

122. 12-14

"Report on Spanish Speaking
Peoples," Staff paper
submitted to The United States
Commission on Civil Rights,

5 February 1964

[3 Folders]

Savona

Staff Paper

SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLES

Submitted to the
UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
February 5, 1964

#

Table of Contents

	Page
PREFACE	1
PART I.--HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	3
Social Characteristics	6
Puerto Ricans	9
Demographic Characteristics	15
PART II.--AREAS OF SURVEY	17
Voting	17
Education	21
Employment	33
Housing	42
Administration of Justice	47
Public Accommodations	51
PART III.--SUMMARY	
APPENDIX A.--Statistical Data	
APPENDIX B.--Selected Bibliography	

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS
STAFF PAPER
FOR
INTERNAL USE AND LIMITED
DISTRIBUTION ONLY
NOT FOR PUBLICATION

DEPT OF DEFENSE

5-1964

AMERICAN CHILDREN-IN-HOME

child of bedlam

RECEIVED NO NOTIFICATION OF CHILD'S DEATH

NOV 2 1964

W W W W W W

Child of God

1

GO-AHEAD

2

AMERICAN CHILDREN-IN-HOME--.I THAT

3

be it known to all men

4

that in other

5

so it is to be done

6

YOUTH TO CHILD--.I THAT

7

YOUTH

8

to be known

9

therefore

10

whereas

11

to be known to all men

12

and it is ordered

YOUTH--.I THAT

13.1. AMERICAN CHILDREN-IN-HOME

14.2. AMERICAN CHILDREN-IN-HOME

15.3. GO-AHEAD
16.4. STATE
17.5. FOR

18.6. CHILDREN-IN-HOME

19.7. AMERICAN CHILDREN-IN-HOME

20.8. CHILDREN-IN-HOME

21.9. CHILDREN-IN-HOME

PREFACE

In 1962 the United States Commission on Civil Rights^{1/} engaged Dr. Julian Samora^{2/} to conduct a preliminary survey to determine to what extent, if any, Spanish-speaking peoples of the United States are being denied equal protection of the laws and to indicate areas for study.

A research team assembled and supervised by Dr. Samora reviewed and abstracted the major works in the field, compared and analyzed demographic data, conducted an opinion survey of professionals working in many localities and interviewed a number of interested persons. The product of their work, as developed into a manuscript by Dr. Samora, forms the basis for this Staff Paper.

The survey was designed to include persons who themselves or whose ancestors came from the West Indies, Mexico, Central America or South America.

Almost all are citizens of the United States. The majority are of Mexican

1/ The Commission is an independent bipartisan agency established by the Congress of the United States in 1957 to investigate sworn complaints alleging deprivations of voting rights based on color, race, religion or national origin; study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting denials of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; appraise Federal laws and policies with respect to equal protection; and report its findings and recommendations to the President and the Congress from time to time and at the end of each statutory term. Civil Rights Act of 1957, 71 Stat. 634, 42 U.S.C. secs. 1975-1975e (1958).

2/ Dr. Samora presently is an associate professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Notre Dame. He is a long-time student of the Spanish-speaking peoples of the United States.

descent. The next largest number come from Puerto Rico. A substantial
3/ number are of Spanish colonial origin. Most have Spanish surnames. Most
people speak Spanish and many are bilingual. But all identify or are identified
with one of these peoples. Their descendants are still to be defined.
One term is difficult to find, a term which embraces the many peoples surveyed
and yet preserves their cultural distinctions. The Census term
"white persons of Spanish surname" is too narrow, as is "Mexican-American."
In current usage "Latin-American" connotes foreignness. Historically
"Spanish-American" has been limited to descendants of Spanish colonials
and "Mexican," to immigrants. The term "Spanish-speaking" was selected as
being broadly descriptive of the origins of the people to be included in
the study.

Dr. Samora wishes to acknowledge the invaluable assistance of Profes-
sors Donald N. Barrett and William V. D'Antonio of the Department of
Sociology, University of Notre Dame. Professor Barrett prepared the
demographic materials and Professor D'Antonio prepared the materials on
the Puerto Rican peoples. Messrs. Herman Gallegos and William Gutierrez of
California; Messrs. Bernard Valdez, Lino M. Lopez and Jacabo Duran of
Colorado; and Dr. Hector Garcia and Mr. Herbert Hernandez of Texas made
use of the materials available to them to furnish sets of basic
materials from their respective States available to Dr. Samora. The fol-
lowing students worked as part of the research team: Charles E. Noll,
David Strutz, the Rev. Huber Schwan, C.S.C., James Fendrich and Jesse
Daffron, Jr.

3/ See Marden and Meyer, Minorities in American Society 14 (1962).

PART I

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

More than four centuries ago, adventurers from Spain discovered, explored, and colonized the Americas. Landing first on islands in the Caribbean, they soon conquered what is now Mexico, then moved southward the length of a continent and northward into the present Southwestern United States.

One of the first colonizing efforts was led by Juan Del Onate in 1598.

It extended as far north as the present northern New Mexico. There the

Spanish established a colony called San Juan at a location very close to

the present town of Espanola, New Mexico. By 1630 the settlers had es-

tablished 25 missions. In 1680 the Indians rebelled and the settlers

were forced out. Twelve years later Diego de Vargas reconquered the

province and established new settlements.^{4/} During the mid-seventeenth

century, Spaniards also colonized parts of Arizona, California and Texas.

For the next 250 years, despite the hostile environment and isolation

from their native land and each other, their settlements flourished and
gradually became known as Mexican civilization. In the late 1800's Spanish culture was established in the United States.

The Spanish settlements were removed from the mainstream of

and tribal and mestizo society when the railroad came and

European historical developments between 1600 and 1800. Most escaped

direct involvement in the Mexican, Central American and South American

revolutionary movements of the early 1800's.

(2) (b) (6)(D) (E) (F) (G) (H) (I) (J) (K) (L) (M) (N) (O) (P) (Q) (R) (S)

^{4/} McWilliams, North From Mexico 25 (1949).

I CHAV

Although the great westward movement of Americans did not appreciably affect the isolated villages, it did affect Santa Fe and other urban centers. By 1836, Americans outnumbered the Spanish-speaking people of Texas.⁵ The hostility engendered by the clash of cultures had led to a revolution by the English-speaking majority and the formation of the Republic of Texas. Nine years later Texas was admitted to Statehood. The Mexican-American War followed and, by the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the remainder of the Mexican territory north of the Rio Grande became part of

the United States in 1848.

Many of the Spanish settlements in the United States remained essentially folk societies until the turn of the century. Even up to 1940, the Spanish-speaking people in the Southwest were highly resistant to acculturation.

The majority have never been completely assimilated into the English-speaking

culture.

^{5/} See "The Social History of Spanish-Speaking People in Southwestern

United States Since 1846," Address by Lyle Saunders, 4th Regional Conference of the Southwest Council on Education of Spanish-Speaking People, Albuquerque, N.M., Jan. 24, 1950.

6/ Dr. George I. Sanchez has for many years emphasized the point that the Spanish colonials were a conquered people who did not come to this country as did other immigrants, did not ask the United States to come to the Southwest, and believe that they have been almost totally neglected as a people. Sanchez, "The American of Mexican Descent," 20 Chicago Jewish Forum 120 (1961-62).

Historical account of the development of the Mexican-American border

Between 1910 and 1930, a major immigration of Mexicans took place.

Most of them were agricultural workers who came to work in agriculture, or to unskilled or skilled labor in small commercial enterprises on railroads or in industries beginning to expand into the Southwest.

After the Mexican revolution, many Mexicans left Mexico for the United States. Some went as far North and East as Detroit. Many were fleeing the Mexican revolution, which was followed by the Mexican Revolution of 1910 and its bloody aftermath. Following the Great Depression, immigration resumed. Most of the Mexican immigrants have become naturalized.

Other Mexicans (Viseros) enter the United States as resident aliens. It is estimated that about 200,000 Mexican laborers left the United States during 1960 and June 30,

1961. In addition, the Bracero program, an agreement between the Government of Mexico and the United States for agricultural laborers, brought

294,149 Mexican nationals into the United States during 1961. Finally, a

large number of Mexicans commute to jobs in the United States.

10. Spanish-speaking Mexican-Americans

The Border Crosser or Commuter Problem: New Developments

7/ "The Visero, or the Passport Mexican Program," Address by James H.

Strauss, 11th Conference of the National Catholic Council for the Spanish-Speaking, Milwaukee, Wis., May 8, 1962.

8/ U.S. Dept. of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1961

Annual Report 48 (1961).

9/ "The Border Crosser or Commuter Problem: New Developments," Address by Robert Sanchez, 11th Conference of the National Catholic Council for the Spanish-Speaking, Milwaukee, Wis., May 9, 1962.

(CCR) "Spanish-speaking Mexican-Americans" (Spanish, English)

(Mexican (Spanish)) (Mexican American) (Mexican Spanish speaking)

(Mexican American) (Mexican) (Mexican American) (Mexican American)

(Mexican American) (Mexican American) (Mexican American)

(Mexican American) (Mexican American) (Mexican American) (Mexican American)

(Mexican American) (Mexican American) (Mexican American) (Mexican American)

Social characteristics.--An examination of the factors affecting social life¹⁰ associated with the Southwest reveals certain relationships between Spanish-speaking and Anglo which reveals certain characteristics of the two groups. The Anglo culture and language differences which have been barriers to the development of a common ground of understanding. Initially language differences, which remained until quite recently, were the chief barrier to communication. The differences in political background also create difficulties. The Spanish-speaking are of the traditional Roman Catholic heritage; Anglos are of the Protestant ethic. Anglos place greater emphasis on formal education.¹¹ Finally, patterns of social segregation which have developed over the years continue to exist.

¹⁰/ The term "Anglo" has come into common usage in the Southwest as the designation for white non-Spanish-speaking people. Cf. Saunders, Cultural Differences and Medical Care, 249 (1954); McWilliams, op. cit.

¹¹/ supra note 4, at 8; De La Garza, "Who Are You," LULAC News, Sept. 1932; It will be used in that sense throughout this Staff Paper.

¹¹/ "The English colonists who had settled on the Atlantic seaboard brought to America the most liberal political practices known in the world of that day." Universal manhood suffrage, states' rights, local self-government, elective officers and trial by jury were not a part of the political background of the Spanish-speaking. Richardson and Rister, The Greater Southwest, 87 (1934).

¹²/ Id. at 88.

¹³/ See Samora, "Minority Leadership in a Bi-Cultural Community" (1953) (Unpublished thesis in Washington University (St. Louis) Library); Simmons, "Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans in South Texas: A Study in Dominant-Subordinate Group Relations (1952) (unpublished thesis in Harvard University Library); "Social and Cultural Integration in the Southwest," Address by Lyle Saunders, 11th Annual Institute of Race Relations, Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., July 2, 1954.

The Spanish-speaking peoples of the Southwest are a heterogeneous population, but they do share a strong group identification and certain social characteristics.

Where family ties were strong and each person was called upon to fill

^{14/} many of the roles which exist in a community. Insulated by isolation

from the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Industrial Revolution, their

forebears were less subject than other Europeans to the pressure to de-

velop the commitment to innovation and progress that had come to be

more or less taken for granted in the dominant society that had come to be

the dominant culture of modern Europe. Formal education, difficult to obtain, was not emphasized. Social organization, centering around family and church,

was developed along rigid and patriarchal lines.

As with many close to the land, these rural folk lived rhythmic lives,

the activities of the typical seasonal laborer being dictated by responding to seasons and the endless days and not to a job, a clock or

a weekly cycle. Time was without value. Each day was equally important.

Each day had its work which could not be done before it began nor after it

^{15/} ended. When crises developed, they would be dealt with by the group.

(See Dr. Samora's paper on the Spanish-speaking labor and so were not a cause for individual anxiety.)

(See Lyle Saunders' paper on the Spanish-speaking labor and so were not a cause for individual anxiety.)

In such an environment little opportunity for specialization existed

since most people had the same background and experience. Little oppor-

tunity for trade existed since their economy was self-contained.

Opportunity for change in status existed since relationships were fixed

^{14/} Dr. Samora wishes to give credit to Lyle Saunders for most of the ideas contained in this section. This material comes from unpublished statements, conversations and correspondence.

^{15/} See Campa, "Manana is Today," in Pearce and Thomason, Southwesterners. Write 291, 294 (1947).

and not considered subject to change. One was either an owner (patron) or a laborer (peon). It was not proper or desirable to be what one was

~~not.~~ Change did not occur and could offend others directly. Authoritarianism by ~~law~~ ^{rule}

Authority resided in physically present individuals rather than in abstract organizations. The dependency of the people upon their social

institutions was the primary, personal one of man upon man rather than the secondary, abstract one of man upon rule of law. Dependency begot acceptance and resignation and normalized fatalism. The close, continual, personal, pastoral relationship of parishioner to priest tended to reinforce the attitude of dependency.

From three centuries of the relative peace and tranquility engendered

by their way of life, a people who revere the folk values were thrust

into contact with a society which emphasizes achievement, activity and

efficiency. Without a high degree of mutual respect and understanding, it was inevitable that dissimilar cultural values would collide.

16/ See Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, Variations in Value Orientations (1961); Woods, Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups (1956); UNESCO, Cultural Patterns and Technical Change 168-93 (Mead ed. 1953); Kluckhohn, "Dominant and Substitute Profiles of Cultural Orientations: Their significance for the Analysis of Social Stratification," 28 Social Forces 376 (1950).

17/ See Williams, American Society 1415-70 (2d ed. 1960).

native has equalized. It seems appropriate to call it as mixed.

It was perhaps predictable that the more aggressive Anglo culture would

eventually push out the Spanish one. However, there was no conflict at first because the Spanish-speaking did not become dominant.

Spanish-speaking culture did not stop its basic Spanish speech and or behavior but of the Spanish-speaking would adapt itself to the new sources of authority

thus local offices and local courts like those in Spain, became more influential than without supplanting those that previously existed. Adapting as it did,

^{18/} the Spanish-speaking culture avoided assimilation.

Reference continues Chapter 6 to political, cultural and social life.

The extent to which the decades might have eroded this rigid way of

political family and community life would difficult to ascertain. In the case of

life, as it did in the cases of the other and even more inflexible European

immigrant countries, contact with the native people left many traces in the immigrant subcultures, may never be known. For beginning fifty years ago,

it is estimated 1920 to present steady flow of immigrants from Mexico. Thus the steady Mexican immigration has continually infused the Spanish-speaking

community with a flow of families whose adherence to the traditional values

of the community was still strong and was not diluted by contact with the Anglos.

Puerto Ricans--Columbus discovered Puerto Rico for Spain in November

of 1493. Its settlement, however, did not begin until 1508 under Ponce

de Leon. At the time of settlement an estimated 50,000 Indians of the

Carib and Boringuen tribes lived on the island. By 1515 disease and mis-

treatment had reduced the Indian population to less than 4,000. Settle-

ment of the island by Europeans was very slow. Spaniards who had failed

to find a profitable livelihood in one of the island's two main towns and

soldiers who had deserted the fortress of San Juan settled in the in-

terior. Thus began the development of the distinct type of rural dweller

^{18/} See Watson and Samora, "Subordinate Leadership in a BiCultural Community: An Analysis," American Sociological Review 413, 414 (1954).

^{19/} See Hanson, Transformation: The Story of Modern Puerto Rico (1955).

known as the Jibaro, generally of predominant Spanish lineage and living
 below orifice of a civilization from the old colonial period now 31
^{20/} in isolation in the open country. The descendants of the African slaves,
 originally brought from the old colonial period now 31 .descendents
 first brought to the island about 1513 to work in the sugar cane fields
 which surrounded the two main towns, were all freed by the early 19th cen-
^{21/} turn and had taken their places in urban life.
 In 1897 Luis Munoz Rivera, father of the present governor, succeeded
 in obtaining a Charter of Self-Rule from Spain which gave the island dominion
 status. However, before the charter could be put into effect, Spain was
 at war with the United States. By the peace treaty of 1899, Puerto Rico
 was ceded to the United States.
 At the time of cession 96 percent of the island's 950,000 inhabitants
 were landless. The majority of these were Jibaros living on subsistence
 agriculture or working on the few large sugar and tobacco estates. The
 pleasant climate and the year-round growth of food made bare subsistence
 living possible for the Jibaro without much effort. The church did not
 follow him into the wilderness, local aristocracy ignored him, tropical
 diseases weakened him, occasional hurricanes further discouraged him, and
 the lack of any education continued and reinforced the pattern of isolation.
 Progress in the urban areas -- through sugar and tobacco production, the be-
 ginnings of an educational system, and the presence of the church--tended
^{20/} Rosario, The Development of the Puerto Rican Jibaro and His Present
Attitude Toward Society 8 (1935); Clark and Associates, Puerto Rico
And Its Problems XVIII (1930).
^{21/} The first U.S. Army census in 1899 showed that Negroes comprised 38
 percent of the 950,000 inhabitants; by 1950 this figure had dropped to
 20 percent. At the request of the Puerto Rican Government, the Bureau
 of the Census compiled no statistics on color or race in 1960.

^{22/} One such effort was made by the U.S. government to widen the gap between the Jibaro and the city dweller.

The United States established a decentralized universal free-coed-
educational system with English as the primary language. But the system
failed to meet the needs of the vast majority--rural Puerto Ricans--for
vocational and agricultural education. As a result, the holding power of
the schools was very limited.

^{23/}

In 1917 the Congress passed the Jones Act which made Puerto Ricans
citizens of the United States. In the late 1930's Luis Munoz Marin be-

gan his campaign for "Bread, Land and Liberty." Munoz Marin sought inde-

dominion status for his island. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt sent
Rexford Guy Tugwell to investigate conditions. Tugwell urged more self-

rule, economic reform and a more realistic educational policy for the
country. In 1947 the office of governor was made elective. Munoz Marin

was elected governor in 1948 and reelected in 1952, 1956 and 1960. In

1952 the people of Puerto Rico voted to call a constitutional convention.
The constitution was adopted in March of the same year and

the new constitution was ratified by the U.S. Congress in 1953. The new constitution
had more extensive autonomy than the Jones Act but still did not grant Puerto Rico
the right to elect its own president or to have a U.S. representative in the U.S. Congress.

^{22/} Rosario, op. cit. supra note 20, at 39; Mixer, Puerto Rico, History
and Conditions 50-51 (1926).

^{23/} Act of March 2, 1917, ch. 145, 39 Stat. 951, 48 U.S.C. sec. 731
(1958).

subsequently approved by Congress. The island has held Commonwealth status since that time.

In 1948 Munoz Marin launched the now famous "Operation Bootstrap." Its major emphasis was on diversification of the economy, slum clearance and low cost housing, and raising educational levels and health standards. As Operation Bootstrap raised living standards and aspirations, it encouraged Puerto Ricans to seek jobs on the mainland.

The Puerto Rican migration has been a relatively small one compared to others, but it has not been perceived as such. Clarence Senior makes

the following comment:

For an account of U.S. administration from 1899 to 1952, see Isern "From Colony to Commonwealth," 285 Annals 16 (1953).

Handlin, The Newcomers 136 (1959). There were less than 2,000 Puerto Ricans on the mainland in 1910; some 12,000 by 1920; about 53,000 by 1930; approximately 58,000 in 1935. Migration averaged almost 20,000 per year between 1940 and 1950, and then increased for the first 3 years of the 1950's, reaching over 70,000 in 1953. It fell off to less than 50,000 a year during the latter part of the decade. Id.

at 50-51, 142-43; Chenault, The Puerto Rican Migrant in New York City 53 (1938). For New York City itself, the net migration during the 1950's from Puerto Rico was 209,250, while natural increase amounted to 157,050. In 1960 Puerto Ricans constituted 7.9 percent of the city's 7,781,984 residents. N.Y. State Commission for Human Rights,

The Puerto Rican Population of the New York City Area, Population of New York State, 1960 at 3 (1962).

EST. 1960 P.R. IN U.S. 209,250 (NET) 157,050 (NATURAL INCREASE)

(CENSUS)

research and reports to ^{26/}accuse of racial and social bias based on the following observations:

oldsmobile used and at Bowdoin found one way paper (P) that a N. in 1946
"One daily newspaper's headline in 1946 was 'Tidal

Wave of Puerto Ricans Swamping City.' The net migration

VS

gration to the mainland United States in 1945 was

according to the Bureau of the Census of Puerto Ricans living in the U.S. in 1945 was 13,573; in 1946 it was 39,911. The figure of

population of 710,000 Puerto Ricans in New York City was used.

VS

by another paper in 1948 (when the total was about

180,000) and a few years later, still another paper

recently reported, "there are an estimated 2,000,000 Puerto

Ricans living in the nation's largest city." That

according to the Bureau of the Census of Puerto Ricans living in the U.S. in 1953, there were around 448,000, if 100,000

children born in New York City of Puerto Rican parents of whose children of both parents were included."

despite the fact that, as late as 1950, the majority of Puerto Ricans

(about 80 percent) still lived in the rural areas of the island, migrants have

come primarily from the urban centers. In times of economic prosperity

migration has been heavy, and to returning only when need

for, on the mainland, migration from the island has been heavy. Recessions have

led to many returning to the island. Nevertheless, in recent years more

migration has been heavy, and to returning only when need

and more Puerto Ricans have come to stay and are gradually dispersing to

places other than New York City.

(SRR 1961) or published

to abroad. (See) Brewster (1961) of the same month as the above

Brewster of Three distinct groups of Puerto Ricans are discernible on the mainland

(1961) involved in the first group is "isolated" today. The first comprises a relatively small number of culturally as-

(1961) of the second group will be assimilated easily among their own families, descendants of the earliest migrants, who have been

and the third group of the second group will be tightly knit formally educated and have moved into suburban life.

-Second-class is equivalent to the third group of the first group of the second group

26/ Senior, Strangers Then Neighbors 20 (1961).
27/ Id. at 22.

The second and by far the largest is composed of those who have migrated
within the last 25 years. They are found crowded in the least desirable
neighborhoods of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and other industrial areas.

The third, also small in numbers, is made up of transient farm workers.
A dilemma faces dark-skinned Puerto Ricans who come to the mainland.

They quickly discover that here, color is a basis for discrimination.
As a result many go to great pains to identify themselves as Puerto Ricans.

But for them, color combines with cultural differences to doubly obstruct
attempts to acculturate. Since 1948 these migrants, mostly young men who come without their
families (in contrast to domestic Spanish-speaking migrants), have
been under the protection of the Bureau of Employment and Migration
of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, a special agency created to control
contracts between the workers and the employers. See Ferreras, "The
Puerto Ricans in Seasonal Agricultural Work," Proceedings of the Eleventh
Annual Conference of the National Catholic Council for the Spanish-Speaking
56 (May 1962).

See Padilla, Up from Puerto Rico 75 (1958); Steward (ed.), People of
Puerto Rico 425 (1946); Fitzpatrick, "Attitudes of Puerto Ricans Toward
Color," 20 American Catholic Sociological Review 7 (1959).

Berle, Eighty Puerto Rican Families in New York City 45-48 (1958).

In New York City the nonwhite proportion of Puerto Ricans dropped
from eight to four percent during the period 1950 to 1960 but this
may be due in part to the Census Bureau's new technique of self-enumera-
tion for recording race in the 1960 census. See N.Y. State Commission
for Human Rights, op. cit. supra note 25, at 3.

~~the following information is known to available at the time of the 1960 census.~~

Demographic Characteristics.--According to the Census of Population,

~~5,108,586 Spanish-speaking persons were in the United States in 1960. This figure is minimal. It does not include persons with Spanish surname outside the Southwest. It does not include illegal immigrants, Braceros or commuters.~~

~~The largest concentrations of Spanish-speaking people are in California, Texas, New York, New Mexico, Arizona and Colorado. More than half are in California and Texas. Most Spanish-speaking of Puerto Rican origin are concentrated in New York, New Jersey, Illinois, California, Pennsylvania and Florida. Two-thirds are in New York City. Recent trends indicate that a considerable number of Spanish-speaking are relocating in other States.~~

^{older A. 1960}
Before 1940 the Spanish-speaking in the Southwest were a predominantly rural people. During the forties military service, defense employment and opportunities under the G.I. Bill brought many to urban centers. By 1950 two-thirds lived in urban centers. By 1960 the number had risen to four-fifths. Colorado had the highest percentage of urban increase and Texas, the lowest. In California, 85 percent of Spanish-speaking live in urban centers. In New Mexico, 58 percent live in urban centers.

-
- 31/ The Census Bureau makes a special tabulation of persons of Spanish surname in five Southwestern States only: Ariz., Calif., Colo., N.M. and Tex.
- 32/ See App. A, tables 1 and 3.
- 33/ See App. A, table 2.

Between 1950 and 1960, the number of Spanish-speaking people in California increased by 666,085 (87.6 percent); in Arizona, by 66,038 (51.4 percent); in Texas, by 384,042 (37.1 percent); in Colorado, by 39,042 (33.0 percent); and in New Mexico, by 20,242 (8.1 percent). In 1960 Spanish-speaking residents accounted for 28.3% of the population of

New Mexico, 14.9% of Arizona, 14.8% of Texas, 9.1% of California and 9.0% of Colorado. Proportions remained substantially the same over the decade except in New Mexico where the 1950 percentage was 36.5.

In 1960 there were 892,513 Spanish-speaking persons of Puerto Rican origin in the United States, an increase of 196% since 1950.

34/ See App. A, table 4. This is due in part to higher fertility rates.

See App. A, table 5.

edit the results off utilized **PART II** which not utilized because below

there is no space left **AREAS OF SURVEY**

1956 or 1957 **Voting** . See the new addition of Spanish

The traditional religious, familial and economic institutions of the Spanish-speaking are centered around individuals rather than institutions.

Thus, although the Spanish-speaking culture has been exposed to Anglo-American democracy for over 100 years, many of the Spanish-speak-

ing in the Southwest have either automatically supported the patrones or

have declined to participate in the political processes. In a few parts

of northern New Mexico and southern Colorado the patrones have controlled

local government for years. In other areas, being long absent from govern-

ment or politics as a people, many have not demonstrated interest.

But there is evidence of an awakening. Spanish-speaking persons

hold or have held many offices including those of Lieutenant Governor of

New Mexico, member of Congress from Texas and New Mexico, state legislator

in Colorado, and councilman in Los Angeles.^{35/} In 1957 the first Spanish-

speaking mayor of El Paso, Texas, was elected. In the primaries Raymond

Telles, now Ambassador to Costa Rica, defeated the incumbent Tom Rogers

by 18,688 to 15,934. It was reported that some 18,000 Spanish-speaking

persons had registered, the highest number ever, and that 90 percent had

no connection with the patrones.

The following is from Marden and Meyer:

^{35/} See Marden and Meyer, *op. cit. supra note 3*, at 134.

voted, almost solidly for Telles. Traditionally the winner of the Democratic primary runs unchallenged. But on this occasion a write-in Anglo candidate was put forth. Telles won 17,080 to 8,961.^{36/}

More recently, Spanish-speaking residents of Crystal City, Texas gained control of the municipal government. Prior to 1963 Anglos controlled it, although 75 percent of the city's population was Spanish-speaking. The change in administrations was brought about as the result of an intensive registration drive by the Political Association of Spanish-Speaking Organizations.

^{37/} Thus in some localities the Spanish-speaking are encouraged to register and urged to vote. Some Anglo candidates encourage political rallies for the Spanish-speaking and even address groups in Spanish.

Nineteen percent of the respondents to the questionnaire used in conjunction with this survey indicated that, in their opinion, there was voting discrimination against Spanish-speaking in their localities. Most of these listed obstructions to registration as the major problem. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that there was no voting

36/ Ibid.

37/ Newsweek, Apr. 29, 1963, p. 26.

38/ The questionnaire cited throughout this report was sent to 2,600 professionals working with the Spanish-speaking. The response of 12% is considered low and the results should not be construed as representing any more than the opinions of those who responded.

discrimination. In the five Southwestern States, 28 percent of the respondents reported voting discrimination and 52 percent indicated no voting denials.

In New York Puerto-Ricans literate in the Spanish language are not permitted to vote if they are not literate in the English language as required by the constitution of that State.^{39/} In 1958 Jose Camacho, a

resident of New York City, filed a suit to compel election officials to permit him to take a voter registration literacy test in the Spanish language. He contended that he was being denied the right to vote. The court denied the petition holding that Camacho, instead of being denied the right to vote, was only required first to learn and write English, and added:

"This cannot be deemed an unreasonable requirement."^{40/}

39/ See N.Y. Const. art. II, sec. 1. Eighteen other States have English literacy requirements: Ala., Alaska, Ariz., Calif., Conn., Del., Ga., Ind., Ia., Me., Mass., Miss., N.H., N.C., Ore., S.C., Va., Wash., and Wyo. Hawaii permits voter registration literacy tests in the Hawaiian language. See U.S. Dept. of Defense, Voting Information (1962); Bryce M. Smith, Voting and Election Laws 65-67 (1960); Legislative Reference Service (Library of Congress), Qualifications for Voting: Summaries and Tables of State Laws Governing Voter Qualifications, Registration and Penalties and for Violations (1961).

40/ Camacho v. Doe, Civ. No. 11884/58, N.Y. Sup. Ct., Bronx County, Sum. Oct. 10, 1958; aff'd, 194 N.Y.S.2d 33 (N.Y. 1959); 5 Race Rel. L. Rep. 775 (1960).

was not to discriminatory. Camacho then sought relief in the Federal courts. A three-judge panel on December 18, 1961, ^{41/} dismissed his complaint, stating:

"The statute is not an unreasonable exercise of the powers of the state to provide requirements for exercising the elective franchise. It is not unreasonable to expect a voter not only to be conversant with the issues presented for determination in choosing between candidates for election, but also to understand the language used in connection with voting. For example, there are printed in English and Spanish on the ballot synopses of proposed constitutional amendments, titles of the offices to be filled and directives as to the use of the paper ballot or voting machine. Finally, what is more proper than the voter be literate in the language used to conduct the business of government in his state." ^{42/}

41/ Camacho v. Rogers, 199 F. Supp. 155, 159 (S.D.N.Y. 1961); 7 Race Rel.

L. Rep. 147 (1962). The Court also held that the Treaty of Paris applies only to the rights of persons born in and resident of Puerto Rico, and that they are not given rights which they are entitled to exercise in contravention of the valid laws of a state to which they may move from Puerto Rico. They do not acquire a special status which would give them preferential treatment over a resident of a sister state who moves to New York and seeks to vote from his new residence. ^{43/} Id. at 158.

Another recent case arising in New York City involved a charge that the State legislature, in reapportioning congressional districts in the Borough of Manhattan, "contrived" to exclude "non-white citizens and citizens of Puerto Rican origin" from one district and to "include the overwhelming number" in three other districts. A three-judge Federal district court, with one dissent, dismissed the action on the basis of insufficient proof. Wright v. Rockefeller, 211 F. Supp. 460 (S.D.N.Y. 1962), 8 Race Rel. L. Rep. 124 (1963), prob. juris. noted, 374 U.S. 377 (1963). As of Dec. 31, 1963, no decision had been rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court in this case.

SS

On July 30, 1963, Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Jr. formally endorsed an anti-literacy-test campaign sponsored by the Spanish language newspaper *El Diario* and *La Prensa*. The mayor and Paul R. Scovane, president of the city council, called for an amendment to the state constitution to permit Spanish-speaking citizens to take the literacy test in Spanish.

Education

The children of the Spanish-speaking have often encountered special difficulties in learning & taught ~~in~~ ^{42/} English before and

difficulties in obtaining a formal education. One writer observes:

"A variety of factors prevent many of them from concentrating upon their studies -- the

inability to use 'correct' English, their own need and education

poverty and sometimes the necessity for part-time work, the lack of privacy at home, and

not to mention the remoteness of the goals toward which they are striving.

education leads. The result is often a high rate of truancy. All too often, also, even

among those students who attend docilely merely sit

out their lessons, without the incentive to pay attention to what transpires in the classroom."

42/ *Newspaper to Abolish English Requirement to Be Dropped* ^{43/}
N.Y. Times, July 31, 1963, p. 1. As of Dec. 31, 1963, no action had been taken on this proposal by the State legislature. Among others, the N.Y. Times has argued that abolition of the English-literacy requirement would retard the integration of the city's Puerto Ricans.

See N.Y. Times, Aug. 1, 1963, p. 26.

43/ Handlin, op. cit. supra note 25, at 78.

-Edna has become utilized in the project. A sufficient reason, 6861, is cited as
In a society where fewer and fewer jobs are available to the unskilled,

In segregated educational institutions and the consequent advantages and disadvantages the student who drops out is at a competitive disadvantage.

add to discrimination, unanswered. A long time longer add - account of the situation.
Although segregation of public school pupils by race or color has

history of multitudinous which exist of discrimination and segregation which has been declared unconstitutional by the courts, it still affects the

balance of good vocational out of schools Spanish-speaking and non-Spanish-speaking
Spanish-speaking in many areas as a result of segregated housing patterns.

^{political}
Twenty-nine percent of the questionnaires received indicated that there
exists discrimination against over public school children and the same exists
are segregation and discrimination in education against Spanish-speaking.

:
: 1914
: Colorado and New Mexico. Therefore, a great number of the Southwest
Forty percent of the Southwestern respondents so indicated.

should be given priority according to priority 11
For many years, segregation of the Spanish-speaking in Southwestern
add -- attribute should traps particularly those

schools has been condemned by law. Arizona's Attorney General ruled in

-class of education and conditions has approved
1915 that its statute permitting segregation of "pupils of the African
American race to separate from white add , now said
race" did not empower schools or trustees to segregate Mexican children from

^{44/} add a article at direct add .abcd multitudes
white children." By constitutional provision, Colorado prohibits "any
move ,color ,grade add .etc. However to exist
distinction or classification of pupils" in public schools, "on account

^{45/} add article add article ,which add the ^{46/}
of race or color." The New Mexico constitution provides that:

-public add no distinction shall be made by

"except

44/ Biennial Report of the Attorney General of Arizona 65 (1915-16).

and reference on 6861, 12 add to 44, L.C. 8611, 12 1915, County X.M. add

45/ Colo. Const. art. IX, sec. 8 (1876).

and reference on 6861, 12 add to 44, L.C. 8611, 12 1915, County X.M. add

46/ N. Mex. Const. art. XIII, sec. 10 (1911).

and reference on 6861, 12 add to 44, L.C. 8611, 12 1915, County X.M. add

and reference on 6861, 12 add to 44, L.C. 8611, 12 1915, County X.M. add

and reference on 6861, 12 add to 44, L.C. 8611, 12 1915, County X.M. add

and reference on 6861, 12 add to 44, L.C. 8611, 12 1915, County X.M. add

"Children of Spanish descent in the state of

New Mexico shall never be denied the right and privilege of admission and attendance in the public educational institutions of the state, and they shall never be classed in separate schools, but shall forever enjoy perfect equality with other children in all public schools and educational institutions of the state, and the legislature shall provide penalties for the violation of this section."

The New Mexico constitution also expressly encourages teachers to become "proficient in both English and Spanish languages."

In 1930 a Texas court said that "school authorities have no power to arbitrarily segregate Mexican children, assign them to separate schools, and exclude them from schools maintained for children of other white people and because of their race." ^{47/} ~~and to~~ ^{48/} races, merely or solely because they are Mexicans." The court refused, however, to enjoin the enlargement of a separate school for children of Spanish or Mexican descent. The school superintendent testified that the separate school was established because the majority of the children belonged

to families engaged in cotton-fields-or-other-ranch-work, that they were always late in enrolling in school in the fall, and that they had difficulty with the English language. The court concluded, therefore, that no racial motive was involved.

47/ N.M. Const. art. XII, sec. 8 (1911). 48/ Independent School Dist. v. Salvatierra, 33 S.W.2d 790, 795 (Tex. Civ. App. 1930), appeal dismissed, 284 U.S. 580 (1931).

49/ Id. at 796.

Where it existed, the segregation of Spanish-speaking pupils in the Southwest was "purportedly" based on English language deficiencies and not on ethnic differences. The constitutionality of this practice was tested in a lawsuit arising in California. United States citizens of Mexican

descent who attended public elementary schools in Orange County alleged that school officials had formulated a common plan and practice to segregate them in schools attended solely by children of Mexican and Latin

descent. The school officials admitted this charge but defended on the grounds that a large number of school children in this group were unfamiliar with and unable to speak the English language. The Federal district court ruled in favor of the Spanish-speaking petitioners, holding the action of the school officials violative of the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. It found no California law to support the segregation. To the contrary, State laws were wholly inconsistent with such practices.

^{50/} Concerning the school board's defense that segregation was necessary in the elementary grades because of the English language deficiencies, the court said:

^{50/} Mendez v. Westminster School Dist., 64 F. Supp. 544 (S.D. Calif. 1946).

^{51/} The Court thus distinguished Plessy v. Ferguson (163 U.S. 537 (1896)) which upheld the constitutionality of a State law requiring segregation and established the separate-but-equal doctrine. This doctrine was not repudiated by the Supreme Court until 1954. Brown

v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

^{52/} Mendez v. Westminster School Dist., *supra* note 50, at 549.

(1946) 63 U.S. 464, *Separate But Equal*, (1954) 347 U.S. 483.

Soldado Mendez et al. parties to object to Negro admission of Mexican children
"A paramount requisite in the American system"

fundamental of public education is social equality. It must be made clear
be open to all children by unified school association
should remain the fundamental guarantee of educational equality and
association regardless of lineage. . . .

judges opine "The evidence clearly shows that Spanish-speaking Negroes and
children are retarded in learning English by lack
of exposure which is not due to lack of desire, ability or capacity, but to lack of
exposure to its use because of segregation, and
judges opine that commingling of the entire student body instills
and develops a common cultural attitude among the
and strengthens to each no bond of common understanding and common educational
school children which is imperative for the per-

petuation of American institutions and ideals. . . .

It is also established by the record that the methods
of school officials lead to economic and social practices resulting in
of segregation prevalent in the defendant school

and in neighboring districts, foster antagonisms in the children and tend to
suggest inferiority among them where none exists."

as best example of parading our Republic's principles before the world

Although this decision was affirmed in 1947 by the United States
Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit,
53/

Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, segregation of Spanish-speaking
children over requires to stand up to segregation didn't stand off

children continued in many localities in the Southwest. In 1955 the
Court to stand off no longer were able to do so effectively any longer

Federal courts in California were again involved with litigation initiated
by Spanish-speaking parents on behalf of their children. The complaint
alleged that the school officials of Imperial County "as officers of the

State of California . . . acting, with a common plan, design, and purpose . . .
have adopted, and do practice ethnic and racial discrimination and segre-
gation . . . in the operation, management and control of their said systems

54/ and racial in making their facilities, school, 3
and facilities." Also in 1955 the parents of school children in the
and resources in educating the Mexican children to stand off

53/ Westminister School Dist. v. Mendez, 161 F.2d 774 (9th Cir. 1947).

54/ Romero v. Weakley, 131 F. Supp. 818, 820 (S.D. Calif. 1955). The
district court dismissed the complaint on the basis that it was a
proper matter for the State courts. The court of appeals reversed
this decision and directed the district court to hear the case.

Romero v. Weakley, 226 F.2d 399 (9th Cir. 1955).

public schools in Driscoll, Texas brought an action in a Federal district court against school officials of that city and State. They alleged that

the practice by school officials of placing children of Mexican descent in separate classes for a four-year period during which they were taught

first and second grade subjects was in deprivation of their rights under the 14th Amendment, being discrimination on the basis of ancestry.

School officials answered that segregation was not based on race or ancestry, but

solely on the inability of some to speak and understand English. They

counterclaimed, asking that the parents of the school children involved

be restrained by the court from speaking any language but English in the

presence of their school-age children and requiring the parents not to

permit the children to associate with anyone who does not speak English.

The court found that grouping of pupils on the basis of ancestry was arbitrary and unreasonable and ruled that only grouping on the basis of individual ability to speak and understand the English language would be permitted. The school district's counterclaim was dismissed.

55/ Hernandez v. Driscoll Consolidated Independent School District, Civ.

Supp. No. 1384, S.D. Tex., Jan. 11, 1957, 32 Race Rel. L. Rep. 3329 (1957).

See 2 Race Rel. L. Rep. 34 (1957) (reprints of the bill of complaint, answer, and other pleadings and orders). The court said that it

"was impressed with the testimony and opinions of Dr. George I. J.

Sanchez, Professor and Consultant in Latin American Education, Chairman, Dept. of the History and Philosophy of Education, The

University of Texas, and his conclusion that the best method is that

there be no grouping on account of the language barrier from the very

beginning. Perhaps in time this will be accepted but it is not now in keeping with the opinions and recommendations of other outstanding authorities." Id. at 330.

In 1951 a concomitant of segregated schools is inferior schools. In 1951

¹⁴² a Federal district court in Arizona found that "children of Mexican or

Latin descent or extraction are . . . segregated and required to . . .

"cannot attend a neighboring school to whom they are entitled to attend" one school "while other schools are maintained . . . exclusively

for Anglo-American children." ^{56/} The court added, "there is a sub-

stantial inequality in the accommodations accorded the petitioners when compared to the facilities and accommodations made available by respondents

^{57/} ". . . children of Mexican or Latin descent . . . to children in the district of Anglo-American extraction." In New

Mexico the distribution of State public school equalization funds for the

1939-40 school year gave the four counties with the highest concentration

of Spanish-speaking less than \$50 per classroom unit. The average distribu-

tion for the State was \$90 and one county among the lowest proportion of

Spanish-speaking received \$160 per unit. Several counties with low

^{58/} Spanish-speaking populations received more than \$100 per unit.

Education and the 14th Amendment

56/ Gonzales v. Sheely, 96 F. Supp. 1004, 1006 (D. Ariz. 1951).

¹⁴³ In this case the court held that the Tolleson School District had violated the 14th Amendment by maintaining inferior schools for Mexican-American children.

57/ Id. at 1007. Although decided 3 years before Brown v. Board of

Education (supra note 51), the decision anticipated the holding of the

Brown case by concluding as a matter of law that "segregation of

school children in separate school buildings because of racial or

national origin, as accomplished by regulation, customs and usages"

" . . . of school officials constitutes a denial of the equal protection of

citizenship as defined by the Constitution" (supra note 51). The Tolleson School District had the effect of segregating Mexican-American children from white children.

The court held that the practice of maintaining separate schools for Mexican-American children violated the 14th Amendment. The Tolleson School District had the effect of segregating Mexican-American children from white children.

The court held that the practice of maintaining separate schools for Mexican-American children violated the 14th Amendment.

58/ Sanchez, Forgotten People 33 (1940).

Education and the 14th Amendment

Today what school segregation exists results primarily from segregated residential patterns." In its 1959 Report the Commission noted:

"... the concentration of colored Americans in restricted residential areas of most major cities produces a high degree of school segregation even in communities accepting Negroes as a result of the Supreme Court's decision. With the migration of Negroes and Puerto Ricans to the North and the right of Negroes to live where they want in the South and West, and an influx of Mexicans into the West and Southwest, the whole country is now sharing the segregation problem and the responsibilities."

At the Commission's 1960 hearings in Los Angeles, it was stated that "if de facto segregation is defined as a public school in which 85 percent or more of the students are of one or more racial or nationality groups, then Negro and Mexican-American schools exist not in isolated instances but in scores in Los Angeles city alone, with similar instances in Pasadena, Compton, Monrovia" and that "overwhelming Mexican-American student enrollment, policy against de facto segregation".

59/ 1959 Report 15.

60/ Hearings in Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif., Before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 76, 79 (1960) (hereinafter cited as California Hearings). At another of its hearings, the Commission was told of the one-time existence of two adjacent mining communities in Arizona, "one for the people of Mexican extraction and one for the people of non-Mexican extraction," each with a separate school. Conference in Nashville, Tenn., Before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Education

and declared that "in all areas under our control or subject to our influence, the policy of elimination of existing segregation and curbing

any tendency toward its growth must be given serious and thoughtful

consideration by all persons involved at all levels." ^{61/} Recently the

Los Angeles Board of Education determined, by a vote of 5 to 2, to avoid

creating new de facto segregated schools. ^{62/}

In New York City fully 455 of the 704 schools in the city were

"homogeneous to the extent that 90 percent or more of their students were

either Negro or white or Puerto Rican." ^{63/} Moreover, "the schools they

attend are, by their very character, housed in the oldest buildings, have

the least desirable reputations, and are shunned by the best teachers." ^{64/}

In 1960 the New York City Board of Education adopted an "open enrollment"

program whereby pupils at the entrance level of junior and senior high schools could choose between (.X.M., 10th Street) schools which had a heavy concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican students

were given an opportunity to transfer to certain other schools which were

61/ California State Board of Education, Declaration of Policy With

Reference to De Facto Racial Segregation in Public Schools, June 14,

1962, 7 Race Rel. L. Rep. 1267 (1962).

62/ Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, May 21, 1963, p. 1.

63/ Handlin, op. cit. supra note 25, at 79-80. (1961) 637

64/ Id. at 80. See note (.X.M., 10th Street) schools to which

political leaders refer according to Israel J.O.Y. SAWYER (801K, 1961)

not actually Negro schools because they are not controlled by Negroes

but rather by Negroes who control them themselves and command

members of established Negro groups within the school system who are to

expel non Negroes if they do not conform to Negroes from Negroes

(1961) 637. See also 638-639. Negroes outside the

65/

utilized at less than 90 percent of capacity. The board has reported that, including the 1963-64 school year, a cumulative total of 14,500

pupils have participated in this program. The open enrollment policy

is to be converted into a "free-choice transfer policy" in February 1964.

Under this new program any pupil in a school with a high Negro and Puerto

Rican enrollment may transfer, at his parents' request, to any other school

in the city where there is space available. The plan will apply to all

levels of education. The transfers, to be offered on a first-come-first-

served basis, will include free transportation. On Dec. 9, 1963, the

Urban League of Greater New York asserted in a 108-page report that, etc

65/ Joint Statement by Charles H. Silver, President of the Board of Education, and Dr. John J. Theobald, Superintendent of Schools,

Brooklyn, N.Y., Aug. 31, 1960, 5 Race Rel. L. Rep. 911 (1960).

66/ Board of Education (New York City, N.Y.), Progress Toward Integration, September 1-November 30, 1963 and Plans For The Immediate Future 10

(Dec. 1963). On June 14, 1963, the N.Y. State Commissioner of Education issued a memorandum directing all local school administra-

tors and school board presidents to re-examine racial imbalance in local schools, to declare local policy in regard to such imbalance,

to report on progress made in eliminating such conditions, and to

formulate plans for future corrective action. 8 Race Rel. L. Rep.

738 (1963).

67/ Board of Education (New York City, N.Y.), Plan For Integration 5

(Aug. 1963). The N.Y.C. Board of Education also reported intensified efforts to recruit Negro and Puerto Rican teachers, efforts to increase the number of Negro and Puerto Rican supervisors, inclusion of new materials about minority group contributions to American history and culture, and increased college opportunities for Negro and Puerto Rican pupils. Id. at 3.

despite efforts by the Board of Education and other city agencies to correct the situation, racial imbalance in the city schools had grown worse in the last 5 years.^{68/} Admittedly no kind of race is to education right but nevertheless now

Finally, there is the problem of language. While Spanish-speaking pupils are learning English, other children are studying regular subjects.^{69/}

Many teachers do not speak Spanish. Spanish-speaking pupils unable to make themselves understood, are often compelled to retreat into their own world and isolate themselves from their teachers (and from other pupils).^{70/}

At this Commission's hearings in Phoenix, Arizona, a witness testified that Spanish-speaking pupils were reprimanded and punished for speaking Spanish in the school grounds and classrooms. This "approach on the part of the schools immediately puts in the child's mind that the Spanish language is inferior--not socially acceptable, since you cannot use it... in public; and it is to be used only in the privacy of the home."^{71/} In cooperation with the League of the United Latin-American Citizens, the State of Arizona in 1962 inaugurated the 'Little School' of the 400.^{72/} This is a project designed to teach pre-school Spanish-speaking children 400 basic words in English.^{73/}

- 68/ N.Y. Times, Dec. 10, 1963, p. 34L.
- 69/ Rand, The Puerto Rican 111-16 (1958).
- 70/ Hearings in Phoenix, Ariz., Before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 88 (1962) (hereinafter cited as Phoenix Hearings).
- 71/ Ibid.

Source: The New York City Board of Education has also attempted to meet the English language deficiency challenge. Its Puerto Rican Study, 1953-57

was concerned with methods of teaching English to Spanish-speaking children.

The report concluded that knowledge of Spanish was not essential to

teaching English, but recognized the importance of teachers having an ade-

^{72/} understanding of the Puerto Rican culture and background. The board has also organized a special group of bilingual teachers to work with classroom teachers and Puerto Rican pupils and parents and help accelerate adjustment.

^{73/} Experiments with demonstration schools have been successful.

Census data on educational achievement for Standard Metropolitan

Statistical Areas (SMSA), in five Southwestern States indicate that the

Spanish-speaking have less formal education than Anglos. Colorado and New

Mexico have the lowest percentages of Spanish-speaking who have not com-

^{plet}
pleted 4 years of school. In 10 out of 15 Texas SMSA's 40 percent or more of the Spanish-speaking have not completed 4 years of school. Eight out of

^{74/} California SMSA's have 20 percent or more in this category. Only in

Miami and Newark have more than 20 percent of Spanish-speaking who

have not completed 4 years of school.

^{72/} Board of Education (New York City, N.Y.), The Puerto Rican Study, 1953-1957 at 96, 99 (1958). For comment on the N.Y. study see Senior, op. cit. supra note 69, at 111-13.

^{73/} Morse, Schools of Tomorrow - Today 41-59 (1960).

^{74/} See App. A, table 6.

(published in 1960 as Report to Congress) (HQG) 93

12/12/12/

than 15 percent of the Spanish-speaking of Puerto Rican origin completed

75/ high school. Nonwhites generally fare better in educational attainment

76/ than the Spanish-speaking. The results of this survey indicated

that both white and Negroes at Employment but Negroes were more vitalized

etc. Fifty percent of the questionnaires received in connection with this

survey indicated some type of employment discrimination against Spanish-

77/ speaking persons. Most of the persons interviewed identified such problems as inability to attain higher status jobs and difficulty in getting employment.

Some also included differential wages, and longer and less satisfactory work hours.

78/ A history of the employment patterns of the Spanish-speaking in the

United States would, until the turn of the century, be concerned primarily

with agricultural and unskilled laborers. With the expansion of industry in

the Midwest and West and the urbanization of the Southwest which began during

79/ World War I, many Spanish-speaking people came from Mexico and so

80/ ~~in the Southwestern United States there was a great deal of discrimination against Spanish-speaking people~~

75/ See App. A, table 7.

76/ See App. A, tables 6 and 7.

81/ Of the 174 questionnaires received from the 5 Southwestern States,

102 answered "Yes" to the question: "Do you know of any cases of discrimination during the past two years in . . . employment?"; 51

answered "No"; 14 answered "Don't Know"; and 7 did not respond.

82/ ~~in the Southwestern United States there was a great deal of discrimination against Spanish-speaking people~~

83/ ~~in the Southwestern United States there was a great deal of discrimination against Spanish-speaking people~~

84/ ~~in the Southwestern United States there was a great deal of discrimination against Spanish-speaking people~~

85/ ~~in the Southwestern United States there was a great deal of discrimination against Spanish-speaking people~~

86/ ~~in the Southwestern United States there was a great deal of discrimination against Spanish-speaking people~~

obtained opportunities for work in a variety of industries. But for the majority, it was at the level of unskilled work. The three main industries open to the Spanish-speaking in the Midwest were the railroads, the steel industry and the meat-packing industry. It is estimated that the Mexican employees in the Chicago and Calumet regions in 1928 numbered from 13,000 to 15,000.^{78/} With the coming of the depression in 1929, many of the employment opportunities in the Midwest ended and many of the Spanish-speaking returned either to the Southwest or Mexico.^{79/}

In the Southwest the Spanish-speaking have, to a large extent, supplied the unskilled labor pool. In many instances there has been a double standard of wages. They have seldom been organized effectively. Certain types of employment have not been traditionally open to them.^{80/} Mainland Spanish-speaking persons of Puerto Rican origin earn less on the average and are among the last hired and the first fired. But the extent to which this is directly attributable to discrimination or is a consequence of the complexity of forces that afflict migrants who speak little or no English, have little formal education, and have limited manual

^{78/} Taylor, "Mexican Labor in the United States, Chicago and the Calumet Region," 7 Univ. of Calif. Publications in Economics 25, 70 (1932).

^{79/} Marden and Meyer, op. cit. supra note 3, at 120-42.

^{80/} In the recession of 1953-54, "one prosperous Ohio Puerto Rican community of around 3,000 shrank to 900." Senior, op. cit. supra note 26, at 61.

Since Operation Bootstrap began in the late 1940's many residents of Puerto Rico have come to the mainland seeking jobs in order to improve their living standards. Even the migrant farm laborer can hope to save as much in 6 months of farm work on the mainland as he could hope to earn in a year on the island. As migration increased after World War II, the Puerto Rican government became aware of abusive practices by labor contractors. Corrective legislation was passed in 1947 and 1948. Government offices to assist migrants and receiving communities were first opened in New York City and Chicago. The Migration Division of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor presently maintains twelve mainland offices.^{81/} Originally established only to protect the interests of Puerto Rican migrant laborers, they soon began to function also as employment agencies. Major industries and businesses now call the migration office when they have job openings. It offers trained Spanish-speaking personnel to act as intermediaries between potential workers and employers. It also coordinates the efforts of local agencies and helps new arrivals adjust to life on the mainland.

-
- 81/ Ferreras "The Puerto Ricans in Seasonal Agricultural Work," Proceedings of the Eleventh Conference of the National Catholic Council for the Spanish Speaking, Milwaukee, Wis. 56 (May 1962). Mr. Ferreras is director of the Chicago Office of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Dept. of Labor. Migration Division (Dept. of Labor, Puerto Rico), Facts and Figures (1963).

Approved for distribution by the Puerto Rico State Planning Board
and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rican Department of
Labor, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Puerto Rican Department of
(AES) Social and Economic Action Council of Puerto Rico, and the Puerto Rican
(P.R.) State Planning Board, and the Puerto Rican Department of Labor.

Where Puerto Ricans are members of unions, they are usually passive members. The language barrier and different cultural orientation frequently result in their remaining apart from the complexities of membership in associations.^{82/}

The improvement in the economic situation of the Puerto Rican can be

attributed in large part to this Nation's era of general prosperity and

to State fair employment practices laws.^{83/} The major breakthrough in employ-

ment to date has been in government.^{84/} Discrimination based on color, race,

religion or national origin in hiring, assignment, inservice training and

promotion by Federal, State and local governments is contrary to the 5th

and 14th Amendments to the Constitution.^{85/} In 1948 the Federal Government

established administrative machinery to enforce this prohibition.^{86/} Since

1943 the Federal Government has banned employment discrimination by Federal

contractors, requiring inclusion of a nondiscrimination clause in all contracts

for work or services performed for the Government.^{87/} The President's

~~...and which still do not allow discrimination by the various contractors.~~

82/ Rand, op. cit. supra note 69, at 150.

83/ See Handlin, op. cit. supra note 25, at 69.

84/ Senior, op. cit. supra note 26, at 61.

85/ The Congress first adopted the principle of "merit employment" in the Civil Service Act of 1883. See 3 1961 Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Employment 6 (1961).

86/ Exec. Order No. 9980, 13 Fed. Reg. 4311 (1948). Several State and local governments have taken similar action in regard to government and government-contractors. See The Potomac Institute, State-Executive Authority to Promote Civil Rights: An Action Program for the 1960's 17-22 (1963).

87/ Exec. Order No. 9346, 8 Fed. Reg. 7183 (1943).

Committee" on Equal Employment Opportunity is charged with insuring equal opportunity in the Federal service, by Government contractors, and in certain

federally assisted construction projects.^{88/}

The President's Committee has actively concerned itself with equal employment opportunities for the Spanish-speaking peoples in the United States. It has printed and distributed a brochure in Spanish explaining

its functions and the procedure for filing complaints.^{89/} It conducts an-

nual surveys of Spanish-speaking employees in the Federal service, ^{90/} and in

four selected Northeastern States^{91/} and in five Southwestern States.^{92/}

On November 14, 1963, the Committee held in Los Angeles a conference of community leaders from the five Southwestern States. The conference was an

outgrowth of President Lyndon B. Johnson's appearance before the Mexican-

American and Mexican communities in the Southwest.

^{88/} Exec. Order No. 10925, 26 Fed. Reg. 1977 (1961), 6 Race Rel. L. Rep. 9 (1961). Between December 1961 and January 1962, the Committee received 41 complaints from Spanish-speaking persons alleging discrimination in

construction of buildings and other facilities undertaken wholly or in part as a result of Federal grant-in-aid programs and it was empowered

to withhold funds when workers are discriminated against. Exec. Order

No. 11114, 28 Fed. Reg. 6485 (1963).

^{89/} President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, Igualdad en las

Oportunidades de Empleo Para Todos Los Ciudadanos de los Estados Unidos

(1963). Between March 1961 and November 1963, the Committee received 41

complaints from Spanish-speaking persons alleging employment discrimina-

tion in the 5 Southwestern States: (Ariz.), 31 of 139 complaints received

from the State; Calif., 41 of 139; Colo., 2 of 128; N.M., 8 of 14; Tex.

1 of 124 of 139; Wash., 1 of 139.

^{90/} See App. A, table 15.

^{91/} See App. A, table 16.

^{92/} See App. A, table 17.

American Education Conference in California on August 19, 1963, "At that time I told the leaders of the Mexican-American community that I would arrange a conference that would enable them to sit down with officials of the Federal government in workshops and work out effective steps to open up equal opportunity for all Americans," the then Vice President said.

Dr. Joaquin B. Gonzalez, a San Antonio physician, and industrialist Edgar F. Kaiser were co-chairmen. Both are public members of the President's Committee

on Equal Employment Opportunity.

In addition to the efforts on the Federal level, 25 States have enacted

enforceable fair employment practices laws prohibiting discrimination by

private employers and labor unions. Inquiries were sent to the agencies

responsible for administering these laws in each of the 25 States asking the

number of Spanish-speaking on the agency staffs and the number and disposition

of cases involving the Spanish-speaking. Thirteen agencies responded giving

information as follows:

President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity News Release, EEO

Number 1132, Sept. 27, 1963.

94/ See Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson Before the Regional

Conference of Community Leaders on Equal Employment Opportunity, Los

Angeles, Nov. 14, 1963. See also note concerning the

95/ The States are N.J., N.Y. (1945); Mass. (1946); Conn. (1947); N.M.,

Ore., R.I., Wash. (1949); Mich., Minn., Pa. (1955); Colo., Wis. (1957);

Alaska, Calif., Ohio (1959); Del. (1960); Idaho, Ill., Kan., Mo.

96/ (1961); Hawaii, Ind., Iowa, D.C. (1963). See Hightland Park v. FEPC, Ill.

N.W. 2d 797 (Mich. 1961) (sustaining the constitutionality of Mich.'s FEP law). The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that there is no conflict between these laws and related Federal directives. Colorado Anti-Discrimination Commission v. Continental Air Lines, 372 U.S. 714 (1963), reversing, 368 P. 2d 970 (Colo. 1962).

91

96/

the following information:

Number of total personnel do you have at Headquarters personnel
Total agency staff 348

Statistics re specifications concerning the above personnel showing the number of
Spanish-speaking on staff 11

Below classification shows cumulative monthly count of persons with qualified to enter
Number of complaints docketed

involving Spanish-speaking 619

and the percentage of these cases which were settled by adjustment or
Disposition of the cases: 27/

Indicates to percentage which were settled and in settlement which resulted

Satisfactory adjustment 243
 and those successfully resolved by Spanish-speaking staff members

Insufficient evidence of discrimination 35
 and those which were not referred to the Office of Civil Rights

No evidence of discrimination 247

Accusation filed 30
 and those which were referred to the Office of Civil Rights

Open or pending 21
 and those which were referred to the Office of Civil Rights

Failure to proceed or complaint withdrawn 15
 and those which were referred to the Office of Civil Rights

An important obstacle to overcome in securing equal employment
 is the lack of sufficient educational and vocational training and cultural level.

"The Puerto Ricans have less and Spanish-speaking witness said "Puerto Ricans cultural level
 is quite low and their educational and vocational training is very limited
 and they are not able to compete with other groups in the labor market.
 An important obstacle to overcome in securing equal employment
 is the lack of sufficient educational and vocational training and cultural level
 and they are not able to compete with other groups in the labor market.
 Another witness said: "Puerto Ricans are employed
 and those which were referred to the Office of Civil Rights

96/ N.Y. accounts for about two-thirds of all figures.
 and those which were referred to the Office of Civil Rights

97/ These categories are not mutually exclusive. Puerto Ricans in New York
 account for 475 of the above cases during the period 1945-60. California
 and Colorado account for 126 of the cases, most of which are recent.

98/ Hearings in Newark, N.J., Before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

467 (1962) (hereinafter cited as Newark Hearings). This witness further
 stated that the "biggest Puerto Rican problem is related to the areas
 of education, community organization, and family services." Ibid.

by industry, principally in the lower job classifications. There is little
doubt that if trained technicians such as engineers, architects, or chemists
were to apply from among the Puerto Rican citizens, such individuals would
be employed by industry." — But a government official testifying at the

Commission's hearings in Los Angeles stated that "past patterns of discrimination in employment have discouraged Negro and Mexican-American youth from

seeking training in many of the areas which now represent the greatest
opportunity."

In percent unemployed, type of occupation, or annual income, figures

indicate that Spanish-speaking have a lower socio-economic status than the

total white population. Comparing the male unemployment rates in the

Southwest, the nonwhite population has the highest in Arizona, California,
New Mexico and Texas, the Spanish-speaking has the next highest rate, and

the total white population has the lowest. The Spanish-speaking of
Puerto Rican origin have higher unemployment rates than the Anglo population
in seven SMSA's with high Puerto Rican concentrations. In only two
cities surveyed do nonwhites have higher unemployment rates than Puerto
Ricans.

99/ Newark Hearings 210.

100/ California Hearings 336. "Employment of . . . minorities is directly affected by the amount and kind of training and education available to them, and the development of incentive and motivation which leads them to take advantage of such opportunities." Id. at 343.

101/ See App. A, table 8. — U.S. Office of Population, U.N. Bureau of Statistics, 102/ See App. A, table 9. (utilizing Newell as basic information) (1961).

comes out of Section 11 molding much damage done to us must be done

103/ "concerned against the most discriminatory practices throughout the

and it cannot be made range of AMR because not enough data about AMR

^{101/} The occupational distribution of the Spanish-speaking in five South-

^{102/} western States in 1950 and 1960 indicated that they were concentrated in

the less skilled and lower paid occupations, and that only a few were in the

skilled and professional occupations. The State of New Mexico has pro-

portionally twice as many Spanish-speaking in high status jobs as have

^{103/} any of the other States, and fewer in the low status categories. To integrate

data for the total white population in the five Southwestern States has a higher

-median family income than either the Spanish-speaking or the nonwhite popula-

^{104/} tion. Taking the percent of families with incomes under \$1,000 and of

\$10,000 and over, the relationship remains the same. In the \$10,000 and over

^{105/} category, the percentages for the total white population as compared to the

Spanish-speaking and nonwhite is at least double. ARTHUR THOMAS

In both 1950 and 1960 the Puerto Rican population in New York had a

lower median income than either the total white or the nonwhite population.

^{106/} In 1949 the median individual income in New York City for Puerto Ricans was

\$1,647. The figure for whites was \$2,517 and for Negroes, \$1,707. The

^{107/} See App. A, table 10.

^{108/} See App. A, table 11.

^{109/} See App. A, table 13.

^{110/} See U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Final Report P-C No. 32 and
Special Report P-E No. 3D.

(Section 81, and of spurious individuals in Section 40, (above) above
(Section 41, can not be profitably pursued in 41, and the two visits below
below the 40, account, notwithstanding the merit of some of the
works already studied, could easily be done in 40, on account of the limited
number of errors which may be found in them.)

Below the 40, account, notwithstanding the merit of some of the
works already studied, could easily be done in 40, on account of the limited
number of errors which may be found in them.)

1959 family income figures for selected SMSA's again show the Puerto Rican

107/ to earn the least. In the under \$1,000 and the \$10,000 and over P

108/ categories, the Puerto Rican fairs poorly. See CQCI in second section

and also with regard to the Housing section of the CQCI.

- Segregated housing is a part of the pattern of discrimination against

any minority. The problem of housing discrimination includes governmental

109/ support of residential segregation, the inability to obtain loans for certain

properties, the refusal of some real estate brokers to show certain properties

to Spanish-speaking home seekers, the charging of higher rents to the Spanish-

110/ speaking, and the outright refusal by landlords, builders, and homeowners to

rent or sell to them. Fifty-four percent of those who responded to the CQCI

questionnaire indicated some type of housing discrimination. See CQCI

111/ At its Newark hearings the Commission heard testimony that "housing is

is one commodity that cannot be bought or rented on the open market by

Negroes and Puerto Ricans . . . without restrictions, subterfuges, excessive

110/ prices, or limited choice." In New York City a representative of the

111/ Council of Puerto Rican and Spanish-American Organizations of Greater New

York told the Commission that "we are primarily concerned . . . with the

107/ See App. A, table 12.

.01 cited at Newark 208 VOL

108/ See App. A, table 14.

.01 cited at Newark 208 VOL

109/ See CQCI. The types of discrimination indicated were: segregated sections or

.01 cited at Newark 208 VOL

neighborhoods, 30 percent; lack of facilities (sewers, street lights, paved roads), 24 percent; inability to obtain mortgage loans, 13 percent; racial restrictive covenants, 11 percent; differential rents, 11 percent; other, 10 percent. From 5 Southwestern States, 61 percent indicated housing discrimination as did 57 percent from those States where there is a substantial Puerto Rican population.

110/ Newark Hearings 211.

seen in recent years since the post-war housing situation. . . . This scarcity of housing, complicated by dis-

cri "discriminatory rental practices toward Puerto Ricans," results in numerous evils.

planned to reduce old neighborhood markets . . . What was once a free housing market in the 1930's is today a greatly

more limited and disadvantageous one." 111/ At its California hearings, the

Commission heard that: "Residential segregation based on race is a general

of short lived racial rule which has been a dominant social and economic

rule in towns and cities of the West. It was strengthened and given moral

sanction by unconstitutional judicial enforcement of racial restrictive

covenants which were in effect from 1919 to 1948. Nowhere in the Nation

"anywhere I visited about the country there were

were there as many of these restrictive covenants which included Negroes or

or below, Japanese, Negroes, Chinese, and Orientals, as in California." 112/

In 1948 the Supreme Court of the United States declared that State

courts enforcement of racially restrictive covenants violates the 14th

Amendment. 113/ Shortly after this decision a California appellate court

reversed the ruling of a lower court enjoining a home buyer of Mexican

ancestry from using or occupying a parcel of property in Alameda County

because it was subject to certain restrictions, one of which read: "No

persons of Mexican ancestry shall be allowed to buy, own, hold,

111/ Hearings in New York, N.Y., Atlanta, Ga., and Chicago, Ill., Before

the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Housing 387 (1959).

112/ California Hearings 207.

113/ Shelley v. Kraemer, 334 U.S. 1 (1948). The Court did not, however, declare racial restrictive covenants null-and-void and they still appear in many deeds and other instruments involving real property.

Four States have enacted legislation nullifying such covenants: Minn. (1953); Colo. (1959); Calif. (1961); N.Y. (1962).

person or persons of the Mexican race, or other than the Caucasian race

114/

"... shall use or occupy any building" except as "domestic servants."

A more recent New York lawsuit further illustrates the problem of housing

discrimination against Spanish-speaking peoples. A Puerto Rican family con-

tracted to buy a house from a builder in a residential section of Massapequa,

Nassau County on Long Island. The family alleged that an individual went to

the builder, expressed anger at the impending sale to "colored persons," and

threatened injury to them and the builder. The Puerto Ricans cancelled the

contract to buy because they were "put in fear of their personal safety,"

and sued the person who made the threats for damages. The court denied a

motion to dismiss the suit stating that the "ultimate purpose of keeping

'colored people' out of the neighborhood could not be accomplished unless the

immediate objective of putting them in fear for their safety first succeeded."

115/

Statistically the Spanish-speaking family is most likely to be confined

to substandard, crowded housing. Deteriorating units are common among homes

occupied by Spanish-speaking than by Anglos in all 31 SMSA's in the five South-

western States. None of the SMSA's have as much as 15 percent deteriorating

114/ Matthews v. Andrade, 198 P.2d 66 (Calif. Dist. Ct. App. 1948).

115/ Ruiz v. Bertolotti, 236 N.Y.S. 2d 854 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 1962), 8 Race

Rel. L. Rep. 196 (1963), aff'd: N.Y.S. 2d 77 (App. Div. 1963).

The trial of this case was pending as of Dec. 31, 1963.

(SDG) (P.D.) (D.C.L) (R.M.B) (R.G.L) (R.W.L)

(SDG) (P.D.) (D.C.L) (R.M.B) (R.G.L) (R.W.L)

"not-for-housing occupied by Anglos," whereas 16 of the 31 SMSA's have over 25

percent deteriorating or dilapidated housing; among nonwhite occupied homes 100 percent deteriorating for housing occupied by Spanish-speaking. In all

31 SMSA's there was at least twice the percentage of dilapidated units

~~for Spanish-speaking occupied homes~~ ^{116/} as for Spanish-speaking occupied homes as for those occupied by Anglos.

A large minority and, in one case, the majority of Spanish-speaking

~~occupied~~

people of Puerto Rican origin in the seven SMSA's live in deteriorating

or dilapidated housing. A comparison of homes occupied by Puerto Rican

and nonwhite families with those occupied by Anglo families indicates dis-

Dilapidated units make up .com^{117/} of nonwhite occupied units in all of the SMSA's. In no major city in which Puerto Ricans

are numerous or scattered at ~~anywhere~~ less than ~~one~~ percent of nonwhite units are found in substantial numbers do as many as 20 percent live in dwelling

units with .50 or less persons per room. In every instance nonwhites and

Anglos have more living space.

To further illustrate the difference in living conditions and spaces available

In 25 of the 31 SMSA's in five Southwestern States, over 30 percent and

as high as 72 percent of the Spanish-speaking live in dwellings with 1.01

and less than 1.00 square feet per person. The highest proportion in Anglo-occupied units

occupies an average house of 1100 square feet per person ^{118/} while the Spanish-speaking with more than 1 person per room is 16 percent.

As noted earlier from data in

116/ See App. A, table 18. The terms "deteriorating" and "dilapidated"

~~as used herein are defined in the U.S. Census of Housing: 1960,~~

Final Reports HC(1) Series.

(SRR) Q10. ~~com~~

117/ See App. A, table 19.

118/ See App. A, table 21.

119/ See App. A, table 20.

~~as used herein are defined in the U.S. Census of Housing: 1960,~~

~~Final Reports HC(1) Series.~~

46

After supporting discriminatory housing practices and segregated neighborhood patterns for many years, the Federal government in 1962 declared its policy to withhold support. On November 20, 1962, President John F. Kennedy issued an Executive order directing Federal agencies to act to prevent discrimination in the sale or rental of "residential property and related facilities" owned by the Federal government or aided or assisted by it.

This action directly involved the public housing and urban renewal programs and affected builders, lending institutions and apartment owners which receive FHA and VA mortgage insurance assistance. The order also established the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing to promote coordination of agency implementation activity and to encourage educational programs. In addition 11 States and numerous municipalities have enacted fair housing laws prohibiting discrimination in the sale and rental of private residential properties. Persons interviewed thought that lack of adequate housing was the basic problem and that the solution to this problem would bring about the solution to such other problems as delinquency, health and broken homes.

120/ Exec. Order No. 11063, 27 Fed. Reg. 11527 (1962), 7 Race Rel. L.

Rep. 1019 (1962).
121/ Colo., Conn., Mass., Ore. (1959); Minn., N.H., N.J., N.Y., Pa. (1961); Alaska (1962); Calif. (1963). The cities (outside of the above States) that have enacted fair housing ordinances are: Albuquerque, N.M.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Madison, Wis.; Oberlin, Ohio; Tacoma, Wash.; Toledo, Ohio; Yellow Springs, Ohio; Washington, D.C.

Administration of Justice

The problem of differential treatment before the law is not one that

is unique to people of minority status, but it would appear that persons

involving self-government are considered among
within the lower socio-economic grouping -- people without financial means,
without influence in the community, without someone to speak for them, with-

out legal or qualified advice from someone who
out counsel -- generally are more likely to be deprived of their civil rights
in the administration of justice.

122/

in the administration of justice.

This Commission's California State Advisory Committee reported in 1963

123/ the Mexican bar college carried out a survey that found

"In general, the Spanish-speaking population of New

echoes the complaints of the Negroes. These
people feel that they are the objects of unequal
treatment by law enforcement agencies and that insufficient effort is made by
expended by governmental organizations (including
the police) to communicate with their groups.

They also complain about alleged employment discrimination.

Spanish-speaking groups do not feel that their

and other social organizations

122/ "The chief victims of lawless policemen are 'little people' who
lack purse, power and pull." Deutsch, The Trouble With Cops 73
(1955).

123/ Calif. Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights,
Report on California: Police-Minority Group Relations 37 (1963).

"Studies in the '30's and '40's document the unequal application of
law with regard to the Spanish-speaking. See McWilliams, op. cit. supr.
note 4, at 227-43; Griffith, American Me (1948); Gamio, Mexican
Immigration to the United States: A Study of Human Migration and
Adjustment (1930).

and to Spanish with similar periodic publications and "who are

"not represented in the justice system."

racist and just as bad as the Negro's, because they are the subject of copies of their problems are complicated by the additional reason. Evidently directly often -- because of the fact that many speak mainly Spanish. Often, they do not apparently, Spanish-speaking persons literally do not understand what is happening to them in right little right to be given off of their own language -- because we contacts with the police, district attorneys, and some courts."

Commissioner of Puerto Rican told this Commission that it was her belief "that the treatment of the Puerto Ricans by the police and municipal courts in Newark is fair, and just, and in keeping with the rights and safeguards granted to citizens under the Constitution of the United States of America. . . .

I think the major cause of seeming injustice has been the lack of communication, and I divide the lack of communication in two broad areas: One is the lack of communication because of language. . . . The other . . . --and this may be more common--is the cultural barrier that makes people not able to communicate.

124/ Newark Hearings 461, 462. Another witness stated:

"Certain positive steps have been taken by

the city government. A Spanish interpreter has been appointed to serve in the municipal court. There is a Cuban policeman on the

police force who speaks Spanish, and some police

(125) 125/ Newark Hearings 461, 462. Another witness stated that the "treatment

of minority groups on the part of the personnel of the Newark Police

Department is as good as you could expect through their limited training

in community relations." Id. at 470. See also note 124.

125/ Newark Hearings 467. A Los Angeles witness lamented the fact that there

was only "one Spanish-speaking attorney within the personnel of the public defender system." California Hearings 307.

Spanish-speaking officers took a conversational Spanish course
last year.

For DDC "There is room for plenty of improvement."

"The police and courts should further their
efforts to bridge the problem of communica-

tion. Some suggestions in this area are the assignment
of Spanish-speaking officers serving
in areas of the city that are heavily populated

by Puerto Ricans; a police interpreter available
when arrests or bookings on non-English-speaking

Puerto Ricans are made; the courts should pay a
Spanish-speaking lawyer.

Of 1,328 complaints of police brutality received by the United States

Department of Justice during the period January 1, 1958 to June 30, 1960,

126/ 10 were known to be from Spanish-speaking persons. These 10 were included in the 461 complaints received from Negro and other minorities.

In some cases Spanish-speaking persons have been alleged victims of police misconduct. Other cases have involved charges of prejudice in the courts.

Still others have arisen out of protests against the practice of excluding Spanish-speaking persons from juries.

(126/ 127/ See e.g., Rochin v. California, 342 U.S. 165 (1952); Gallegos v. Nebraska

342 U.S. 55 (1951) (involving an arrest in Tex. and extradition to Neb.).

128/ See e.g., Cruz v. People, 368 P. 2d 774 (Colo. 1962); People v. Agron, 176 N.E. 2d 556 (N.Y. 1961); Reyes v. Arthur Tickle Engineering Works, 152 N.Y.S. 2d 698 (App. Div. 1956), aff'd., 144 N.E. 2d 723 (N.Y. 1957).

129/ An early New Mexico ruling denied the claim of a defendant that he had not received a fair trial because all the jurors were Mexicans and none of them understood the English language (all the proceedings were orally interpreted to them in Spanish). Territory of New Mexico v. Romine, 2 N.M. 114 (N.M. 1881).

Prior to 1954 the courts uniformly held that the prohibition against
 the systematic exclusion of a racial group from jury service did not

"include and apply to members of different nationalities." Mexicans or Latin-Americans are not of a race different than white,^{130/} a Texas court said.^{131/}

In a landmark decision the Supreme Court of the United States extended the
 application of federal laws to areas of

jury exclusion rule to Spanish-speaking peoples. The Court held that the

protection of the 14th Amendment in this regard is not limited to classes of
 "white" and "Negro" but includes any class against which distinctions are

made in the community and which make up a substantial portion of the popula-

^{132/} Charges of jury exclusion, however, continued to arise.

^{133/} See Strauder v. West Virginia, 100 U.S. 303 (1880); Norris v. Alabama,
 294 U.S. 587 (1935).

^{131/} See Rogers v. State, 236 S.W. 2d 141, 143 (Tex. Crim. App. 1951). Accord,

Salazar v. State, 193 S.W. 2d 211 (Tex. Crim. App. 1946); Sanchez v. State, 181 S.W. 2d 87 (Tex. Crim. App. 1944). Contra, Juarez v. State,

277 S.W. 1091 (Tex. Crim. App. 1925) (jury exclusion of Roman Catholics).

^{132/} Hernandez v. Texas, 347 U.S. 475 (1954).

^{133/} See, e.g., Bary v. United States, 248 F. 2d 201 (10th Cir. 1957) (Colo.); People v. Agron, supra note 128; Moralez v. State, 320 S.W. 2d 340

(1955) (Tex. Crim. App. 1959); Montoya v. People, 345 P. 2d 1062 (Colo. 1959); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 318 P. 2d 662 (Kan. 1957); Ramirez v. Texas, 293 S.W. 2d

(1956) (Tex. Crim. App. 1956); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

(1957) (Tex. Crim. App. 1957); Montoya v. State (v. Lopez), 322 S.W. 2d 816

Other participation by Spanish-speaking peoples in the instrumentalities of justice appears to be minimal. The selection of Judge Carlos M. Teran in 1959 was the first appointment of a person of Mexican descent to the

134/ superior court in Los Angeles County. Id. at 334. In 1960, the Good Neighbor Commission's "Public Accommodations" study found that

"Jacob still has a long way to go." Public Accommodations, 10 Texas Good Neighbor Commission's Hearings, Vol. I, at 334. The report found that discrimination in places of public accommodation against Spanish-speaking peoples varies from State to State and even within States. Through

legislation at both the State and municipal level and through the work of

135/ private organizations and the efforts of such agencies as the Texas Good

Neighbor Commission, most of this type of discrimination is gradually being eliminated. Thirty-one percent of the responses to the questionnaire indi-

136/ cated discrimination in public accommodations. Id. At witness at this Commission's Phoenix hearings recalled that 15 or 20 years ago the Spanish-speaking

134/ California Hearings 319. In 1959 the Los Angeles Police Department had a Spanish-speaking captain. Id. at 334.

135/ See The Texas Good Neighbor Commission, Texas: Friend and Neighbor (1961).

136/ Forty-seven percent indicated no discrimination; 11.4 percent, "Don't know;" 9.5 percent did not respond. For 5 Southwestern States, 34.4 percent responded "Yes"; 45.9 percent, "No"; 10.9 percent, "Don't know"; and 8.6 percent did not respond. As to the type of facilities, the "Yes" responses were subdivided as follows: Transportation, 19.3 percent (SW, 18.3); Health, 8.2 percent (SW, 9.7); Recreation, 3.1 percent (SW, 4.0); Business, 0.6 percent (SW, 1.2); Social entertainment, 0.6 percent (SW, 1.2).

population was refused access to certain of the city's recreational parks,

137/ swimming pools, restaurants, hotels and theaters.

One of the court decisions in this area involved the municipally owned

and operated recreational facilities in San Bernardino, California.

Federal district court found that all persons of "Mexican or Latin descent

have been denied admission to, and the use, benefit and enjoyment of said

swimming pool, plunge, bath house, and facilities within said park and play-

ground" and that "such denial of admission, use, benefit and enjoyment is

138/

based solely upon the fact that petitioners are of Mexican or Latin descent."

ruled. The court ruled that the denials violated the equal protection clause of the

14th Amendment and enjoined the city officials.

Thirty-one States and numerous municipalities have enacted statutes and

ordinances barring discrimination and segregation in privately owned places

139/

of public accommodation. Many of these laws have been in effect for a

number of years but have only recently been vigorously enforced.

137/ Phoenix Hearings 86.

138/ Lopez v. Seccombe, 71 F. Supp. 769, 771 (S.D. Calif. 1944).

These States are Mass. (1865); Kan., N.Y. (1874); Conn., Iowa, N.J.,

Ohio (1884); Colo., Ill., Ind., Mich., Minn., Neb., R.I. (1885); Pa.

(1887); Wash. (1890); Wis. (1895); Calif. (1897); Ore. (1953); Mont.,

N.M. (1955); Vt. (1957); Alaska, Maine (1959); Idaho, N.H., N.D.,

E.Q.L. (1961); Del., Md., S.D. (1963). The municipalities (outside of

I.L.S. (1961); (S.I. (1961) (1961); (S.I. (1961) (1961)

the above States) are: El Paso, Tex.; Kansas City, Mo.; Louisville, Ky.

St. Joseph, Mo.; St. Louis, Mo.; University City, Mo.; and Washington, D.C.

(S.I. (1961) (1961)

PART III
Public opinion relating to policies of the United States concerning the Spanish-speaking people of the United States
Summary

(1) The history of the Spanish-speaking people of the United States differs in some respects from that of other peoples who have come to this country.

Descendants of the original Spanish settlers in the Southwest and in Puerto Rico had well defined social institutions by the time the United States gained dominion over them. In the Southwest these institutions have been continually reinforced by a seemingly endless stream of immigrants and alien laborers from Mexico. The situation has been complicated by the fact that these new arrivals are customarily in the lowest socio-economic stratum.

By the time the major Puerto Rican migration began after World War II, the island's social institutions had begun to reflect contact with Anglo-American culture. As citizens of the United States in search of better economic opportunity, their migration was not unlike that of many rural mainlanders who yearly migrate to urban centers. But they do have a different language and culture and special Commonwealth agencies to assist them in adjusting.

The six million Spanish-speaking peoples of the United States have concentrated in California, Texas, New York, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Illinois and Florida. Their number is fast growing. It has doubled over the past ten years. They are, in general, educated less, employed less, working in lower job categories when employed, earning less, and living in poorer housing conditions than nonwhites.

THE CHIEF
The patterns of voting and political participation of Spanish-speaking
peoples

peoples vary widely. In a few areas they control local government. In other areas they hardly participate. There is some evidence of voting discrimination against them, but this appears to be due in part to language difficulties.

Schools attended by the Spanish-speaking have been segregated, often because of residential concentrations. Poorer training has lead to poorer employment opportunities. Language difficulties sometimes complicate the situation. The Spanish-speaking often group together in residence, renting more often than Anglos, getting less for their money and living more poorly.

Often in deteriorating, dilapidated and overcrowded housing without basic sanitary facilities. The situation is perpetuated by discriminatory practices.

The consequences include police mistreatment, differential arrest and conviction patterns, and exclusion from jury duty.

With rare exception the Spanish-speaking peoples' recourse to the courts, both Federal and State, has resulted in the redress of their grievances and more effective protection of their civil rights. Anti-discrimination legislation on both the State and municipal levels has

also aided these ends. Federal governmental agencies have shown an increased awareness of the civil rights problems of the Spanish-speaking and are taking steps better to protect these rights.

Individuals have usually taken my best efforts to improve the lot of all peoples.

• additional draft omitted below opinion section

APPENDIX A

Statistical Data

TABLES IN APPENDIX A

TABLE	REPORT
1. Spanish-Speaking Population of The United States and of The States: c. 1960	.01
2. Spanish Surname Population of Selected Standard Metropolitan Areas in Five Southwestern States: c. 1950 & c. 1960	.15
3. Puerto Rican Population Born in Puerto Rico and of Puerto Rican Parentage in Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas: c. 1960	.01
4. Proportion and Growth of Spanish Surname Population in Five Southwestern States: c. 1950-1960	.01
5. Child-Woman Ratio for Spanish Surname, Other White and Nonwhite, in Five Southwestern States: 1960	.01
6. Percent of Spanish Surname, Other White and Nonwhite Populations 25 Years or Over Who Have Completed Four Years of School or Less and Four Years of High School or More in Five Southwestern States	.01
7. Percent of Puerto Rican, Other White and Nonwhite Populations 25 Years or Over Completing Four Years or Less of School and Four Years or More of High School in Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas: 1960	.01
8. Percent Unemployed of Civilian Labor Force, By Sex, for Spanish Surname, Total White and Nonwhite Populations in Five Southwestern States, 1950-1960	.01
9. Percent Unemployed of Civilian Labor Force for The Total, Puerto Rican, Other White and Nonwhite Populations in Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas: 1960	.01

A. SPANISH IN SOUTHWESTERN STATES

TABLE

MIGRANT

10. Percent Distribution of Employed Spanish Surname Population, by Major Occupation Group, in Five Southwestern States: 1950-1960
-
11. Median Family Income of the Total White, Spanish Surname, and Nonwhite Populations in Five Southwestern States: 1960
-
12. Median Family Income, 1959, for Puerto Ricans, Other Whites and Nonwhites in Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas: 1960
-
13. Percent of Spanish Surname, Total White and Nonwhite Families Earning Under \$1,000 and \$10,000 or More in Five Southwestern States: 1960
-
14. Percent of Puerto Rican, Other White and Nonwhite Families Earning Under \$1,000 and \$10,000 or More in Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas: 1960
-
15. Minority Groups in Federal Employment, June 1962, Spanish-Speaking and Total Employment by Grade and Salary Groups
-
16. Minority Groups in Federal Employment, June 1962, Employees of Puerto Rican Origin in Selected States
-
17. Minority Groups in Federal Employment, June 1962, Employees of Mexican Origin in Selected States
-
18. Condition of Housing Units Occupied by Spanish Surname, Other White and Nonwhite Populations in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas in Five Southwestern States
-
19. Condition of Housing Units Occupied by Puerto Rican, Other White and Nonwhite Populations in Selected Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas: 1960

TABLE

20. Percent of Housing Units Occupied by Spanish Surname,
Other White and Nonwhite with .50 or Less Persons
Per Room and 1.01 or More Persons Per Room in Five
Southwestern States: 1960
21. Percent of Housing Units Occupied by Puerto Rican, Other
White and Nonwhite With .50 or Less Persons Per Room
and 1.01 or More Persons Per Room in Selected Standard
Metropolitan Statistical Areas: 1960

.00

መመሪያ የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ ይሸጋል

በመሆኑ ማረጋገጫ የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ

የዚህን አገልግሎት የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ

በመሆኑ ማረጋገጫ የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ

የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ

የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ

የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ

በመሆኑ ማረጋገጫ የዚህን አገልግሎት ተስተካክለ

51. New Jersey
52. Massachusetts
53. Connecticut

54. Rhode Island
55. New Hampshire

56. New York
57. New Jersey
58. Connecticut

SPANISH-SPEAKING POPULATION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE STATES: 1960

RANK	NAME OF STATE OR AREA	MEXICAN STOCK 1/ S. 1000	OTHER LATIN-AMERICAN STOCK 1/ S. 1000	TOTAL LATIN- AMERICAN STOCK 1/ S. 1000		SPANISH SURNAME 3/ S. 1000	PUERTO RICAN STOCK 2/ S. 1000	TOTAL SPANISH-SPEAKING POPULATION S. 1000
				580,679 005	2,316,671			
1. United States		1,735,992 736		580,679 005	2,316,671	1,899,402	892,513	5,108,586
2. Alabama		614 515		1,835 052	2,449	663	53,112	5,108,586
3. Alaska		592 347		342 350	7934	562	TC 21,496	5,108,586
4. Arizona		105,342 324		1,683 320	107,025	95,825	1,008	5,108,586
5. Arkansas		789 315		431 314	71,220	707	TC 1,427	5,108,586
6. California		695,643 354		73,469 354	769,112	656,674	28,108	1,453,894
7. Colorado		20,091 605		2,693 035	722,784	135,277	1,844	5,158,905
8. Connecticut		645 372		10,630 372	11,275	15,247	TC 26,522	5,108,586
9. Delaware		181 277		793 502	30,974	773	TC 1,747	5,108,586
10. District of Columbia		590 452		6,494 452	7,084	1,373	TC 8,457	5,108,586
11. Florida		3,928 174		89,190 174	93,118	19,535 174	TC 112,653 174	5,108,586
12. Georgia		759 227		2,801 227	30,560 227	2,334	5,894	5,108,586

Table 1 (continued)

AREA	MEXICAN STOCK 1/ (\$'000)	OTHER LATIN-AMERICAN STOCK 1/ (\$'000)	TOTAL LATIN- AMERICAN STOCK 1/ (\$'000)	SPANISH SURNAME 3/ (\$'000)	PUERTO RICAN STOCK 2/ (\$'000)	TOTAL SPANISH-SPEAKING (\$'000)
13. Hawaii 2/	260	722	988	1,630	4,289	5,919
14. Idaho 2/	101	3,341	3,442	603	3,686	3,686
15. Illinois 2/	63,063	10,114,785	10,777,848	36,081	113,929	113,929
16. Indiana 2/	30,031	14,041	44,072	5,626	1,715	23,933
17. Iowa 2/	22,113	3,374	25,487	1,224	4,598	7,824
18. Kansas 2/	10,12,972	151,697	14,669	30	532	532
19. Kentucky	10,348	527	10,361,130	1,657	32,852	1,376
20. Louisiana	2,3,714	10,728	13,728	14,442	1,935	16,377
21. Maine 2/	212	1,632	1,844	626	838	403
22. Maryland 2/	11,22,336	1,345	12,566,602	57,947	1,205	63,229
23. Massachusetts	10,1,305	16,278	17,583	1,214	2,717	22,800
24. Michigan	2,298	8,726	10,024	1,012	1,012	1,012
25. Minnesota	3,436	1,698	5,134	387	3,806	5,521
26. Mississippi	674	1,174	1,848	301	2,149	2,149
27. Missouri	8,159	2,258	10,417	940	11,357	11,357

Table 1 (continued)

AREA NAME	MEXICAN STOCK 1/ STOCK 2/	OTHER LATIN-AMERICAN STOCK 1/ STOCK 2/	SPANISH SURNAMES STOCK 1/ STOCK 2/	TOTAL LATIN-	
				AMERICAN	SPANISH SPEAKING
28.5. Montana	1,852	458	2,310	2053	2,363
29.6. Nebraska	5,858	5597	6,455	52,333	6,788
30.7. Nevada	2,833	341	3,374	3,179	3,553
31.8. New Hampshire	103	346	3486	3,212	3,601
32.9. New Jersey	2,280	281	30,531	35,351	85,882
33.10. New Mexico	34,459	922	35,381	235,342	271,156
34.11. New York	10,074	233,271	243,345	642,622	885,967
35.12. North Carolina	1,914	1253	1,251	1,265	1,866
36.13. North Dakota	361	179	540	5,131	5,688
37.14. Ohio	9,960	7,522	17,482	13,940	31,422
38.15. Oklahoma	4,316	1,806	6,122	11,398	17,520
39. Oregon	3,119	1,392	4,511	233	4,744
40. Pennsylvania	4,195	13,869	18,064	21,206	39,270
41. Rhode Island	208	2,002	2,210	447	2,657

Table 1 (continued)

PO. AREA	NAME	CITY	STATE	MEXICAN STOCK 1/			OTHER LATIN-AMERICAN STOCK 1/			TOTAL LATIN-AMERICAN STOCK 1/			SPANISH SURNAME 3/	PUERTO RICAN STOCK 2/	TOTAL SPANISH-SPEAKING
				STOCK	STOCK	STOCK	STOCK	STOCK	STOCK	STOCK	STOCK	STOCK			
342. U.S. South Carolina		W. Charleston	S.C.	1,349			1,056			1,405			1,114	2,519	
343. U.S. South Dakota				253			205			458			124	582	
344. U.S. Tennessee				805			1,334			2,139			499	2,638	
345. U.S. Texas				523			1,655			11,017			6,540	1,448; 874	
346. U.S. Utah				557			10,557			502	907		6,464	6,937	
347. U.S. Vermont				81			3,120			307			321	388	532; 215
348. U. Virginia				353			5,110			5,086			26,439	9,410	
349. U.S. Washington				84			11,084			3,182			14,266	1,738	16,004
350. U.S. West Virginia				520			3,532			511			1,031	252	1,283
351. U. Wisconsin				705			2,6,705			2,107			8,812	3,574	12,386
352. U. Wyoming				773			2,773			266			3,039	502	3,089

1/ Stock includes persons either foreign-born or born of one or both foreign-born parents.

2/ Puerto Rican stock includes persons born either in Puerto Rico or of one or both Puerto Rican parents. Puerto Rican parents include persons born in Puerto Rico and persons born elsewhere of Puerto Rican parents.

3/ Spanish surnames includes only native born persons born of native born parents.

Part I (Scrapings)

Sources: U.S. Census of the Population: 1960, Final Reports PC (1)-D Series, PC (2)-1D and PC (2)-1B.

Tucson

132,000

Total Hispanic Population

2,000,000

Phoenix

132,000

Total Hispanic Population

2,000,000

Tucson

132,000

Total Hispanic Population

2,000,000

Tucson

132,000

Total Hispanic Population

2,000,000

Phoenix

132,000

Total Hispanic Population

2,000,000

Phoenix

132,000

Total Hispanic Population

2,000,000

Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960Table 2
SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION OF SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950 & 1960

Area	1950		1960		Percent Spanish Surname
	Total Population	Spanish Surname	Total Population	Spanish Surname	
<u>Arizona</u>	1,302,161	194,356	975,161	132,644	14.9
<u>Phoenix</u>	663,510	78,996	548,084	36,430	11.9
<u>Tucson</u>	265,660	44,481	204,572	16,607	16.7
<u>Urban</u>	970,616	145,538	777,061	108,017	15.0
<u>Rural</u>	1,331,545	48,618	198,100	84,627	49.595
<u>California</u>	15,717,204	1,426,538	13,028,692	1,261,974	9.7
<u>Bakersfield</u>	76,291,984	6,29,219	62,242,358	4,20,407	10.0
<u>Fresno</u>	365,945	61,418	276,962	27,565	16.8
<u>Los Angeles-Long Beach</u>	6,742,696	5,466,352	594,476	9.3	311,294
<u>Sacramento</u>	502,778	30,078	434,748	37,952	6.0
					14,883
					5.4

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

1950

1960

1950

1960

1950

1960

1950

1960

1950

1960

1950

1960

Table 2 (continued)

City or County	Total Population	1960		1950		1940		1930		1920	
		Spanish Surname	Nonwhite	Spanish Surname	Nonwhite	Spanish Surname	Nonwhite	Spanish Surname	Nonwhite	Spanish Surname	Nonwhite
<u>California</u>											
<u>San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario Area</u>	2,307,612	2,111,504	1,752,222	1,313,733	1,153,035	1,527,311	1,382,222	1,527,311	1,382,222	1,527,311	1,382,222
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	809,782	96,401	675,166	537,303	457,035	757,311	38,215	11.9	11.9	11.9	11.9
San Diego	1,033,011	64,810	911,261	56,940	56,940	1,021,233	1,021,233	1,021,233	1,021,233	1,021,233	1,021,233
San Francisco-Oakland	2,783,359	177,239	2,259,426	346,694	346,694	2,507,215	1,701,701	1,701,701	1,701,701	1,701,701	1,701,701
San Jose	642,315	76,755	543,870	20,690	20,690	508,067	30,130	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2
Santa Barbara	168,962	22,267	140,520	6,175	6,175	121,471	121,471	13.2	13.2	13.2	16.7
Stockton	249,989	30,585	194,657	24,747	24,747	194,657	194,657	12.2	12.2	12.2	19.8
<u>Urban</u>	13,573,155	1,218,115	11,201,691	11,153,349	11,153,349	11,153,349	2,029,000	2,029,000	2,029,000	2,029,000	2,029,000
<u>Rural</u>	2,144,049	208,423	1,827,001	108,625	108,625	1,827,001	1,827,001	1,827,001	1,827,001	1,827,001	1,827,001
<u>Colorado</u>	1,753,947	157,173	1,543,527	53,247	53,247	1,543,527	1,543,527	9.0	9.0	9.0	8.9
Colorado Springs	143,742	16,135	131,572	11,720	11,720	131,572	131,572	4.3	4.3	4.3	3.1
Denver	969,383	60,294	829,934	57,973	57,973	829,934	829,934	6.5	6.5	6.5	4.8
Pueblo	118,707	25,437	90,648	2,622	2,622	90,648	90,648	21.4	21.4	21.4	16.4

Table 2 (continued)

3

Geographic Area	Total Population	1960		1950		Percent Spanish Surname
		Spanish Surname	Other White	Total Population	Nonwhite	
<u>Urban</u>	1,292,790	108,025	1,138,762	46,003	46,253	8.4
<u>Rural</u>	461,157	49,148	404,765	7,244	7,460	10.7
<u>New Mexico</u>	1,951,023	269,122	660,641	75,260	75,473	28.3
<u>City, town, or townsite</u>						
Albuquerque	262,199	68,101	185,347	8,751	8,751	26.0
<u>Urban</u>	626,479	155,222	446,616	24,641	24,800	24.8
<u>Rural</u>	324,544	113,903	160,025	50,619	50,619	35.1
<u>Others</u>	7,063,607	3,023,607	9,930	1,201,930	1,201,930	14.8
<u>Texas</u>	9,579,677	1,417,810	6,957,021	1,204,846	1,033,768	13.4
<u>City, town, or townsite</u>						
Abilene	120,377	6,676	107,832	5,869	(3,248) ^a	5.5
Big Spring-Tyler			23,733	8,733	1,948 ^b	2.7
Amarillo	149,493	4,004	137,430	8,059	8,059	2.2
<u>Austin</u>	212,136	26,072	158,840	27,224	27,224	12.3
<u>Beaumont-Port Arthur</u>	306,016	8,119	234,496	63,401	63,401	2.7

^a 1960 U.S. Census of Population, Texas, 1960, Vol. 1, General Population, Part 1, Summary Tables, Table 1.

^b 1960 U.S. Census of Population, Texas, 1960, Vol. 1, General Population, Part 1, Summary Tables, Table 1.

Table 2 (continued)

Area	Total Population	1960			1950		
		Spanish Surname	Other White	Nonwhite	Percent Spanish Surname	Percent Spanish Surname	Percent Spanish Surname
Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito	151,098	96,744	53,133	5,121	64.0	(81,080)	64.8
Corpus Christi	221,573	84,386	126,794	10,393	38.1	(358,939)	35.6
Dallas	1,083,601	36,990	888,630	157,981	3.4	(1,032,14,430)	3.9
El Paso	354,070	113,693	166,562	210,515	43.6	89,555	45.9
Fort Worth	573,215	2219,966	491,813	5,436	3.5	TOT 8,552	2.2
Galveston-Texas City	140,384	811,872	98,425	30,967	58.5	TOT 6,914	56.1
Houston	243,158	3075,013	918,672	249,473	56.0	39,471	54.9
Laredo	64,791	52,784	12,726	281	79.9	47,525	84.7
Lubbock	156,271	17,003	126,799	12,469	10.9	47,477	16.4
Midland	67,717	4,423	12,395	12,033	6.5	11,584	6.5
Odessa	90,925	27,000	56,981	6,313	30.4	1,599	3.8
			OFFICE 1,746	1,746	7.3	7.7	7.3
			79,120	4,875	6.1	6.1	6.1
						TOT 1,599	1,599

Table 5 (continued)

Total
Population
1960
1950

Table 2 (continued)

Area	Total Population	Spanish Surname	1960		1950	
			Other White	Nonwhite	Percent Spanish Surname	Percent Spanish Surname
Texas (cont.)						
San Angelo	64,630	8,876	52,551	3,203	13.7	6,896
San Antonio	687,151	257,090	382,666	47,395	37.4	176,877
Texarkana	91,657	652	68,464	22,541	0.7	N.A.*
Tyler	86,350	613	62,353	23,384	0.7	N.A.*
Waco	150,091	7,801	118,069	24,221	5.2	4,445
Wichita Falls	129,638	3,494	117,036	9,108	2.7	1,808
Urban	7,187,470	1,114,050	5,106,738	905,089	15.5	704,112
Rural	2,392,207	303,760	1,783,690	299,757	12.7	329,656
						11.5

*Not available.

Note: Figures in parenthesis are for areas which were not classified as Standard Metropolitan Areas in 1950 but are comparable.

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PC(1)-B Series, FC(2)-1B and PHC(1) Series; U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Final Reports P-A and P-E No. 3C.

T₂₅T₂₁

(continued)

Sample	Preparation	Temperature (°C.)	Time (hrs.)	Weight loss (%)
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	10	25.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	20	30.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	30	35.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	40	40.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	50	45.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	60	50.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	70	55.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	80	60.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	90	65.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	100	70.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	110	75.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	120	80.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	130	85.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	140	90.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	150	95.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	160	98.0
T ₂₅	Pyrolysis	300	170	100.0

Sample	Preparation	Temperature (°C.)	Time (hrs.)	Weight loss (%)
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	10	20.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	20	25.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	30	30.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	40	35.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	50	40.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	60	45.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	70	50.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	80	55.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	90	60.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	100	65.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	110	70.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	120	75.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	130	80.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	140	85.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	150	90.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	160	95.0
T ₂₁	Pyrolysis	300	170	100.0

It is evident from the above data that the weight loss at 300°C. is considerably greater for samples prepared by the pyrolytic method than for samples prepared by the thermal method.

It is also evident that the weight loss at 300°C. is considerably greater for samples prepared by the thermal method than for samples prepared by the pyrolytic method.

Table 3

PUERTO RICAN POPULATION BORN IN PUERTO RICO AND OF PUERTO RICAN
PARENTAGE IN SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS:
CENSUS OF POPULATION, 1960

SMSA'S COPI	Total	Born in Puerto Rico COPI	Puerto Rican Parentage
United States, Total	892,513	617,056	275,457
New York, N.Y.	629,430	439,576	189,854
Chicago, Ill.	35,361	25,416	9,945
Philadelphia, Pa.	22,373	15,735	6,638
Jersey City, N.J.	14,911	10,784	4,127
Newark, N.J.	12,727	8,958	3,769
Miami, Fla.	11,804	8,687	3,117
Bridgeport, Conn.	6,006	4,371	1,635
Total SMSA'S, U.S.	732,612	513,527	219,085
SMSA Percent of U.S. Total	85.6	86.1	84.4

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC(1) Series and
COPI PC(2)-1D.

PC-12-4 (Rev. 12-1961)

Table 4
ESTIMATED PROPORTION AND GROWTH OF SPANISH SURNAME IN POPULATION IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1950-1960

State	1960		Percent		1950	
	Total Population	Spanish Surname Population	Growth Percent Spanish Surname	Spanish Surname 1950-60	Spanish Surname Population	Spanish Surname Percent
Arizona	1,302,161	194,356	14.9	51.4	128,318	17.1
California	15,717,204	1,426,538	9.1	87.6	760,453	7.2
Colorado	1,753,947	157,173	9.0	33.0	118,131	8.9
New Mexico	951,023	269,122	28.3	8.1	248,880	36.5
Texas	9,579,677	1,417,810	14.8	37.1	1,033,768	13.4
Total	29,304,012	3,464,999	11.8	51.3	2,289,550	

Source:—U.S.—Census-of-Population:—1960,—Final-Reports-PC-1(B)—Series,
1950 (1) Not available. (2) Not available (no source). (3) Estimated.
PC-1 (C) Series and PC(2)=1B; U.S. Census of Population: 1950,

Final Report P-E No. 3C.

Table 5

CHILD-WOMAN RATIO FOR SPANISH SURNAME, OTHER WHITE
SURNAMES AND NONWHITES, IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1960.

STATE	AREA	Spanish Surname Ratio	Other White Ratio	Nonwhite Ratio
<u>ARIZONA:</u>				
Phoenix		.896	.547	.850
Tucson		.776	.525	.762
<u>CALIFORNIA:</u>				
Bakersfield		.846	.557	.797
Fresno		.814	.511	.720
Los Angeles-				
Long Beach		.717	.493	.605
Sacramento		.702	.570	.691
San Bernardino-				
Riverside-Ontario		.786	.569	.787
San Diego		.705	.554	.755
San Francisco-Oakland		.605	.476	.613
San Jose		.778	.563	.590
Santa Barbara		.715	.527	.703
Stockton		.719	.490	.729
<u>COLORADO:</u>				
Colorado Springs		.839	.575	.725
Denver		.798	.554	.664
Pueblo		.837	.569	.614
<u>NEW MEXICO:</u>				
Albuquerque		.826	.592	.720
<u>TEXAS:</u>				
Abilene		.933	.527	.695
Austin		.899	.456	.593
Beaumont-Port Arthur		.622	.553	.678
Corpus Christi		.864	.543	.609
Dallas		.771	.510	.722

Table 5 (Continued)

Area	Spanish Surname	Other White	Ratio
	Catalan-Gallego Catalan-Spanish Other	White Nonwhite	Ratio
El Paso	.729	.664	.751
Fort Worth	.730	.526	.719
Galveston-Texas City	.742	.497	.637
Houston	.812	.531	.685
Laredo	.721	.757	1.017
Lubbock	1.201	.539	.877
Odessa	1.042	.577	.724
San Angelo	.813	.517	.693
San Antonio	.780	.544	.626
Waco	.858	.501	.693

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC(1) Series
and PC (1) - B Series.

NORTHWEST			
QSY.	QSY.	QSY.	Alaska-Columbia
QSP.	QSP.	QSP.	Oregon Coast
QSD.	QSD.	QSD.	Washington Coast
QSE.	QSE.	QSE.	Washington State
QSY.	QSY.	QSY.	Washington State
QST.	QST.	QST.	Washington State
MIDWEST			
QSY.	QSY.	QSY.	Michigan-Oscoda
QSD.	QSD.	QSD.	Michigan Upper Peninsula
QSE.	QSE.	QSE.	Michigan Lower Peninsula
SOUTHEAST			
QSY.	QSY.	QSY.	Alabama-Mississippi
QSP.	QSP.	QSP.	Georgia
QSD.	QSD.	QSD.	Tennessee
CENTRAL			
QSY.	QSY.	QSY.	Kansas
QSP.	QSP.	QSP.	Missouri
QSD.	QSD.	QSD.	Arkansas-Texas
SOUTHWEST			
QSY.	QSY.	QSY.	Arizona
QSP.	QSP.	QSP.	New Mexico
QSD.	QSD.	QSD.	Colorado
QSE.	QSE.	QSE.	Utah
QSY.	QSY.	QSY.	Nevada

Table 6

PERCENT OF SPANISH SURNAME, OTHER WHITE AND NONWHITE POPULATIONS 25 YEARS OR OVER WHO HAVE COMPLETED FOUR YEARS OF SCHOOL OR LESS AND FOUR YEARS OF HIGH SCHOOL OR MORE IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES

AREA	SPANISH SURNAME		OTHER WHITE		NON WHITE	
	4 years of school or less	4 years of H.S. or more	4 years of school or less	4 years of H.S. or more	4 years of school or less	4 years of H.S. or more
<u>ARIZONA</u>	35.0	14.7	3.6	53.3	37.5	15.7
Phoenix	42.7	12.5	3.7	52.8	21.2	22.3
Tucson	24.4	18.3	2.4	59.3	30.2	18.6
<u>CALIFORNIA</u>	23.9	24.5	3.6	54.8	12.0	39.7
Bakersfield	35.6	17.3	5.5	45.9	23.1	20.6
Fresno	42.1	12.6	6.9	46.2	19.1	29.6
Los Angeles -						
Long Beach	19.4	26.2	2.9	56.9	8.6	43.8
Sacramento	20.6	31.8	3.1	58.3	14.1	43.6
San Bernardino	29.0	17.8	3.4	52.9	12.8	31.7
San Diego	20.2	27.3	2.1	57.0	8.4	39.5
San Francisco	15.7	34.3	3.7	57.7	14.1	37.6
San Jose	25.4	22.2	3.8	60.2	11.7	51.2
Santa Barbara	30.0	20.1	2.6	61.3	16.1	34.5
Stockton	35.8	16.7	7.9	41.1	28.4	23.4
<u>COLORADO</u>	23.9	18.7	3.2	54.7	8.4	44.6
Colorado Springs	11.9	36.8	1.6	62.2	4.7	52.8
Denver	17.4	24.8	2.4	59.5	7.0	45.4
Pueblo	22.2	15.1	6.7	43.1	14.8	29.6
<u>NEW MEXICO</u>	29.6	18.9	3.6	57.1	39.2	19.1
Albuquerque	18.8	25.6	2.2	66.7	13.7	42.7
<u>TEXAS</u>	51.7	11.9	6.3	46.4	23.6	20.8
Abilene	56.3	12.3	5.6	50.4	21.2	24.1
Austin	53.6	12.1	7.0	56.2	18.0	24.1
Beaumont- Port Arthur	23.8	31.9	6.8	47.9	32.7	18.4
Corpus Christi	53.3	11.2	5.0	54.9	24.4	18.7
Dallas	40.0	18.8	4.5	53.0	18.8	23.7
El Paso	37.1	16.9	2.9	65.2	7.4	48.0
Fort Worth	28.4	25.5	4.5	49.0	17.7	22.6
Galveston Texas City	34.6	16.7	6.4	44.7	21.8	22.2
Houston	38.2	16.9	4.5	51.8	18.2	25.3

6-1057

THIS IS ANNUAL REPORT OF THE STATE OF KARNAKA
TO THE GOVERNOR OF KARNAKA
ON THE STATE OF KARNAKA
FOR THE YEAR 1956-57.

STATE NO.	NAME	STATEMENT		STATEMENT		NAME
		STATE NO.	STATE NO.	STATE NO.	STATE NO.	
7.25	2.72	3.25	3.0	7.41	6.23	<u>INDIA</u>
3.02	2.12	3.24	7.8	3.91	7.64	KARNATAKA
4.62	2.00	3.22	4.0	3.82	3.48	GOVT
7.82	0.81	3.42	3.5	2.42	2.68	<u>LEGISLATURE</u>
9.02	2.82	2.62	3.2	3.71	3.26	GOVT OFFICIAL
6.82	2.61	2.71	2.6	3.92	2.21	GOVT
						- GOVT OFFICIAL
3.81	2.0	3.82	2.9	2.82	3.21	GOVT PROB
3.61	2.41	3.22	1.2	3.42	3.01	GOVT MEMBERS
7.31	2.51	2.52	4.8	3.71	3.01	GOVT MEMBERS
3.92	4.8	3.12	1.8	3.72	2.63	GOVT MIN
7.12	2.42	3.12	7.8	3.42	3.21	GOVT MEMBERS
2.12	2.22	2.02	6.2	2.22	4.22	GOVT MIN
2.13	2.82	2.52	2.2	2.02	2.22	GOVT MEMBERS
4.22	2.32	2.52	2.7	3.82	3.23	GOVT MEM
3.42	2.0	2.42	2.6	2.82	2.22	<u>GOVT MEMBERS</u>
6.52	2.4	2.22	3.2	3.82	2.12	GOVT MEMBERS
4.82	2.7	2.42	4.2	3.42	4.72	GOVT
3.22	2.42	2.52	7.8	2.82	3.22	GOVT
1.92	2.72	2.12	3.5	2.82	2.22	<u>GOVT MEMBERS</u>
7.31	2.62	2.12	2.2	3.82	2.01	GOVT MEMBERS
3.02	2.22	2.62	2.6	3.12	2.22	GOVT MIN
1.42	2.12	2.02	2.2	2.82	2.02	GOVT MIN
2.12	2.62	2.22	2.7	2.82	2.22	GOVT MIN
						- GOVT MIN
4.81	2.02	3.72	2.9	3.42	6.52	GOVT MEMBERS
3.61	2.42	3.42	2.2	3.12	3.82	GOVT MEMBERS
7.42	2.32	3.62	2.4	3.82	3.02	GOVT MEM
6.72	2.7	3.12	2.2	3.62	2.42	GOVT MIN
3.72	2.72	2.22	2.7	3.82	2.22	GOVT MIN
3.22	2.72	2.22	2.3	3.82	2.22	GOVT MIN
						- GOVT MIN

Table 7

PERCENT OF PUERTO RICAN, OTHER WHITE AND NONWHITE POPULATIONS 25 YEARS OR OVER COMPLETING FOUR YEARS OR LESS OF SCHOOL AND FOUR YEARS OR MORE OF HIGH SCHOOL IN SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS: 1960

STANDARD METROPOLITAN AREA	PUERTO RICANS		OTHER WHITE		NONWHITE	
	4 years or less of school	4 years or more of school	4 years or less of H.S.	4 years or more of H.S.	4 years or less of school	4 years or more of school
New York	28.7	13.4	7.7	43.8	11.3	31.1
Chicago, I.L.	30.0	12.1	5.8	44.2	12.7	28.9
Philadelphia	30.9	13.6	5.8	41.5	14.1	23.5
Jersey City	28.9	13.1	8.6	29.5	15.9	21.5
Newark, N.J.	24.4	16.5	5.9	46.8	13.1	26.4
Miami, Fla.	24.2	26.1	5.1	50.7	24.0	18.1
Bridgeport	30.6	14.3	5.8	41.6	11.9	27.1
Total	28.2	12.9	7.5	42.7	12.0	29.7

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC(1) Series.

See column (I) of Bureau of the Census, *Final Report on School Enrollment, 1960*, PC(1) Series A-4, Appendix Table 1, *Census of Population: 1960* (PC-15-71), 1962, Vol. 1, p. 1.

Table 814P

PERCENT UNEMPLOYED OF CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, BY SEX, FOR SPANISH SURNAME,
 TOTAL WHITE AND NONWHITE POPULATIONS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES, 1950-
 1960. (IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ECONOMIC SURVEY
 DATA FROM WHICH THESE ARE DERIVED)

STATE	SPANISH SURNAME			TOTAL WHITE		NON WHITE	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Arizona	8.11	8.81	7.7	7.81	7.8	7.8	7.8
1950	7.81	13.4	4.4	12.4	6.3	11.3	7.8
1960	5.41	6.2	3.1	8.1	3.2	14.4	10.8
California	9.21	6.98	8.2	11.31	9.89	11.0	9.2
1950	11.81	13.0	8.8	15.9	9.2	13.9	14.1
1960	6.48	7.7	7.08	11.2	7.2	10.1	9.8
Colorado	9.11	8.18	8.2	8.31	8.38	8.0	8.0
1950	15.6	12.7		4.3	3.8	5.8	5.7
1960	9.5	8.91		3.8	4.1	6.7	6.4
New Mexico							
1950	11.0	6.6		5.8	3.8	6.3	4.1
1960	10.3	8.6		5.4	5.6	16.0	8.9
Texas							
1950	9.5	7.8		3.7	3.1	6.0	6.0
1960	8.2	8.2		4.0	4.3	7.3	6.7

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports, PC(1) C Series and
 PC(2)-1B; U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Final Reports P-A and
 P-E No. 3C.

Table 9

PERCENT UNEMPLOYED OF CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE FOR THE TOTAL,
PUERTO RICAN, OTHER WHITE AND NONWHITE POPULATIONS IN SE-
LECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS: 1960

SMSA'S	Total	Puerto Rican	Other white	Nonwhite
New York, N.Y.	4.4	9.7	3.8	6.8
Chicago, Ill.	4.0	8.6	3.0	10.5
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	4.7	12.5	3.7	10.6
Jersey City, N.J.	5.4	10.0	5.1	8.0
Newark, N.J.	3.8	9.2	3.1	8.3
Miami, Fla.	5.8	8.2	5.5	7.1
Bridgeport, Conn.	4.3	8.3	4.0	9.3
Baltimore, Md.	4.2	8.1	3.8	8.9
Hartford, Conn.	4.0	8.2	3.9	8.5
Stamford, Conn.	4.4	8.5	4.1	8.7
Worcester, Mass.	4.5	8.8	4.0	8.6
Boston, Mass.	4.5	8.5	4.1	8.8
Providence, R.I.	4.2	8.3	3.9	8.5
New Haven, Conn.	4.2	8.1	4.0	8.4
Albany, N.Y.	4.5	8.5	3.9	8.6
Portland, Me.	4.3	8.3	4.1	8.5
Oakland, Calif.	4.3	8.5	4.0	8.6
San Francisco, Calif.	4.6	8.8	4.2	8.7
Seattle, Wash.	4.2	8.3	3.9	8.5
Portland, Ore.	4.3	8.5	4.1	8.6
Tacoma, Wash.	4.4	8.6	4.0	8.7

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC(1) Series C.

Table 10

PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYED SPANISH SURNAME POPULATION,¹⁰
BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP, IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: NEW
MEXICO, COLORADO, TEXAS, ARIZONA AND CALIFORNIA
1950-1960

Major Occupation Group	Year	Ariz.	Last PERCENT				State
			Calif.	Colo.	New Mexico	Texas	
Total	1950	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, technical and kindred workers	1950	2.2	7.4	1.4	4.1	2.1	1.4
	1960	3.3	4.7	4.8	6.6	3.7	3.7
Farmers and farm managers	1950	1.5	2.2	6.3	10.7	4.2	4.2
	1960	.6	1.4	2.1	2.6	2.0	
Managers, officials and proprietors,	1950	3.9	4.3	3.0	4.3	4.4	4.4
	1960	3.5	3.7	2.8	4.6	4.1	
Clerical, sales and kindred workers	1950	10.6	10.6	7.4	10.5	10.1	10.1
	1960	10.4	13.9	11.0	15.4	12.8	
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	1950	10.6	11.1	7.6	10.7	10.1	10.1
	1960	10.7	12.3	9.7	12.4	11.8	
Operatives and kindred workers	1950	23.3	26.3	21.7	13.7	17.4	17.4
	1960	21.0	26.2	23.9	16.9	21.4	
Private household workers	1950	3.2	1.4	3.4	3.6	4.1	4.1
	1960	2.7	1.5	3.5	4.0	4.5	

Table 10 (continued)

Major Occupation Group	Year	PERCENT				
		Ariz.	Calif.	Colo.	New Mexico	Texas
Service workers, except						
private household	1950	8.8	7.0	8.7	9.7	8.2
in agriculture			33.1	14.0	33.5	
and 1960	9.8	7.8	13.3	15.0		9.8
Farm laborers, unpaid						
and farm foreman	1950	20.7	19.2	19.4	14.0	22.9
1960	22.6	12.3	8.5	6.8	13.3	
Laborers, except farm	1950		8.1	8.2		
and mine	1950	13.9	13.9	18.2	15.5	15.2
1960	10.9	9.7	15.3	11.2		11.8
Occupation not						
reported	1950	1.3	1.0	1.8	3.2	1.3
not over 14 (1) or under 16 (1) years old	1960	4.6	6.5	5.2	4.4	4.8
		.84-(C) or less	.84-(C) or less	.84-(C) or less		

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Report PC(2)-1B; U.S. Census of Population: 1950, Final Report P-E No. 3C.

Table 11

(Bureau of the Census)

**MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME OF THE TOTAL WHITE, SPANISH SURNAME,
AND NONWHITE POPULATIONS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1960**

S.6 State	T.Q Total	T.S White	C.P Nonwhite	Median Family Income, Dollars		
				S.8 Spanish Surname	S.9 Median Family Income, Dollars	S.10 Nonwhite
S.C	9,821	8,821	6,7	8,2		
S.Arizona	9,41	\$5,790.21	7,02	\$4,183	\$2,457	
S-California	9,3	6,857.81	8,53	65,533	4,971	
Colorado		5,816		4,108	4,531	
S-New Mexico	9,21	5,543.81	8,21	63,595	2,484	
S-Texas	9,42	5,239.8	9,01	62,914	2,591	
<i>Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PC(1)A Series, PC(1)C Series, and PC(2)-1B.</i>						

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960, Final Reports PC(1)A Series, PC(1)C Series, and PC(2)-1B.

Table 12

~~ANNUAL GROSS INCOME OF MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME AND MEDIAN
MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME 1959 FOR PUERTO RICANS, OTHER WHITES AND
NONWHITES IN SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS: 1960~~

SMSA	Total population	Puerto Rican	Other White	Nonwhite
New York, N.Y.	2,000,000	\$3,839	\$6,980	\$4,484
Chicago, Ill.	4,421,444	4,268	7,695	4,786
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	6,312,000	3,603	6,781	4,291
Jersey City, N.J.	9,000,000	3,976	6,319	4,450
Newark, N.J.	9,021,000	3,914	7,530	4,807
Miami, Fla.	1,621,000	3,723	5,724	3,367
Bridgeport, Conn.		4,147	6,922	4,527

.72 - (B)CH 640

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC (1) Series.

Table 13

PERCENT OF SPANISH SURNAME, TOTAL WHITE AND NONWHITE FAMILIES EARNING
 UNDER \$1,000 AND \$10,000 OR MORE IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES: 1960

State	Spanish Surname		Total White		Nonwhite	
	Under \$1,000	\$1,000 and over	Under \$10,000	\$1,000 & over	Under \$10,000	\$1,000 & over
Arizona	7.2	4.6	4.1	15.4	26.9	2.8
California	14.5	10.8	3.0	22.7	6.3	9.7
Colorado	6.4	4.8	3.5	14.8	6.3	6.5
New Mexico	11.3	4.5	5.6	15.0	28.2	3.4
Texas	13.6	2.7	6.3	13.1	18.0	1.5
U.S.	12.0	4.4	4.4	14.4	22.4	2.4

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports, PC(1)-C Series

and PC(2) - 1B.

(1) DATA FOR SPANISH SURNAME FAMILIES REFERRED TO AS SPANISH, C. N. (continued)

Table 14

PERCENT OF PUERTO RICAN, OTHER WHITE AND NONWHITE FAMILIES EARNING
UNDER \$1,000 AND \$10,000 OR MORE IN SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN
STATISTICAL AREAS: 1960

AREA	PUERTO RICAN		OTHER WHITE		NONWHITE	
	Under \$1,000	\$10,000 & over	Under \$1,000	\$10,000 & over	Under \$1,000	\$10,000 & over
New York, N.Y.	6.8	3.3	2.5	25.3	6.3	6.7
Chicago, Ill.	7.0	4.5	2.0	28.5	7.4	8.8
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	6.7	2.8	2.4	21.4	7.7	5.4
Jersey City, N.J.	5.6	2.4	2.6	16.4	5.9	5.6
Newark, N.J.	5.7	4.8	2.2	29.1	6.8	8.0
Miami, Fla.	8.6	3.8	5.3	15.8	8.4	1.7
Bridgeport, Conn.	7.0	2.8	2.2	21.1	8.4	6.2

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC(1) Series.

Table I

TO CZECHOSLOVAKIA
IN, THE RUSSIAN

Table 15
MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962

1/ This data excludes employment in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Overseas data is as of July 31, 1962 and covers U.S. citizens only in Department of State (including Agency for International Development and Peace Corps), Department of Defense, U.S. Information Agency, Panama Canal Company, and Canal Zone Government.

Source: President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Table 15 (contd.)

MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962
SPANISH-SPEAKING AND TOTAL EMPLOYMENT BY GRADE AND SALARY GROUPS

Pay Category	Total Employees	All Agencies	Summary, Spanish- Speaking Employees	Department of the Army		Department of the Navy		Department of the Air Force		Department of the Army Reserve	
				Total Employees	% Spanish- Speaking Employees	Total Employees	% Spanish- Speaking Employees	Total Employees	% Spanish- Speaking Employees	Total Employees	% Spanish- Speaking Employees
Up to \$4,499	104,210	7,302	7.0	23,106	1.5	1,306	5.7	16,384	3.8	13,653	3.3
\$4,500 to \$7,999	441,198	19,329	4.4	110,062	3.5	4,841	4.4	159,510	3.0	104,566	3.0
\$8,000 and over	23,708	161	0.7	4,978	5.5	513	1.0	9,032	0.7	220	2,999
Total Postal Field Service	516,047	8,618	1.5	242	7.3	107	1.0	167	1.0	13	243
FFS-1 thru 4	21,333	497,396	1.6	8,159	1.6	235	1.6	65	1.0	20	240
FFS-5 thru 11	75,016	455	0.6	455	0.6	102	0.6	102	0.6	102	0.6
FFS-12 thru 20	3,635	4	0.1	2	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1	1	0.1
Total Other Pay Categories	49,110	554	1.1	25,1,744	20	1.1	25,5,421	20	1.1	25,5,421	20
Up to \$4,499	112,635	233	1.8	95	1.0	95	1.0	112,635	0.1	112,635	0.1
\$4,500 to \$7,999	20,825	219	1.1	559	1.7	13,017	1.7	13,017	1.7	13,017	1.7
\$8,000 and over	15,950	102	0.6	230	0.9	230	0.9	230	0.9	230	0.9

2/ Includes 4th Class Postmasters and Rural Carriers.

RESERVE (CONT.)

51. Executive Branch Employment by Pay Category.

JO'S MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962

SPANISH-SPEAKING AND TOTAL EMPLOYMENT BY GRADE AND SALARY GROUPS

Post Office Department Department of Agriculture Department of Interior

Veterans Administration All Other Agencies

Pay Category	Total Employees	Spanish-Speaking Number							
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
TOTAL	1,227,215	157,763	9,618	1.5	55,093	992	1.8	92,104	1.6
Total Class. Act or E.O. 11471,538 or similar	41,892	565	1.3	78,661	794	1.0	110,869	1,401	1.3
GS-1 thru 4	280	52	1.8	11,757	264	2.2	2724,654	49702.0	55,618
GS-5 thru 11	748	97	1.3	23,320	329	1.2	38,44,180	12860.6	44,035
GS-12 thru 18	510	70	1.4	1,205	6,815	0.3	1302,9,827	11,201	11,216
Total Wage Board	39	40	1.0	11,764	410	3.5	11,477	682	5,9
Up to \$4,499	2	2	100	1,443	1,454	100	1,304	599	8.0
\$4,500 to \$7,999	35	7,733	1,164	2,135	3,955	1,231	13,656	269	2.0
\$8,000 and over	2	477	2	0.4	71	2.1	13,656	41,681	658
Total Postal Field Service	576,017	8,618	1.5	—	—	—	239	5,920	18

- PRIVATE CONTRACTORS AND OTHER FIELD OFFICES SPANISH SPEAKERS

ANNUAL GROSS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, 1962 FIGURES

DRAFT IN (CONT'D.)

Table 15 (contd.)

JO'S MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962

SPANISH-SPEAKING AND TOTAL EMPLOYMENT BY GRADE AND SALARY GROUPS

Post Office Department Department of Agriculture Department of Interior

Veterans Administration All Other Agencies

Pay Category	Total Employees	Spanish-Speaking Number							
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
TOTAL	1,227,215	157,763	9,618	1.5	55,093	992	1.8	92,104	1.6
Total Class. Act or E.O. 11471,538 or similar	41,892	565	1.3	78,661	794	1.0	110,869	1,401	1.3
GS-1 thru 4	280	52	1.8	11,757	264	2.2	2724,654	49702.0	55,618
GS-5 thru 11	748	97	1.3	23,320	329	1.2	38,44,180	12860.6	44,035
GS-12 thru 18	510	70	1.4	1,205	6,815	0.3	1302,9,827	11,201	11,216
Total Wage Board	39	40	1.0	11,764	410	3.5	11,477	682	5,9
Up to \$4,499	2	2	100	1,443	1,454	100	1,304	599	8.0
\$4,500 to \$7,999	35	7,733	1,164	2,135	3,955	1,231	13,656	269	2.0
\$8,000 and over	2	477	2	0.4	71	2.1	13,656	41,681	658
Total Postal Field Service	576,017	8,618	1.5	—	—	—	239	5,920	18

- PRIVATE CONTRACTORS AND OTHER FIELD OFFICES SPANISH SPEAKERS

ANNUAL GROSS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, 1962 FIGURES

DRAFT IN (CONT'D.)

SOURCES: U.S. BUREAU OF CENSUS, 1960 CENSUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING;
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, 1960 CENSUS OF INCOME.

Table 15 (contd.)

MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962

SPANISH-SPEAKING AND TOTAL EMPLOYMENT-BY GRADE AND SALARY GROUPS

Pay Category Salary Groups	Post Office Department		Department of the Interior		Department of Agriculture		Veterans Administration		All Other Agencies		
	Total Employees	Spanish- Speaking Number	Total Employees	Spanish- Speaking Number	Total Employees	Spanish- Speaking Number	Total Employees	Spanish- Speaking Number	Total Employees	Spanish- Speaking Number	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
PFS-1 thru 4 ^{2/}	497,396	8,159	1.6	6,124	1,071	17.4	6,124	1,071	1,124	1.3	
PFS-5 thru 11	75,016	455	0.6	7,740	70	0.5	37,925	745	0.2	35,105	70
PFS-12 thru 20	3,635	14	0.1	3,633	50	0.3	3,633	51	0.0	3,633	50
Total Other Pay Categories	15			1,437	17	1.2	1,966	1	0.1	4,057	2
Up to \$4,499	74,227	5,062	6.7	7,776	16	2.1	626	1	0.2	1,673	22
\$4,500 to \$7,999	115,494	10,717	9.2	12,585	1,065	8.3	12,585	1,065	5.3	35,058	32
\$8,000 and over	15,115	1,610	10.5	610	1	0.2	1,072	1	0.0	1,638	40
TOTAL	323,330	308,323		32,330	2,718		2,718	2,718		108	1.0
(Gross figures in thousands)											

2/ Includes 1st Class Postmasters and Rural Carriers.

NOTE: Data for Postmaster and Rural Carrier

in Post Office Department are not available

Total

Table 16

MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962
EMPLOYEES OF PUERTO RICAN ORIGIN IN SELECTED STATES

Pay Category	CONNECTICUT			NEW JERSEY			NEW YORK			PENNSYLVANIA			ALL SELECTED STATES (Combined Data)		
	Total Employees	Puerto Rican Employees Number	Puerto Rican Employees %	Total Employees	Puerto Rican Employees Number	Puerto Rican Employees %	Total Employees	Puerto Rican Employees Number	Puerto Rican Employees %	Total Employees	Puerto Rican Employees Number	Puerto Rican Employees %	Total Employees	Puerto Rican Employees Number	Puerto Rican Employees %
TOTAL	14,534	8	0.1	55,276	132	0.2	174,236	4,092	2.3	136,982	3,220	2.3	381,028	4,275	1.1
Total Class. Act. Major Similarities	4,536	1	2/	24,025	44	0.2	62,303	600	1.0	60,057	25	0.4	150,921	3,120	2%
GS-1 thru 4	1,552	1	0.1	7,798	20	0.3	21,208	427	2.0	21,114	5	0.3	51,672	5	0.9
GS-5 thru 11	2,336	2	0.2	11,376	19	0.2	31,679	162	0.5	31,401	16	2/	76,792	197	0.3
GS-12 thru 18	648	3	0.2	4,851	5	0.1	9,416	11	0.1	7,542	4	2/	22,457	20	0.1
Total Wage Board	1,633	1	0.1	12,280	56	0.5	33,818	1,417	4.2	37,179	14	2/	84,910	1,488	1.7
Up to \$1,499	270	6	0.4	1,787	14	1.8	5,596	772	13.8	4,353	4	0.1	11,006	791	7.2
\$4,500 to \$7,999	11,321	42	0.4	26,365	639	2.4	31,867	10	2/	70,600	6	0.1	691	11.0	2/
\$8,000 and over	42	446	11.0	11,047	42	0.4	1,857	6	0.3	959	5	0.5	3,304	1,045	0.2

1/ Includes 4th Class Postmasters and Rural Carriers.

2/ Minor Groups in Federal Employment June 1962

Source: President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Minority Groups in Federal Employment June 1962

Table 16 (contd.)

Pay Category ¹	MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962										ALL SELECTED STATES (Combined Data) ²		
	EMPLOYEES OF PUERTO RICAN ORIGIN IN SELECTED STATES												
Total	Puerto Rican	Total	Puerto Rican	Total	Puerto Rican	Total	Puerto Rican	Total	Puerto Rican	Total	Puerto Rican		
Employees	Number	%	Employees	Number	%	Employees	Number	%	Employees	Number	%		
Total Postal Field Service	8,229	6	18,493	2,271	12	0.2	76,686	2,046	2.7	36,086	1,175	4	
PFS-1 thru 4 1/2	7,330	6	16,354	2,6	16	0.2	69,172	1,994	2.9	30,867	2,2	7	
PFS-5 thru 11	854	1	2,067	1	52	0.7	7,148	4,964	69	0.7	15,033	53	0.3
PFS-12 thru 20	45	1	72	1	32	0.1	366	738	20	0.2	2,792	12	0.2
Total Other Pay Categories	12,136	12	3,063	478	15	1.6	31,429	2,9	9.2	20,200	3,660	18	
Up to \$4,499	70	4	345	4	12	1.2	538	115	2.8	2,074	2	1	
\$4,500 to \$7,999	53	—	95	—	100	—	616	12	1.9	1,156	13	1.1	
\$8,000 and over	13	—	38	—	100	—	275	2	7	430	2	0.3	

1/ Includes 4th Class Postmasters and Rural Carriers.

2/ Less than 0.05 percent.

TABLE 17
MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962
EMPLOYEES OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
EMPLOYEES OF MEXICAN ORIGIN IN SELECTED STATES

Pay Category	Total Employees	Mexican Origin No.	% Total Employees	CALIFORNIA		COLORADO		NEW MEXICO		TEXAS		ALL SELECTED STATES ³ (Combined Data)						
				Mexican Origin No.	% Total Employees	Mexican Origin No.	% Total Employees	Mexican Origin No.										
TOTAL	19,054	1,387	7.3	246,095	7,900	3,283	35.562	2,939	8,332	23,622	33,404	16,911	118,907	17,538	14.7	443,240	33,768	7.6
Total Class. Act. or Similar	10,077	313	3.1	102,499	1,626	1.6	20.581	563	2.7	14,726	300	57,911	4,945	8.5	205,794	9,183	4.5	
GS-1 thru 4	3,775	163	4.3	36,563	949	2.6	7,353	396	5.4	5,038	25	20,009	20.0	20	72,772	5,227	7.3	
GS-5 thru 11	5,313	148	2.8	51,596	632	1.2	10,124	165	1.6	7,476	681	9.1	31,176	7	2,168	105,685	3,794	3.6
GS-12 thru 18	18,665	989	5.2	14,320	1,104	6.1	0.1	2,212	461	2.1	36,712	4	673	1.0	327,337	30,162	10.6	
Total Wage Board	5,514	773	14.0	85,976	4,615	5.4	8,584	2,092	24.4	6,260	2,138	34.1	10,642	30.6	14,070	20,260	14.4	
Up to \$4,499	4,411	85	11.5	10,248	136	5.5	1,917	434	21.9	1,615	662	41.0	10,672	41.2	(17,487)	5,716	32.7	
\$4,500 to \$7,999	4,572	684	15.0	78,581	4,448	5.7	6,486	1,655	25.5	4,477	1,451	32.4	23,664	6,237	26.4	117,780	14,475	12.3
\$8,000 and over	201	4	2.0	4,913	31	0.6	121	3	1.5	14.9	400	6	5,803	69	1.5	10,425	1,042	1.2

Source: President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

Table 17 (cont'd.)

TABLE 17 (cont'd.)
 MINORITY GROUPS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT, JUNE 1962
 EMPLOYEES OF MEXICAN ORIGIN IN SELECTED STATES

Pay Category	ARIZONA			CALIFORNIA			COLORADO			NEW MEXICO			TEXAS			ALL SELECTED STATES (Combined Data)			
	Mexican Origin No.	Total Em- ployees No.	%	Mexican Origin No.	Total Em- ployees No.	%	Mexican Origin No.	Total Em- ployees No.	%										
Total Postal Field Service	3,217	294	9.1	53,180	1,639	3.1	6,174	281	4.5	2,085	54	2.6	24,974	1,893	7.6	89,630	4,161	4.6	
PFS-1 thru 4 1/	2,795	269	9.6	47,399	1,583	3.3	5,377	272	5.1	1,685	52	3.1	21,390	1,838	8.6	78,646	4,014	5.1	
PFS-5 thru 11	409	25	6.1	5,374	55	1.0	708	9	1.3	394	2	0.5	3,367	55	1.6	10,252	1,146	1.4	
PFS-12 thru 20	13	1	0.2	407	1	0.2	895	6	0.7	394	1	0.2	217	1	0.5	732	1	0.1	
Total Other Pay Categories	246	7	2.8	4,440	20	0.4	7,223	35	1.3	551	76	13.8	1,286	0	58	4,5	6,746	164	2.4
Up to \$4,499	107	4	3.7	427	4	0.9	126	2	1.6	196	49	25.0	677	15	48	7.1	1,533	107	7.0
\$4,500 to \$7,999	91	3	3.3	2,938	11	0.4	57	1	1.7	243	26	10.7	469	9	1.9	3,798	50	1.3	
\$8,000 and over	48			1,075	5	0.5	40			112	11	0.9	140	1	0.7	1,457	7	0.5	

1/ Includes 4th Class Postmasters and Rural Carriers.

CONDITION OF HOUSING UNITS OCCUPIED BY SPANISH SURNAME,
OTHER WHITE AND NONWHITE POPULATIONS IN STANDARD METRO-
POLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN STATES

Table 18

AREA	SPANISH SURNAME		OTHER WHITE		NONWHITE	
	Percent Deter- iorating dated	Percent Dilapi- orating	Percent Deter- iorating	Percent Dilapi- orating	Percent Deter- iorating	Percent Dilapi- orating dated
<u>Arizona</u>						
Phoenix	27.0	15.6	9.8	8.0	3.7	26.7
Tucson	19.9	11.7	8.0	5.5	2.5	23.5
<u>California</u>						
Bakersfield	25.3	14.0	16.5	6.5	24.9	12.1
Fresno	27.4	19.8	14.1	5.9	24.9	18.2
Los Angeles— Long Beach	15.3	5.1	5.6	1.1	12.8	2.6
Sacramento	17.2	4.8	9.1	2.2	21.2	7.8
San Bernardino— Riverside-Ontario	19.6	7.7	11.3	2.9	19.9	13.0
San Diego	15.2	5.6	7.2	1.7	19.3	6.0
San Francisco— Oakland	10.1	3.8	6.8	1.5	16.4	5.1
San Jose	14.8	8.5	5.3	1.8	13.9	5.9
Santa Barbara	23.0	10.3	7.3	2.4	18.3	13.3
Stockton	21.7	8.8	13.0	5.2	24.0	13.8
<u>Colorado</u>						
Colorado Springs	6.5	6.5	11.7	2.7	30.3	9.4
Denver	26.0	5.7	9.1	1.5	26.4	3.5
Pueblo	26.9	15.0	19.9	7.8	25.1	18.2

Table 18 (continued) ~~THE OUTPUT SURNAMES OF SPANISH SURNAME NO. POPULATION~~

AREA	SPANISH SURNAME				NONWHITE			
	Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent	
	Deteriorating	Dilapidated	Deteriorating	Dilapidated	Deteriorating	Dilapidated	Deteriorating	Dilapidated
New Mexico								
Albuquerque	18.1	11.0	17.1	2.2	18.2	13.6		
Texas								
Abilene	26.4	2.2	30.0	15.5	6.1	31.0	34.1	
Austin	24.6	2.8	18.1	11.3	4.3	26.1	21.8	
Beaumont	11.9	1.5	6.0	7.0	3.1	13.1	10.0	
Port Arthur	20.3	6.6	15.4	4.3	30.0	16.1		
Corpus Christi	28.1	12.1	13.8	7.5	30.0	11.0		
Dallas	26.6	7.5	11.2	3.3	30.8	14.6		
El Paso	22.4	14.5	9.8	2.5	16.5	6.7		
Fort Worth	19.5	8.4	12.8	3.9	24.9	13.4		
Galveston-Texas City	26.3	12.8	21.1	6.1	28.7	18.9		
Houston	23.7	6.1	10.4	2.4	24.6	6.6		
Laredo	31.2	22.7	14.2	3.6	19.6	17.4		
Lubbock	38.5	18.0	12.4	3.3	32.4	27.0		
Odessa	30.6	14.0	13.5	5.1	28.8	36.0		
San Angelo	32.4	12.6	14.3	3.4	33.9	12.7		
San Antonio	24.9	12.6	11.7	3.7	23.6	9.5		
Waco	32.5	13.6	14.4	6.2	28.6	28.8		

Sources: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC (1) Series;
U.S. Census of Housing: 1960, Final Reports HC (1) Series.

Table 19

CONDITION OF HOUSING UNITS OCCUPIED BY PUERTO RICAN, OTHER WHITE
AND NONWHITE POPULATIONS IN SELECTED STANDARD METROPOLITAN
STATISTICAL AREAS: 1960

AREA	PUERTO RICAN		OTHER WHITE		NONWHITE	
	Percent Deter- iorating	Percent Dilapi- dated	Percent Deter- iorating	Percent Dilapi- dated	Percent Deter- iorating	Percent Dilapi- dated
Bridgeport, Conn.	20.1	3.1	9.3	1.3	23.2	10.3
Chicago, Ill.	28.9	7.1	8.3	1.5	24.1	7.0
Jersey City, N.J.	46.7	12.0	12.1	2.4	29.2	14.7
Miami, Fla.	17.1	9.1	6.4	1.4	17.3	8.9
New York, N.Y.	29.4	10.3	8.6	1.7	24.6	8.3
Newark, N.J.	35.4	5.6	8.1	1.5	32.7	14.2
Philadelphia, Pa.-N.J.	31.8	4.2	6.9	1.4	23.7	6.5

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC (1) Series.

Table 20

(Continued) CS of 1960

PERCENT OF HOUSING UNITS OCCUPIED BY SPANISH SURNAME, OTHER
 CO. & WHITE AND NONWHITE WITH .50 OR LESS PERSONS PER ROOM
 CITIES TO AND 1.01 OR MORE PERSONS PER ROOM IN FIVE SOUTHWESTERN
 STATES: 1960

S. 25 SMSA	S. 18	CITIES					
		SPANISH SURNAME		OTHER WHITE		NONWHITES	
		.50 or less	1.01 or more	.50 or less	1.01 or more	.50 or less	1.01 or more
<u>Arizona</u>							
Phoenix	8.42	8.01	8.82	6.12	8.11	32.2	35.6
Tucson	8.42	13.8	46.7	37.2	11.9	27.1	39.5
<u>California</u>							
Bakersfield	8.42	16.5	40.7	37.5	12.2	32.2	25.9
Fresno	8.42	16.1	42.3	43.7	9.1	31.1	23.0
Los Angeles- Long Beach	8.42	22.1	7.26.9	8.44.9	6.51	35.2	17.7
Sacramento	8.42	24.0	7.21.0	8.39.4	8.5	27.7	18.8
San Bernardino- Riverside-Ontario	8.42	19.5	8.32.9	8.43.3	9.3	32.3	25.2
San Diego	8.42	20.8	27.4	39.9	9.1	26.9	23.9
San Francisco- Oakland	8.42	30.0	8.16.5	7.46.7	5.51	29.1	20.0
San Jose	8.42	20.3	29.3	40.3	6.6	26.2	17.4
Santa Barbara	8.42	23.3	30.3	44.3	7.6	30.6	21.0
Stockton (1)	8.42	22.9	30.1	43.4	18.8	27.9	21.2
<u>Colorado</u>							
Colorado Springs	17.9		31.6	42.5	9.0	31.5	23.3
Denver	19.2		31.1	43.5	7.9	36.4	16.9
Pueblo	11.9		47.3	39.6	13.1	36.2	20.0
<u>New Mexico</u>							
Albuquerque	16.5		39.6	37.6	10.1	22.5	35.3

Table 20 (Continued)

SMSA	SPANISH SURNAME		OTHER WHITE		NONWHITES	
	1.00 or less	1.01 or more	0.50 or less	1.01 or more	0.50 or less	1.01 or more
<u>Texas</u>						
Abilene	11.0	53.5	39.1	11.5	28.0	32.4
Austin	13.0	49.2	10.4	43.5	67.9	37.3
Beaumont	Port Arthur	22.7	25.9	37.9	11.3	30.2
Corpus Christi	11.6	51.6	39.9	10.9	34.3	21.6
Dallas	18.4	40.2	43.6	8.5	30.4	28.5
El Paso	13.5	47.4	25.7	8.2	24.6	25.3
Fort Worth	21.2	32.0	40.3	9.6	33.9	26.1
G. Galveston-Texas City	20.2	36.3	41.2	9.2	33.6	24.0
Houston	18.0	39.3	42.5	8.5	34.8	24.6
Laredo	17.3	47.8	36.7	9.6	N.A.*	N.A.*
Lubbock	8.3	47.2	35.7	12.3	21.0	42.4
Odessa	7.5	61.6	27.6	15.9	19.4	43.3
San Angelo	12.9	49.9	44.7	9.6	41.8	21.7
San Antonio	15.2	44.7	43.4	9.8	36.7	20.5
Waco	15.7	41.7	46.3	8.3	37.9	26.0
Others	8.2	4.3	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
*.Totals not available.	8.4	8.0	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.6

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC (1) Series;

U.S. Census of Housing: 1960, Final Reports HC (1) Series.

						Other
8.65	8.13	0.9	8.94	8.13	8.71	8.71
8.61	4.83	8.7	8.64	1.13	8.01	8.01
8.02	8.83	1.61	8.22	8.74	8.11	8.11
8.66	8.98	1.01	8.73	8.63	8.61	8.61

Table 21

PERCENT OF HOUSING UNITS OCCUPIED BY PUERTO RICAN, OTHER WHITE
AND NONWHITE WITH .50 OR LESS PERSONS PER ROOM AND
1.01 OR MORE PERSONS PER ROOM IN SELECTED
STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS: 1960

SMSA	PUERTO RICAN		OTHER WHITE		NONWHITE	
	.50 or less	1.01 or more	.50 or less	1.01 or more	.50 or less	1.01 or more
Bridgeport, Conn.	7.0	36.4	42.6	6.9	28.3	24.5
Chicago, Ill.	6.4	45.9	41.0	7.8	24.9	27.4
Jersey City, N.J.	8.6	40.0	40.2	8.5	30.9	24.2
Miami, Fla.	19.0	30.7	45.7	7.2	20.2	35.3
New York, N.Y.	12.1	38.3	37.6	7.9	28.6	22.1
Newark, N.J.	13.0	38.6	44.3	5.1	31.6	20.4
Philadelphia, Pa.-NJ	14.9	37.8	49.3	4.8	40.8	16.6

Source: U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Final Reports PHC(1) Series.

WITHIN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA TO PROVIDE
FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN THE
FORM OF LAND OR BUILDINGS FOR USE AS
GOVERNMENTAL OR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES;

NAME OF COMPANY	COST IN U.S. DOLLARS			COST IN CANADIAN DOLLARS			NAME OF COMPANY
	10. 00	10. 00	10. 00	10. 00	10. 00	10. 00	
McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.48	2.48	McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.
McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.73	4.73	McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.
McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.	5.45	5.45	5.45	5.45	5.45	5.45	McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.
McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.	8.53	8.53	8.53	8.53	8.53	8.53	McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.
McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.	11.25	11.25	11.25	11.25	11.25	11.25	McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.
McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.	14.05	14.05	14.05	14.05	14.05	14.05	McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.
McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.	16.61	16.61	16.61	16.61	16.61	16.61	McGraw-Hill Co., Inc.

Source: (a) All figures in U.S. \$ U.S. \$ converted to Canadian \$ at rate of 1.00 : 1.00

APPENDIX B

- SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY
- ANNUAL INSTITUTE OF RACE RELATIONS; 11th (Fisk University, Nashville, Tenn., June 28-July 10, 1954). "Social and Cultural Integration in the Southwest," a paper presented by Lyle Saunders, July 2, 1954.
- BERLE, BEATRICE B. Eighty Puerto Rican Families in New York City. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1958.
- CALIFORNIA (STATE). DIVISION OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES. FEPC First Annual Report, June 1961. Sacramento, 1961.
- . "Report to Governor Edmund G. BROWN on Discrimination in Employment." ---. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF. Preliminary Report on Survey of Active Apprentices. April, 1962. Sacramento, 1962.
- JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF. CRIMINAL STATISTICS, BUREAU OF. Narcotics Arrests and Their Dispositions in California, January 1, 1960-December 31, 1960. Los Angeles, 1961.
- (MICHIGAN C.S.) MICHIGAN HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION. The CENTER FOR HUMAN RELATIONS STUDIES. "Living in Chelsea," by Rhetta M. Arter. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1959.
- CLARK, MARGARET. Health in the Mexican American Culture. Berkeley, California, Univ. Press, 1959.
- CLARK, VICTOR S. Puerto Rico and its Problems. Washington, D.C., Brookings Institution, 1930.
- COLORADO. STATE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION COMMISSION. Seventh Annual Report, 1960-1961. Denver, Colo., 1962.
- COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, OFFICE OF. Facts and Figures About Puerto Rico. Washington, D.C., 1963.
- CONANT, JAMES B. Slums and Suburbs. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.
- COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS, and the PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON MIGRATORY LABOR (St. Louis, Mo., April 7-9, 1959). Co-Sponsored Mid-American Conference on Migratory Labor. Chicago, 1959.
- COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS. Social Change in Latin America Today. New York, Harper & Row, 1960.
- DEUTSCH, ALBERT. The Trouble With Cops. New York, Crown Pubs., Inc., 1955.
- GAMIO, MANUEL. Mexican Immigration to the United States: a Study of Human Migration and Adjustment. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1930.

A. MIGUEZKA

GRIFFITH, BEATRICE.

American Me. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1948.
INTER-AMERICAN EDUCATION

HANDLIN, OSCAR.

The Newcomer. New York, Anchor Books, 1962.

HANSON, EARL P.

Transformation: The Story of Modern Puerto Rico. New York, Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1955."Sociedad en el norteamericano Puerto Rico," in Social Class and Mental Illness.

HOLLINGSHEAD, AUGUST B. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

"The Spanish-Speaking Population of Texas," by Lyle Saunders.

Austin, University of Texas Press, 1949.

INTER-AMERICAN EDUCATION, OCCASIONAL PAPERS, NO. V.

"The Wetbacks in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas," by Lyle Saunders, and Olen Leonard. Austin, University of Texas Press, 1951.

"Strangers in our Fields," by Ernesto Galarza. Washington, D.C., 1956.

KIBBEE, PAULINE R.

Latin Americans in Texas. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 1946.

KINGREA, NELLIE W.

History of the First Ten Years of the Texas Good Neighbor Com-

mission, and Discussion of its Major Problems. Ft. Worth, Texas,

Texas Christian Univ. Press, 1954.

KLUCKHOHN, FLORENCE. Variations in Value Orientations. Evanston, Ill., Row, Peterson & Co., 1961.

KOOS, EARL L. The Health of Regionville. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1954.

LEO POTISHMAN FOUNDATION. "Grass-Roots Diplomat," by Marguerite Potter. Worth, Texas, Texas Christian Univ., 1961.

LOOMIS, CHARLES P.

Rural Social Systems, and Adult Education. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1953.

Rural Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1956.

LOS ANGELES (CALIF.) COMMUNITY RELATIONS CONFERENCE.
"Employment Discrimination in Southern California," January 25, 1960." Report of the Employment Committee. Los Angeles, 1960.

McDONAGH, EDWARD C. "Ethnic Relations in the United States." New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

MARDEN, CHARLES F. "Minorities in American Society," by Charles F. Marden and Gladys Meyer. 2nd ed. New York, American Book Co., 1962.

MIXER, KNOWLTON. "Porto Rico, History and Conditions." New York, Macmillan Co., 1926.

MORSE, ARTHUR D. "Schools of Tomorrow--Today." New York, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1960.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FARM LABOR. Information Letter No. 20. August 1962. New York, N.A.C.F.L., 1962.

"The Position of Farm Workers in Federal and State Legislation," by Robin Myers. New York, N.A.C.F.L., 1959.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC COUNCIL FOR THE SPANISH SPEAKING. 11th Annual Conference, Milwaukee, Wisc., May 7-10, 1962.

"The Border Crosser or Commuter Problem: New Developments," paper presented by Robert Sanchez. Milwaukee, Wisc., 1962.

"The Puerto Ricans in Seasonal Agricultural Work," paper presented by Salvador E. Ferreras. Milwaukee, Wisc., May 8, 1962.

"The Visero, or the Passport Mexican Program," paper presented by James H. Strauss. Milwaukee, Wisc., 1962.

NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE (NEW YORK). "Migrant Farm Labor in Colorado: a Study of Migratory Families," by Howard E. Thomas and Florence Taylor. New York, N.C.L.C., 1951.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION. RURAL EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF. "The Education of Migrant Children: a Study of the Educational Opportunities and Experiences of Agricultural Migrants," by Shirley E. Greene. Washington, D.C., N.E.A., 1954.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON POLICE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS. (8th Annual, May 20-25, 1962).

"Equal Protection Under Law--Fact or Fiction," paper presented by John A. Hannah. Ann Arbor, Kellogg Center for Continuing Education, Michigan State Univ., 1962.

NATIONAL SHARECROPPERS FUND, INC.

"The Condition of Farm Workers in 1959." Report to the Board of Directors, by Fay Bennett. New York, N.S.F.I., 1959.

"The Condition of Farm Workers in 1961." Report to the Board of Directors, by Fay Bennett. New York, N.S.F.I., 1961.

NEW YORK (CITY) BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Plan for Integration. New York City Board of Education, 1963.

Progress Towards Integration, September 1-November 30, 1963 and Plans for the Immediate Future. New York City, Board of Education, 1963.

NEW YORK STATE COMMISSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS.

The Puerto Rican Population of the New York City Area; Population of New York State 1960. Its Report No. 2 (May 1962). New York, 1962.

OREGON, LABOR, BUREAU OF.

"Migrant Problems Demand Attention," by Tom Current and Mark M. infants. Salem, 1959.

PADILLA, ELENA.

Up From Puerto Rico. New York, Columbia Univ. Press, 1958.

PAUL, BENJAMIN D. (ed.)

Health, Culture and Community. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1955.

PEARCE, THOMAS M. (ed.)

Southwesterners Write. Albuquerque, N.M., University of New Mexico Press, 1947.

PETERSON, WILLIAM. The Negro Population. New York, Macmillan Company, 1961.

The POTOMAC INSTITUTE. (including) Remarks of Lyndon B. Johnson, States Executive Authority to Promote Civil Rights. Washington, D.C., Potomac Institute, 1963.

RAND, CHRISTOPHER. The Puerto Ricans. New York, Oxford Univ. Press, 1958.

REGIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMUNITY LEADERS ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY, Los Angeles, Calif. Remarks by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson. November 14, 1963.

RICHARDSON, RUPERT N. The Greater Southwest. Glendale, Calif., Arthur H. Clark Co., 1934.

ROSARIO, JOSE C. CHOLEMEX Y TINGUEO, GUA. Subject to Extinction. The Development of the Puerto Rican Jibaro and his Present Attitude Toward Society. San Juan, Puerto Rico, 1935.

SANCHEZ, GEORGE I.: Introduction to Slums. U.S. M. University of New Mexico, 1940.
 "Forgotten People." Albuquerque, N.M.; University of New Mexico, 1940.

SAUNDERS, LYLE.
Cultural Differences and Medical Care. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1954.

SENIOR, CLARENCE.
Strangers Then Neighbors. New York, Freedom Books, 1961.

SHELDON, PAUL M.
Mexican Americans in Urban Public High Schools. San Francisco, Calif., Rosenberg Foundation, 1959.

SHOTWELL, LUISA R.
The Harvesters: the Story of the Migrant People. New York, Doubleday & Co., 1961.

SMITH, CONSTANCE E.
Voting and Election Laws. New York, Oceana Publishers, Inc., 1960.

STONE, IRVING.
Men to Match my Mountains. New York, Doubleday & Co., 1956.

TAYLOR, PAUL S.
An American-Mexican Frontier. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 1934.

TEXAS GOOD NEIGHBOR COMMISSION.
Texas: Friend and Neighbor. Austin, Von Boeckmann-Jones Press, 1961.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO).
Cultural Patterns and Technical Change. Margaret Mead, ed. New York, Unesco Press, 1953.

U.S. AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF. ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE.
 "Education and Earnings of the Hired Farm Working Force of 1960," by James D. Cowhig. Its Bulletin No. 262. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

"The Hired Farm Working Force of 1959," Its Information Bulletin, No. 238. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1961.

"The Hired Farm Working Force of 1960." Its Bulletin No. 266. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

U.S. AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF. ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE.
Its Bulletin No. 267. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

U.S. AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT OF. ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE.
Its Bulletin No. 268. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

U.S. CENSUS, BUREAU OF. U.S. CENSUS OF POPULATION: 1950. Special Reports, Part 3, Chapter C, Persons of Spanish Surname. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1953.

Special Reports, Part 3, Chapter D, Puerto Ricans in Continental United States. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1953.

U.S. CENSUS OF POPULATION: 1960. Subject Reports of Persons of Spanish Surname, Final Report PC(2)-1B. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1963.

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS. 1959 Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1959.

1961 Report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (5 vols.) Vol. 2. Education: Vol. 4. Housing: Vol. 5. Justice. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1961.

Conference in Nashville, Tenn., Before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Education. (March 1959). Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1959.

Hearings in Los Angeles and San Francisco, Before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. (January 1960). Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1960.

Hearings in New York City, Atlanta, and Chicago, Housing. (February, April, May 1959). Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1959.

Hearings in Washington, D.C. (Conference with Federal Housing Officials). Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1959.

Hearings in Newark, New Jersey (September 11-12, 1962). Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. Testimony of John Edgar Hoover, Director, January 24, 1962. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

U.S. CONGRESS. HOUSE. APPROPRIATIONS, OFFICE ON. Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1963 Appropriations. Testimony of John Edgar Hoover, Director, January 24, 1962. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

U.S. CONGRESS. SENATE. LABOR AND WELFARE, COMMITTEE ON. Hearings ... on Migratory Labor. Part II. February 8-9, 1962. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

U.S. DEFENSE, DEPARTMENT OF. Voting Information. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1962.

U.S. IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE. Annual Report, 1961. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1961.

U.S. LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF. Farm Labor Fact Book. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1959.

(SAC) OR, SUBDIVISION CHASING
 U.S. LABOR, DEPARTMENT OF, BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY, "Off"
 "Hired Farm Workers in the United States," by Albert Shastock
 and John R. Elliott. Its BES No. R-200. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1961.

U.S. LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. (LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE) OR, CHASING
 "Voter Qualifications for Voting: Summaries of State Laws Governing
 Voter Qualifications, Registration and Penalties for Violations."
 Washington, D.C., Library of Congress, Legislative Ref. Serv., 1961.

U.S. PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON MIGRATORY LABOR.

Migratory Labor in American Agriculture. Washington, D.C., 1951.
 (Subsidized by the Ford Foundation)

U.S. PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY.

Igualdad en las Oportunidades de Empleo Para Todos Los Ciudadanos
 de los Estados Unidos. Washington, D.C., 1963.

News Release. EEOP-132. September 27, 1963. Washington, D.C., 1963.

U.S. TREATIES AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL ACTS. (INFORMATION TO GO CIRCLED)
 Vol. 5. Edited by H. Miller. Washington, D.C., Govt. Print. Off., 1937.

WILLIAMS, ROBIN M., Jr. OR, CHASING
 "American Society: a Sociological Interpretation." New York, A.A. Knopf, 1952.

WOODS, (SISTER) FRANCES JEROME.

Cultural Values of American Ethnic Groups. New York, Harper & Row, 1956.

Mexican Ethnic Leadership in San Antonio, Texas. Washington, D.C., Catholic Univ. of America Press, 1949.

PERIODICALS. (OR, CHASING)
 "Catholic Social Action in the United States," by James Schulman.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 20:3 (1959).

"Attitudes of Puerto Ricans Toward Color," by Joseph Fitzpatrick.

"Conceptions of Health and Disease Among Spanish Americans," by Julian Samora. Vol. 22, no. 24 (1961).

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 19: 4 (1954).

"Subordinate Leadership in a Bi-Cultural Community: an Analysis," by James B. Watson, and Julian Samora.

ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, 195-196 (1953).

"From Colony to Commonwealth," by Dr. Antonio Fernos Isern.

ANNALS OF THE NEW YORK ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, 84: Art. 17 (1960).
 "Rural Healthways in New Mexico," by Sam Schulman.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, 210:3 (1962).

"You Can't Make Them Learn," by Dave Berkman.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA, ANTHROPOLOGICAL SERIES 13 (1948).

"Maternity Care in a Spanish American Community of New Mexico," by Sister M. Lucia Van der Eerden.

CHICAGO JEWISH FORUM, 20 (1961).

"The American of Mexican Descent," by George R. Sanchez. (SACI) .S.U
"Mexican Americans," section from U.S. and Mexican Social Survey
COMMONGROUND, 18 (1948). (SACI) .S.U. ON THE ONE SIDE .SACI .A noted one
"Those Gringos," by Malcolm Ross. .SACI .SACI .SACI

LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS, 21: 2 (1956). (SACI) TO YANKEE .S.U
"A Critical Analysis of the Wetback Problem," by Eleanor M. Hadley.

LULAC NEWS, 13 (1947). (SACI) according to YANKEE .S.C. notes below
"Our Classification--what is it?" by George Garza.

NEW YORK TIMES NO VOLUME NO NUMBER NO PUBLICATION .S.U
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION JOURNAL, 51: 5 (1962). (SACI) .SACI
"School dropouts," by Daniel Schreiber.

NEW REPUBLIC, 115: 13 (1946). (SACI) notes below and see section I
"Reconverting Mexican Americans," by Daniel L. Schorr. .SACI .SACI

NEWARK NEWS MAGAZINE, 773 (Sept. 1, 1957).

"Migrants Pose Problems for New Jersey Farmers Who Need Them," by
John T. Cunningham. .SACI

PACIFIC COAST SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY, PROCEEDINGS (1946). (SACI) .S.U
"Crime and Punishment Among Minority Groups in Los Angeles," by
Edwin M. Lemert, and Judy Rosberg. .SACI

PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, DAEDALUS, 90: 2 (1961). (SACI) notes below and see section I
"Mutual Images and Expectations of Anglo American and Mexican
Americans," by Ozzie G. Simmons.

RURAL SOCIOLOGY, 25: 2 (1960). (SACI) notes below and see section I
"The United States-Mexican Border: a Selective Guide to the Literature
of the Region," by Charles C. Cumberland.

THE REPORTER, 20: 2 (1959). (SACI) notes below and see section I
"The Forgotten People," by Paul Jacobs. .SACI .SACI .SACI

SOCIAL ACTION, 20: 6 (1954).

"Children of Misfortune," by Shirley E. Greene.

SOCIAL FORCES, 28: 4 (1950). (SACI) .SACI .SACI

"Dominant and Substitute Profiles of Cultural Orientation," by
Florence R. Kluckhohn.

SOCIAL ORDER, 10: 1 (1960). (SACI) notes below and see section I
"Economics of Migrant Labor," by Varden Fuller.

U.S. SOCIAL SECURITY BULLETIN, 25: 2 (1962). (SACI) notes below and see section I
"The Cuban Refugee Program," by James P. Mitchell.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PUBLICATIONS IN ECONOMICS, 7: 2 (1932).
"Mexican Labor in the United States, Chicago and the Calumet Region,"
by Paul S. Taylor.

GSA-WASH/DC 64-11193 30 MAY 1962 TO YANKEE LIBRARY FILE NO. 11193
(SACI)

RECORDED ON 11193 30 MAY 1962 BY YANKEE LIBRARY FILE NO. 11193

(SACI) 11193 30 MAY 1962 RECORDED TO YANKEE LIBRARY FILE NO. 11193
RECORDED ON 11193 30 MAY 1962 BY YANKEE LIBRARY FILE NO. 11193

(SACI) 8:00 PM MAY 1962 BY YANKEE LIBRARY
RECORDED ON 11193 30 MAY 1962 BY YANKEE LIBRARY FILE NO. 11193

(SACI) 8:00 PM MAY 1962 BY YANKEE LIBRARY FILE NO. 11193
RECORDED ON 11193 30 MAY 1962 BY YANKEE LIBRARY FILE NO. 11193