

4 A Horne Avenue  
Winsted, Connecticut 06098  
February 18, 1974

Dear Senator Ribicoff, *WEIKERT*, *REP. GRASSO*

Although the apparent plight of the migrant farm worker has been in the back of my mind for some time, I have only recently become acquainted with more details that give me reason to ponder the situation more closely. Some information gaps exist at least in my own mind, and maybe you can help.

First, what was the original intent of Congress in excluding farm workers from the National Labor Relations Act passed in 1935? It appears that if they were included, they would legally have the right to bargain collectively with their employers. Also, why hasn't the NLRA been amended to include them? Is it strong corporate lobbyists that are behind all this? Is it because the farm workers might be priced right out of the market if automation became a cheaper alternative? If not either of these, what can be the reason?

Second, if their cause is just, and it appears it is, why isn't more pressure put on the agricultural corporations to provide relatively decent working conditions? By pressure I do not mean formal government regulation to which I am opposed, but informal pressure from members of the Congress and Executive branch. Surely, the government carries some weight outside of the law to persuade the corporations to comply with reasonable standards.

Generally I am asking if you can provide me with some information that will allow me to see the situation in the proper perspective. I personally feel everyone has the right to organize if their condition so warrants. I am against unions that use irrational or radical behavior or half-truths to achieve unreasonable goals, but I see no reason why those who have such relatively deplorable working conditions to work under not have a right to demand more. The corporation has a moral obligation to humanity and if it is unwilling to reasonably fulfill this obligation, the worker is justified in organizing to achieve a reasonable settlement. I realize the term "reasonable" is difficult to define and everyone would have his own concept of the term, however, if we all look deep enough within ourselves I am sure we would all be able to find a proper definition.

Also, I have one question concerning Social Security benefits. What is the intent of the Social Security regulations to limit the amount of money a beneficiary can earn to be eligible for benefits? It seems everyone, no matter what his income, should receive what is due especially after monetary contributions have been made. With all the emphasis on improving the private pension plan system, why is the government overlooking this apparently unfair practice in its own backyard?

Thank you very much for your patience in reading this letter. I hope to hear from you in the near future.

Sincerely,

*James W. Gebryel*  
James W. Gebryel