereof, and creating the office of the executive director of the department of higher education with certain powers, duties, and functions.

Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 42, by Senators DeBerard, Enstrom, Gill, Garnsey and Armstrong—Making a supplemental appropriation to the junior college districts of the state of Colorado.

Committee on Appropriations.

S. B. No. 43, by Senators Vollack and Stockton—Concerning the operation of motor vehicles, and authorizing the suspension of licenses for violations of the statute concerning speed limits.

Committee on Transportation.

S. B. No. 44, by Senators Jackson, Enstrom, Strickland and Decker, and Representatives Burch, Farley and Safran—Concerning the public utilities commission, and providing for the compensation of the members thereof.

Committee on Appropriations.

S. B. No. 45, by Senator Taylor and Representative Massari—Relating to firemen's pensions.

Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1085, by Representatives Grimshaw, Bain, and Mullen—For an act concerning planning, and providing for the formation of metropolitan councils, and providing for the powers, duties, and functions thereof.

Committee on Local Government.

S. B. No. 46, by Senators Anderson, Schieffelin, Bergham, Decker, Enstrom, Hodges, Massari and Vollack, and Representatives Schafer, Jackson, Lamm, et al.—Requiring the controller of the state of Colorado to adopt an accounting system based upon the accrual or modified accrual system of accounting.

Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 47, by Senators Gill and Massari—Concerning funds appropriated to the university of Colorado and by the general assembly, and providing that none of such funds shall be utilized to compensate any person who is a member of the communist party.

Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 48, by Senators Garnsey and Denny, and Representatives Jackson and Arnold—Concerning motor vehicles, prohibiting the alteration or manipulation of motor vehicle odometers, and requiring an affidavit as to the accuracy of the odometer reading upon its repair or replacement and upon sale or transfer of the vehicle.

Committee on Transportation.

S. B. No. 49, by Senators Stockton, Bergham, and Kemp—Concerning income earned by persons who are suffering from permanent and total disability, as defined in Section 115-1-15, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, to provide that the

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 50, by Senators Bergham, Anderson, Jackson and Schieffelin, and Representatives Bryant, Fentress and Gustafson—Prohibiting dumping of human wastes into streams from campers, trailers, or other conveyances.

Committee on Game, Fish and Parks.


Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 52, by Senator Cisneros—Concerning the operation of motor vehicles, and relating to minor operators' licenses and instruction permits therefor.

Committee on Transportation.


Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 54, by Senator Dines and Representative Burch—Amending 80-8-5, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, concerning the "child labor law of 1965".

Committee on Judiciary.


Committee on Health and Welfare.


Committee on State Affairs.


Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 58, by Senator Kemp—Amending 87-1-6, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, concerning limitation of actions against certain establishments and persons licensed by the state.

Committee on Judiciary.


Committee on State Affairs.
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

A meeting of the Legislative Committee was held at the Argonaut Hotel, 233 East Colfax Ave., Denver, Colorado at noon, January 2, 1969.

Present were:

Wayne Pearson, Chairman
Bud Kintzele
Bob Briggs
and
Frank Hayes
Paul Bradley
John Orcutt
Dorothy Conroy, Secretary

There was a lengthy discussion regarding industry problems and steps which can be taken to present a bill to the State Legislature to amend the Colorado Labor Peace Act to specifically include greenhouse operations under the agricultural classification.

While some preliminary investigations have been made by Mr. Hayes, it was felt some additional contacts should be made before the final decision is made. Then if the situation still appears favorable, it was agreed that Mr. Paul Bradley should register to present the proposed bill. Mr. Frank Hayes will be his associate.

Estimated expenses, payable one-half at beginning and balance when job is completed, are as follows:

$10,000 - Paul Bradley
2,500 - Expenses - Paul Bradley
2,500 - Expenses - Frank Hayes

Messrs Hayes & Bradley will advise the Committee when further contacts have been made.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Conroy, Secretary
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
1968-69
(Appointive Committee)

Wayne Pearson, Chairman
7391 West 38th Avenue
Wheatridge, Colorado 80033

Bob Briggs
6351 North Pecos Street
Denver, Colorado 80221

Bud Kintzele
33 South Lowell Blvd.
Denver, Colorado 80219

John Byerly
Associated Wholesale
September 10, 1968

Mrs. Dorothy Conroy  
Colorado Flower Growers Assn.  
901 Sherman St., Suite 1410  
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Dorothy:

Thank you for your communication regarding adding Messrs. Pearson, Briggs and Kintzele to our list to receive legislative bulletins. This we have done.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

John H. Walker  
Executive Director

JHW:bjs
July 16, 1968

Mr. John Walker  
Society of American Florists  
Sheraton - Park Hotel  
Washington, D. C.  20008

Dear Mr. Walker:

At the request of our newly formed Legislative Committee, I am writing to ask that each member of our Committee be placed on your mailing list to receive all information pertaining to legislation affecting the floral industry.

The members are:

Mr. Wayne Pearson  
7391 West 38th Avenue  
Wheatridge, Colorado  80033

Mr. Bob Briggs  
6951 North Pecos Street  
Denver, Colorado  80221

Mr. Bud Kintzele  
33 South Lowell Blvd.  
Denver, Colorado  80219

Many thanks for your help.

Kind personal regards,

Dorothy Conroy,  
Secretary
WAGE-HOUR BULLETIN
September, 1968

From: Kenneth R. Morefield, SAF Labor Consultant

During the SAF 84th Annual Convention at the Americana Hotel in New York seminars were held with the three main segments of the industry to discuss the Fair Labor Standards Act, usually referred to as the Wage-Hour Law. There follows information covering the points raised most often in these meetings:

GROWERS

The minimum wage under the Federal law is $1.15 per hour which increases to $1.30 per hour on February 1, 1969. No overtime is required for agricultural workers. However, to be classed as agricultural, the employee must spend 100% of his time in work related to the agricultural production of his employer. If the employee handles commodities which are purchased for resale the employee will lose the agricultural status and become subject to a minimum wage of $1.60 per hour with time and one half for hours worked in excess of 40 per week.

The making of dish gardens by growers or greenhouse operators is not "agricultural" if the employer purchases commodities for inclusion in the garden. The making of dish gardens is "agricultural" if the employer grows all of the commodities used in the gardens.

Agricultural employees are not covered by the Act unless the employer used as many as 500 man-days of agricultural labor in at least one calendar quarter in the preceding calendar year. A man-day is a day on which an employee works one hour or more.

WHOLESALERS

All employees of a wholesale florist are covered by the law if the employer has an annual dollar volume of sales made or business done of as much as $500,000. The dollar test will drop to $250,000 on February 1, 1969. If the dollar volume is less than that listed above, the individual employee will be subject to the Act if he engages in interstate commerce, or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. Generally speaking, if the wholesaler is purchasing from out of state or shipping out of state, all employees, including clerical employees will be covered by the law.

The major problem discussed, and also found in visits to SAF members, is that relating to inside salesmen. There is no exemption for an employee who is employed within a wholesale florist company for the purpose of making sales. Such sales are usually made through telephone calls by the salesman or through visits to the wholesaler by the customer.
If the primary duty of the employee is to make sales under these conditions he is subject to the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Act. There is no salary, however high, which can be paid to a salesman which will cause him to be exempt. He is subject to overtime payment whether he is paid on any hourly, salary or commission basis.

An employee who spends 80% of his time away from the establishment in making sales or in work related to such sales is exempt from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the Act.

RETAILERS

A retail enterprise with an annual volume of sales made or business done of as much as $500,000 is subject to the Act today. The dollar test drops to $250,000 on February 1, 1969. If the dollar volume is as much as $1,000,000 the minimum wage is $1.60 per hour with overtime required after 40 hours per week. The minimum wage for those enterprises doing less than $1,000,000 but $500,000 or more is $1.15 per hour with overtime after 42 hours per week. The minimum becomes $1.30 on February 1, 1969 with overtime after 40 beginning on the same date. The minimum increases to $1.45 on February 1, 1970, to $1.60 on February 1, 1971.

In order to test whether he meets the dollar volume test the retailer must include all "sales made" and "business done." If the florist makes a sale of flowers which are to be delivered in another state or if he delivers flowers as a result of an order coming from out of state he must consider both transactions as being in interstate commerce. If the total interstate sales are as much as 50% of the total sales the retail establishment is subject to the minimum wage of $1.60 per hour and overtime after 40 hours irrespective of the dollar volume.

If interstate sales are less than 50% the enterprise is covered only if it meets the dollar volume tests of $500,000 at present - $250,000 on February 1, 1969.

The computation of "sales made or business done" must be carefully calculated in order to determine whether the retail enterprise meets the $500,000 or $250,000 test. You must include all sales or other income. On outgoing wire or phone orders the total of the sale of flowers, any service charges, wire or phone charges, or any other incidental charge must be included as "sales made." On incoming orders you must include as "business done" the total amount of income to the enterprise, which normally would be the selling price of the arrangement less discount. If the enterprise has income from any other source, such as rental of property, the income from such sources must be included. Not included are excise taxes separately stated at the retail level.

Irrespective of the dollar volume of the enterprise, an individual retail establishment is exempt if the total volume of sales made or business done is less than $250,000 and more than 50% of all sales are within the state in which the establishment is located.

However, employees of retail enterprises which have more than one establishment are subject to the Act, irrespective of dollar volume, if the employees are employed by the chain of establishments rather than one establishment. For example, if an enterprise operates two establishments those employees engaged in central office or warehouse activities will be subject to the Act.

GENERAL

During the seminars several members of the audiences recounted experiences in undergoing investigations by the Wage-Hour Division. Investigators have the authority to enter the establishment, check sales records or other records which would establish coverage, interview employees, check time and pay roll records and investigate any practices they deem necessary to determine compliance with the Act. If you are not certain as to your status under the Act don't hesitate to contact SAF for assistance. SAF's Labor Consultant can also assist in the event of an investigation.
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado  80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes    __   No     __

   (Your Name)
   ____________________________
   (Mailing Address)
   ____________________________
   (City) Colorado 80076 (Zip)
December 2, 1968

COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   REP. TED BRYANT
   SENATOR JOE SHOEMAKER

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes X
   No ___

(Your Name)

(Mailing Address)

(City) Colorado 80222

(Your Signature)
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado  80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   STATE REP.  WALTER YOUNGLAND
   TONY MULLEN
   JOHN BIERLY
   SEN.  TED STRICKLAND

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

Ray Kitagama
(Your Name)

571, Box 169
(Mailing Address)

Brighton, Colorado 80601
(City) (Zip)
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   Harry Hunt - Pgr.
   Nathaniel Munnall - Pgr.
   Youlove - I don't think he knows me but I know his law partner very well -

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes X
   No ___

   (Your Name)
   Charles J. Haley
   PO Box 786
   (Mailing Address)
   Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901
   (City) (Zip)
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:
   Mine are all Laos - Woman
   Roy Romero - Univ. Boulder
   Kris Marquart - First Butler

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?
   Yes
   No

(Your Name)

Gordon’s Greenhouses
3651 S. Sheridan Blvd.
Denver, Colorado 80235

(Mo) (City) Colorado (Zip)

PERSONAL CALL FROM GORDON 1-16-69:

Jim Ritchie
P.R. Man - Safeway
Has worked for Den. Post,
Meets w/minority groups
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   Mr. Ray Black
   Mr. Anderson
   Mr. Ron Strahie

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes  
   No 

Walter K. Ehmann, D. C.
(Your Name)
615 Country Club Road
(Mailing Address)

Rt. Collins, Colorado 80521
(City) (Zip)
December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   [Signature]

   [Signature]

   [Signature]

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes [X]

   No [ ]

[Your Name]

[4501 E. Mexico]

[Denver, Colorado 80222]
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   HAROLD MCCORMICK

   [List continued]

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes [✓]
   No ___

   HERBERT VENTKER
   (Your Name)

   1313 SOUTH STREET
   (Mailing Address)

   CANON CITY, Colorado 81212
   (City) (Zip)
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

I don’t know anyone in the State Capital.

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

Yes  
No  

James R. Mee  
(Mailing Address)  
5891 So. Parker Rd.  
Denver, Colo. 80232

(City)  
Colorado  (Zip)
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado  80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   George Gentles - State Rep.
   Ruth Stack - State Senator
   Joe Schaffan - State Senator
   John Bidly - State Representative

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes  
   No   

(Your Name)
P.O. Box 1106

(Mailing Address)
DENVER, Colorado 80201

(City) (Zip)
COLORADO FLOWER GrowERS ASSOCIATION, INC.
901 Sherman, Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

[Signature]

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

Yes [X]
No __________

(Your Name)
P.O. Box 5087
(Mailing Address)
Denver, Colorado 80217
(City) (Zip)
December 2, 1968

QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

   No one

   

   

   

   

   

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes ___

   No ___

(Your Name)

570 Federal Blvd

(Mailing Address)

Denver, Colorado 80211

(City) (State) (Zip)
QUESTIONNAIRE
from
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE

Please return this questionnaire to the CFGA Office, or bring to the Grower Meeting December 12, 1968.

1. List those people you know in the State House of Representatives, the State Senate, and high officials of the State of Colorado:

2. Would you, if called upon, personally contact any of the above listed people on behalf of CFGA?

   Yes  
   No   

(Your Name)

(Mailing Address)

, Colorado  
(City)  (Zip)
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
COLORADO FLOWER GROWERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

A meeting of the Legislative Committee was held at the Argonaut Hotel, 233 East Colfax Ave., Denver, Colorado at noon, January 2, 1969.

Present were:

Wayne Pearson, Chairman
Bud Kintzele
Bob Briggs
and
Frank Hayes
Paul Bradley
John Orcutt
Dorothy Conroy, Secretary

There was a lengthy discussion regarding industry problems and steps which can be taken to present a bill to the State Legislature to amend the Colorado Labor Peace Act to specifically include greenhouse operations under the agricultural classification.

While some preliminary investigations have been made by Mr. Hayes, it was felt some additional contacts should be made before the final decision is made. Then if the situation still appears favorable, it was agreed that Mr. Paul Bradley should register to present the proposed bill, Mr. Frank Hayes will be his associate.

Estimated expenses, payable one-half at beginning and balance when job is completed, are as follows:

$10,000 - Paul Bradley
2,500 - Expenses - Paul Bradley
2,500 - Expenses - Frank Hayes

Messrs Hayes & Bradley will advise the Committee when further contacts have been made.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Conroy, Secretary
Simply change wording to something like "ag workers as defined elsewhere."
Should not living in trailers.

Drawers pay fee to State Dept of Ag.
& are already classified ag in most respects.

Not issue - evolved down to
vaccial issue

Proviso = Paul Bradley to check
John Love to see if he will sign
bill should it pass.

Bills will be introduced starting
Wednesday, Jan 8, 1969.

They allow pre-printing of bills.

We should start this in the
Weakest House.
Bill Armstrong - Floor Leader
Palmer Birch - Maj. Floor Leader
Bob Schaper - Chairman Labor Committee

Paul Bradley will be registered to present Bill. Frank Hayes will work in the background.

$75,000 = 10,000 - Paul Bradley
2,500 - Exp. - Hayes
2,500 - Exp. - Bradley

Hayes states he acts 30-35% to expenses. This is split between the different clients. He reports it as income.

Payable: 1/2 fee at the beginning
+ 1/2 when the job is finished
(if we lose?"
May get Frank Kemp to sponsor

John Vanderhoof

Work with Dave Rice Farm Bureau

Contingent on Sue Talmi
Mr. Robert Briggs, Pres.
Colorado Flower Growers Assn.
1411 Sherman Plaza
Denver, Colorado 80203

BULLETIN NO. 1

This Legislative Report will include the title of the proposed legislation as it is introduced, the number of the House or Senate Bill, the names of the sponsors, and the Committee to which it is initially referred. From time to time, on subjects of specific importance to the business community, extensive analysis and in-depth comments will also be sent to the members of CACI.

HOUSE BILLS

H. B. No. 1001, by Representatives Strahle, Gustafson, Koster, Porter and Schubert; also Senators Jackson and Schieffelin—For an act relating to the disposition of unclaimed and abandoned funds and property, and to apply such funds to the state park development fund.
Committee on Game, Fish, and Parks and then to Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1002, by Representative Sack—For an act relating to the immunity of the state, its agencies and political subdivisions, from actions at law; providing exceptions there­to, for the payment of claims and judgments, and for the purchase of liability insurance.
Committee on State Affairs and then to Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1003, by Representative Sack—For an act concerning inspections of state institutions under the department of institutions.
Committee on Health, Welfare, and Institutions.

H. B. No. 1004, by Representative Bastien—For an act concerning contracts of employment, and making unlawful certain provisions in such contracts.
Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1005, by Representative Bastien—For an act concerning labor, and providing for full payment of back pay awards, including the repayment of amounts received as unemployment benefits to the unemployment compensation fund.
Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1006, by Representative Jackson—For an act creating a department of civil service in the executive department of the state government, and providing for the transfer of the civil service commission and its powers, duties, and functions to said department.
Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1007, by Representative Jackson—For an act concerning the retirement fund of the public employees' retirement association, and providing for the investment of moneys in such fund in certain common and preferred stocks.
Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1008, by Representative Farley—For an act subjecting securities issued or guaranteed by intrastate air common carriers to the registration requirements of Article 1, chapter 125, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended.
Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1009, by Representative Lamm—For an act concerning child abuse.
Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1010, by Representative Lamm—For an act concerning minors, and providing that certain minors are competent to give consent for medical, surgical, hospital, and dental care.
Committee on Health, Welfare and Institutions.

H. B. No. 1011, by Representatives McNeil and Lamm—For an act to extend the definition of taxpaying elector in school bond elections to include a person obligated to pay ad valorem school taxes under a contract to purchase real property.
Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1012, by Representative Neal—For and act amending 137-2-2, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, to provide for the exemption from the general property tax of real property owned and used by any religious organization for the residence of its minister, preacher, priest, or rabbi.
Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1013, by Representative Neal—For an act concerning general mechanics' liens, and authorizing the allowance of attorney fees when personal judgment is rendered for any mechanics' lien claimant.
Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1014, by Representative Neal—For an act concerning public records, and authorizing the transfer of certain data relating to students from one school district custodian of records to another.
Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1015, by Representatives Klein, Friedman, and Knox—For an act concerning labor, and providing for a system of collective bargaining by public employees, and placing certain limitations on activities of public employees.
Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1016, by Representative Fuhr; also Senators Gill and Schieffelin—For an act concerning crimes and punishments, and prohibiting certain trespass upon the prop-
erty of and the interference with the peaceful conduct of institutions of higher education.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1017, by Representative Fentress—For an act concerning fire protection districts, and authorizing said districts to require the cutting and removing of weeds that constitute a fire hazard on unimproved land.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1018, by Representatives Bastien and Laman—For an act amending 39-7-11, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, concerning separate trials of joint defendants in criminal actions.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1019, by Representatives Sack and Byerly; also Senator Strickland—For an act concerning taxation, and providing for the abolition of the food sales tax credit.

Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1020, by Representative Schafer—For an act to authorize the formation of special districts for the purpose of preventing the growth of livestock running at large, concerning the formation, operation, and effect of such districts, and for the dissolution thereof.

Committee on Agriculture and Livestock.

H. B. No. 1021, by Representative Bryant—For an act concerning the treatment of motor vehicle license plates with a reflective material, and providing a fee therefor.

Committee on Transportation and Highways.

H. B. No. 1022, by Representative Bryant—For an act concerning sanitation of swimming areas.

Committee on Health, Welfare and Institutions.

H. B. No. 1023, by Representative Mullen—For an act amending 123-6-14 (1), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, relating to excess growth in school districts.

Committee on Education.

H. B. No. 1024, by Representative Mullen—For an act concerning towns and cities, and providing for certain changes in the procedures for organizing new cities and incorporated towns.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1025, by Representative Mullen; also Senator MacManus—For an act concerning credit health and credit accident and health insurance, and providing that such insurance shall not be provided in connection with a loan or other credit transaction unless it is requested by the debtor.

Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1026, by Representative Mullen; also Senator MacManus—For an act concerning credit health and credit accident and health insurance, and providing that such insurance shall not be provided in connection with a loan or other credit transaction unless it is requested by the debtor.

Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1027, by Representatives Strahle, Cole, H. McCormick, and Dameron; also Senators Stockton, Taylor, Deck- er, and MacFarlane—For an act relating to the judicial department of state government, and creating a court of appeals, and providing for the jurisdiction thereof and procedures in connection therewith.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1028, by Representatives Fuhr, Bain, Bastien, Mullen, Black, Grue, Koster, Cole, Dameron, Braden, Sack and Johnson; also Senators Stockton, Strickland, MacManus, Kemp, Vollack, and L. Fowler—For an act concerning consumer protection; defining deceptive trade practices; and providing enforcement by the attorney general.

Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1031, by Representatives Black and Burns; also Senators Gill, Taylor, and Stockton—For an act concerning the regulation of the selling and fitting of hearing aids to the public; and establishing a state board of hearing aid dealers and examiners.

Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1032, by Representative Klein—For an act concerning labor, and providing for the inclusion of agricultural labor within the provisions of “The Workmen’s Compensation Act of Colorado” and “The Colorado Occupational Disease Disability Act.”

Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1033, by Representative Klein—For an act concerning labor, and providing for the inclusion of agricultural labor within the provisions of “The Labor Peace Act”.

Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1034, by Representative Klein—For an act concerning labor, and providing for the inclusion of agricultural labor within the provisions of “The Colorado Employment Security Act”.

Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1035, by Representative Klein—For an act concerning the general property tax, and relating to exempt property.

Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1036, by Representative Klein—For an act concerning the financing of small business, and creating a state small business authority, including a state small business authority commission, and prescribing the powers, duties, and functions thereof.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1037, by Representative Klein—For an act concerning education, implementing section 3 of article VII of the constitution of the state of Colorado, and the equal protection of the laws clause of section 1 of article XIV of the amendments to the constitution of the United States, by providing the means for equal educational opportunities for all students in all grades seven through twelve by authorizing the use of state funds for the lending of certain textbooks to such students; and making an appropriation therefor.

Committee on Education and then to Committee on Appropriations.

H. B. No. 1038, by Representatives Gustafson, Schubert, Koster, and Porter; also Senators Schieffelin and Jackson—For an act concerning outdoor recreation, and revising chapter 62, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended.

Committee on Game, Fish, and Parks.

H. B. No. 1039, by Representatives Burch, Black, Burns, Calabrese, Lamb, Singer, and Vanderpool; also Senators Dines, Gill, Kemp, Taylor, and Vollack—For an act concerning public printing for the legislative department, and providing for the publication and distribution of the sessions laws of the state of Colorado.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1040, by Representatives Gustafson and Schubert; also Senators Schieffelin and Jackson—For an act concerning the authority of the state board of land commissioners, and authorizing said board to sell certain saline and internal improvement lands in this state, and providing for the proceeds of the sale of any such lands to be credited to the parks cash fund, to be utilized for acquisition of parks and park improvements.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1041, by Representatives H. McCormick, Klein, and Massari; also Senators Stockton and Vollack—For an act concerning pleas of guilty to criminal offenses.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1042, by Representatives H. McCormick, Bastien, Bryant, Massari, and Safran; also Senators Stockton, MacFarlane, and Vollack—For an act concerning the procedures for the sentencing, detention, and release of criminals; providing
for a full-time parole board; enacting the uniform mandatory disposition of detainees act and an agreement concerning detainees; and establishing a Colorado reception and diagnostic center.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1043, by Representatives Fentress, Sack, and Mullen; also Senator Vollack—For an act prohibiting the sale, loan, or exhibition of harmful pictures, photographs, motion pictures, films, drawings, or printed matter to minors.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1044, by Representatives Fentress and Moore; also Senator Shoemaker—For an act concerning limitation of actions against architects, contractors, engineers, inspectors, and surveyors.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1045, by Representative Fentress—For an act amending 139-21-5(2) and 139-21-6(3), Colorado revised statutes 1963, as amended, concerning annexation of unincorporated areas having more than two-thirds boundary contiguity with any municipality.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1046, by Representative Fentress—For an act concerning crimes relating to flags.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1047, by Representative Burns—For an act relating to the transfer and conveyance of certain state lands, owned by the state for the benefit of the Colorado National Guard, to Prowers County.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1048, by Representatives Fuhr and Sack—For an act concerning "the unfair practices act", and providing that the attorney general shall administer and enforce the same.

Committee on Business Affairs.

H. B. No. 1049, by Representatives Fuhr and Bastien—For an act concerning the income tax, and providing for the exemption therefrom of compensation of members of the Colorado national guard not to exceed two thousand dollars in any year.

Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1050, by Representative Fuhr—For an act concerning the annexation of real property owned by a school district.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1051, by Representatives Schafer, Jackson, and Lamm; also Senators Anderson, Schieffelin and Decker—For an act concerning the duties of the state auditor, and providing for performance post audits.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1052, by Representative H. McCormick; also Senator Locke—For an act to provide additional penalties for the use of firearms in the commission of certain crimes.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1053, by Representative Cole—For an act concerning the inheritance and succession tax, and providing changes in exemptions from the tax and the rates of tax.

Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1054, by Representative Cole—For an act concerning damages for death by negligence, to increase the damages allowable for death under 41-1-1, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1055, by Representative Cole—For an act concerning damages for death by negligence, to remove the limitation on damages for death under section 41-1-3, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1056, by Representative Sack; also Senator Decker—For an act authorizing the state board for community colleges and occupational education and school districts to purchase or contract for services from certain agencies and institutions, including approved proprietary schools.

Committee on Education.

H. B. No. 1057, by Representative Grimshaw; also Senator Vollack—For an act providing that the United States of America or any of its agencies shall be exempt from the payment of the tax of one dollar on certain actions filed in courts of record, which tax is assessed to reimburse the general fund for appropriations made for the use of the committee on statute revision.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1058, by Representative Fuhr—For an act amending 139-21-5 (1) and (2), and 139-21-6 (3), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, concerning annexation of enclaves and partly surrounded lands in unincorporated areas.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1059, by Representative Sack; also Senator Decker—For an act to require applicants for marriage licenses to furnish birth certificates as a part of the application.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1060, by Representatives Lamb, Schafer, Shubert, Braden, Hart, Munson, Edmonds, and Sonnenberg; also Senators Hedges, Gill, and Minister—For an act providing that the counties of Kit Carson and Lincoln shall be removed from the fourth judicial district and shall be included in the thirteenth judicial district.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1061, by Representative Mullen—For an act concerning towns and cities, and relating to annexation of enclaves, partly surrounded land, and city owned land, under the Municipal Annexation Act of 1965.

Committee on Local Government.

H. B. No. 1062, by Representative Mullen—Or an act concerning taxation, and providing for the exemption from the sales and use taxes of sales of textbooks for use in certain courses of instruction.

Committee on Education and then to Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1063, by Representative Mullen—For an act concerning schools, and increasing the limit of bonded indebtedness which a school district may contract in cases where school enrollment has increased ten per cent or more in any year.

Committee on Education and then to Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1064, by Representative Mullen—For an act concerning the Public School Foundation Act, and providing that pupil enrollment be used as the basis of measurement in determining the number of classroom units to which a school district may be entitled in the computation of minimum equalization support.

Committee on Education.

H. B. No. 1065, by Representative Mullen—For an act concerning the Public School Foundation Act, and providing for the inclusion of children enrolled in special programs under the "Handicapped Children Educational Act" in determining the number of classroom units to which a school district may be entitled in the computation of minimum equalization support.

Committee on Education.


Committee on Judiciary.
SENATE BILLS

S. B. No. 1, by Senator Gill—Creating a department of civil service in the executive department of the state government, and providing for the reorganization of the civil service commission and its powers, duties, and functions to said department.
Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 2, by Senator Gill and Representative Lamb—Creating the community college of Akron.
Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 3, by Senator Decker—Relating to civil service systems for fire protection districts.
Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 4, by Senator Enstrom—Concerning legal holidays, and providing for changes in the dates of certain legal holidays in order that the dates of such legal holidays will conform to federal law.
Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 5, by Senator Gill—Concerning the national guard, and providing for free tuition at state institutions of higher learning for the spouse or widow, and certain children, of any member of the Colorado national guard who is killed or totally disabled while on active duty or on active service.
Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 6, by Senator Gill—Amending 72-6-1 (3) (e), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, to increase the limitation in the amount of group life insurance on the life of any debtor.
Committee on Business Affairs and Labor.

S. B. No. 7, by Senator Gill—Concerning public records.
Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 8, by Senator Enstrom—Concerning blind pedestrians.
Committee on Transportation.

S. B. No. 9, by Senator Stockton—Amending 78-3-9, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, concerning juries in counties having a population of more than one hundred thousand persons.
Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 10, by Senator Stockton—Concerning the appointment of jury commissioners in counties having a population in excess of one hundred thousand persons.
Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 11, by Senator Nicholson—Amending the system of allocation of moneys in the highway users tax fund.
Committee on Finance.

S. B. No. 12, by Senator Denny—Concerning general property taxes, and making valuations for assessment inapplicable to unpatented non-producing mining claims.
Committee on Natural Resources.

S. B. No. 13, by Senator Denny—Amending 13-4-23 (1) (a), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, concerning the suspension of minor operators' licenses.
Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 14, by Senators Jackson, Enstrom, Strickland, and Decker, and Representatives Burch, Farley, and Safran—Concerning public utilities, providing for the regulation thereof by the public utilities commission, and providing for the organization, funding, powers, duties, and procedures of the public utilities commission.
Committee on Business Affairs and Labor.

S. B. No. 15, by Senators Stockton, Schieffelin, and Vollack, and Representatives Grisham, Fentress, et al—Concerning law enforcement authorities, and providing for the creation thereof by certain counties.
Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 16, by Senator Bingham—Concerning the general property tax, and providing for a delay in the removal of the exemption from certain residential structures owned and used for charitable purposes.
Committee on Finance.

S. B. No. 17, by Senators Kemp, Dines, and Vollack, and Representatives Black, Burns, and Singer—Concerning the attempted to corruptly influence certain elected officers by certain means, and providing the penalty therefor.
Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 18, by Senators Kemp, Dines, Gill, Taylor, and Vollack, and Representatives Black, Burns, et al—Concerning the governor-elect, and providing a system to facilitate the transition of state government to a new administration.
Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 19, by Senators Schieffelin and Jackson, and Representatives Gustafson, Schubert, et al—Concerning the state highway system, and providing that such system shall include roads providing ingress to and egress from, and roads within, state park and recreation areas.
Committee on Transportation.

S. B. No. 20, by Senators Stockton and Taylor, and Representatives Black, Burns, and Parley—Providing for the adoption of the interstate library compact.
Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 21, by Senator Gill—Concerning the appropriation and use of water; providing for the execution and administration of water laws by the state engineer; and providing penalties.
Committee on Water.

S. B. No. 22, by Senator Gill—Concerning claims for the appropriation of designated ground water, providing a system of priorities therefor, and providing for the abandonment thereof.
Committee on Water.

S. B. No. 23, by Senator Gill—Amending 112-3-37, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, concerning the state board of land commissioners.
Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 24, by Senators Brown, Cisneros, MacFarlane, and Massari—Concerning instruction in the public schools of the state of the history, culture, and contributions of the Spanish Americans and the American Negroes in the United States.
Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 25, by Senators Brown and Cisneros—Concerning schools; and providing that teacher certificates and letters of authorization shall not be renewed unless applicants for renewal shall have completed a course in human relations and the problems of minorities.
Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 26, by Senators Brown and Cisneros—Concerning disadvantaged schools; and providing for the training of special teaching assistants to assist such schools; and making an appropriation therefor.
Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 27, by Senators Locke, Shoemaker, and Brown, and Representatives Hart, Fentress, and Bastien—Concerning the Joint Budget Committee.
Committee on Appropriations.

S. B. No. 28, by Senators Stockton, Decker, and Schieffelin, also Representatives Grisham and Safran—Relating to civil service systems for fire protection districts.
Committee on Local Government.

S. B. No. 29, by Senators Brown and Cisneros—Authorizing school districts to employ teacher aids, and making an appropriation therefor.
Committee on Education.

Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 31, by Senator Chance—Concerning the willful or malicious destruction of property by minors under the age of eighteen years, and increasing the parental liability for such destruction from three hundred dollars to one thousand dollars.
Committee on Judiciary.
This Legislative Report will include the title of the proposed legislation as it is introduced, the number of the House or Senate Bill, the names of the sponsors, and the Committee to which it is initially referred. From time to time, on subjects of specific importance to the business community, extensive analysis and in-depth comments will also be sent to the members of CACI.

HOUSE BILLS

H. B. No. 1095, by Representatives Lamm and Dittemore—For an act concerning neglected or dependent children.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1096, by Representatives Lamm and Dittemore—For an act amending 22-1-3 (19) (b), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963 (1967 Supp.), concerning the definition of a neglected or dependent child.

Committee on Judiciary.

H. B. No. 1097, by Representative Cooper—For an act concerning labor, and requiring employers to give employees notice or rights and duties in workmen’s compensation and occupational disease cases.

Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1098, by Representative Cooper—For an act concerning labor, and providing that in workmen's compensation and occupational disease cases an injured or disabled employee may choose his own physician if there are real and compelling reasons for doing so.

Committee on Labor and Employment Relations.

H. B. No. 1099, by Representatives Shore, Koster, and Quinlan; also Senator Anderson—For an act amending 3-4-1 (2) (d) and (e), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, concerning the keeping of inventories of state property.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1100, by Representative Porter—For an act concerning the payment of the cost of criminal proceedings; providing that when the payment of such costs would cause severe financial hardship for a county, the general assembly may, by appropriation, provide for the payment of such costs.

Committee on State Affairs.

H. B. No. 1101, by Representative Porter—For an act making an appropriation to the County of San Juan.

Committee on Appropriations.

H. B. No. 1102, by Representatives Calabrese, Baer, Bain, Bastien, Coloroso, Cooper, Dameron, DeMoulin, Farley, Grace, Grant, Horst, Jackson, Klein, Kogovsek, Koster, Massari, Ed McCormick, McNeil, Mullen, Munson, J. E. Newman, Rose, Sack, Sanchez, and Woodard; also Senators Stockton, Becker, Kemp, MacFarlane, Massari, Nicholson, Saunders, and Schiefelbein—For an act concerning exemptions from the income tax for resident individuals, and providing that an additional personal exemption of seven hundred fifty dollars from the
income tax shall be allowed for persons who are mentally retarded.

Committee on Finance.

H. B. No. 1103, by Representative Klein—For an act to provide that proceedings conducted pursuant to the provisions of section 22-1-4, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, shall be open to the public, unless it is the opinion of the court that it is in the best interest of a child that they be closed.

Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 60, by Senator Cisneros—Concerning the operation of motor vehicles, and prohibiting driving within two hours after drinking intoxicating liquors.

Committee on Business Affairs and Labor.

S. B. No. 61, by Senators Saunders, Cisneros and Fowler, and Representative Rose—Providing that courses of instruction in the public schools may be taught in a language other than English.

Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 62, by Senators Kemp and Brown—Relating to insurance and providing for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance.

Committee on Business Affairs and Labor.

S. B. No. 63, by Senator Kemp—Relating to information secured in connection with medical studies for the purpose of reducing morbidity and mortality, and providing for the governing of the use and publication of such information and of resulting findings and conclusions, and providing immunity from liability based on the furnishing or use of such information.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 64, by Senators Enstrom, Denny, Schieffelin, Jackson and DeBerard—Making a supplemental appropriation to the division of game, fish, and parks.

Committee on Appropriations.

S. B. No. 65, by Senators Saunders, Bingham, Decker and Kemp—To create a state public school building authority for the purpose of acquiring real and personal property, and acquiring, constructing, improving, maintaining, and operating buildings for educational purposes.

Committee on Education.

S. B. No. 66, by Senators Stockton, DeBerard, Decker, Kemp, Nicholson, Saunders and Schieffelin, and Representatives Bain, Calabrese and Lamm—Concerning alcoholism, drug dependence, and noxious substances; providing that the department of health may make grants to fund programs, or contract for services, concerning alcoholism, drug dependence, and noxious substances; creating a state advisory council on problems of alcohol and drugs and prescribing its functions; and making an appropriation.

Committee on Institutions.

S. B. No. 67, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Bain and Cooper et al—Amending the child care act.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 68, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Bain and Cooper et al—Concerning child welfare services.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 69, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Bain and Cooper et al—To repeal and re-enact article I of chapter 144, Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, concerning the Colorado state veterans center.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 70, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Bain and Cooper et al—Concerning aid to the blind.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 71, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Bain and Cooper et al—Concerning the division of rehabilitation.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 72, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Bain and Cooper et al—Concerning the duties of the Colorado board of veterans affairs and the Colorado veterans affairs section.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 73, by Senator Armstrong—For the relief of Virginia Stuck.

Committee on Business Affairs and Labor.

S. B. No. 74, by Senator Schieffelin—Concerning cosmetology.

Committee on Business Affairs and Labor.

S. B. No. 75, by Senators Gill and Denny—Concerning water, and providing for the efficient utilization thereof.

Committee on Water.

S. B. No. 76, by Senators Kemp and Vollack, and Representatives Gustafson, Horst and Jackson—Concerning the investment of public employees' retirement association funds.

Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 77, by Senators Kemp and Vollack, and Representatives Gustafson and Horst—Concerning the public employees' retirement association.

Committee on State Affairs.

S. B. No. 78, by Senator Locke, and Representative Himan—Amending 56-2-5 (1) (a) and 56-2-6 (1) (a), Colorado Revised Statutes 1963, as amended, concerning the classification of the county of Clear Creek.

Committee on Local Government.

S. B. No. 79, by Senators Shoemaker and Vollack, and Representatives Shore, Schmidt and Strahle—Concerning the gift of all or part of a human body, and providing procedures to effect the same.

Committee on Judiciary.

S. B. No. 80, by Senator Nicholson—Concerning the state highway commission, and providing for the appointment of one member at large and two members from each congressional district.

Committee on Transportation.

S. B. No. 81, by Senators Gill and Denny—Concerning water, and enacting the "Water Right Determination and Administration Act of 1969".

Committee on Water.

S. B. No. 82, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Calabrese and Horst—Concerning aid to the needy disabled.

Committee on Health and Welfare.


Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 84, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Calabrese and Horst—Concerning state homes for the aged.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 85, by Senators Kemp, Nicholson, Taylor and Vollack, and Representatives Calabrese and Horst—Amending the old age pension law.

Committee on Health and Welfare.

S. B. No. 86, by Senators Gill and Denny—Concerning water, and providing for the development, administration, and financing thereof.

Committee on Water.

S. B. No. 87, by Senators Gill and Denny—Concerning water, and providing for the formation of division water advisory committee.

Committee on Water.

S. B. No. 88, by Senators Gill and Denny—Relating to water, and providing for the storage, use, and regulation thereof.

Committee on Water.
MEMO

February 4, 1969

TO: BOB BRIGGS
FROM: DOROTHY CONROY

Mr. Lee Bennett has suggested that the best days to visit the Legislature would be Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday. At the present time, sessions generally begin at 10:00 A.M.; however, he feels that by April the sessions will be starting at 9:00 A.M.

The Committees generally meet in the afternoons beginning at 1:30 P.M. The two committees which might be of particular interest, the Labor Committee and the Business Affairs Committee, both meet, simultaneously, on Monday and Wednesday afternoons.

He indicated that since April will probably be a hectic time it might be that you would want to schedule your visit during February or March.

At any rate, he stated he would be happy to make the necessary arrangements and set up luncheons with legislative member or members if you so desire.
Paul Bradley

HB # 1272 I have been printed, is out, introduced. It will be considered by the Labor Committee Wed. afternoon. He will call later, when he knows the time.
Dear Friends:

As of this writing, our new Administration is still in the process of establishing itself, and the new Congress has not yet accelerated into full swing because the budget of the previous Administration requires alteration and because President Nixon has yet to send the Congress his legislative package.

Despite the fact that not all matters are yet settled, much work is being done behind the scenes. Much needs to be done in the way of reorganization of federal programs, and in some cases fundamental changes must be made to redirect our government.

However, the Nixon Administration is deliberately determined to take a cautious approach toward problem solving and the conduct of government. All Americans, I am sure, will welcome this change. True, there will be no miracles...no instant solutions...but, with the help of the Congress, the job will be done properly. It may take longer, but the results will be permanent.

Hopefully we are beginning a new era of less talk and more results.

Sincerely yours,

Gordon Allott
United States Senator
PAY INCREASES

Few matters have aroused the people in Colorado as much as the pay raise for Members of Congress and other government officials, including Justices of the Supreme Court and Cabinet officers, and rightly so.

At a time when the hard-earned dollar of the working man is still caught up in the bind of inflation and higher taxes, a pay raise for government officials hardly seemed proper and just.

I voted against the pay raise and opposed it on the floor of the Senate.

I have also joined other Senators in legislation to abolish the Presidential Commission which proposed the pay increases. I remain constitutionally opposed to this method of "back-door financing" and continue to believe that this whole pay raise episode was a fiasco which shall prove to be a black day for the Congress.

I appreciate the many of you who took the time and trouble to make your views known to me. Of the hundreds of letters I received, exactly one supported the pay raise.

Incidentally, the salary of Members of Congress is now $42,500, while Cabinet officials and Supreme Court Justices receive $60,000.

Committee Work

This Congress my Committee and Subcommittee Assignments are quite similar to those in the 90th Congress.

However, I have the added opportunity and responsibility of serving as the ranking Republican on the Senate Interior Committee.

My Subcommittees include:

** Water and Power Resources
** Public Lands
** Minerals, Materials and Fuels
** Territories and Insular Affairs.

I also continue to serve on the Appropriations Committee where I have advanced in seniority and rank. I serve on six subcommittees totaling some 80% of the budget. I am ranking Republican on the Independent Offices Subcommittee. Others include:

** Defense
** Deficiencies and Supplements
** Transportation
** Public Works
** Treasury-Post Office and Executive Offices.

BIAFRA

I have received much mail on the tragic situation in Biafra. I have co-sponsored a measure designed to encourage more international support for that unfortunate land and I support whatever effort we can make to bring peace for these brave people.
FLORISSANT

This year I have once again introduced legislation designed to establish the Florissant Fossil Beds as a National Monument.

My bill would set aside 6,000 acres of distinctively preserved insect and leaf fossils located within the ancient Florissant Lake Beds in Teller County, Colorado.

Last May, I had the opportunity to personally tour this area and that investigation reinforced my conviction that 6,000 acres are absolutely essential to protect the best preserved and most famous fossil bearing lake shales in the area.

I am very optimistic that this bill, which is co-sponsored by Senator Dominick, will receive consideration by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this Congress.

I believe it is most important that the 6,000 acres be acquired now. Budgetary considerations may force us to postpone the development of museum buildings and access roads to a later date. However, we cannot afford to allow this valuable land to be damaged or dissected, so we must act before it is too late.

I have pledged to work for passage of this bill at the earliest practicable date during the present session of Congress.
The Student Revolution...

There is little question that the student revolution has become one of the most burning and pressing issues of our times.

What began as a small problem on isolated campuses has spread from coast to coast and now even threatens high schools.

As I travel throughout Colorado, I find this topic constantly on the minds of law abiding citizens whose money supports the very educational institutions which the anarchists seek to destroy.

We have long heard that the student revolutionaries represent only a small minority of the total student population. This is correct. But it is not how small a percentage they represent that is important, it is rather how successful they are in achieving their goals that must concern us.

Owing to permissiveness on the part of campus authorities on one hand, and the well financed and organized efforts of the revolutionaries on the other, the record of success among such groups as SDS has been almost universal.

The people are now looking to their leaders to act judiciously to solve this menace.

Some of the complaints the students have may well be justified considering the fantastic education bureaucracies which have been established over the years, but no complaint, no matter how grievous, ever justifies the kind of organized, physical confrontation that we have witnessed in Colorado and elsewhere.

Primarily, the responsibility for controlling this alarming situation belongs with the local college and university authorities as well as local law enforcement authorities. The Federal Government does not operate, nor should it ever operate, a police force to handle local problems.

However, we in the federal government do have the responsibility to determine just how these revolutionaries are financed, and when we do, to cut off their money supply. Such a move would go a long way toward stopping these movements.

My own information indicates that both private and public sources have financed these anarchists, and we must now act constructively to cut off their money supply.

******
March 31, 1969

Mr. Robert Briggs, President
Colorado Flower Growers Association, Inc.
901 Sherman Street - Suite 1410
Denver, Colorado 80203

Dear Bob:

We do appreciate so much you and your board members taking your valuable time to spend a day at the Statehouse. Certainly the particular day selected was one of the most exciting days thusfar.

My sincere apologies for not being able to spend the day with you, however, as I explained, we were obligated to a very important hearing of the Business Affairs Committee with a Harvard law professor and it was imperative that I be in his company and with the members of that committee.

I do hope and am assured that Mr. Kingman provided you with adequate hospitality in our behalf.

Sincerely,

Lee Bennet
Executive Director

LB:ab
PURPOSES OF THIS BOOKLET

This booklet was prepared by the South Central Farmers Committee (the Delano grape growers) in response to numerous requests for the growers' side of a controversy generated by a group which has been trying unsuccessfully since 1965 to organize grape workers.

Briefly, this report will show that:

Despite intensive recruiting, the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee has failed to attract more than a handful of the 5,000 workers who have regularly picked the entire grape crop in the Delano area.

Delano grape pickers are and for a long time have been among the highest paid farm workers in the nation. Their average earnings long have exceeded the minimum hourly wage set by Congress for industrial workers, now $1.60 per hour.

Delano grape workers (as well as all California farm workers) are covered by more protective laws, including workmen's compensation and disability insurance, than farm workers in any other state.

Fully 90 percent of the Delano grape pickers, even at peak harvest are residents of the area -- not homeless migrants as often pictured.

Free housing, free transportation, and other benefits are provided by the growers for pickers unable to provide their own.

Delano table grape growers, like many other farmers, are caught in an ever-tightening cost-price squeeze. They do not fix prices. They do not receive government price supports.

Table grape growers early in 1968 formed the California Table Grape Commission aimed at improving the financial position of the growers, and their workers, by instituting a quality research program and an advertising and promotion campaign. Cost of both programs is being paid for entirely by the grape growers.
Why did Cesar Chavez and his advisors select Delano as the launching site for their attempt to organize farm workers?

Their heavily financed propaganda would have you believe it was because Delano grape pickers are the lowest paid. That they are poor, forgotten, homeless migrants.

Growers are convinced Delano was chosen for precisely opposite reasons!

Here is what the growers say:

**First,** Delano's grape pickers are among the highest paid in the U.S. and therefore it appeared to organizers that they would be best able to pay dues.

**Second,** the so-called "union" needed a well settled, non-migrant work force. (Migrants don't stay in one place long enough for convenient recruiting, or dues collecting.) Delano fitted the union's requirements admirably, because approximately 90 percent of the Delano grape workers live in the community or within easy commuting distance to their work.

**Third,** Delano grape growers were targeted because:

a. They are less scattered than most grower groups and therefore were presumed to be more vulnerable to concentrated attack.

b. They grow a crop which does not lend itself readily to mechanical harvest.

*Time Magazine* (March 22, 1968) reports that the UFWOC is receiving $10,000 per month from the AFL-CIO and $7,500 per month from the UAW. With contributions from other union locals, church groups and student organizations the UFWOC probably spends $500,000 a year on its efforts.
WHO ARE THE DELANO GRAPE GROWERS?

They came as penniless immigrants, in the late '20's and the '30's. Mainly from Yugoslavia, Armenia, Italy. Some had grown grapes in the lands of their birth. It was their dream to grow grapes in the land of their adoption. But, at first, they had no land. And no money.


Families worked together, pooled their savings. And, little by little, they acquired land in small plots, planted vines, and improved the soil. It was not until the 1940's that their hard work and sacrifices began to pay off.

Now, one and two generations later, these families are still working together.

Of approximately 70 grape "ranches" in the Delano area, all but two are family owned and family operated. Holdings range in size from 40 acres to 2,500 acres, with the average at around 450 acres. Not large when it is remembered that ownership in most cases is shared by fathers and sons and other relatives.

It is a tribute to their years of labor and their desire to excel, that table grapes in the Delano area are superior in quality and are in greatest demand in the major markets of the nation.
Table grape growers are in a tight financial spot. Most of their costs have doubled in the past few years. But prices they received have remained at almost the same level.

According to a report by the Federal-State Market News Service, table grapes for all uses were marketed at an average price of $60 per ton 10 years ago. Last year the average price was $61.90 per ton and the 10-year average ending in 1967 was $56 per ton.

Meanwhile, grape growing production costs have advanced anywhere from 25 percent to 100 percent.

A few examples:

The tractor most commonly used in the vineyards now costs approximately $17,000 where only ten years ago it cost in the neighborhood of $10,000.

Property taxes have increased from an average of $16 per acre in 1962, to approximately $30 per acre in 1968.

Shipping cartons which cost 35 cents each, ten years ago, now cost approximately 45 cents.
WHAT TABLE GRAPE GROWERS ARE DOING

TO FIGHT THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

With the costs of producing table grapes outracing prices by an ever-growing margin, the question is:

How much longer can the growers remain in business and at the same time meet demands for higher and higher wages?

During the spring of 1968, growers of California table grapes took a major positive step aimed not only at improving their own chances of survival, but also at improving the opportunities of their workers for higher earnings.

They voted overwhelmingly to form the California Table Grape Commission, a self-help organization whose purposes are to finance quality research and to expand the sales of table grapes through grower-paid advertising and promotion.

To finance these efforts the growers have authorized the Commission to levy an assessment against every box of table grapes they sell.

Growers of table grapes have never asked the government for price support.

They prefer to pay their own way, sell in the open and competitive market, and to obtain better prices by increasing the quality and the demand for grapes.

By this means they hope to improve their own welfare and the welfare of their workers. Welfare of workers depends upon profit-making growers, not upon invading pickets.
GROWERS NOT OPPOSED TO UNIONS

The South Central Farmers Committee is not opposed to unions, per se. It is opposed, however to the unequal and overwhelming power which now lies in the hands of a union to utterly destroy a grower by a strike at harvest or at any other critical time in the growing of a crop. Agriculture is peculiarly and disastrously vulnerable to strikes... unlike most industries. Perishable crops must be harvested on time or they spoil. Metals can wait to be processed.

Farmers will continue to oppose unionization as long as they are threatened with strikes -- weapons which make collective bargaining a one-way street for the unions. Is this a false fear? Not at all. Just recently $7 million worth of pineapples in Hawaii were left to rot in the fields in a 61 day strike.

Delano grape growers would not be able to compete in the markets if forced to sign contracts with UFWOC. Terms of such contracts would push their costs far above their competitors in other areas of California, in other states, and in foreign countries. Delano grape growers already pay higher wages than most of their competitors. Table grapes are being shipped into the U.S. in increasing volume from South America, where grape workers earn about as much in one day as Delano grape workers earn in one hour.

It is often erroneously assumed that non-union farm workers have no collective bargaining power. Delano grape growers often meet with their workers at the request of the latter, to discuss wages, working conditions, grievances. That these meetings have been fruitful is borne out by the fact that Delano grape picker earnings have regularly been the highest, and that benefits have been added.
WHO ARE THE GRAPE WORKERS?

Clever propagandists regularly describe Delano grape pickers as migrants — to convey the false impression that all are homeless wanderers, completely at the mercy of their employers.*

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is that approximately 90 percent of the more than 5,000 pickers hired at the peak of the harvest in Delano are residents of the area.

Payroll records provide the proof. A typical payroll, for example, reveals that 70 percent of the grower's employees in 1967 lived in Delano, 13 percent in Bakersfield, one percent in Richgrove, and 10 percent with home addresses outside the immediate living or commuting area.

The harvest season lasts for about four months — usually from September through December. Not all pickers are family heads solely responsible for the total support of their families. Many are local housewives, students and casual workers who pick grapes part time to supplement family incomes.

Between harvests Delano growers employ approximately 2,500 workers in such tasks as pruning, irrigating, cultivating, fertilizing, stripping, tying of vines, erecting or replacing trellises, weeding, spraying, girdling and thinning.

For many — mostly family heads — Delano vineyards provide almost year 'round employment.

*In 1963, the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems reported as follows: "California's agricultural labor force no longer fits the classic picture of the migrant following the crops from town to town and county to county as a camper with no fixed place of residence. Eighty-eight percent of the farm worker population (in California) now live regularly in the same county; 73 percent have been county residents for more than five years."
GRAPE PICKER EARNINGS HIGHEST

Average earnings of Delano grape pickers consistently have been higher than the average earnings of U.S. farm workers:*  

Higher than the average earnings of California farm workers (which are higher than the U.S. average).

Higher than the national minimum of $1.60 per hour set by Congress for industrial workers.

Delano grape pickers earned an average of between $2 and $2.12 per hour during the 1967 season. More experienced pickers earned $2.50 and more per hour.

Those earnings were achieved under a combination hourly and piece rate system: $1.40 per hour PLUS 15 and 25 cents per box, depending upon variety.

For the 1968 seasons, growers are paying $1.50 per hour, PLUS 15 and 25 cents per box. This is intended to produce average earnings of about $2.50 per hour.

Good pay scales for Delano grape pickers date back many years. In 1964, for example, Delano grape pickers were earning an average of about $1.73 per hour.**

The SRS report for the same year showed average earnings of $1.36 per hour for California farm workers, and $1 per hour for U.S. farm workers.

* Crop Reporting Board, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 1, 1968 report. California's average composite hourly earnings, $1.69 per hour. Next highest: Washington, $1.64. (NOTE: earnings of Delano grape pickers are consistently higher than California average.)

** Page 539, report on hearings of Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress.
California farm workers not only are the highest paid in the U.S., they also are covered by the greatest number of protective laws.

Of the ten major state and federal laws covering farm workers (listed in a U.S. Department of Labor bulletin in 1963), California provides nine.

Since this bulletin (No. 264) was published, Congress enacted a minimum wage law for farm workers which applies to all Delano grape growers. However, earnings of grape workers far exceed the $1.15 per hour minimum provided by law.

Other laws covering California farm workers include:

1. Workmen's Compensation
2. Disability Insurance
3. Farm Labor Camp Regulation
4. Farm Labor Contractor Regulations
5. Wage Collection Law
6. Child Labor Law
7. Transportation Regulations
8. Wage Payment Law

California farm workers also participate in the nation's social security benefits.

California has a liberal social welfare law and its administration has been such to protect the rights of farm workers so that they do not lose their eligibility when they accept temporary farm employment.

These provisions, under recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, are available to all people with no residence requirement. Even before this decision, California counties had reciprocal agreements that made all California residents eligible for assistance regardless of whether they were residing in their home county when in need.
WHAT ABOUT THE SO-CALLED "STRIKE"?

Despite three years of intensive and often abusive organizing tactics, UFWOC has failed to attract more than a handful of grape workers.

Union claims of 17,000 members "at the peak" do not jibe with the fact that more than 5,000 grape workers have regularly picked the crops in the fields that are supposed to be struck.

Picketing activities have been conducted primarily by paid professionals and by volunteers from student groups, campus militants, and cooperating clergymen (many recruited by the Migrant Ministry) and social reform organizations.

Many workers shun UFWOC because they regard it as a tool for political opportunists -- not as a legitimate labor union. Many others, deeply religious, resent being the targets of obscenities hurled at them by pickets.

Of the approximately 70 table grape growers in the Delano area, only three have active contracts with the UFWOC. None of these three is primarily a grower of table grapes. They are food processors, vintners, or large scale liquor manufacturers.

How have the workers fared under such contract?

Many of them have lost their jobs on these ranches. Why? Employers involved, understandably, are reluctant to discuss details, but it is common knowledge in the area that terms of the union contracts forced these growers to discontinue harvesting their grapes for table use. Instead, their grapes are being harvested for wine because much less hand labor is needed. Wages imposed by the contracts do not appear to have been the major consideration. Difficulty in obtaining workers through the union hiring hall, inefficiency of union labor, and reluctance of good workers to join the union are reported to be prime reasons for management decisions to abandon the table grape business after union contracts were signed.
WHO IS BEHIND CESAR CHAVEZ?

Chavez makes no secret of the fact that he received most of his organizational training under Saul Alinsky, the master activist who has fanned the flames of discontent into raging fires of civil disturbance throughout the nation.

In spite of this training in directional violence, Chavez wears the mantle of "non-violence" and preaches it even while his pickets are throwing clods at farm workers minding their own business and picking grapes.

Growers have steadfastly refused to accept the bait when frequently they have been given the opportunity to try to place the "communist" label on Chavez. A number of reporters, investigators, and researchers have sought to lead growers down this path, but to no avail.

The California State Senate Fact Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, often noted for its bold statements on such matters, was careful not to pin any subversive or communist label on Chavez.

What the 1967 report did say was "At this juncture, the evidence shows that the Delano grape strike was of exceptional interest to the Communist Party and the leftists who supported it. We have not said that the strike was directed by Communists, but that it was turned into a civil rights 'movement' and operated as a cause, not a labor dispute. This view is amply supported by the activity of known members of the Communist Party who were on the scene and aiding the strike almost from its inception; by favorable accounts that consistently appeared in the Communist press; by the participation in strike demonstrations of such organizations as the Du Bois Clubs of America; Students for a Democratic Society; Progressive Labor Party; Vietnam Day Committee, Trotskyite groups and other organizations moved by similar objectives; by the reports of all law enforcement agencies connected with the subject". (Pages 44 and 45)

The inference is, of course, that the Communist Party did not direct the activities, but it certainly sought to use them for its own purposes.
Some clergymen have assailed grape growers from their pulpits and have joined in picketing and boycott activities against them, without first (a) giving congregations the opportunity to listen and weigh the side of the growers or (b) obtaining a mandate from their congregations.

Are these clergymen representing the majority views of their church members?

Did these clergymen submit the issue to a vote of their members - after giving both sides an opportunity to be heard?

How can such clergymen be impartial judges when they adopt such a rigid, one-sided stand?

When clergymen, as individuals, arbitrarily align themselves with one side of an issue and presume to speak for their congregations they not only foster the breakdown of democratic processes, they also spread distrust within their communities. The church's role as a conciliator, as a healer of the wounds of human strife, is thereby destroyed.
Having failed repeatedly to "sell" grape pickers on the value of union membership, leaders of UFWOC now in desperation are threatening naked force to accomplish their ends.

UFWOC is telling growers that their grapes will be boycotted unless they sign contracts on behalf of their workers ....whether the workers want to join or not.

How would such blackjack tactics affect the workers?

The answer is simply this: Many of them would lose their jobs.

Already hurting from an increasing cost-price squeeze, and already paying the highest wages in their industry, it is no exaggeration to say that a successful boycott would force growers to drastically reduce their payrolls.

Their alternatives would be to (1) pull up their vines and turn to crops using little labor or, (2) harvest their grapes mechanically for wine and/or raisin use.* Harvesting grapes for wine use requires far fewer pickers than harvesting them for table use.

Forcing growers to sign contracts, under threats of boycotts, would not increase the price of grapes nor make it possible to pay higher wages.

* No mechanical picker has been developed as yet for table grapes. However, it is predicted that machines now being tested will be harvesting the bulk of the wine and raisin grapes within five years. Some of the grape varieties now being harvested by hand for table use can also be used for making wines or raisins.
GROWERS ORGANIZE, WHY NOT WORKERS?

Growers are asked: Growers form cooperatives and other organizations to protect their economic development; why shouldn't workers have the same right?

Limiting their response specifically to UFWOC, and its methods, the growers respond as follows:

1. There is nothing to prevent the workers from joining a union or other organization for their own betterment.

2. Membership in a farm organization is voluntary, whereas UFWOC is seeking to compel workers to join through coercion. Having failed to recruit workers, UFWOC is now resorting to the threat of boycotts against the growers if they do not sign contracts. This would force workers into UFWOC whether they desired membership or not.

3. No buyer of farm products is compelled to bargain with a farm organization on the matter of prices to be paid. Here is the big difference between a farm organization and a union such as UFWOC, because UFWOC demands that the growers must bargain with it or face economic strangulation.
PURPOSES OF THIS BOOKLET

This booklet was prepared by the South Central Farmers Committee (the Delano grape growers) in response to numerous requests for the growers' side of a controversy generated by a group which has been trying unsuccessfully since 1965 to organize grape workers.

Briefly, this report will show that:

Despite intensive recruiting, the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee has failed to attract more than a handful of the 5,000 workers who have regularly picked the entire grape crop in the Delano area.

Delano grape pickers are and for a long time have been among the highest paid farm workers in the nation. Their average earnings long have exceeded the minimum hourly wage set by Congress for industrial workers, now $1.60 per hour.

Delano grape workers (as well as all California farm workers) are covered by more protective laws, including workmen's compensation and disability insurance, than farm workers in any other state.

Fully 90 percent of the Delano grape pickers, even at peak harvest are residents of the area -- not homeless migrants as often pictured.

Free housing, free transportation, and other benefits are provided by the growers for pickers unable to provide their own.

Delano table grape growers, like many other farmers, are caught in an ever-tightening cost-price squeeze. They do not fix prices. They do not receive government price supports.

Table grape growers early in 1968 formed the California Table Grape Commission aimed at improving the financial position of the growers, and their workers, by instituting a quality research program and an advertising and promotion campaign. Cost of both programs is being paid for entirely by the grape growers.
Why did Cesar Chavez and his advisors select Delano as the launching site for their attempt to organize farm workers?

Their heavily financed propaganda would have you believe it was because Delano grape pickers are the lowest paid. That they are poor, forgotten, homeless migrants.

Growers are convinced Delano was chosen for precisely opposite reasons:

Here is what the growers say:

**First,** Delano's grape pickers are among the highest paid in the U.S. and therefore it appeared to organizers that they would be best able to pay dues.

**Second,** the so-called "union" needed a well settled, non-migrant work force. (Migrants don't stay in one place long enough for convenient recruiting, or dues collecting.) Delano fitted the union's requirements admirably, because approximately 90 percent of the Delano grape workers live in the community or within easy commuting distance to their work.

**Third,** Delano grape growers were targeted because:

a. They are less scattered than most grower groups and therefore were presumed to be more vulnerable to concentrated attack.

b. They grow a crop which does not lend itself readily to mechanical harvest.

*Time Magazine* (March 22, 1968) reports that the UFWOC is receiving $10,000 per month from the AFL-CIO and $7,500 per month from the UAW. With contributions from other union locals, church groups and student organizations the UFWOC probably spends $500,000 a year on its efforts.
WHO ARE THE DELANO GRAPE GROWERS?

They came as penniless immigrants, in the late '20's and the '30's. Mainly from Yugoslavia, Armenia, Italy. Some had grown grapes in the lands of their birth. It was their dream to grow grapes in the land of their adoption. But, at first, they had no land. And no money.


Families worked together, pooled their savings. And, little by little, they acquired land in small plots, planted vines, and improved the soil. It was not until the 1940's that their hard work and sacrifices began to pay off.

Now, one and two generations later, these families are still working together.

Of approximately 70 grape "ranches" in the Delano area, all but two are family owned and family operated. Holdings range in size from 40 acres to 2,500 acres, with the average at around 450 acres. Not large when it is remembered that ownership in most cases is shared by fathers and sons and other relatives.

It is a tribute to their years of labor and their desire to excel, that table grapes in the Delano area are superior in quality and are in greatest demand in the major markets of the nation.
Table grape growers are in a tight financial spot. Most of their costs have doubled in the past few years. But prices they received have remained at almost the same level.

According to a report by the Federal-State Market News Service, table grapes for all uses were marketed at an average price of $60 per ton 10 years ago. Last year the average price was $61.90 per ton and the 10-year average ending in 1967 was $56 per ton.

Meanwhile, grape growing production costs have advanced anywhere from 25 percent to 100 percent.

A few examples:

The tractor most commonly used in the vineyards now costs approximately $17,000 where only ten years ago it cost in the neighborhood of $10,000.

Property taxes have increased from an average of $16 per acre in 1962, to approximately $30 per acre in 1968.

Shipping cartons which cost 35 cents each, ten years ago, now cost approximately 45 cents.
WHAT TABLE GRAPE GROWERS ARE DOING

TO FIGHT THE COST-PRICE SQUEEZE

With the costs of producing table grapes outracing prices by an ever-growing margin, the question is:

How much longer can the growers remain in business and at the same time meet demands for higher and higher wages?

During the spring of 1968, growers of California table grapes took a major positive step aimed not only at improving their own chances of survival, but also at improving the opportunities of their workers for higher earnings.

They voted overwhelmingly to form the California Table Grape Commission, a self-help organization whose purposes are to finance quality research and to expand the sales of table grapes through grower-paid advertising and promotion.

To finance these efforts the growers have authorized the Commission to levy an assessment against every box of table grapes they sell.

Growers of table grapes have never asked the government for price support. They prefer to pay their own way, sell in the open and competitive market, and to obtain better prices by increasing the quality and the demand for grapes.

By this means they hope to improve their own welfare and the welfare of their workers. Welfare of workers depends upon profit-making growers, not upon invading pickets.
GROWERS NOT OPPOSED TO UNIONS

The South Central Farmers Committee is not opposed to unions, per se. It is opposed, however, to the unequal and overwhelming power which now lies in the hands of a union to utterly destroy a grower by a strike at harvest or at any other critical time in the growing of a crop. Agriculture is peculiarly and disastrously vulnerable to strikes... unlike most industries. Perishable crops must be harvested on time or they spoil. Metals can wait to be processed.

Farmers will continue to oppose unionization as long as they are threatened with strikes -- weapons which make collective bargaining a one-way street for the unions. Is this a false fear? Not at all. Just recently $7 million worth of pineapples in Hawaii were left to rot in the fields in a 61 day strike.

Delano grape growers would not be able to compete in the markets if forced to sign contracts with UFWOC. Terms of such contracts would push their costs far above their competitors in other areas of California, in other states, and in foreign countries. Delano grape growers already pay higher wages than most of their competitors. Table grapes are being shipped into the U.S. in increasing volume from South America, where grape workers earn about as much in one day as Delano grape workers earn in one hour.

It is often erroneously assumed that non-union farm workers have no collective bargaining power. Delano grape growers often meet with their workers at the request of the latter, to discuss wages, working conditions, grievances. That these meetings have been fruitful is borne out by the fact that Delano grape picker earnings have regularly been the highest, and that benefits have been added.
WHO ARE THE GRAPE WORKERS?

Clever propagandists regularly describe Delano grape pickers as migrants -- to convey the false impression that all are homeless wanderers, completely at the mercy of their employers.*

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is that approximately 90 percent of the more than 5,000 pickers hired at the peak of the harvest in Delano are residents of the area.

Payroll records provide the proof. A typical payroll, for example, reveals that 70 percent of the grower's employees in 1967 lived in Delano, 13 percent in Bakersfield, one percent in Richgrove, and 10 percent with home addresses outside the immediate living or commuting area.

The harvest season lasts for about four months -- usually from September through December. Not all pickers are family heads solely responsible for the total support of their families. Many are local housewives, students and casual workers who pick grapes part time to supplement family incomes.

Between harvests Delano growers employ approximately 2,500 workers in such tasks as pruning, irrigating, cultivating, fertilizing, stripping, tying of vines, erecting or replacing trellises, weeding, spraying, girdling and thinning.

For many -- mostly family heads -- Delano vineyards provide almost year 'round employment.

*In 1963, the Governor's Advisory Commission on Housing Problems reported as follows: "California's agricultural labor force no longer fits the classic picture of the migrant following the crops from town to town and county to county as a camper with no fixed place of residence. Eighty-eight percent of the farm worker population (in California) now live regularly in the same county; 73 percent have been county residents for more than five years."

7.
GRAPE PICKER EARNINGS HIGHEST

Average earnings of Delano grape pickers consistently have been higher than the average earnings of U.S. farm workers:*

Higher than the average earnings of California farm workers (which are higher than the U.S. average).

Higher than the national minimum of $1.60 per hour set by Congress for industrial workers.

Delano grape pickers earned an average of between $2 and $2.12 per hour during the 1967 season. More experienced pickers earned $2.50 and more per hour.

Those earnings were achieved under a combination hourly and piece rate system: $1.40 per hour PLUS 15 and 25 cents per box, depending upon variety.

For the 1968 season, growers are paying $1.50 per hour, PLUS 15 and 25 cents per box. This is intended to produce average earnings of about $2.50 per hour.

Good pay scales for Delano grape pickers date back many years. In 1964, for example, Delano grape pickers were earning an average of about $1.73 per hour.**

The SRS report for the same year showed average earnings of $1.36 per hour for California farm workers, and $1 per hour for U.S. farm workers.

* Crop Reporting Board, Statistical Reporting Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, January 1, 1968 report. California's average composite hourly earnings, $1.69 per hour. Next highest: Washington, $1.64. (NOTE: earnings of Delano grape pickers are consistently higher than California average.)

** Page 539, report on hearings of Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress.
California farm workers not only are the highest paid in the U.S., they also are covered by the greatest number of protective laws.

Of the ten major state and federal laws covering farm workers (listed in a U.S. Department of Labor bulletin in 1963), California provides nine.

Since this bulletin (No. 264) was published, Congress enacted a minimum wage law for farm workers which applies to all Delano grape growers. However, earnings of grape workers far exceed the $1.15 per hour minimum provided by law.

Other laws covering California farm workers include:

1. Workmen's Compensation
2. Disability Insurance
3. Farm Labor Camp Regulation
4. Farm Labor Contractor Regulations
5. Wage Collection Law
6. Child Labor Law
7. Transportation Regulations
8. Wage Payment Law

California farm workers also participate in the nation's social security benefits.

California has a liberal social welfare law and its administration has been such to protect the rights of farm workers so that they do not lose their eligibility when they accept temporary farm employment.

These provisions, under recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, are available to all people with no residence requirement. Even before this decision, California counties had reciprocal agreements that made all California residents eligible for assistance regardless of whether they were residing in their home county when in need.
WHAT ABOUT THE SO-CALLED "STRIKE"?

Despite three years of intensive and often abusive organizing tactics, UFWOC has failed to attract more than a handful of grape workers.

Union claims of 17,000 members "at the peak" do not jibe with the fact that more than 5,000 grape workers have regularly picked the crops in the fields that are supposed to be struck.

Picketing activities have been conducted primarily by paid professionals and by volunteers from student groups, campus militants, and cooperating clergymen (many recruited by the Migrant Ministry) and social reform organizations.

Many workers shun UFWOC because they regard it as a tool for political opportunists -- not as a legitimate labor union. Many others, deeply religious, resent being the targets of obscenities hurled at them by pickets.

Of the approximately 70 table grape growers in the Delano area, only three have active contracts with the UFWOC. None of these three is primarily a grower of table grapes. They are food processors, vintners, or large scale liquor manufacturers.

How have the workers fared under such contract?

Many of them have lost their jobs on these ranches. Why? Employers involved, understandably, are reluctant to discuss details, but it is common knowledge in the area that terms of the union contracts forced these growers to discontinue harvesting their grapes for table use. Instead, their grapes are being harvested for wine because much less hand labor is needed. Wages imposed by the contracts do not appear to have been the major consideration. Difficulty in obtaining workers through the union hiring hall, inefficiency of union labor, and reluctance of good workers to join the union are reported to be prime reasons for management decisions to abandon the table grape business after union contracts were signed.
WHO IS BEHIND CESAR CHAVEZ?

Chavez makes no secret of the fact that he received most of his organizational training under Saul Alinsky, the master activist who has fanned the flames of discontent into raging fires of civil disturbance throughout the nation.

In spite of this training in directional violence, Chavez wears the mantle of "non-violence" and preaches it even while his pickets are throwing clods at farm workers minding their own business and picking grapes.

Growers have steadfastly refused to accept the bait when frequently they have been given the opportunity to try to place the "communist" label on Chavez. A number of reporters, investigators, and researchers have sought to lead growers down this path, but to no avail.

The California State Senate Fact Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, often noted for its bold statements on such matters, was careful not to pin any subversive or communist label on Chavez.

What the 1967 report did say was "At this juncture, the evidence shows that the Delano grape strike was of exceptional interest to the Communist Party and the leftists who supported it. We have not said that the strike was directed by Communists, but that it was turned into a civil rights 'movement' and operated as a cause, not a labor dispute. This view is amply supported by the activity of known members of the Communist Party who were on the scene and aiding the strike almost from its inception; by favorable accounts that consistently appeared in the Communist press; by the participation in strike demonstrations of such organizations as the Du Bois Clubs of America; Students for a Democratic Society; Progressive Labor Party; Vietnam Day Committee, Trotskyite groups and other organizations moved by similar objectives; by the reports of all law enforcement agencies connected with the subject". (Pages 44 and 45)

The inference is, of course, that the Communist Party did not direct the activities, but it certainly sought to use them for its own purposes.
Some clergymen have assailed grape growers from their pulpits and have joined in picketing and boycott activities against them, without first (a) giving congregations the opportunity to listen and weigh the side of the growers or (b) obtaining a mandate from their congregations.

Are these clergymen representing the majority views of their church members?

Did these clergymen submit the issue to a vote of their members - after giving both sides an opportunity to be heard?

How can such clergymen be impartial judges when they adopt such a rigid, one-sided stand?

When clergymen, as individuals, arbitrarily align themselves with one side of an issue and presume to speak for their congregations they not only foster the breakdown of democratic processes, they also spread distrust within their communities. The church’s role as a conciliator, as a healer of the wounds of human strife, is thereby destroyed.
Having failed repeatedly to "sell" grape pickers on the value of union membership, leaders of UFWOC now in desperation are threatening naked force to accomplish their ends.

UFWOC is telling growers that their grapes will be boycotted unless they sign contracts on behalf of their workers ... whether the workers want to join or not.

How would such blackjack tactics affect the workers?

The answer is simply this: Many of them would lose their jobs.

Already hurting from an increasing cost-price squeeze, and already paying the highest wages in their industry, it is no exaggeration to say that a successful boycott would force growers to drastically reduce their payrolls.

Their alternatives would be to (1) pull up their vines and turn to crops using little labor or, (2) harvest their grapes mechanically for wine and/or raisin use.* Harvesting grapes for wine use requires far fewer pickers than harvesting them for table use.

Forcing growers to sign contracts, under threats of boycotts, would not increase the price of grapes nor make it possible to pay higher wages.

* No mechanical picker has been developed as yet for table grapes. However, it is predicted that machines now being tested will be harvesting the bulk of the wine and raisin grapes within five years. Some of the grape varieties now being harvested by hand for table use can also be used for making wines or raisins.
GROWERS ORGANIZE, WHY NOT WORKERS?

Growers are asked: Growers form cooperatives and other organizations to protect their economic development; why shouldn’t workers have the same right?

Limiting their response specifically to UFWOC, and its methods, the growers respond as follows:

1. There is nothing to prevent the workers from joining a union or other organization for their own betterment.

2. Membership in a farm organization is voluntary, whereas UFWOC is seeking to compel workers to join through coercion. Having failed to recruit workers, UFWOC is now resorting to the threat of boycotts against the growers if they do not sign contracts. This would force workers into UFWOC whether they desired membership or not.

3. No buyer of farm products is compelled to bargain with a farm organization on the matter of prices to be paid. Here is the big difference between a farm organization and a union such as UFWOC, because UFWOC demands that the growers must bargain with it or face economic strangulation.
STATE OF THE U. S. A.
Summer-Fall-1968

Despite an unprecedented level of business activity, the average small business man in
the United States today has more cause for anxiety and worry than at any time since World
War II.

Inevitably, he asks himself, "What has done all this?"

It should be endlessly hammered home that the policies of the labor unions, aided by
their legal privileges and immunities, are at the root of much of the discontent in this country,
including riots and violence.

If you as a union negotiator, for example, advertise the great gains you have made for
your privileged members, you have certainly contributed to the envy of the unprivileged.

Remember, that in a certain sense, the word "unprivileged" means any American
citizen who is not a card-carrying union member. The privileges and immunities heaped on
the unions by the courts mean that, in respect to these privileges, everyone else is a second­
class citizen. With impunity, the unions violate laws that would send any of the rest of us to
jail.

Let it be said at once that the union members did not seek these privileges. It was the
union bosses who went to the courts and obtained them. That the courts should never have
granted them is obvious. But the fact remains that these privileges now exist. They are the
means whereby, often against the wishes of their members, the union bosses can and do "call
the shots" that disrupt or threaten the economy.

Furthermore -- conditioned by years of this sort of thing -- even the members of some
unions are active parties to this spirit and will demand more than their bosses do, on occasion.

The result is a privileged class, capable of even sabotage in some strikes.

As if this were not enough, the courts have now created a new class of underprivileged
citizens. This is the rank-and-file union member himself, in relation to the union. The
union and its bosses outrank him. In a practical sense, they often enslave him. Over and
over again the courts have given to the union as an entity, rights over its members as indi­
viduals. This is a new and certainly non-American doctrine.

The union bosses outrank us all. Any who are interested in this novel doctrine should
write me for examples.

When to this situation is added the burden of economic underprivilege, for those outside
the unions, the stage is set for discontent, likely to erupt in violence.

On top of the special gains for individual union members, the union economists constant­
ly drive for over-all national policies which add to the problems of marginal workers, the
partly-employed and the unemployed. Thus --

1. Accelerating union wage gains mean rising production and construction costs
   which mean a rising cost of housing and living, naturally hurting the weakest
   and poorest the most.

2. On top of that, constantly higher minimum wage rates gradually put more and
   more people out of work - especially the teen-agers - and this makes for still
   more trouble and provides breeding-grounds for riots.

(Over)
And as if all this were not enough, increasing aggregate payrolls at rising wage levels mean a bigger supply of money which threatens the value of the dollar.

Restrictive employment practices (as in the building trades), and the use of union legal immunities to stop work or threaten to stop it, simply add to the economic and social strains.

Look at it as you will, the reduction of the economic power of the unions is the first step toward both sanity and solvency for this nation — and for civil order as well.

Every business man, I hope, will reflect deeply on these facts. I know of no alternative to these conclusions. These facts mean that the drive for legislation and investigation in these fields is of top importance in the next Congress. It should be emphasized from now to then. Every concerned business man should prepare examples from his own knowledge and experience, to have ready.

No one concerned with a stable economy for the United States can overlook these basic factors. No business meeting should pass without noting them. Every concerned business man should have at his elbow some of the sustaining law cases, and know how bad they are.

These facts and cases apply socially as well as economically. Their visible fruit is turbulence and violence — by both the privileged and the under-privileged. The union member is encouraged to use his power to the hilt — and his victim fights back at "the system." Probably no more potent machine for social upset exists in the western world than that put together by the courts and the unions in this country.

The most massive legislative effort that can be made should be applied to issues involving the unions, their policies, their privileges and their friends in the government. Most particularly is this true of their illegal political activities. This means also investigating the construction of the Taft-Hartley and other laws by the courts. Finally and above all, it means examining the economic beliefs of the unions, without which the dollar would be far safer than it is today.

I urge every member of the CONFERENCE to spread this alert to his business associates. Ask for extra copies of this memorandum (free for distribution), and for supporting material. Supply copies to any interested business man. Get them out through your local business groups, chambers of commerce and trade associations.

Here is where the fundamental battle for the U.S.A. really is — over views deeply held by union officers, their economists, organizers and agents. If unchecked these views will wreck this country as they have already wrecked Great Britain.

If the union views are not overcome in the halls of Congress, then the other things Congress does to relieve the economy (higher taxes, less spending) will not succeed, because union-driven inflationary factors will come up from behind and cancel out the effects of anything and everything else that is tried. Both social and financial instability in this country will continue indefinitely, if the unions are not stopped.

I have not even referred to the adverse effect of union policies on our balance of payments problem — the "dollar crisis." Naturally, higher costs tend to reduce our exports and make our balance of payments worse. This alone might be the straw that broke the purchasing value of the dollar. But the damage to social and economic stability within the country has already been done. It must be undone, step by step, in the halls of Congress.

Yours Sincerely,

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.
Co-Chairman