

of money out there, I reported to the Executive Council that from the very simple trade union approach we were not having any success, we were not organizing workers into permanent unions.

The opposition of the employers was strong; the opposition of the banking fraternity in California that owns many of these farms was strong and even the State government was not very helpful. We, of course, had this bracero situation, the workers coming up from Mexico and being herded in there.

All in all, from the strict trade union point of view, after about 4 years of experience we were not setting up a permanent union. However, I told the Executive Council and produced some figures to show that while we were not getting new members we were doing something that was very, very important from a trade union point of view; we were raising the wages of the farmworkers because the typical defense of the farm employer would be to add a few cents more. This went on time and time again so that the wages were raised considerably and the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO said, well, if that is what is happening even if we don't get another member we are going to continue our efforts.

The cash outlay that we put in California up until a month or two ago from 1960 to date amounted to \$1,450,000. This is cash that we sent out there to help these people. We furnished legal counsel and I can say that we are very happy because even though we have not achieved a permanent organization as yet, we have been instrumental in improving the conditions of these people; their wages have gone up little by little until they do have the best wages in the agricultural farms in the country.

However, in the last 8 or 9 months, we have made a breakthrough in organization. We do have a going organization; it is headed up by a man by the name of Cesar Chavez, a Mexican-American, who is doing a real good job, and they have even had some successful strikes. They have signed up for a collective bargaining contract with the DiGiorgio Co.

Now, it would be a tremendous help to these workers and we feel that if we build up the conditions in California that they will surely spread to the other areas of the country. It would be a tremendous help to these workers to get a decent working condition if they have the same rates as the other workers in the country insofar as the national law is concerned.

Now, I am familiar with this situation. I can recall working in the legislation in the State of New York handling all sorts of labor legislation, and a good deal of it we were successful in passing. New York was, I think, in the forefront of the more liberal States in the Union. But as a matter of just plain commonsense accepting the legislative conditions we automatically eliminated the farmer from every bill we ever wrote to help them, not because he didn't need the help, not because he didn't have the same problems as other workers, but simply because it was impossible with the state of mind of the legislators, especially those from the rural areas—it was impossible to pass any kind of legislation.

Unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, all the protective and remedial laws that went to other workers were denied to farmers and the argument was that your farmer was your neighbor